

**Evaluation of Annual Leadership Conference
A John A. Hartford Foundation Funded Project
for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Capacity Initiative**

A Report by The Measurement Group¹

5811A Uplander Way
Culver City, California 90230
310.216.1051

www.TheMeasurementGroup.com

Table of Contents

Background	1
Target Audience and Invited Conference Attendees	1
Design of the Evaluation	2
Quantitative Findings from the Evaluation	3
Table 1: Quantitative Results from All Respondents	4
Table 2: Quantitative Results from All Hartford Scholars	9
Table 3: Quantitative Results from All Hartford Pre-doctoral Scholars	14
Table 4: Quantitative Results from All Hartford Post-doctoral Scholars	19
Comparison of the Ratings of Types of Respondents	23
Qualitative Findings from the Evaluation	24
Table 5: All Respondents	25
Follow-up	34
Recommendations	34
Appendix I: Evaluation Form	
Appendix II: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents	
Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Hartford Scholars	
Appendix IV: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Pre-doctoral Scholars	
Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-doctoral Scholars	

Background: The first annual Leadership Conference for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Capacity (BAGNC) Initiative funded by the John A. Hartford Foundation was held on November 14th and 15th in Chicago. The Leadership Conference agenda was designed by Angela McBride, Ph.D., and Claire Fagin, Ph.D., in consultation with the Directors of the Hartford Centers of Geriatric Nursing Excellence and the Director of the John. A. Hartford Institute at New York University, all of who appeared on the program in various capacities. The BAGNC Initiative is part of a larger Gerontological Nursing Initiative of the John A. Hartford Foundation.

Target Audience and Invited Conference Attendees: The primary target audience for the Leadership Conference was 10 pre-doctoral and 7 post-doctoral John A. Hartford Scholars. The initial funding for the scholars started on July 1st and continues for 2 years. In addition to the 17 Scholars in attendance, there were representatives at the meeting of different agencies and institutions funded as part of the Hartford Gerontological Nursing Initiative. The groups represented were as follows:

- The Director and Staff from each of the five Hartford Centers of Geriatric Nursing Excellence (Oregon Health & Science University School of Nursing; University of Arkansas for Medical

¹ Staff contributing to this report include G. J. Huba, Ph.D., Lisa A. Melchior, Ph.D., A. T. Panter, Ph.D., Alexi Saldamando, Sara Bleich, and Celia Stillwell.

Sciences College of Nursing; University of California San Francisco School of Nursing; University of Iowa College of Nursing; University of Pennsylvania School of Nursing.

- Faculty from each of 7 Hartford Geriatric Nursing Investment Program schools (Case Western Reserve University Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing; University of Michigan School of Nursing; University of Minnesota School of Nursing; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Nursing; University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston; University of Rochester School of Nursing; University of Washington School of Nursing).
- The Director and Staff from the Coordinating Center for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Excellence housed at the American Academy of Nursing. The AAN Coordinating Center administers the Scholarship Programs.
- Faculty and Staff from the John A. Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing at New York University.
- The Director and Staff from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing charged with administering three parts of the Gerontological Nursing Initiative: Enhancing Gerontology/Geriatric Nursing Education in Undergraduate Baccalaureate Programs; Enhancing Gerontology/Geriatric Nursing Education in Advanced Practice Nursing Programs; Creating Careers in Geriatric Advanced Practice Nursing.
- 10 Pre-doctoral John A. Hartford Scholars (Anna Song Beeber, MSN, RN, University of Pennsylvania; Stewart M. Bond, MSN, RNC, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Joyce Chan, RN, MS, CA, University of California, San Francisco; Valerie Gruss, MSN, GNP, Rush University; Diane E. Holland, MS, RN, University of Minnesota; Jennifer A. Hagerty, RN, MSN, CRNP, University of Pittsburgh; Rita A. Jablonski, MSN, RN, CS, ANP, Virginia Commonwealth University; Tamika R. Sanchez, MSN, MBA, RN, University of Miami; Karen B. Tetz, RN, MS, Oregon Health & Science University; Prudence Twigg, MSN, RN, CS, Indiana University). These Scholars were a primary target audience for the conference.
- 7 Post-doctoral John A. Hartford Scholars (Janet C. Mentes, PhD, RNCS, GNP, University of California, Los Angeles; Mary G. Bourbonniere, PhD(c), MS, RN, ONC, University of Pennsylvania and Brown University; Charon A. Pierson, PhD, APRN, GNP, University of Hawaii at Manoa and University of California, San Francisco; Kristine Williams, PhD(c), RN, CS, FNP, University of Kansas; Mary A. Dolansky, PhD(c), RN, Case Western Reserve University; Lissi Hansen, PhD(c), RN, University of Washington, Seattle; Diana Lynn Woods, PhD, RN, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences). These Scholars were a primary target audience for the conference.
- Faculty Mentors for John A. Hartford Scholars.
- An outside consultant – Dr. Angela McBride – charged with primary responsibility for the contents of the Conference in collaboration with the AAN Center.
- The Director and Staff from the independent evaluator, The Measurement Group.
- Project Officers and Staff from the John A. Hartford Foundation.

Design of the Evaluation. A conference evaluation form was included in the handout packet distributed to all conference attendees. Evaluation conference attendees were asked to complete the Evaluation Form as the Conference proceeded, although by observation many individuals completed the entire form at the end of the conference. A total of 38 forms were returned at the end of the Conference with three additional forms, for a total of 41, returned by U.S. mail within two weeks. The Evaluation Form is shown as Appendix I to this report.

Quantitative Findings from the Evaluation. Table 1 summarizes the quantitative findings from the evaluation for all respondents who completed the evaluation form. Table 2 summarizes the quantitative findings from the evaluation for all 15 Hartford Scholars who completed an evaluation form. Table 3 summarizes the quantitative findings from all 9 Pre-doctoral Scholars with data and Table 4 summarizes the quantitative findings from all 6 Post-doctoral Scholars with data.

Supplemental quantitative findings are given in Appendix II for all respondents; Appendix III for all Hartford Scholars; Appendix IV for all Pre-doctoral Scholars; and Appendix V for all Post-doctoral Scholars. The supplemental findings present the full frequency distributions on each of the quantitative response variables along with frequency distributions on various background, experience, and demographic indicators collected on the Evaluation Form.

