

**Evaluation of 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference
A John A. Hartford Foundation Funded Project
for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Capacity Initiative**

Appendix I:

Invited Conference Attendees

2001 Pre-Doctoral AAN 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, University of California San Francisco School of Nursing
- 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

2001 Post-Doctoral AAN 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 School of Nursing
- 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

2002 Pre-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars:

- Emelia P. Amoako, MSN, GNP, University of North Carolina at Chapel-Hill School of Nursing
- Charles P. Buscemi, MSN, ARNP, BC, University of Miami School of Nursing
- Karen E. Greco, RN, MN, ANP, Oregon Health Sciences University School of Nursing
- Gwenneth A. Jensen, RN, BSN, MN, University of Iowa
- Sue H. McLennon, MSN, ARNP, University of Florida College of Nursing
- Cheryl A. Monturo, MSN, CRNP-CS, University of Pennsylvania
- Diane L. Norcio, RN-C, GNP, MS, MPH, University of California San Francisco School of Nursing
- Lori L. Popejoy, MSN, RN, CS, GCNS, University of Missouri-Columbia School of Nursing
- Kristine M. C. Talley, RN, BSN, University of Minnesota School of Nursing
- Laura M. Wagner, RN, MSN, Emory University School of Nursing
- Cora D. Zembrzusi, PhD(c), APRN, CS, New York University

2002 Post-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars:

- Beth E. Barba, PhD, RN, University of North Carolina at Greensboro and subcontracted with Duke University School of Nursing – TRAC Center
- Howard K. Butcher, RN, PhD, APRN, BC, University of Iowa
- Patricia R. Coleman, PhD, RN, APRN, BC, University of Rochester School of Nursing, Center for Clinical Research on Aging
- Deanna Gray-Miceli, DNSc, RN, CS, CRNP, University of Pennsylvania
- Judith E. Hertz, PhD, RN, Northern Illinois University School of Nursing and University of Iowa
- Karyn Holm, PhD, RN, FAAN, University of Illinois at Chicago
- Alison E. Kris, RN, BSN, PhD(c), University of California San Francisco School of Nursing

- Debra L. Schutte, PhD, RN, University of Iowa College of Nursing
- Nancy A. Stotts, RN, EdD, FAAN, University of California San Francisco School of Nursing

2002 MBA Hartford Scholars:

- Elizabeth Miller, CRNP(c), RN, University of Pennsylvania
- Denise Jones-Baucke, PhD, RN, University of Washington

2002 AACN Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars:

- Summer Armack, Yale University
- Darby Baker, Case Western Reserve
- Vickie Bierman, Radford University
- Katharine Dexter, University of Washington
- Ughanmwan Efeovbokhan, University of Texas Health
- Dadriane Fice, University of Illinois
- Gloria Flack-Reeves, Radford University
- Cecelia Galeota, University of Pennsylvania
- Alicia Ann Gardiner, Case Western Reserve
- Karen Gilbert, University of Washington
- Susan Grigsby, University of Texas Health
- Jennifer Hahn, Oregon Health and Science
- Karla Heath, University of Washington
- Susan Downs Jaszemski, University of Maryland
- Kathryn Jordan, University of Texas Health
- Haesook Kim, University of Michigan
- John Kinabrew, Yale University
- Cynthia J. Kowalski, Wilkes University
- Shane LaGore, University of Michigan
- Henny Lukas, Case Western Reserve
- Sharolyn McClurg, University of Minnesota
- Laura A. McNamara, Boston College
- Kristen Milio, University of Maryland
- Kathryn Mimick, University of Minnesota
- Beth Morrow, Radford University
- Margaret E. Moss, Boston College
- Jill Radel, University of Minnesota
- Sabrina Reed, Radford University
- Anne Roy, University of Maryland
- Katherine M. Scally, George Mason University
- Tara Schlattman, University of Minnesota
- Carrie Smith, University of Pennsylvania
- Linda Todd, Seattle Pacific University
- Lucy Watson, Northeastern University
- Imelda (Joan) Weddington, Oregon Health and Science
- Yi Zhang, University of Minnesota

Appendix II:
Evaluation Form

**John A. Hartford Foundation
Building Academic Geriatric Nursing 2002 Leadership Conference
Evaluation Form**

Thank you for participating in the John A. Hartford Foundation Building Academic Geriatric Nursing 2002 Leadership Conference. Please take a few moments to provide feedback about this conference. In completing this evaluation, please consider the purposes of this conference:

- To assist the scholars to orchestrate full careers;
- To facilitate the scholars in obtaining the skills training necessary to build programs of research;
- To encourage the development of a national network of geriatric nurse researchers/leaders; and
- To link research to practice and policy changes.

Before we begin, please answer the following six questions. We may wish to follow up with you at a future date about this conference; the information you provide will permit us to develop a special code for you that will allow us to link follow-up data to your responses to this evaluation form while keeping your responses anonymous.

- a. On what day of the month were you born? _____ (1-31)
- b. What is the first letter of your mother's first name? _____ (A-Z)
- c. What is the first letter of your mother's maiden name? _____ (A-Z)
- d. What is the month of your mother's birthday? _____ (1-12)
- e. What is the day of the month of your mother's birthday? _____ (1-31)
- f. In what state were you were born? (enter "ZZ" if not born in U.S.) _____ (2-letter abbreviation)

A. For each session that you attended, please answer the following questions.

Wednesday, November 20, 2002

1. Welcome Lunch (Fagin, McClure)

- a. I attended this session (choose one)
1 Yes 0 No → *If no, skip to Question 2.*
- b. How well did this session frame the purpose of this conference? (choose one)
5 Excellent 4 Very Good 3 Good 2 Fair 1 Poor
- c. How closely did the purpose (as described in this session) match your expectations about this conference? (choose one)
3 Very Closely 2 Somewhat 1 Not at All
- d. How would you rate the session quality? (choose one)
5 Excellent 4 Very Good 3 Good 2 Fair 1 Poor

Comments about this session (optional): _____

**2. “Orchestrating A Research Career” (McBride) or
Poster Presentation Development Session (Beilenson)**

- a. I attended this session (choose one)
1 Yes 0 No → *If no, skip to Question 3.*
- b. Which Session did you attend? (Check all that apply)
2 Orchestrating a Research Career: (McBride)
3 Poster Presentation Development Session: (Beilenson)
- c. How relevant was the session for your work? (choose one)
5 Extremely Relevant 4 Very Relevant 3 Moderately Relevant 2 Slightly Relevant 1 Not at All Relevant
- d. How would you rate the session quality? (choose one)
5 Excellent 4 Very Good 3 Good 2 Fair 1 Poor
- e. How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing? (choose one)
5 Extremely Useful 4 Very Useful 3 Moderately Useful 2 Slightly Useful 1 Not at All Useful
- f. Should this type of session be repeated in future years? (choose one)
5 Definitely 4 Probably 3 Not Sure 2 Probably Not 1 Definitely Not
- g. Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you? (choose one)
1 Yes 0 No

Comments about this session (optional): _____

3. Panel on “Using Risk-Taking/Creativity to Influence Change” (Beverly, Naylor, Harrington)

- a. I attended this session (choose one)
1 Yes 0 No → *If no, skip to Question 4.*
- b. How relevant was the session for your work? (choose one)
5 Extremely Relevant 4 Very Relevant 3 Moderately Relevant 2 Slightly Relevant 1 Not at All Relevant
- c. How would you rate the session quality? (choose one)
5 Excellent 4 Very Good 3 Good 2 Fair 1 Poor
- d. How useful was this session for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing? (choose one)
5 Extremely Useful 4 Very Useful 3 Moderately Useful 2 Slightly Useful 1 Not at All Useful
- e. Should this type of session be repeated in future years? (choose one)
5 Definitely 4 Probably 3 Not Sure 2 Probably Not 1 Definitely Not
- f. Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you? (choose one)
1 Yes 0 No

Comments about this session (optional): _____

6. Panel on "Strategic Vision" (Mezey, Strumpf, Beck)

- a. I attended this session (choose one)
1 Yes 0 No → *If no, skip to Question 7.*
- b. How relevant was the session for your work? (choose one)
5 Extremely Relevant 4 Very Relevant 3 Moderately Relevant 2 Slightly Relevant 1 Not at All Relevant
- c. How would you rate the session quality? (choose one)
5 Excellent 4 Very Good 3 Good 2 Fair 1 Poor
- d. How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing? (choose one)
5 Extremely Useful 4 Very Useful 3 Moderately Useful 2 Slightly Useful 1 Not at All Useful
- e. Should this type of session be repeated in future years? (choose one)
5 Definitely 4 Probably 3 Not Sure 2 Probably Not 1 Definitely Not
- f. Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you? (choose one)
1 Yes 0 No