The overall pattern of findings illustrated in these numerical ratings is fairly similar for the entire groups of respondents and the two groups of Scholars. [Certain selected statistical comparisons are given later after the tables of results.]

The quantitative results can be summarized in the following way.

- Overall, the different sessions were very well received by all groups.
- Scholar groups tended to be somewhat more positive about the sessions than the total group (including the scholars); this is to be expected as the conference was targeted toward the scholar groups.
- The one session that seems to have been least preferred by the respondents was that offered by an outside consultant on communication strategies. It should be noted that this session was the longest, was the one that respondents were asked to prepare “homework” for, and was in a somewhat different format than other sessions. The session was also the only one presented by an individual without personal experience in the field of nursing and because this session is offered at a number of John A. Hartford-sponsored grantee meetings, some respondents may have attended the session previously.
- Although very highly rated, respondents would have preferred somewhat more interactive content in the conference.
- Most respondents felt that there was content in the conference that could be applied directly to their own career practice.

Table 1: Quantitative Results from All Respondents (N=41)

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How well did this session frame the purpose of the conference?	Excellent	75.7%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How much did the purpose (as described in this session) match your expectations about this conference?	Very Much	92.1%
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How would you rate session quality?	Excellent	64.9%
		Excellent or Very Good	94.6%
Description of Five CGNEs	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	35.9%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	92.3%
Description of Five CGNEs	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	38.5%
		Excellent or Very Good	84.6%
Description of Five CGNEs	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	48.7%
		Definitely or Probably	87.2%
Description of Five CGNEs	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	23.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	63.2%
Description of Five CGNEs	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	25.6%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	56.4%
Description of Five CGNEs	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	42.1%
		Definitely or Probably	89.5%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	39.5%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	78.9%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	35.1%
		Excellent or Very Good	78.4%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	51.4%
		Definitely or Probably	78.4%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	32.4%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	64.9%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	37.8%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	64.9%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	58.3%
		Definitely or Probably	88.9%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	62.5%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	82.5%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	80.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	95.0%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Orchestrating a Research Career	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	85.0%
		Definitely or Probably	95.0%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	66.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	89.7%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	65.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	85.0%
Orchestrating a Research Career	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	84.6%
		Definitely or Probably	87.2%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	30.8%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	69.2%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	13.2%
		Excellent or Very Good	65.8%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	38.5%
		Definitely or Probably	74.4%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	23.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	60.5%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	20.5%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	59.0%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	25.6%
		Definitely or Probably	61.5%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	47.5%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	72.5%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	40.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	75.0%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	65.0%
		Definitely or Probably	92.5%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	38.5%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	69.2%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	37.5%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	62.5%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	71.4%
		Definitely or Probably	97.1%
Linking Research	How relevant was the session for	Extremely Relevant	58.3%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Programs to National Strategic Planning	your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	86.1%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	61.1%
		Excellent or Very Good	94.4%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	77.8%
		Definitely or Probably	97.2%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	58.3%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	80.6%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	52.8%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	75.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	75.0%
		Definitely or Probably	94.4%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	83.3%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	97.2%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	77.8%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	82.9%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	94.4%
		Definitely or Probably	97.2%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	79.4%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	94.1%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	82.4%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	91.2%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting	How valuable was the content of this	Extremely Valuable	75.8%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	93.9%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	82.4%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	94.1%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	94.1%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How relevant was this leadership conference for your work?	Extremely Relevant	62.2%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	94.6%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How much did the conference match your expectations?	Very Much	78.4%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	Would you recommend a similar conference to a peer?	Definitely	86.5%
		Definitely or Probably	91.9%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How would you rate the conference quality?	Excellent	71.4%
		Excellent or Very Good	97.1%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How likely are you to use the information from the conference?	Very Likely	88.9%
		Very Likely or Somewhat Likely	97.2%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How valuable was the overall conference in helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	55.6%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	94.4%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How useful was the overall conference in helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	54.1%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	89.2%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How appropriate was the number of networking opportunities provided at this conference (e.g., networking luncheons, breaks)?	Just Right	47.2%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How conducive was the setting of this conference to networking?	Extremely	20.0%
		Extremely or Very	82.9%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How appropriate was the combination of workshops, panels, and other sessions at this conference?	Just Right	79.4%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How helpful were the pre-conference materials and information packet?	Extremely Helpful	9.1%
		Extremely Helpful or Very Helpful	54.5%

Table 2: Quantitative Results from All Hartford Scholars (N=15)

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How well did this session frame the purpose of the conference?	Excellent	93.3%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How much did the purpose (as described in this session) match your expectations about this conference?	Very Much	100.0%
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How would you rate session quality?	Excellent	73.3%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Description of Five CGNEs	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	26.7%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	93.3%
Description of Five CGNEs	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	46.7%
		Excellent or Very Good	93.3%
Description of Five CGNEs	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	33.3%
		Definitely or Probably	80.0%
Description of Five CGNEs	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	20.0%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	66.7%
Description of Five CGNEs	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	26.7%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	66.7%
Description of Five CGNEs	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	53.3%
		Definitely or Probably	86.7%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	40.0%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	80.0%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	42.9%
		Excellent or Very Good	85.7%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	50.0%
		Definitely or Probably	78.6%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	28.6%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	64.3%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	50.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	71.4%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	57.1%
		Definitely or Probably	92.9%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	80.0%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	93.3%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	86.7%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Orchestrating a Research Career	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	93.3%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	86.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	86.7%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	86.7%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	86.7%
Orchestrating a Research Career	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	86.7%
		Definitely or Probably	86.7%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	33.3%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	80.0%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	13.3%
		Excellent or Very Good	73.3%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	53.3%
		Definitely or Probably	86.7%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	26.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	60.0%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	33.3%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	73.3%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	33.3%
		Definitely or Probably	60.0%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	46.7%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	73.3%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	46.7%
		Excellent or Very Good	73.3%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	66.7%
		Definitely or Probably	93.3%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	46.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	86.7%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	53.3%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	86.7%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	78.6%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Linking Research	How relevant was the session for	Extremely Relevant	84.6%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Programs to National Strategic Planning	your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	92.3%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	84.6%
		Excellent or Very Good	92.3%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	92.3%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	84.6%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	84.6%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	76.9%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	92.3%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	92.3%
		Definitely or Probably	92.3%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	92.3%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	100.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	92.3%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	92.3%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	92.3%
		Definitely or Probably	92.3%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	84.6%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	92.3%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	84.6%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	92.3%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting	How valuable was the content of this	Extremely Valuable	76.9%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	92.3%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	84.6%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	92.3%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	92.3%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How relevant was this leadership conference for your work?	Extremely Relevant	86.7%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How much did the conference match your expectations?	Very Much	86.7%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	Would you recommend a similar conference to a peer?	Definitely	86.7%
		Definitely or Probably	93.3%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How would you rate the conference quality?	Excellent	71.4%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How likely are you to use the information from the conference?	Very Likely	93.3%
		Very Likely or Somewhat Likely	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How valuable was the overall conference in helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	66.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	93.3%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How useful was the overall conference in helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	66.7%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	93.3%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How appropriate was the number of networking opportunities provided at this conference (e.g., networking luncheons, breaks)?	Just Right	20.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How conducive was the setting of this conference to networking?	Extremely	30.8%
		Extremely or Very	84.6%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How appropriate was the combination of workshops, panels, and other sessions at this conference?	Just Right	64.3%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How helpful were the pre-conference materials and information packet?	Extremely Helpful	15.4%
		Extremely Helpful or Very Helpful	69.2%

Table 3: Quantitative Results from All Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholars (N=9)

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How well did this session frame the purpose of the conference?	Excellent	88.9%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How much did the purpose (as described in this session) match your expectations about this conference?	Very Much	100.0%
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How would you rate session quality?	Excellent	66.7%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Description of Five CGNEs	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	11.1%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	88.9%
Description of Five CGNEs	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	33.3%
		Excellent or Very Good	88.9%
Description of Five CGNEs	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	33.3%
		Definitely or Probably	88.9%
Description of Five CGNEs	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	22.2%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	66.7%
Description of Five CGNEs	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	22.2%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	77.8%
Description of Five CGNEs	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	55.6%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	44.4%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	88.9%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	50.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	62.5%
		Definitely or Probably	87.5%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	50.0%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	87.5%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	75.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	87.5%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	75.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	88.9%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	77.8%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Orchestrating a Research Career	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	100.0%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	100.0%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	100.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	100.0%
Orchestrating a Research Career	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	33.3%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	88.9%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	11.1%
		Excellent or Very Good	77.8%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	55.6%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	33.3%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	66.7%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	44.4%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	88.9%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	44.4%
		Definitely or Probably	88.9%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	44.4%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	66.7%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	44.4%
		Excellent or Very Good	66.7%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	66.7%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	44.4%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	77.8%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	55.6%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	88.9%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	77.8%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Linking Research	How relevant was the session for	Extremely Relevant	88.9%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Programs to National Strategic Planning	your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	88.9%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	88.9%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	100.0%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	100.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	88.9%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	100.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	88.9%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	100.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	100.0%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	100.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	88.9%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	88.9%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting	How valuable was the content of this	Extremely Valuable	88.9%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	100.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How relevant was this leadership conference for your work?	Extremely Relevant	100.0%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How much did the conference match your expectations?	Very Much	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	Would you recommend a similar conference to a peer?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How would you rate the conference quality?	Excellent	77.8%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How likely are you to use the information from the conference?	Very Likely	100.0%
		Very Likely or Somewhat Likely	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How valuable was the overall conference in helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	66.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How useful was the overall conference in helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	77.8%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How appropriate was the number of networking opportunities provided at this conference (e.g., networking luncheons, breaks)?	Just Right	33.3%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How conducive was the setting of this conference to networking?	Extremely	37.5%
		Extremely or Very	75.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How appropriate was the combination of workshops, panels, and other sessions at this conference?	Just Right	77.8%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How helpful were the pre-conference materials and information packet?	Extremely Helpful	11.1%
		Extremely Helpful or Very Helpful	66.7%

Table 4: Quantitative Results from All Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars (N=6)

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How well did this session frame the purpose of the conference?	Excellent	100.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How much did the purpose (as described in this session) match your expectations about this conference?	Very Much	100.0%
Welcome & Charge to the Group	How would you rate session quality?	Excellent	83.3%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Description of Five CGNEs	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	50.0%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Description of Five CGNEs	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	66.7%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Description of Five CGNEs	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	33.3%
		Definitely or Probably	66.7%
Description of Five CGNEs	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	16.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	66.7%
Description of Five CGNEs	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	33.3%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	50.0%
Description of Five CGNEs	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	50.0%
		Definitely or Probably	66.7%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	33.3%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	66.7%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	33.3%
		Excellent or Very Good	66.7%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	33.3%
		Definitely or Probably	66.7%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	0.0%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	33.3%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	16.7%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	50.0%
Networking Lunch 1 (Hosted by CGNE Directors)	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	33.3%
		Definitely or Probably	83.3%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	66.7%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	83.3%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	100.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Orchestrating a Research Career	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	83.3%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	66.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	66.7%
Orchestrating a Research Career	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	66.7%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	66.7%
Orchestrating a Research Career	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	66.7%
		Definitely or Probably	66.7%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	33.3%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	66.7%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	16.7%
		Excellent or Very Good	66.7%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	50.0%
		Definitely or Probably	66.7%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	16.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	50.0%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	16.7%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	50.0%
Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	16.7%
		Definitely or Probably	16.7%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	50.0%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	83.3%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	50.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	83.3%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	66.7%
		Definitely or Probably	83.3%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	50.0%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	100.0%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	50.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	83.3%
Networking Lunch 2 (Advisory Board Members host tables)	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	80.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Linking Research	How relevant was the session for	Extremely Relevant	75.0%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
Programs to National Strategic Planning	your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	75.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	75.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	75.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	50.0%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	50.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	50.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	75.0%
Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	75.0%
		Definitely or Probably	75.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	100.0%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	100.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	100.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How valuable was the content of this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	75.0%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	75.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	100.0%
Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	75.0%
		Definitely or Probably	75.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant	75.0%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	75.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent	75.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	Would you recommend a similar session to a peer?	Definitely	75.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Endnotes: Charting	How valuable was the content of this	Extremely Valuable	50.0%