Comments about this session (optional): _____

7. Concurrent Sessions

- a. I attended this session (choose one)
1 Yes 0 No → *If no, skip to Question 8.*
- b. Which Session did you attend? (Check all that apply)
2 Being an Effective Mentor: (Claire Fagin and Angela McBride)
3 Getting the Most Out of the PreDoc: (Kathy Richards and Carolyn Williams)
4 Getting the Most Out of the PostDoc: (Patricia Archbold and Meridean Maas)
5 Getting the Most Out of Your Masters Program: (Eileen Sullivan-Marx and Mark Foreman)
- c. How relevant was the session for your work? (choose one)
5 Extremely Relevant 4 Very Relevant 3 Moderately Relevant 2 Slightly Relevant 1 Not at All Relevant
- d. How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF* grant? (choose one)
5 Extremely Valuable 4 Very Valuable 3 Moderately Valuable 2 Slightly Valuable 1 Not at All Valuable
- e. How useful was this session for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing? (choose one)
5 Extremely Useful 4 Very Useful 3 Moderately Useful 2 Slightly Useful 1 Not at All Useful
- f. Should this type of session be repeated in future years? (choose one)
5 Definitely 4 Probably 3 Not Sure 2 Probably Not 1 Definitely Not
- g. Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you? (choose one)
1 Yes 0 No

Comments about this session (optional): _____

* JAHF = The John A. Hartford Foundation

18. How appropriate was the number of networking opportunities provided at this conference (e.g., networking luncheons, breaks)? (choose one)

- Too many Just right Not enough

19. How conducive was the setting of this conference to networking? (choose one)

- Extremely Very Moderately Slightly Not at All

20. How appropriate was the combination of panels, concurrent sessions, networking receptions, and other sessions at this conference? (choose one)

- Too Didactic Just Right Too Participatory

21. Please provide up to three (3) concrete or specific examples of how you think you will use the information from the conference to increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

22. What types of sessions that were not included at the conference would have been helpful? What would be helpful in future leadership conferences to build on material provided at this year's conference?

C. Please think back to last year's conference.

23. Did you attend the Leadership Conference last year?

- Yes No → *If no, skip to Question 27.*

24. Check the box that best describes your opinion of how this year's conference was compared to last year's conference.

a. The overall quality of this year's conference was: (choose one)

- Better than last year About the same Not as good as last year

c. The overall relevance of this year's conference to my work was: (choose one)

- More relevant than last year About the same Less relevant than last year

d. The opportunities for networking and interacting with peers in this year's conference were: (choose one)

- Better than last year About the same Not as good as last year

e. This year's conference increased my leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing (choose one)

- More than last year About the same Less than last year

25. Did you use any information from last year's Leadership Conference over the course of the year?

- Yes No → *If no, skip to Question 26.*

Please provide up to three (3) concrete examples of how you used the information received from the 2001 Leadership Conference over the course of the year.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

26. Did the networking opportunities provided by the 2001 Leadership Conference result in any synergistic relationships or collaborations during the year?

- Yes No → *If no, skip to Question 27.*

Please provide up to three (3) concrete examples of synergistic relationships or collaborations that arose from networking opportunities that occurred during the 2001 Leadership Conference.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Thank you very much for your feedback. Please turn in your completed evaluation form to the registration desk or to a representative of The Measurement Group.

Appendix III:

Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

A. Welcome Lunch

Welcome Lunch: How well did this session frame the purpose of this conference?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Good	4	44.4	44.4	55.6
		Excellent	4	44.4	44.4	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	5	41.7	41.7	50.0
		Excellent	6	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	4	66.7	66.7	66.7
		Excellent	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Excellent	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Good	1	7.7	10.0	10.0
		Very Good	4	30.8	40.0	50.0
		Excellent	5	38.5	50.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Good	1	7.1	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	3	21.4	25.0	33.3
		Excellent	8	57.1	66.7	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Welcome Lunch: How closely did the purpose (as described in this session) match your expectations about this conference?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Closely	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Somewhat	2	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Closely	10	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Closely	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Closely	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Somewhat	1	7.7	10.0	10.0
		Very Closely	9	69.2	90.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Somewhat	2	14.3	16.7	16.7
		Very Closely	10	71.4	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Welcome Lunch: How would you rate the session quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Good	4	44.4	44.4	55.6
		Excellent	4	44.4	44.4	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	5	41.7	41.7	50.0
		Excellent	6	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Excellent	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Excellent	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Good	1	7.7	10.0	10.0
		Very Good	4	30.8	40.0	50.0
		Excellent	5	38.5	50.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Fair	1	7.1	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	3	21.4	25.0	33.3
		Excellent	8	57.1	66.7	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

B. “Orchestrating A Research Career”/Poster Presentation Development Session**Research Career/Poster Presentation Development: Which Session did you attend?**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Poster Presentation Development Session	4	44.4	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	5	55.6		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Orchestrating a Research Career	12	100.0	100.0	100.0
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Poster Presentation Development Session	5	83.3	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Orchestrating a Research Career	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Orchestrating a Research Career	6	46.2	75.0	75.0
		Poster Presentation Development Session	2	15.4	25.0	100.0
		Total	8	61.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	38.5		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Orchestrating a Research Career	6	42.9	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	8	57.1		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Research Career/Poster Presentation Development: How relevant was the session for your work?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	3	33.3	75.0	75.0	
		Extremely Relevant	1	11.1	25.0	100.0	
		Total	4	44.4	100.0		
	Missing	System	5	55.6			
	Total		9	100.0			
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	8.3	8.3	8.3	
		Very Relevant	4	33.3	33.3	41.7	
		Extremely Relevant	7	58.3	58.3	100.0	
		Total	12	100.0	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	5	83.3	100.0	100.0	
		Missing	System	1	16.7		
		Total	6	100.0			
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	16.7	
		Extremely Relevant	5	83.3	83.3	100.0	
		Total	6	100.0	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	7.7	12.5	12.5	
		Very Relevant	2	15.4	25.0	37.5	
		Extremely Relevant	5	38.5	62.5	100.0	
		Total	8	61.5	100.0		
	Missing	System	5	38.5			
Total		13	100.0				
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Relevant	3	21.4	60.0	60.0	
		Extremely Relevant	2	14.3	40.0	100.0	
		Total	5	35.7	100.0		
	Missing	System	9	64.3			
	Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Research Career/Poster Presentation Development: How would you rate the session quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	2	22.2	50.0	50.0
		Excellent	2	22.2	50.0	100.0
		Total	4	44.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	55.6		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	2	16.7	16.7	25.0
		Excellent	9	75.0	75.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	3	50.0	60.0	60.0
		Excellent	2	33.3	40.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Excellent	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Fair	1	7.7	12.5	12.5
		Excellent	7	53.8	87.5	100.0
		Total	8	61.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	38.5		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Good	2	14.3	40.0	40.0
		Excellent	3	21.4	60.0	100.0
		Total	5	35.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	9	64.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Research Career/Poster Presentation Development: How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Useful	3	33.3	75.0	75.0
		Extremely Useful	1	11.1	25.0	100.0
		Total	4	44.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	55.6		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Useful	5	41.7	41.7	50.0
		Extremely Useful	6	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Useful	5	83.3	100.0	100.0
		Missing	System	1	16.7	
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Useful	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Extremely Useful	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	7.7	12.5	12.5
		Very Useful	2	15.4	25.0	37.5
		Extremely Useful	5	38.5	62.5	100.0
		Total	8	61.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	38.5		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Moderately Useful	3	21.4	60.0	60.0
		Very Useful	1	7.1	20.0	80.0
		Extremely Useful	1	7.1	20.0	100.0
		Total	5	35.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	9	64.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Research Career/Poster Presentation Development: Should this type of session be repeated in future years?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	11.1	25.0	25.0
		Probably	1	11.1	25.0	50.0
		Definitely	2	22.2	50.0	100.0
		Total	4	44.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	55.6		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Definitely	11	91.7	91.7	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Definitely	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Definitely	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	7.7	12.5	12.5
		Definitely	7	53.8	87.5	100.0
		Total	8	61.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	38.5		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Not Sure	1	7.1	20.0	20.0
		Definitely	4	28.6	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	35.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	9	64.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Research Career/Poster Presentation Development: Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	11.1	25.0	25.0
		Yes	3	33.3	75.0	100.0
		Total	4	44.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	55.6		
		Total	9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	2	16.7	18.2	18.2
		Yes	9	75.0	81.8	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
		Total	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	16.7	33.3	33.3
		Yes	2	33.3	66.7	100.0
		Total	3	50.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	50.0		
		Total	6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	1	7.7	12.5	12.5
		Yes	7	53.8	87.5	100.0
		Total	8	61.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	38.5		
		Total	13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	No	1	7.1	20.0	20.0
		Yes	4	28.6	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	35.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	9	64.3		
		Total	14	100.0		