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

Session	Variable	Indicator	Percent of Respondents
the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	75.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	50.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	75.0%
Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders	Should this type of session be repeated for you in future years?	Definitely	75.0%
		Definitely or Probably	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How relevant was this leadership conference for your work?	Extremely Relevant	66.7%
		Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How much did the conference match your expectations?	Very Much	66.7%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	Would you recommend a similar conference to a peer?	Definitely	66.7%
		Definitely or Probably	83.3%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How would you rate the conference quality?	Excellent	60.0%
		Excellent or Very Good	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How likely are you to use the information from the conference?	Very Likely	83.3%
		Very Likely or Somewhat Likely	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How valuable was the overall conference in helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable	66.7%
		Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	83.3%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How useful was the overall conference in helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful	50.0%
		Extremely Useful or Very Useful	83.3%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How appropriate was the number of networking opportunities provided at this conference (e.g., networking luncheons, breaks)?	Just Right	0.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How conducive was the setting of this conference to networking?	Extremely	20.0%
		Extremely or Very	100.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How appropriate was the combination of workshops, panels, and other sessions at this conference?	Just Right	40.0%
Overall Evaluation of Conference	How helpful were the pre-conference materials and information packet?	Extremely Helpful	25.0%
		Extremely Helpful or Very Helpful	75.0%

Comparison of the Ratings of Types of Respondents. Three groups of attendees were formed: a) 6 Post-doctoral Scholars; b) 9 Pre-doctoral Scholars; and c) 26 Other Respondents. All three groups were compared in terms of their overall reactions to the conference using an appropriate nonparametric statistical test (Kruskal-Wallis). Of 11 comparisons, three were found to be different using typical significance levels. The following differences were observed:

- Types of respondents differed in how relevant they thought that the conference was for their work ($p = .019$). Pre-doctoral Scholars thought the conference was most relevant, followed by Post-doctoral Scholars and Other Respondents.

- Types of respondents differed in their perception of the appropriateness of the number of networking opportunities ($p = .011$). Post-Doctoral Scholars thought that the number of opportunities was least appropriate while Other Respondents thought that it was most appropriate.
- Types of respondents differed in their perception of the appropriateness of the mix of workshops, panels, and other sessions ($p = .051$). Post-doctoral Scholars thought the mix was most appropriate while Other Respondents thought it was the least appropriate.

We also compared the responses of just the Pre-doctoral and Post-doctoral Scholars again using appropriate nonparametric statistical tests. These latter tests are more suggestive because of the total small sample size and the fact that the statistical significance tests do not suggest as reliable a degree of difference. Nonetheless they are informative so long as that is recognized.

- Types of respondents differed in how relevant they thought that the conference was for their work ($p = .072$). Pre-doctoral Scholars thought that the conference was more relevant than Post-doctoral Scholars.
- Types of respondents differed in the degree to which they thought that the conference matched their expectations ($p = .072$). Pre-doctoral Scholars thought that the conference was more consistent with their expectations.
- Types of respondents differed in the degree to which they would recommend a similar conference to a peer ($p = .072$). Pre-doctoral Scholars would be more likely to recommend such a conference to a peer.
- Types of respondents differed in the degree to which they felt the number of networking opportunities was appropriate ($p = .127$). Pre-doctoral Scholars thought that the networking opportunities were more appropriate than did the Post-doctoral Scholars.

Qualitative Findings from the Evaluation. Table 5 summarizes the qualitative findings from the evaluation for all respondents who completed the evaluation form. In this table, results are shown for both the Scholars and Other Respondents from the Conference. Comments made by scholars are shown in *this font*; those made by other respondents are shown in *this font*. The numbers in the parentheses refer to the number of comments in each category made by conference participants.

Several general themes emerge from these comments that might be addressed in future conferences.

- In general, the participants were extremely positive about the Leadership Conference. As with the quantitative ratings, these comments point out that the Conference was a success.
- Respondents would generally have preferred more opportunities for networking and interaction. Possibly, a number of individuals did not know how to make full use of the opportunities provided.
- In general, the diversity of professional experience levels and backgrounds of individuals in the room during the two days may not have been taken into account fully in planning the program. Different types of respondents each seem to suggest that they would have preferred at least some targeted programming (or breakout sessions) oriented toward their specific level of experience or leadership development needs.
- There may have been a small group of individuals at the conference – specifically mentors not linked to the Initiative in other ways and Investment Schools – who were less sure of their role at the Conference than others and did not see the agenda as quite as relevant to their own development. Expectations for different kinds of individuals at the Conference might be clarified in the future.
- Somewhat less time may have been devoted to “introductions” of meeting attendees than would have been preferred by many in the group. Also, various physical introduction cues (name tags with identifying information besides name; table cards with name of participants and identifying information to facilitate calling individuals by name) might be added. Such cues might help with networking.

- Minor “complaints” about meeting room temperature, physical layout, and rest room facilities are less than one usually sees in comparable evaluations.