C. Panel on “Using Risk-Taking/Creativity to Influence Change”**Panel: How relevant was the session for your work?**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		Extremely Relevant	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Relevant	5	41.7	41.7	50.0
		Extremely Relevant	6	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Extremely Relevant	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Relevant	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
		Extremely Relevant	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Moderately Relevant	2	15.4	18.2	27.3
		Very Relevant	6	46.2	54.5	81.8
		Extremely Relevant	2	15.4	18.2	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
	Total	13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Very Relevant	4	28.6	30.8	38.5
		Extremely Relevant	8	57.1	61.5	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
	Total	14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Panel: How would you rate the session quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	2	22.2	22.2	22.2
		Very Good	3	33.3	33.3	55.6
		Excellent	4	44.4	44.4	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	8	66.7	66.7	75.0
		Excellent	3	25.0	25.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	4	66.7	66.7	66.7
		Excellent	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	4	66.7	66.7	66.7
		Excellent	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Poor	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Good	2	15.4	18.2	27.3
		Very Good	5	38.5	45.5	72.7
		Excellent	3	23.1	27.3	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Fair	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Very Good	5	35.7	38.5	46.2
		Excellent	7	50.0	53.8	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Panel: How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		Very Useful	3	33.3	33.3	77.8
		Extremely Useful	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	2	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Useful	6	50.0	50.0	66.7
		Extremely Useful	4	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Useful	4	66.7	66.7	66.7
		Extremely Useful	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Very Useful	1	16.7	16.7	50.0
		Extremely Useful	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	7.7	10.0	10.0
		Moderately Useful	4	30.8	40.0	50.0
		Very Useful	4	30.8	40.0	90.0
		Extremely Useful	1	7.7	10.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
	Total	13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Slightly Useful	2	14.3	15.4	15.4
		Moderately Useful	1	7.1	7.7	23.1
		Very Useful	4	28.6	30.8	53.8
		Extremely Useful	6	42.9	46.2	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
	Total	14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Panel: Should this type of session be repeated in future years?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		Definitely	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Probably	6	50.0	50.0	58.3
		Definitely	5	41.7	41.7	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	4	66.7	66.7	66.7
		Definitely	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Definitely	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Definitely Not	1	7.7	10.0	10.0
		Not Sure	2	15.4	20.0	30.0
		Probably	3	23.1	30.0	60.0
		Definitely	4	30.8	40.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Probably Not	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Not Sure	1	7.1	7.7	15.4
		Probably	5	35.7	38.5	53.8
		Definitely	6	42.9	46.2	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Panel: Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	
		Yes	6	66.7	66.7	100.0	
		Total	9	100.0	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	8.3	9.1	9.1	
		Yes	10	83.3	90.9	100.0	
		Total	11	91.7	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	8.3			
	Total		12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	4	66.7	100.0	100.0	
		Missing	System	2	33.3		
		Total	6	100.0			
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	3	23.1	33.3	33.3	
		Yes	6	46.2	66.7	100.0	
		Total	9	69.2	100.0		
	Missing	System	4	30.8			
	Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	No	2	14.3	20.0	20.0	
		Yes	8	57.1	80.0	100.0	
		Total	10	71.4	100.0		
	Missing	System	4	28.6			
	Total		14	100.0			

D. Poster Presentation and Reception (Class of 2001)**Poster Presentation: I presented a poster at this session.**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Yes	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	11	91.7	100.0	100.0
		Missing System	1	8.3		
		Total	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	5	83.3	83.3	83.3
		Yes	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	8	61.5	80.0	80.0
		Yes	2	15.4	20.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
		Total	13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	No	9	64.3	90.0	90.0
		Yes	1	7.1	10.0	100.0
		Total	10	71.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	28.6		
		Total	14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Poster Presentation: How relevant was the session for your work?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Extremely Relevant	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	2	16.7	18.2	18.2
		Very Relevant	3	25.0	27.3	45.5
		Extremely Relevant	6	50.0	54.5	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total	12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Extremely Relevant	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Extremely Relevant	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	2	15.4	20.0	20.0
		Very Relevant	5	38.5	50.0	70.0
		Extremely Relevant	3	23.1	30.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
	Total	13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Moderately Relevant	3	21.4	27.3	27.3
		Very Relevant	5	35.7	45.5	72.7
		Extremely Relevant	3	21.4	27.3	100.0
		Total	11	78.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	21.4		
	Total	14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Poster Presentation: How would you rate the session quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		Excellent	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	8.3	9.1	9.1
		Very Good	5	41.7	45.5	54.5
		Excellent	5	41.7	45.5	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Excellent	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Excellent	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Good	2	15.4	20.0	20.0
		Very Good	4	30.8	40.0	60.0
		Excellent	4	30.8	40.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Good	1	7.1	9.1	9.1
		Very Good	3	21.4	27.3	36.4
		Excellent	7	50.0	63.6	100.0
		Total	11	78.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	21.4		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Poster Presentation: How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Useful	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
		Extremely Useful	7	77.8	77.8	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	8.3	9.1	9.1
		Slightly Useful	1	8.3	9.1	18.2
		Moderately Useful	4	33.3	36.4	54.5
		Very Useful	2	16.7	18.2	72.7
		Extremely Useful	3	25.0	27.3	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
Total		12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Useful	4	66.7	66.7	66.7
		Extremely Useful	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Very Useful	1	16.7	16.7	50.0
		Extremely Useful	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	7.7	10.0	10.0
		Slightly Useful	1	7.7	10.0	20.0
		Very Useful	5	38.5	50.0	70.0
		Extremely Useful	3	23.1	30.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Slightly Useful	3	21.4	30.0	30.0
		Moderately Useful	4	28.6	40.0	70.0
		Very Useful	3	21.4	30.0	100.0
		Total	10	71.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	28.6		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Poster Presentation: Should this type of session be repeated in future years?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Definitely	9	100.0	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably Not	1	8.3	9.1	9.1	
		Probably	1	8.3	9.1	18.2	
		Definitely	9	75.0	81.8	100.0	
		Total	11	91.7	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	8.3			
	Total		12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	1	16.7	16.7	16.7	
		Definitely	5	83.3	83.3	100.0	
		Total	6	100.0	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Definitely	6	100.0	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Definitely	10	76.9	100.0	100.0	
		Missing	System	3	23.1		
		Total	13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Not Sure	1	7.1	9.1	9.1	
		Probably	3	21.4	27.3	36.4	
		Definitely	7	50.0	63.6	100.0	
		Total	11	78.6	100.0		
	Missing	System	3	21.4			
	Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Poster Presentation: Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	2	16.7	18.2	18.2
		Yes	9	75.0	81.8	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
		Total	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Yes	10	76.9	100.0	100.0
		Missing	System	3	23.1	
		Total	13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	No	1	7.1	14.3	14.3
		Yes	6	42.9	85.7	100.0
		Total	7	50.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	7	50.0		
		Total	14	100.0		

E. Panel on “Interpersonal/Communication Effectiveness”**Communication Effectiveness: How relevant was the session for your work?**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Relevant	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
		Extremely Relevant	7	77.8	77.8	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Relevant	1	8.3	8.3	16.7
		Extremely Relevant	10	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Relevant	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
		Extremely Relevant	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Extremely Relevant	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	3	23.1	23.1	23.1
		Extremely Relevant	10	76.9	76.9	100.0
		Total	13	100.0	100.0	
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Moderately Relevant	2	14.3	15.4	23.1
		Very Relevant	2	14.3	15.4	38.5
		Extremely Relevant	8	57.1	61.5	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Communication Effectiveness: How would you rate the session quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Good	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
		Excellent	7	77.8	77.8	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	3	25.0	25.0	25.0
		Excellent	9	75.0	75.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Good	3	50.0	50.0	66.7
		Excellent	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Excellent	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Good	1	7.7	7.7	7.7
		Very Good	3	23.1	23.1	30.8
		Excellent	9	69.2	69.2	100.0
		Total	13	100.0	100.0	
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Fair	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Very Good	4	28.6	30.8	38.5
		Excellent	8	57.1	61.5	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
Total			14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Communication Effectiveness: How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Useful	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
		Extremely Useful	7	77.8	77.8	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Useful	2	16.7	16.7	25.0
		Extremely Useful	9	75.0	75.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Useful	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
		Extremely Useful	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Useful	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Extremely Useful	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	7.7	7.7	7.7
		Very Useful	4	30.8	30.8	38.5
		Extremely Useful	8	61.5	61.5	100.0
		Total	13	100.0	100.0	
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Slightly Useful	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Moderately Useful	1	7.1	7.7	15.4
		Very Useful	4	28.6	30.8	46.2
		Extremely Useful	7	50.0	53.8	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Communication Effectiveness: Should this type of session be repeated in future years?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	11.1	11.1	11.1	
		Probably	1	11.1	11.1	22.2	
		Definitely	7	77.8	77.8	100.0	
		Total	9	100.0	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	2	16.7	16.7	16.7	
		Definitely	10	83.3	83.3	100.0	
		Total	12	100.0	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	16.7	16.7	16.7	
		Probably	2	33.3	33.3	50.0	
		Definitely	3	50.0	50.0	100.0	
		Total	6	100.0	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	1	16.7	16.7	16.7	
		Definitely	5	83.3	83.3	100.0	
		Total	6	100.0	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Probably	4	30.8	30.8	30.8	
		Definitely	9	69.2	69.2	100.0	
		Total	13	100.0	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Probably Not	1	7.1	7.7	7.7	
		Probably	3	21.4	23.1	30.8	
		Definitely	9	64.3	69.2	100.0	
		Total	13	92.9	100.0		
	Missing	System		1	7.1		
			Total	14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Communication Effectiveness: Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Yes	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	11	91.7	100.0	100.0
		Missing System	1	8.3		
		Total	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	2	33.3	40.0	40.0
		Yes	3	50.0	60.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing System		1	16.7		
		Total	6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Yes	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Missing System		22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	1	7.7	7.7	7.7
		Yes	12	92.3	92.3	100.0
		Total	13	100.0	100.0	
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	No	2	14.3	16.7	16.7
		Yes	10	71.4	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing System		2	14.3		
		Total	14	100.0		

F. Panel on “Strategic Vision”**Strategic Vision: How relevant was the session for your work?**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	6	66.7	66.7	66.7
		Extremely Relevant	3	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	4	33.3	36.4	36.4
		Extremely Relevant	7	58.3	63.6	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
Total		12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Extremely Relevant	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Extremely Relevant	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	4.5	5.3	5.3
		Moderately Relevant	4	18.2	21.1	26.3
		Very Relevant	8	36.4	42.1	68.4
		Extremely Relevant	6	27.3	31.6	100.0
		Total	19	86.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	13.6		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Very Relevant	6	46.2	54.5	63.6
		Extremely Relevant	4	30.8	36.4	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Very Relevant	3	21.4	23.1	30.8
		Extremely Relevant	9	64.3	69.2	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Strategic Vision: How would you rate the session quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Good	6	66.7	66.7	77.8
		Excellent	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	8.3	9.1	9.1
		Very Good	4	33.3	36.4	45.5
		Excellent	6	50.0	54.5	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
Total		12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Excellent	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Excellent	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Good	3	13.6	15.8	15.8
		Very Good	8	36.4	42.1	57.9
		Excellent	8	36.4	42.1	100.0
		Total	19	86.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	13.6		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Fair	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	6	46.2	50.0	58.3
		Excellent	5	38.5	41.7	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Good	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Very Good	1	7.1	7.7	15.4
		Excellent	11	78.6	84.6	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Strategic Vision: How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Useful	5	55.6	55.6	66.7
		Extremely Useful	3	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	2	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Useful	3	25.0	25.0	41.7
		Extremely Useful	7	58.3	58.3	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Useful	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Extremely Useful	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Useful	1	16.7	16.7	33.3
		Extremely Useful	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	4.5	5.3	5.3
		Slightly Useful	2	9.1	10.5	15.8
		Moderately Useful	2	9.1	10.5	26.3
		Very Useful	5	22.7	26.3	52.6
		Extremely Useful	9	40.9	47.4	100.0
		Total	19	86.4	100.0	
	Missing System	3	13.6			
Total	22	100.0				
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very Useful	8	61.5	66.7	75.0
		Extremely Useful	3	23.1	25.0	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing System	1	7.7			
Total	13	100.0				
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Very Useful	3	21.4	23.1	30.8
		Extremely Useful	9	64.3	69.2	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing System	1	7.1			
Total	14	100.0				

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Strategic Vision: Should this type of session be repeated in future years?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		Definitely	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	4	33.3	36.4	36.4
		Definitely	7	58.3	63.6	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Definitely	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Definitely	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Probably Not	1	4.5	5.6	5.6
		Not Sure	1	4.5	5.6	11.1
		Probably	7	31.8	38.9	50.0
		Definitely	9	40.9	50.0	100.0
		Total	18	81.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	18.2		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Probably	5	38.5	41.7	50.0
		Definitely	6	46.2	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Probably	4	28.6	33.3	33.3
		Definitely	8	57.1	66.7	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Strategic Vision: Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	11.1	14.3	14.3
		Yes	6	66.7	85.7	100.0
		Total	7	77.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	22.2		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	11	91.7	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Yes	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Valid	No	2	9.1	11.8	11.8
		Yes	15	68.2	88.2	100.0
		Total	17	77.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	22.7		
	Total		22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Yes	11	84.6	91.7	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Yes	12	85.7	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

G. Concurrent Sessions**Concurrent Sessions: Which Session did you attend?**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Getting the Most Out of the PreDoc	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Getting the Most Out of the PreDoc	10	83.3	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	2	16.7		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Getting the Most Out of the PostDoc	5	83.3	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Getting the Most Out of the PostDoc	5	83.3	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Getting the Most Out of Your Masters Program	22	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Being an Effective Mentor	11	84.6	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Being an Effective Mentor	6	42.9	60.0	60.0
		Getting the Most Out of the PreDoc	1	7.1	10.0	70.0
		Getting the Most Out of the PostDoc	1	7.1	10.0	80.0
		Getting the Most Out of Your Masters Program	2	14.3	20.0	100.0
		Total	10	71.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	28.6		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Concurrent Sessions: How relevant was the session for your work?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	4	44.4	57.1	57.1
		Very Relevant	2	22.2	28.6	85.7
		Extremely Relevant	1	11.1	14.3	100.0
		Total	7	77.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	22.2		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Relevant	1	8.3	10.0	10.0
		Slightly Relevant	1	8.3	10.0	20.0
		Moderately Relevant	4	33.3	40.0	60.0
		Extremely Relevant	4	33.3	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	83.3	100.0		
Missing	System	2	16.7			
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Very Relevant	2	33.3	40.0	60.0
		Extremely Relevant	2	33.3	40.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Relevant	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Moderately Relevant	2	33.3	40.0	60.0
		Very Relevant	1	16.7	20.0	80.0
		Extremely Relevant	1	16.7	20.0	100.0
	Total	5	83.3	100.0		
Missing	System	1	16.7			
	Total		6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	2	9.1	9.1	9.1
		Very Relevant	4	18.2	18.2	27.3
		Extremely Relevant	16	72.7	72.7	100.0
		Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Very Relevant	1	7.7	9.1	18.2
		Extremely Relevant	9	69.2	81.8	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Relevant	1	7.1	11.1	11.1
		Extremely Relevant	8	57.1	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	64.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	35.7		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Concurrent Sessions: How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Valuable	1	11.1	12.5	12.5
		Slightly Valuable	1	11.1	12.5	25.0
		Moderately Valuable	3	33.3	37.5	62.5
		Very Valuable	1	11.1	12.5	75.0
		Extremely Valuable	2	22.2	25.0	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	11.1		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Valuable	1	8.3	10.0	10.0
		Slightly Valuable	1	8.3	10.0	20.0
		Moderately Valuable	5	41.7	50.0	70.0
		Very Valuable	1	8.3	10.0	80.0
		Extremely Valuable	2	16.7	20.0	100.0
		Total	10	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	16.7		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Valuable	3	50.0	60.0	60.0
		Very Valuable	2	33.3	40.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Valuable	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Moderately Valuable	2	33.3	40.0	60.0
		Very Valuable	2	33.3	40.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Moderately Valuable	6	27.3	27.3	27.3
		Very Valuable	4	18.2	18.2	45.5
		Extremely Valuable	12	54.5	54.5	100.0
		Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Valuable	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Very Valuable	3	23.1	27.3	36.4
		Extremely Valuable	7	53.8	63.6	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Valuable	2	14.3	22.2	22.2
		Extremely Valuable	7	50.0	77.8	100.0
		Total	9	64.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	35.7		
		Total		14	100.0	