Table 5: Qualitative Comments

Session: Welcome and Charge to the Group (Comments made by 4 scholars and 6 other respondents)
Clarified my expectations (Scholars = 1 / Others = 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Actually the session was beyond my expectations!</i> • I came not very clear on aims of conference and so was rather passive; I look forward to more interactive role as a participant.
Introduced the rest of the conference (Scholars = 1 / Others = 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Set the tone.</i> • Good orientation/grounding.
High quality presentation (Scholars = 0 / Others = 2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct; humorous, good presentation. • Well done! Set the tone.
Promoted esprit de corps (Scholars = 0 / Others = 2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eloquent, warm and welcoming. Helped me feel "at home" and part of a group. • Inspiring, welcoming, inclusive.
Good variety of speakers (Scholars = 1 / Others = 0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Good variety of speakers.</i>
Suggestions for improvement (Scholars = 1 / Others = 0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Introduction of the scholars might have been better at the outset of the activities; it seemed to take us a couple of days to learn each others' names, locations, and interests.</i>
Session: Description of Five CGNEs (Comments made by 5 scholars and 12 other respondents)
Quality of the CGNEs (Scholars = 1 / Others = 0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Very impressive! Proud to be a part of this initiative and know that I can have access to these centers.</i>
Value of the session (Scholars = 5 / Others = 6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I gained an increased knowledge about the centers and what each of them do.</i> • <i>I saw or got a feel for what is required of the leaders of these centers.</i> • <i>I learned about the centers' possibilities to provide future employment for myself as well as others.</i> • <i>I will use the centers as possible sites for networking and to obtain knowledge.</i> • <i>Very helpful to know centers' roles/activities as well as geriatric nursing leaders in these institutions</i> • Presentations were uneven but useful in an informational sense (who and what of various undertakings) and in terms of audience aspirations (how might we progress to this level; where are potential linkages and synergies). • Great to hear how others are implementing their grants. • Very interesting to see what and how the HCGNE's found important to share with large group. • Interesting to note the specific foci of centers and specific strengths. • I think this a very informative overview of how centers direct scholarly endeavors; things one can bring "home" and develop. • Was also useful to have one page summaries in the binder.
Importance of the session (Scholars = 0 / Others = 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important for scholars and mentors to be familiar with the 5 HCGNEs and what they are doing.
Knew material already (Scholars = 1 / Others = 0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I was familiar with the 5 HCGNEs. This session provided little new information to me.</i>
Suggestions for improvement (Scholars = 3 / Others = 4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I would like to know what specific research is going on at each center.</i> • <i>I would rather hear these leaders/scholars talk about their careers or what they see for the future of gerontological nursing.</i> • <i>Information about the 7 schools recently joining the nursing initiative would have been very useful.</i> • Of necessity, it was too fast; I wanted a bit more information. • Substantive description of programs should have been done for all centers. • Need written contact information. • Need CVs of mentors and scholars.
Implications for the future (Scholars = 0 / Others = 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be useful to see how projected goals presented at this point in grants/center operations materialize and progress or change; whether goals were fully, partially, or not met.
Comment on evaluation form (Scholars = 0 / Others = 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question is somewhat ambiguous; it does not seem to be a reasonable goal for this type of presentation except in the most abstract sense.

Session: Networking Lunch (Day 1: Hosted by CGNE Directors) (Comments made by 10 scholars and 14 other respondents)
Scholar presentations were informative (Scholars = 3 / Others = 2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Scholar presentations were informative.</i> • <i>Important to know about other scholars (2).</i> • <i>Helpful and interesting to hear from pre- and post-docs.</i> • <i>It was great to hear the scholars articulate their research ideas.</i>
Met the need for networking (Scholars = 2 / Others = 3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The need for networking is high and the regional setup was an excellent idea. Provided good forum to present your ideas and yourself.</i> • <i>Thought-provoking.</i> • <i>Good opportunity to network.</i> • <i>This is a major component of the meeting – knowing and sharing with your "team" of scholars beginning and principal mentors.</i> • <i>Enabled me to get to know the scholars better.</i>
Suggestions for improvement (Scholars = 9 / Others = 14)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Lunch setting not conducive to networking (4 scholars, 3 other respondents).</i> • <i>Not enough time to network (3 scholars, 2 other respondents).</i> • <i>Limit information on mentors (1 scholar, 3 other respondents).</i> • <i>Want to know more about mentors; include CV or bio sketch (1 scholar, 1 other respondent).</i> • <i>Enforce timing and structure of the session; provide more focus for scholars (2 other respondents).</i> • <i>Perhaps a paragraph from each scholar in the notebook would be useful.</i> • <i>It would have been an excellent session if the presentations had not been done at the same time.</i> • <i>I would prefer to sit with people not from my region; I already knew all but one person at my table. A lost networking opportunity.</i>
Session: Orchestrating a Research Career (Comments made by 8 scholars and 14 other respondents)
High quality presentation (Scholars = 7 / Others = 7)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent presentations of research careers – down to earth – practical.</i> • <i>This session was a highlight of the day. I hope that the PowerPoints or text of the presentations will be available on the web.</i> • <i>Great!!</i> • <i>These sessions were very relevant to me. I grapple with career making decisions, and their input was so helpful to me.</i> • <i>Delightful speaker; validated much of what I have experienced in past.</i> • <i>Great to hear example of launch trajectory of a geriatric nursing leader.</i> • <i>Good example of how a career/research program evolves.</i> • <i>Excellent speakers/facilitators (2).</i> • <i>McBride; excellent speaker and focused talk important to scholars! Buckwalter is exemplar of career scholarship and building a diverse research.</i> • <i>Angela McBride's presentation was superb!</i> • <i>This was very beautifully done and put a human face on aspiration of the fellows and of those further along as well. Thank you.</i> • <i>"Down to earth," inviting, warm speaker.</i> • <i>These were actually delightful talks; contained wisdom and 'pearls.'</i>

More appropriate for scholars than for other respondents (Scholars = 0 / Others = 4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most appropriate for pre- and post-doc participants. • Clearly many in the audience are quite advanced scholars and leaders; this type of presentation is more effective for those early in their careers. • Kitty's and Angela's comments were very relevant to the pre and post-doctoral scholars. • It was very basic and probably good for pre-docs but not valuable for the mentors.
Suggestions for improvement (Scholars = 2 / Others = 7)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The last hour needed more structure, like a focus group format.</i> • <i>I would like to learn more about operating in policy environments, administrative roles, scientific review panels, etc.</i> • The open hour after would work better in small sessions with scholars probably divided for pre and post-docs. • I think the post-docs and pre-docs should meet separately and then together learn about research agendas and opportunities to collaborate. The mentors and others should also meet separately. • Would like to have had more focus on her actual research career. • The last hour of discussion should be dropped. • A similar session would be helpful, possibly how to establish a research trajectory (building the research program). • Illustrations of career development from others telling their story are very effective; I suggest this be used repeatedly with different perspectives. • "Right along with the big boys or girls" in re: medicine, is disparaging to nursing.
Session: Strategic Communications: Theory and Practice (Comments made by 10 scholars and 17 other respondents)
Value of session (Scholars = 4 / Others = 7)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The case studies were very helpful.</i> • <i>Excellent session – helpful to do work both in a large group and in dyads.</i> • <i>Valuable idea to have strategic communication presented although I knew about measurable goals etc. Because of the timing, the content will be included in my future work.</i> • <i>The interactive component of this session was great.</i> • <i>Will be valuable later.</i> • Very relevant but individuals will vary with regard to previous exposure to these ideas and/or similar workshops. • Cues and strategies very useful; sharing ideas very useful. • I feel that the interactive parts were the most helpful. • Not valuable for the mentors but OK for pre-docs. • Info and content good. • Excellent presenter and content. • Packaging oneself and marketing are very important skills – nurses often sell themselves short.
Level of Session (Scholars = 2 / Others = 5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The session was too basic for me (2 scholars, 4 other respondents).</i> • The first portion of the session was too elementary but the discussion was good.
Suggestions for improvement (Scholars = 9 / Others = 15)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Perhaps lengthen this session, so we can have more time for practice and 'hands-on' experience. (1 scholar, 4 other respondents).</i> • <i>Break out into small groups (3).</i> • <i>Much of the presentation was redundant with the materials sent earlier (3).</i> • <i>I need to know how to convey messages more forcefully, and to be understood or heard by policy makers, etc.</i> • <i>Case example should be focused on the scholars in their situations (and messages) and less on the centers (they should be more accomplished at this).</i> • A bit too much lecture. Good material, but got a little tedious, maybe more discussion (2). • Delivery came across somewhat in a rough/hesitant/lack of smoothness (2). • Spend less time on how to write objectives and more time on getting message across, targeting the message. • Perhaps this was best for scholars; group work was somewhat helpful. • I might include a nurse in the working through of the case study. • A way of linking to strategic planning and developing a consistent message to diverse populations related to a specific goal. • The second question was too broad to be helpful but again the discussion was good. • It had me reviewing key points in presenting research to diverse groups, but not sure it was best placed in this session. • The needs of the audience are broad; it's difficult to craft messages equally useful to pre- and post-docs and more senior leaders and investigators.