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Concurrent Sessions: How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	3	33.3	37.5	37.5
		Moderately Useful	3	33.3	37.5	75.0
		Very Useful	1	11.1	12.5	87.5
		Extremely Useful	1	11.1	12.5	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	11.1		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	2	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Slightly Useful	3	25.0	30.0	50.0
		Moderately Useful	2	16.7	20.0	70.0
		Very Useful	1	8.3	10.0	80.0
		Extremely Useful	2	16.7	20.0	100.0
		Total	10	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	16.7		
Total		12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Moderately Useful	1	16.7	20.0	40.0
		Very Useful	3	50.0	60.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
Total		6	100.0			
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Slightly Useful	1	16.7	20.0	40.0
		Moderately Useful	2	33.3	40.0	80.0
		Very Useful	1	16.7	20.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
Total		6	100.0			
AACN Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	3	13.6	13.6	13.6
		Moderately Useful	5	22.7	22.7	36.4
		Very Useful	3	13.6	13.6	50.0
		Extremely Useful	11	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Very Useful	4	30.8	36.4	45.5
		Extremely Useful	6	46.2	54.5	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Useful	3	21.4	33.3	33.3
		Extremely Useful	6	42.9	66.7	100.0
		Total	9	64.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	35.7		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Concurrent Sessions: Should this type of session be repeated in future years?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	11.1	12.5	12.5
		Probably	3	33.3	37.5	50.0
		Definitely	4	44.4	50.0	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	11.1		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Definitely Not	1	8.3	10.0	10.0
		Not Sure	3	25.0	30.0	40.0
		Probably	1	8.3	10.0	50.0
		Definitely	5	41.7	50.0	100.0
		Total	10	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	16.7		
Total		12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	2	33.3	40.0	40.0
		Definitely	3	50.0	60.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
Total		6	100.0			
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Definitely Not	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Not Sure	1	16.7	20.0	40.0
		Probably	1	16.7	20.0	60.0
		Definitely	2	33.3	40.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
Total		6	100.0			
AACN Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	4.5	4.5	4.5
		Probably	6	27.3	27.3	31.8
		Definitely	15	68.2	68.2	100.0
		Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Definitely Not	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Definitely	10	76.9	90.9	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Probably	1	7.1	11.1	11.1
		Definitely	8	57.1	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	64.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	35.7		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Concurrent Sessions: Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	3	33.3	37.5	37.5
		Yes	5	55.6	62.5	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	11.1		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	4	33.3	40.0	40.0
		Yes	6	50.0	60.0	100.0
		Total	10	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	16.7		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	3	50.0	75.0	75.0
		Yes	1	16.7	25.0	100.0
		Total	4	66.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	33.3		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	3	50.0	60.0	60.0
		Yes	2	33.3	40.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Yes	22	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Yes	10	76.9	90.9	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Yes	9	64.3	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	5	35.7		
	Total		14	100.0		

H. Conversation with a Geriatric Nurse Heroine: Dr. Mary Starke Harper**Conversation with Heroine: How relevant was the session for your work?**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Extremely Relevant	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	1	8.3	9.1	9.1
		Extremely Relevant	10	83.3	90.9	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	33.3
		Extremely Relevant	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Relevant	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Extremely Relevant	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	4.5	5.0	5.0
		Very Relevant	6	27.3	30.0	35.0
		Extremely Relevant	13	59.1	65.0	100.0
		Total	20	90.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	9.1		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very Relevant	4	30.8	33.3	41.7
		Extremely Relevant	7	53.8	58.3	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	7.1	8.3	8.3
		Very Relevant	1	7.1	8.3	16.7
		Extremely Relevant	10	71.4	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Conversation with Heroine: How would you rate the session quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Excellent	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	2	16.7	18.2	18.2
		Excellent	9	75.0	81.8	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Excellent	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Fair	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Excellent	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Very Good	3	13.6	15.0	15.0
		Excellent	17	77.3	85.0	100.0
		Total	20	90.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	9.1		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Fair	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	2	15.4	16.7	25.0
		Excellent	9	69.2	75.0	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Fair	1	7.1	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	1	7.1	8.3	16.7
		Excellent	10	71.4	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Conversation with Heroine: How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Extremely Valuable	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Valuable	2	16.7	18.2	18.2
		Extremely Valuable	9	75.0	81.8	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Valuable	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Valuable	3	50.0	50.0	66.7
		Extremely Valuable	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Valuable	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Extremely Valuable	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Slightly Valuable	1	4.5	5.0	5.0
		Moderately Valuable	2	9.1	10.0	15.0
		Very Valuable	4	18.2	20.0	35.0
		Extremely Valuable	13	59.1	65.0	100.0
		Total	20	90.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	9.1		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Valuable	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Moderately Valuable	3	23.1	25.0	33.3
		Extremely Valuable	8	61.5	66.7	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Slightly Valuable	2	14.3	16.7	16.7
		Very Valuable	4	28.6	33.3	50.0
		Extremely Valuable	6	42.9	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Conversation with Heroine: How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Extremely Useful	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Useful	2	16.7	18.2	18.2
		Extremely Useful	9	75.0	81.8	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Moderately Useful	1	16.7	16.7	33.3
		Very Useful	2	33.3	33.3	66.7
		Extremely Useful	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Extremely Useful	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	1	4.5	5.0	5.0
		Moderately Useful	1	4.5	5.0	10.0
		Very Useful	5	22.7	25.0	35.0
		Extremely Useful	13	59.1	65.0	100.0
		Total	20	90.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	9.1		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	2	15.4	16.7	16.7
		Very Useful	3	23.1	25.0	41.7
		Extremely Useful	7	53.8	58.3	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	7.1	8.3	8.3
		Very Useful	3	21.4	25.0	33.3
		Extremely Useful	8	57.1	66.7	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Conversation with Heroine: Should this type of session be repeated in future years?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Definitely	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	1	8.3	9.1	9.1
		Definitely	10	83.3	90.9	100.0
		Total	11	91.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Probably	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
		Definitely	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Definitely Not	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Definitely	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Probably	2	9.1	10.5	10.5
		Definitely	17	77.3	89.5	100.0
		Total	19	86.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	13.6		
	Total		22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Definitely	11	84.6	91.7	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Not Sure	1	7.1	8.3	8.3
		Probably	1	7.1	8.3	16.7
		Definitely	10	71.4	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Conversation with Heroine: Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	11	91.7	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	1	8.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Yes	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total		6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Yes	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
	Total		5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
Total		6	100.0			
AACN Scholar	Valid	No	1	4.5	5.0	5.0
		Yes	19	86.4	95.0	100.0
	Total		20	90.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	9.1		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Yes	10	76.9	90.9	100.0
	Total		11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Yes	12	85.7	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
	Total		14	100.0		

I. Panel on “Inspiring and Leading Change”**Inspiring and Leading Change: How relevant was the session for your work?**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Extremely Relevant	6	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	3	25.0	33.3	33.3
		Extremely Relevant	6	50.0	66.7	100.0
		Total	9	75.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	25.0		
	Total	12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Extremely Relevant	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Extremely Relevant	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	2	9.1	10.0	10.0
		Very Relevant	7	31.8	35.0	45.0
		Extremely Relevant	11	50.0	55.0	100.0
		Total	20	90.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	9.1		
	Total	22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Moderately Relevant	2	15.4	16.7	25.0
		Very Relevant	4	30.8	33.3	58.3
		Extremely Relevant	5	38.5	41.7	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
	Total	13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Relevant	2	14.3	15.4	15.4
		Extremely Relevant	11	78.6	84.6	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
	Total	14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Inspiring and Leading Change: How would you rate the session quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		Excellent	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Fair	1	8.3	11.1	11.1
		Very Good	4	33.3	44.4	55.6
		Excellent	4	33.3	44.4	100.0
		Total	9	75.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	25.0		
Total		12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Excellent	5	83.3	100.0	100.0
		Missing	System	1	16.7	
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Excellent	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Good	2	9.1	9.5	9.5
		Very Good	7	31.8	33.3	42.9
		Excellent	12	54.5	57.1	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Fair	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Good	1	7.7	8.3	16.7
		Very Good	4	30.8	33.3	50.0
		Excellent	6	46.2	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Excellent	13	92.9	100.0	100.0
		Missing	System	1	7.1	
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Inspiring and Leading Change: How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	2	22.2	22.2	22.2	
		Very Useful	1	11.1	11.1	33.3	
		Extremely Useful	6	66.7	66.7	100.0	
		Total	9	100.0	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	8.3	11.1	11.1	
		Very Useful	6	50.0	66.7	77.8	
		Extremely Useful	2	16.7	22.2	100.0	
		Total	9	75.0	100.0		
	Missing	System	3	25.0			
Total		12	100.0				
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Extremely Useful	5	83.3	100.0	100.0	
		Missing	System	1	16.7		
		Total	6	100.0			
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	2	33.3	33.3	33.3	
		Extremely Useful	4	66.7	66.7	100.0	
		Total	6	100.0	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	4	18.2	19.0	19.0	
		Very Useful	7	31.8	33.3	52.4	
		Extremely Useful	10	45.5	47.6	100.0	
		Total	21	95.5	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	4.5			
Total		22	100.0				
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	1	7.7	8.3	8.3	
		Moderately Useful	2	15.4	16.7	25.0	
		Very Useful	3	23.1	25.0	50.0	
		Extremely Useful	6	46.2	50.0	100.0	
		Total	12	92.3	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	7.7			
Total		13	100.0				
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Useful	1	7.1	7.7	7.7	
		Extremely Useful	12	85.7	92.3	100.0	
		Total	13	92.9	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	7.1			
	Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Inspiring and Leading Change: Should this type of session be repeated in future years?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Definitely	6	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	3	25.0	33.3	33.3
		Definitely	6	50.0	66.7	100.0
		Total	9	75.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	25.0		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Definitely	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Definitely	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Probably	5	22.7	23.8	23.8
		Definitely	16	72.7	76.2	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
	Total		22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Probably Not	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Not Sure	1	7.7	8.3	16.7
		Probably	1	7.7	8.3	25.0
		Definitely	9	69.2	75.0	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Definitely Not	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Not Sure	1	7.1	7.7	15.4
		Probably	1	7.1	7.7	23.1
		Definitely	10	71.4	76.9	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Inspiring and Leading Change: Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	11.1	12.5	12.5
		Yes	7	77.8	87.5	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	11.1		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	8	66.7	100.0	100.0
		Missing	System	4	33.3	
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	4	66.7	100.0	100.0
		Missing	System	2	33.3	
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Valid	No	1	4.5	4.8	4.8
		Yes	20	90.9	95.2	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
	Total		22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Yes	10	76.9	90.9	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Yes	12	85.7	100.0	100.0
		Missing	System	2	14.3	
	Total		14	100.0		