Session: Networking Lunch (Advisory Board Members Hosting Tables) (Comments made by 7 scholars and 12 other respondents)
Met need for networking (Scholars = 7 / Others = 8)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Great opportunity to network and meet with others (3 scholars, 3 other respondents).</i> • <i>Networking is so important! This was a great opportunity to meet nursing leaders up close and personal.</i> • <i>One of the few opportunities we've had to interact with diverse members of the group.</i> • <i>This was a very good opportunity and the facilitation by a table leader was great.</i> • <i>Having mixed groups at the tables was great; the facilitator allowed free discussion but also helped to lead some focused discussions also.</i> • <i>Good to have more time for networking (2).</i> • <i>I liked not having presentation during lunch and having a facilitator.</i> • <i>I believe that making even one connection at such an opportunity is worth using this type of session.</i> • <i>Networking was on a social and personal level which is important.</i>
Good Discussion (Scholars = 0 / Others = 2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Very enjoyable, more so socially than for any new networking.</i> • <i>I was at Polly Bednash's table; she did an excellent job of "hosting." We had good discussion that included all at table (instead of separate conversations).</i>
Suggestions for improvement (Scholars = 1 / Others = 4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The conversation at my table was influenced by the presence of one of the program speakers. Conversation then centered among the faculty. Someone made negative comments about one of my former mentors.</i> • <i>This was a lunch without much direction.</i> • <i>Networking and discussion in less formal setting.</i> • <i>Need more time to network within groups!</i> • <i>The session was somewhat able to meet its goals; most of the discussion focused on more social topics.</i>
Session: Linking Research Programs to National Strategic Planning (Comments made by 5 scholars and 6 other respondents)
Importance of the session (Scholars = 5 / Others = 5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Very informative; helpful to link my own research to national initiatives.</i> • <i>Gave me a new perspective on NIH/NINR and policy impact; this is one of the reasons I wanted to do this post-doc, i.e. how to make an impact on policy (at my local level for now).</i> • <i>Very important topic; great to get info about research training and funding opportunities.</i> • <i>Very important and eye-opening information provided by the speakers.</i> • <i>I'm sorry that my paper presentation was scheduled at a conflicting time. This session was the one I was most looking forward too!</i> • <i>Good overviews; useful background.</i> • <i>Excellent presenters and presentations.</i> • <i>Valuable points made re: how to target one's research.</i> • <i>IOM information was new to me. I had never understood how one got elected and how it functioned other than reading reports.</i> • <i>The dialogue was most useful aspect of this session.</i>
Suggestions for improvement (Scholars = 0 / Others = 2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I don't think IOM information was very useful for this group.</i> • <i>NINR info was not new ; I'd like more specific information on how much training and research monies are going to aging related projects, % funding rates, and upcoming RFAs, status of center funding with future cans, etc.</i>

<p>Session: Leadership Required: Linking Research to Practice and Policy Changes (Comments made by 6 scholars and 15 other respondents)</p>
<p>High quality presentation (Scholars = 8 / Others = 17)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent and inspirational presentation; gave a vision (3).</i> • <i>A dynamic speaker and example/role model for leadership (1 scholar, 1 other respondent).</i> • <i>Practical suggestions on how to become a leader.</i> • <i>Translated leadership concepts into real world examples.</i> • <i>Very informative. Extremely appropriate presentation.</i> • <i>So sorry to have missed this. I heard it was superb!</i> • <i>Inspirational/inspiring (5).</i> • <i>Excellent speaker and teacher (4).</i> • <i>Effective.</i> • <i>She is such a leader for nursing.</i> • <i>Hands down, the very best presentation of the workshop; absolutely spectacular – a message for everyone in the room, regardless of level.</i> • <i>All nursing students should have exposure to this wonder woman.</i> • <i>Shirley was fantastic.</i> • <i>Especially helpful to the pre-docs.</i> • <i>Outstanding talk. Hartford should consider providing more leadership development to faculty as well as fellows in future conferences.</i> • <i>She was great. Worth the whole trip.</i> • <i>The best speaker! So persuasive! Energetic. Powerful message.</i> • <i>Using her experience was an excellent way of presenting this content.</i>
<p>Session: Endnotes: Charting the Future of Geriatric Nurse Leaders (Comments made by 9 scholars and 14 other respondents)</p>
<p>High quality presentation (Scholars = 9 / Others = 18)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Inspirational/inspiring (2 scholars, 3 other respondents).</i> • <i>Motivating (1 scholar, 1 other respondent).</i> • <i>Absolutely key!</i> • <i>Wow!</i> • <i>At the end of a long day, Dr. Mezey really was able to energize the group.</i> • <i>Thanks for including Dr. Mezey and allowing her to impart her wisdom and guidance in the group.</i> • <i>Wonderful words and guidance to end the conference with and to leave with – couldn't have been done or said better.</i> • <i>So sorry to have missed this. I heard it was superb!</i> • <i>Passion was very evident (3).</i> • <i>Excellent (2).</i> • <i>Superb wrap-up; nice to have a wrap-up with key points to take home for scholars (2).</i> • <i>Pragmatic.</i> • <i>Pearls offered.</i> • <i>Wow what a challenge!</i> • <i>Distilled the essence.</i> • <i>Great advice.</i> • <i>Very good.</i> • <i>Very important.</i>