J. Endnotes: Reflections on Leadership in Gerontology**Endnotes: How relevant was the session for your work?**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	1	11.1	20.0	20.0
		Extremely Relevant	4	44.4	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	55.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	44.4		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	4	33.3	44.4	44.4
		Extremely Relevant	5	41.7	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	75.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	25.0		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Very Relevant	2	33.3	33.3	66.7
		Extremely Relevant	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Extremely Relevant	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	4.5	6.3	6.3
		Moderately Relevant	3	13.6	18.8	25.0
		Very Relevant	7	31.8	43.8	68.8
		Extremely Relevant	5	22.7	31.3	100.0
		Total	16	72.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	6	27.3		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Moderately Relevant	1	7.7	9.1	18.2
		Very Relevant	2	15.4	18.2	36.4
		Extremely Relevant	7	53.8	63.6	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Relevant	2	14.3	20.0	20.0
		Extremely Relevant	8	57.1	80.0	100.0
		Total	10	71.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	28.6		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Endnotes: How would you rate the session quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	1	11.1	20.0	20.0
		Excellent	4	44.4	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	55.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	44.4		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Good	4	33.3	44.4	44.4
		Excellent	5	41.7	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	75.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	25.0		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Very Good	2	33.3	33.3	66.7
		Excellent	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Excellent	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Fair	1	4.5	6.3	6.3
		Good	1	4.5	6.3	12.5
		Very Good	9	40.9	56.3	68.8
		Excellent	5	22.7	31.3	100.0
		Total	16	72.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	6	27.3		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Fair	2	15.4	18.2	18.2
		Excellent	9	69.2	81.8	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Good	3	21.4	30.0	30.0
		Excellent	7	50.0	70.0	100.0
		Total	10	71.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	28.6		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Endnotes: How useful was the session content for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Useful	1	11.1	25.0	25.0
		Extremely Useful	3	33.3	75.0	100.0
		Total	4	44.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	55.6		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	8.3	11.1	11.1
		Very Useful	3	25.0	33.3	44.4
		Extremely Useful	5	41.7	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	75.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	25.0		
Total		12	100.0			
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Very Useful	2	33.3	33.3	83.3
		Extremely Useful	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Extremely Useful	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	1	4.5	6.3	6.3
		Moderately Useful	2	9.1	12.5	18.8
		Very Useful	9	40.9	56.3	75.0
		Extremely Useful	4	18.2	25.0	100.0
		Total	16	72.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	6	27.3		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	1	7.7	9.1	9.1
		Moderately Useful	1	7.7	9.1	18.2
		Very Useful	5	38.5	45.5	63.6
		Extremely Useful	4	30.8	36.4	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Useful	4	28.6	44.4	44.4
		Extremely Useful	5	35.7	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	64.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	35.7		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Endnotes: Should this type of session be repeated in future years?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	1	11.1	25.0	25.0
		Definitely	3	33.3	75.0	100.0
		Total	4	44.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	55.6		
		Total	9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	2	16.7	25.0	25.0
		Definitely	6	50.0	75.0	100.0
		Total	8	66.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	33.3		
		Total	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Probably	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
		Definitely	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Definitely	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Probably Not	1	4.5	6.3	6.3
		Probably	7	31.8	43.8	50.0
		Definitely	8	36.4	50.0	100.0
		Total	16	72.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	6	27.3		
Total	22	100.0				
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Probably Not	2	15.4	18.2	18.2
		Probably	1	7.7	9.1	27.3
		Definitely	8	61.5	72.7	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
Total	13	100.0				
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Probably	3	21.4	30.0	30.0
		Definitely	7	50.0	70.0	100.0
		Total	10	71.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	28.6		
Total	14	100.0				

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Endnotes: Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	4	44.4	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	5	55.6		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	8	66.7	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	4	33.3		
	Total		12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	2	33.3	40.0	40.0
		Yes	3	50.0	60.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Valid	Yes	16	72.7	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	6	27.3		
	Total		22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	2	15.4	18.2	18.2
		Yes	9	69.2	81.8	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Yes	8	57.1	100.0	100.0
	Missing	System	6	42.9		
	Total		14	100.0		

K. Overall 2002 Leadership Conference**Leadership Conference: How relevant was this leadership conference for your work?**

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Extremely Relevant	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Relevant	1	8.3	8.3	16.7
		Extremely Relevant	10	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Relevant	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Extremely Relevant	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Relevant	1	16.7	16.7	33.3
		Extremely Relevant	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Slightly Relevant	1	4.5	4.8	4.8
		Very Relevant	8	36.4	38.1	42.9
		Extremely Relevant	12	54.5	57.1	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Moderately Relevant	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very Relevant	5	38.5	41.7	50.0
		Extremely Relevant	6	46.2	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Moderately Relevant	2	14.3	15.4	15.4
		Very Relevant	3	21.4	23.1	38.5
		Extremely Relevant	8	57.1	61.5	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Leadership Conference: How well did the conference match your expectations?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Closely Match	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Somewhat	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Closely Match	11	91.7	91.7	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Somewhat	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Closely Match	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Somewhat	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Very Closely Match	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Somewhat	5	22.7	23.8	23.8
		Very Closely Match	16	72.7	76.2	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
	Total		22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Somewhat	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very Closely Match	11	84.6	91.7	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Somewhat	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Very Closely Match	13	92.9	92.9	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Leadership Conference: Would you recommend a similar conference to a peer?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Definitely	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Definitely	11	91.7	91.7	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Definitely	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Probably	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Definitely	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	2	9.1	9.5	9.5
		Definitely	19	86.4	90.5	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
	Total		22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Probably Not	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Definitely	11	84.6	91.7	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Probably	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Definitely	13	92.9	92.9	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Leadership Conference: How would you rate the conference quality?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Excellent	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	1	8.3	8.3	16.7
		Excellent	10	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Excellent	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Good	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Good	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
		Excellent	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Good	2	9.1	9.5	9.5
		Very Good	5	22.7	23.8	33.3
		Excellent	14	63.6	66.7	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Fair	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very Good	2	15.4	16.7	25.0
		Excellent	9	69.2	75.0	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Excellent	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Leadership Conference: How likely are you to use the information from the conference?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Somewhat Likely	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Likely	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Somewhat Likely	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Likely	11	91.7	91.7	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Somewhat Likely	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Very Likely	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Somewhat Likely	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Very Likely	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Not Sure	1	4.5	4.8	4.8
		Somewhat Likely	3	13.6	14.3	19.0
		Very Likely	17	77.3	81.0	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Somewhat Likely	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very Likely	11	84.6	91.7	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Somewhat Likely	2	14.3	14.3	14.3
		Very Likely	12	85.7	85.7	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Leadership Conference: How valuable was the overall conference for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant/scholarship?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very Valuable	2	22.2	25.0	25.0
		Extremely Valuable	6	66.7	75.0	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	11.1		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Slightly Valuable	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Valuable	4	33.3	33.3	41.7
		Extremely Valuable	7	58.3	58.3	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Valuable	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very Valuable	1	16.7	16.7	33.3
		Extremely Valuable	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Valuable	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Very Valuable	2	33.3	33.3	66.7
		Extremely Valuable	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Slightly Valuable	1	4.5	4.8	4.8
		Moderately Valuable	1	4.5	4.8	9.5
		Very Valuable	7	31.8	33.3	42.9
		Extremely Valuable	12	54.5	57.1	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Moderately Valuable	1	7.7	10.0	10.0
		Very Valuable	1	7.7	10.0	20.0
		Extremely Valuable	8	61.5	80.0	100.0
		Total	10	76.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	23.1		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Valuable	1	7.1	10.0	10.0
		Extremely Valuable	9	64.3	90.0	100.0
		Total	10	71.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	28.6		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Leadership Conference: How useful was the overall conference in helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very Useful	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
		Extremely Useful	7	77.8	77.8	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All Useful	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very Useful	3	25.0	25.0	33.3
		Extremely Useful	8	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Very Useful	1	16.7	16.7	50.0
		Extremely Useful	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately Useful	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Extremely Useful	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	2	9.1	9.5	9.5
		Very Useful	8	36.4	38.1	47.6
		Extremely Useful	11	50.0	52.4	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Slightly Useful	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very Useful	5	38.5	41.7	50.0
		Extremely Useful	6	46.2	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Very Useful	6	42.9	50.0	50.0
		Extremely Useful	6	42.9	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	14.3		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Leadership Conference: How appropriate was the number of networking opportunities provided at this conference?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not enough	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Just right	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not enough	4	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Just right	8	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not enough	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Just right	4	66.7	66.7	83.3
		Too many	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not enough	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Just right	4	66.7	66.7	83.3
		Too many	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Just right	21	95.5	100.0	100.0
		Missing System	1	4.5		
		Total	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Just right	12	92.3	100.0	100.0
		Missing System	1	7.7		
		Total	13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Not enough	1	7.1	8.3	8.3
		Just right	8	57.1	66.7	75.0
		Too many	3	21.4	25.0	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0	
	Missing System		2	14.3		
		Total	14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Leadership Conference: How conducive was the setting of this conference to networking?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		Very	5	55.6	55.6	66.7
		Extremely	3	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not at All	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		Very	5	41.7	41.7	50.0
		Extremely	6	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Moderately	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Very	1	16.7	16.7	33.3
		Extremely	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Very	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Extremely	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Moderately	4	18.2	19.0	19.0
		Very	11	50.0	52.4	71.4
		Extremely	6	27.3	28.6	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
	Total		22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Moderately	1	7.7	8.3	8.3
		Very	1	7.7	8.3	16.7
		Extremely	10	76.9	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
Total		13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Slightly	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		Very	2	14.3	15.4	23.1
		Extremely	10	71.4	76.9	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
Total		14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Leadership Conference: How appropriate was the combination of panels, concurrent sessions, networking receptions, and other sessions at this conference?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Just Right	7	77.8	77.8	77.8	
		Too Didactic	2	22.2	22.2	100.0	
		Total	9	100.0	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Just Right	8	66.7	80.0	80.0	
		Too Didactic	2	16.7	20.0	100.0	
		Total	10	83.3	100.0		
	Missing	System	2	16.7			
Total		12	100.0				
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Just Right	5	83.3	100.0	100.0	
		Missing	System	1	16.7		
		Total	6	100.0			
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Just Right	5	83.3	100.0	100.0	
		Missing	System	1	16.7		
		Total	6	100.0			
AACN Scholar	Valid	Just Right	20	90.9	95.2	95.2	
		Too Didactic	1	4.5	4.8	100.0	
		Total	21	95.5	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	4.5			
Total		22	100.0				
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Just Right	9	69.2	69.2	69.2	
		Too Didactic	4	30.8	30.8	100.0	
		Total	13	100.0	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Just Right	12	85.7	92.3	92.3	
		Too Didactic	1	7.1	7.7	100.0	
		Total	13	92.9	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	7.1			
Total		14	100.0				

L. Comparison to Last Year's Leadership Conference

Last year: Did you attend the Leadership Conference last year?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	12	100.0	100.0	100.0
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Valid	No	22	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	7	53.8	53.8	53.8
		Yes	6	46.2	46.2	100.0
		Total	13	100.0	100.0	
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	No	4	28.6	28.6	28.6
		Yes	10	71.4	71.4	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Last year: The overall quality of this year's conference was:

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not as good as last year	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
		About the same	2	22.2	22.2	33.3
		Better than last year	6	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	About the same	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Better than last year	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Better than last year	6	46.2	100.0	100.0
		Missing	System	7	53.8	
		Total	13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	About the same	2	14.3	20.0	20.0
		Better than last year	8	57.1	80.0	100.0
		Total	10	71.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	28.6		
	Total	14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Last year: The overall relevance of this year's conference to my work was:

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	About the same	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		More relevant than last year	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	About the same	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		More relevant than last year	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	About the same	1	7.7	16.7	16.7
		More relevant than last year	5	38.5	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	46.2	100.0	
	Missing	System	7	53.8		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	About the same	3	21.4	30.0	30.0
		More relevant than last year	7	50.0	70.0	100.0
		Total	10	71.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	4	28.6		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Last year: The opportunities for networking and interacting with peers in this year's conference were:

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	About the same	2	22.2	22.2	22.2
		Better than last year	7	77.8	77.8	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Not as good as last year	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Better than last year	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	About the same	2	15.4	33.3	33.3
		Better than last year	4	30.8	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	46.2	100.0	
	Missing	System	7	53.8		
		Total	13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	About the same	1	7.1	12.5	12.5
		Better than last year	7	50.0	87.5	100.0
		Total	8	57.1	100.0	
	Missing	System	6	42.9		
		Total	14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Last year: This year's conference increased my leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing:

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	About the same	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		More than last year	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	About the same	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		More than last year	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	About the same	2	15.4	33.3	33.3
		More than last year	4	30.8	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	46.2	100.0	
	Missing	System	7	53.8		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	About the same	3	21.4	33.3	33.3
		More than last year	6	42.9	66.7	100.0
		Total	9	64.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	35.7		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Last year: Did you use any information from last year's Leadership Conference over the course of the year?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	11.1	12.5	12.5
		Yes	7	77.8	87.5	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	11.1		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	3	50.0	100.0	100.0
		Missing	System	3	50.0	
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	1	7.7	25.0	25.0
		Yes	3	23.1	75.0	100.0
		Total	4	30.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	9	69.2		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	No	4	28.6	44.4	44.4
		Yes	5	35.7	55.6	100.0
		Total	9	64.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	5	35.7		
	Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Last year: Did the networking opportunities provided by the 2001 Leadership Conference result in any synergistic relationships or collaborations during the year?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	3	33.3	37.5	37.5
		Yes	5	55.6	62.5	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	11.1		
	Total		9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
		Yes	4	66.7	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total		6	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Missing	System	6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Missing	System	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	1	7.7	20.0	20.0
		Yes	4	30.8	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	38.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	8	61.5		
	Total		13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	No	2	14.3	33.3	33.3
		Yes	4	28.6	66.7	100.0
		Total	6	42.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	8	57.1		
	Total		14	100.0		

M. Demographic Information

Gender

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Male	1	11.1	11.1	11.1	
		Female	8	88.9	88.9	100.0	
		Total	9	100.0	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Male	1	8.3	8.3	8.3	
		Female	11	91.7	91.7	100.0	
		Total	12	100.0	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Female	6	100.0	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Female	6	100.0	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	Male	2	9.1	9.5	9.5	
		Female	19	86.4	90.5	100.0	
		Total	21	95.5	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	4.5			
	Total		22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	Female	12	92.3	100.0	100.0	
		Missing	System	1	7.7		
		Total	13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	Female	14	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Age Group

Type of Attendee		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	20-29 years old	1	11.1	12.5	12.5
		30-39 years old	2	22.2	25.0	37.5
		40-49 years old	4	44.4	50.0	87.5
		50 and older	1	11.1	12.5	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	11.1		
	Total	9	100.0			
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	20-29 years old	2	16.7	16.7	16.7
		30-39 years old	2	16.7	16.7	33.3
		40-49 years old	5	41.7	41.7	75.0
		50 and older	3	25.0	25.0	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	40-49 years old	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
		50 and older	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	40-49 years old	2	33.3	40.0	40.0
		50 and older	3	50.0	60.0	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	16.7		
	Total	6	100.0			
AACN Scholar	Valid	20-29 years old	8	36.4	38.1	38.1
		30-39 years old	6	27.3	28.6	66.7
		40-49 years old	5	22.7	23.8	90.5
		50 and older	2	9.1	9.5	100.0
		Total	21	95.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	4.5		
	Total	22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	40-49 years old	5	38.5	41.7	41.7
		50 and older	7	53.8	58.3	100.0
		Total	12	92.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.7		
	Total	13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	30-39 years old	1	7.1	7.7	7.7
		50 and older	12	85.7	92.3	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	7.1		
	Total	14	100.0			

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Ethnicity/Race

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	White, non-Hispanic, including Middle Eastern, North African	8	88.9	88.9	88.9
		None Marked	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	African American/Black	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
		White, non-Hispanic, including Middle Eastern, North African	9	75.0	75.0	83.3
		Other	2	16.7	16.7	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	White, non-Hispanic, including Middle Eastern, North African	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	White, non-Hispanic, including Middle Eastern, North African	5	83.3	83.3	83.3
		None Marked	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	African American/Black	2	9.1	9.1	9.1
		Asian/Pacific Islander	1	4.5	4.5	13.6
		White, non-Hispanic, including Middle Eastern, North African	18	81.8	81.8	95.5
		None Marked	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
		Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	White, non-Hispanic, including Middle Eastern, North African	12	92.3	92.3	92.3
		None Marked	1	7.7	7.7	100.0
		Total	13	100.0	100.0	
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	White, non-Hispanic, including Middle Eastern, North African	12	85.7	85.7	85.7
		Other	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Type of Attendee