**Whole Conference: Specific Examples of How Participants will Use the Conference Information to Increase Leadership Skills within Gerontological/Geriatric Nursing
(Comments made by 12 scholars and 18 other respondents)**

Networking and collaboration (Scholars = 6 / Others = 5)

- *Will use networking contacts as resources/contacts.*
- *Will commit myself to keeping the tips on networking on the forefront of my brain.*
- *Will use linkages or other scholars and JAHF center directors to implement geriatric nursing initiatives at my home campus.*
- *Will contact at least one other discipline at my university to talk about gerontology.*
- *Will increase networking.*
- *Will e-mail at least 3 people I talked with here to either get more info/help or talk about future collaboration.*
- *Will network (2).*
- *Will collaborate with other funded centers to plan to increase gerontology content in nursing curriculum in the state.*
- *Will link with other projects.*
- *Will connect with other discipline for added strength. Look in from the outside.*

Improve my own knowledge (Scholars = 1 / Others = 1)

- *Will increase knowledge utilization.*
- *Will review materials to become more knowledgeable.*

Dissemination (Scholars = 6 / Others = 3)

- *Will share info about Hartford initiative with others (3).*
- *Will increase knowledge dissemination through articles and presentations.*
- *Will incorporate info into planning and developing a website for gerontology/GNPs at my university.*
- *I have several ideas for potential workshops our center can sponsor and will bring these to the group.*
- *Will increase the knowledge of faculty members regarding gerontology content across specialty disciplines.*
- *Will use in marketing the new initiatives in our institution.*
- *Will develop resources for other groups.*

Communication strategies (Scholars = 6 / Others = 8)

- *Will use communication skills to disseminate messages regarding gerontology, issues and research (1 scholar, 1 other respondent).*
- *Communication strategies will be helpful in increasing the impact of message delivery.*
- *Will communicate my research focus more effectively with faculty and student peers.*
- *Will be able to better communicate my message to others.*
- *Will be more strategic in communication and involvement.*
- *Will formulate a communication strategy for my research to other professionals, lay persons, and policy makers.*
- *Will use communication materials, good resource (2).*
- *Will use to communicate or improve clarity of our mission (2).*
- *Communication – will be more thoughtful about audience.*
- *Will use the "strategic approach to communications" as I engage my colleagues to participate in my goals for a focused component in the curriculum.*
- *Will develop a major theme/idea and use it over and over.*

Leadership and creativity (Scholars = 5 / Others = 6)

- *Will work on leadership skills: speaking up and contributing information.*
- *I am more cognizant of the importance of my role as nursing's ambassador when I'm in interdisciplinary settings – I will try to speak up and be passionate.*
- *Will use information about understanding career trajectories to plan and effectively implement my own career.*
- *Will identify a strategic approach to gain identity and visibility as a gerontology nurse leader/researcher.*
- *Will help me to be more assertive in meetings to seek out opportunities where I can "spread the word" about gerontology.*
- *Will use leadership contents and challenges to function as a leader.*
- *Will identify where I am in developing leadership skills and where I need to go to enhance these skills further.*
- *Will role model leadership for all nurses with whom I come in contact.*
- *Will find the inspiration to dare to be a leader.*
- *Will use leadership ideas presented by Shirley Chater in my collaborative research.*
- *Will be willing to think out of the box.*

Mentoring (Scholars = 1 / Others = 7)

- *Will develop strategies to interest nursing students at my university in geriatric nursing.*
- *Will provide mentorship for graduate students.*

Appendix V: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholars

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will contact several individuals I have identified regarding their research activities and opportunities for sharing and collaboration with my mentee.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Angela McBride's "stage model" will be useful in advising/mentoring young faculty.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will have more dialogue between mentors and mentees.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be comfortable in my role as a mentor.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will mentor others more effectively, including immediate team members and other faculty more broadly in our school.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will establish a mentoring program in our center for nursing research of elders.
Implications for the future (Scholars = 5 / Others = 9)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am definitely pursuing a post-doc at one of the HCGNEs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Career building session was helpful. It helped me to see how other successful nurse leaders juggled work, family, etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be able to more closely link my research to national agendas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will model my plan for professional development using the strategic communications information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be able to manage my career more effectively.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be looking for partnership for education and research.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will use principles by Dr. McBride in academic and career development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will work more effectively in the policy arena, namely in choosing emphases and linking our work to them.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will do cognitive reframing with more emphasis on what I accomplish and do well.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will share stages of career with faculty colleagues and revise merit review criteria to show leveling of responsibilities/competencies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will investigate the P20 award discussed by Patricia Grady.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have ideas to develop gerontological nursing offerings at own university.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will write proposals to develop plans to enhance the quality of gerontological education
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will think about how to publicize program offerings and student recruitment materials
Other comments (Scholars = 0 / Others = 5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Angela McBride's stages – very helpful.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shirley Chater – inspirational.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will integrate strategies into image of being/becoming.
<p style="text-align: center;">Whole Conference: What types of sessions would have been helpful or would be helpful in the future to build on material provided at this year's conference? (Comments made by 10 scholars and 12 other respondents)</p>
Networking (Scholars = 10 / Others = 8)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More networking opportunities for scholars to interact/socialize (5).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poster sessions on other scholar's work would be very helpful.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting in smaller groups or post/pre-doc scholars to network and plan for an ongoing relationship.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategies for networking.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add role of attendee and affiliation on name tags (1 scholar, 1 other respondent)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities to meet with post-docs only. I think pre- and post-doc skills require different development strategies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More networking with colleagues. Group diversity needs to be taken into consideration, i.e., scholars, mentor, HCGNE leaders.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish collaborations and partnerships to move to the next step.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity for HCGNE administrators to get together.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sessions (break-out) for HCGNE directors, coordinator, etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More time for constituencies to interact: HCGNE directors, mentors, pre-docs, post-docs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentors introduce themselves.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should have been a dinner for at least the fellows to facilitate getting to know each other.
Specific research and leadership issues (Scholars = 2 / Others = 4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small group discussions about our various projects or discussions around particular themes related to research and leadership.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific how-to's and examples of developing a research program in geriatric nursing; e.g., building a research team, strategies for disseminating work/research, publication/writing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to develop interdisciplinary research and collaborative activities; geriatric nursing research must be interdisciplinary to be most effective and relevant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marketing. Translating research into the practice arena.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More on specific strategies for providing leadership as a nurse.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More focus on gerontology content and policy would be better.
Individual consultation opportunities (Scholars = 0 / Others = 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual consultation opportunities would enhance the learning significantly.
Other Comments (Scholars = 0 / Others = 3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I'll think about this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I know the focus was on the scholars; it was very interesting, but less directly relevant for my HCGNE work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One day is more than enough. The conference was not a good use of the mentor's time; it may have been OK for the pre-docs.

Whole Conference: How conducive was the physical setting/set-up of the rooms for each of the sessions?

(Comments made by 14 scholars and 17 other respondents)

Overall approval (Scholars = 10 / Others = 10)

- *Fine (4).*
- *Excellent (2).*
- *OK (2 scholars, 2 other respondents).*
- *Wonderful!*
- *Fair.*
- *Good (3).*
- *Very good (2).*
- *Comfortable environment.*
- *Yes.*
- *Satisfactory.*

Restroom facilities (Scholars = 4 / Others = 0)

- *Needed larger/better/more restroom facilities (4).*

Physical set-up (Scholars = 3 / Others = 8)

- *Physical setting was thoughtful. Glad luncheon seating changed and was able to interact with others.*
- *Overall good; it was difficult to attend to presentations during lunch.*
- *The round tables in the communication session promoted interaction but was difficult to see front of room.*
- *Setting conducive to interactions (3).*
- *Good mix of setting layouts and formats.*
- *Chairs uncomfortable.*
- *Fine; round tables were best. Not sure why you changed on Thursday afternoon. Not as good.*
- *Tables were cramped on Wednesday; round tables were better on Thursday.*
- *Rooms were of appropriate size.*

Room temperature control (Scholars = 2 / Others = 2)

- *Warm downstairs/freezing upstairs (2 scholars, 1 other respondent).*
- *Need better control over temperature in the room.*

**Whole Conference: Additional Comments
(Comments made by 8 scholars and 7 other respondents)**

Positive reactions to the conference (Scholars = 4 / Others = 3)

- *This was the most valuable conference I've ever attended. The presenters were knowledgeable, generous, sincere, and inspirational. Thank you for all of your hard work in planning this magnificent event.*
- *This was an excellent way to contact nursing leaders in my field of interest.*
- *Thank you for this opportunity!*
- *I enjoyed meeting the scholars and their mentors.*
- *Excellent program.*
- *11/15 enjoyed interactive work.*
- *This was a very valuable conference and I appreciate the opportunity to participate.*

Suggestions for improvement (Scholars = 7 / Others = 5)

- *Would have been helpful to have on name tags identifying who we were, university, and status (pre-doc, post-doc, mentor, etc.) (1 scholar, 1 other respondent).*
- *Have a tag at GSA that says we are Hartford scholars (for ID badge).*
- *I would have liked an opportunity for the pre-docs and post-docs to spend some time alone. We have arranged such a meeting, but it would have been nice to have a half-hour to ourselves to network with each other.*
- *Have time for scholars to network with each other instead of intros at the lunch (or maybe both).*
- *Include contact info on scholar and mentors in the packet, as well as picture of mentors.*
- *Should be more focused on scholars vs. centers.*
- *Meet in July or August so that people aren't distracted by the GSA. I would have liked to meet my colleagues at the outset of our awards and then reconnected at GSA; we are all spread out!*
- *It was good that it was in conjunction with GSA but the overlap was a problem. I would have liked to go to one of the pre-conference workshop and several presentations on Thursday afternoon.*
- *Evaluation form too long. 5-10 minutes should be all it takes.*
- *11/15 breakfast, prefer healthier food such as fruit, cereal, yogurt.*
- *I think it would be valuable to include fellows and scholars who have participated in the NYU institute as well. They represent yet another cohort who would benefit from this training and networking. We cannot afford to leave them out or behind.*

Other comments (Scholars = 0 / Others = 2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The answers to this will occur later, on reflection you know. Overall: excellent, excellent, excellent. I am a "clinical" person. While not an author, I have done many presentations on local, regional and national level, related to gerontological nursing.

Follow-up. Using a telephone interview, the evaluator intends to contact the Scholars, and a selected set of other conference attendees, about 9-12 months after the conference and ask questions about how the techniques and information provided in the conference have been used in the professional development and practice of the respondent.

Recommendations. The following recommendations are based upon the interpretation of the Staff from the Independent Evaluator and represent global conclusions based on the quantitative and qualitative data presented in this report.

- In general, the conference was perceived as an excellent one. While fine-tuning may make it “better,” the basic conference was extremely well-received and does not need to be changed in drastic ways.
- The individuals sitting in the room were a heterogeneous group in terms of their own level of professional development and interests. This heterogeneity might require that some activities in the conference be developed to speak to the more homogenous needs of subgroups of participants, such as break-out groups or more focused discussion-networking opportunities.
- Because of the diversity of the groups in the room, some explanation might be given about why the group was constituted as such, the role of different groups during the conference, and expectations for each type of attendee. This could be done verbally, in the Welcome Session, or in the Conference Book.
- Comments about the need for more networking opportunities suggest that at least some of the participants do not know how to fully utilize the numerous opportunities provided. Perhaps more structured opportunities might be provided to those beginning their careers or to those who are not naturally extroverted or assertive. At least some individuals may have found it difficult to approach strangers or to talk about themselves without a formal way of doing so.
- Certain “structured” activities may lend themselves to networking such as formal self introductions (1-2 minutes) of all conference attendees, ice-breaker exercises early in the first session, a poster session for Scholars to present their research, short CVs of all Scholars and mentors and other participants in the Conference Book, and a scheduled dinner for Scholars (perhaps separating Pre-doctoral and Post-doctoral Scholars).
- Because there are so many individual attending the conference who are demonstrated leaders in different ways, it may be desirable to find ways for these individuals to have different ways of speaking or otherwise imparting their own experiences in leadership to the Scholars. The comments and ratings seem to indicate that many individuals would welcome the opportunity to also participate in a “leader” role within the Conference itself