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	9	11.0	11.0	11.0
	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	12	14.6	14.6	25.6
	2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	6	7.3	7.3	32.9
	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	6	7.3	7.3	40.2
	AACN Scholar	22	26.8	26.8	67.1
	Mentor of Hartford Scholar	13	15.9	15.9	82.9
	Director/Faculty/Staff	14	17.1	17.1	100.0
	Total	82	100.0	100.0	

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

Do you consider your primary specialty to be gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	2	22.2	22.2	22.2
		Yes	7	77.8	77.8	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	2	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Yes	10	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	Yes	6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	No	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Yes	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0	
AACN Scholar	Valid	No	3	13.6	13.6	13.6
		Yes	19	86.4	86.4	100.0
		Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	No	4	30.8	36.4	36.4
		Yes	7	53.8	63.6	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	15.4		
Total			13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	No	4	28.6	28.6	28.6
		Yes	10	71.4	71.4	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

About how many GSA meetings have you attended in the past?

Type of Attendee		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	1	11.1	11.1
		1	5	55.6	66.7
		2	1	11.1	77.8
		3	2	22.2	100.0
	Total		9	100.0	100.0
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	5	41.7	41.7
		1	4	33.3	75.0
		2	1	8.3	83.3
		3	1	8.3	91.7
	Total		12	100.0	100.0
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	1	1	16.7	16.7
		3	3	50.0	66.7
		6	2	33.3	100.0
	Total		6	100.0	100.0
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	2	3	50.0	50.0
		3	1	16.7	66.7
		6	1	16.7	83.3
		18	1	16.7	100.0
	Total		6	100.0	100.0
AACN Scholar	Valid	0	21	95.5	100.0
	Missing	System	1	4.5	
	Total		22	100.0	
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	0	4	30.8	36.4
		8	2	15.4	54.5
		10	2	15.4	72.7
		14	1	7.7	81.8
		15	2	15.4	100.0
	Total		11	84.6	100.0
	Missing	System	2	15.4	
	Total		13	100.0	
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	0	3	21.4	23.1
		1	1	7.1	30.8
		4	2	14.3	46.2
		5	1	7.1	53.8
		10	1	7.1	61.5
		16	1	7.1	69.2
		19	1	7.1	76.9
		20	3	21.4	100.0
	Total		13	92.9	100.0
	Missing	System	1	7.1	
Total		14	100.0		

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

About how many GSA meetings have you presented at in the past?

Type of Attendee			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	6	66.7	66.7	66.7	
		1	2	22.2	22.2	88.9	
		2	1	11.1	11.1	100.0	
		Total	9	100.0	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	8	66.7	72.7	72.7	
		1	3	25.0	27.3	100.0	
		Total	11	91.7	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	8.3			
	Total	12	100.0				
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	1	2	33.3	33.3	33.3	
		2	1	16.7	16.7	50.0	
		3	2	33.3	33.3	83.3	
		4	1	16.7	16.7	100.0	
		Total	6	100.0	100.0		
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	2	33.3	33.3	33.3	
		1	1	16.7	16.7	50.0	
		2	2	33.3	33.3	83.3	
		6	1	16.7	16.7	100.0	
		Total	6	100.0	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	0	21	95.5	100.0	100.0	
		Missing	System	1	4.5		
		Total	22	100.0			
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	0	3	23.1	27.3	27.3	
		2	2	15.4	18.2	45.5	
		4	1	7.7	9.1	54.5	
		7	1	7.7	9.1	63.6	
		9	1	7.7	9.1	72.7	
		10	1	7.7	9.1	81.8	
		12	1	7.7	9.1	90.9	
		15	1	7.7	9.1	100.0	
		Total	11	84.6	100.0		
		Missing	System	2	15.4		
		Total	13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	0	3	21.4	23.1	23.1	
		1	2	14.3	15.4	38.5	
		4	2	14.3	15.4	53.8	
		8	1	7.1	7.7	61.5	
		16	1	7.1	7.7	69.2	
		18	1	7.1	7.7	76.9	
		19	1	7.1	7.7	84.6	
		20	1	7.1	7.7	92.3	
		25	1	7.1	7.7	100.0	
		Total	13	92.9	100.0		
		Missing	System	1	7.1		
Total	14	100.0					

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

About how many published papers have you authored or co-authored in gerontological/geriatric nursing?

Type of Attendee		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	1	11.1	14.3
		1	4	44.4	57.1
		2	1	11.1	14.3
		6	1	11.1	14.3
		Total	7	77.8	100.0
		Missing System	2	22.2	
	Total	9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	5	41.7	41.7
		1	2	16.7	58.3
		3	2	16.7	75.0
		4	1	8.3	83.3
		6	1	8.3	91.7
		20	1	8.3	100.0
	Total	12	100.0	100.0	
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	1	16.7	16.7
		3	3	50.0	66.7
		10	1	16.7	83.3
		20	1	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	4	1	16.7	20.0
		6	2	33.3	40.0
		10	1	16.7	80.0
		15	1	16.7	100.0
		Total	5	83.3	100.0
	Missing System	1	16.7		
Total	6	100.0			
AACN Scholar	Valid	0	20	90.9	100.0
		Missing System	2	9.1	
	Total	22	100.0		
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	0	1	7.7	9.1
		2	1	7.7	18.2
		5	4	30.8	54.5
		10	1	7.7	63.6
		20	2	15.4	81.8
		25	1	7.7	90.9
		45	1	7.7	100.0
		Total	11	84.6	100.0
	Missing System	2	15.4		
Total	13	100.0			
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	0	5	35.7	38.5
		2	1	7.1	46.2
		8	1	7.1	53.8
		20	1	7.1	61.5
		30	1	7.1	69.2
		40	1	7.1	76.9
		50	1	7.1	84.6
		75	1	7.1	92.3
		100	1	7.1	100.0
		Total	13	92.9	100.0
		Missing System	1	7.1	
		Total	14	100.0	

Appendix III: Supplemental Quantitative Evaluation Results for All Respondents

About how many published papers have you authored or co-authored in total, including other fields?

Type of Attendee		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	1	11.1	12.5
		1	3	33.3	50.0
		4	1	11.1	62.5
		8	1	11.1	75.0
		15	1	11.1	87.5
		40	1	11.1	100.0
		Total	8	88.9	100.0
	Missing	System	1	11.1	
	Total	9	100.0		
2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	0	2	16.7	20.0
		1	4	33.3	40.0
		2	1	8.3	70.0
		4	1	8.3	80.0
		5	1	8.3	90.0
		12	1	8.3	100.0
		Total	10	83.3	100.0
	Missing	System	2	16.7	
	Total	12	100.0		
2001 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	1	2	33.3	33.3
		3	1	16.7	50.0
		4	1	16.7	66.7
		6	1	16.7	83.3
		17	1	16.7	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	100.0
2002 Post-Doctoral Scholar	Valid	12	2	33.3	66.7
		100	1	16.7	100.0
		Total	3	50.0	100.0
	Missing	System	3	50.0	
	Total	6	100.0		
AACN Scholar	Valid	0	20	90.9	100.0
	Missing	System	2	9.1	
		Total	22	100.0	
Mentor of Hartford Scholar	Valid	10	2	15.4	22.2
		12	1	7.7	33.3
		20	3	23.1	66.7
		25	1	7.7	77.8
		50	1	7.7	88.9
		75	1	7.7	100.0
		Total	9	69.2	100.0
	Missing	System	4	30.8	
	Total	13	100.0		
Director/Faculty/Staff	Valid	0	2	14.3	16.7
		4	1	7.1	25.0
		8	1	7.1	33.3
		10	4	28.6	66.7
		25	1	7.1	75.0
		30	1	7.1	83.3
		100	2	14.3	100.0
		Total	12	85.7	100.0
	Missing	System	2	14.3	
		Total	14	100.0	

Appendix III:

Supplemental Qualitative Evaluation Results for Non-Scholars

A. Welcome Lunch

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- It would have been nice to introduce the Mentors.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- This was a great way to start.
- Introduction of Scholars provided a wonderful opportunity to physically see the depth/breadth of this Initiative.
- The introduction of new Scholars was very nice. It made them feel that they were welcome and valued.
- It would have been helpful to hear a bit more about each Scholar; there was mispronunciation of names.
- The schools for the MBA Scholars were not acknowledged/identified.
- Mentors for Scholars not noted.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference.

B. “Orchestrating A Research Career”/Poster Presentation Development Session

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Pearls from personal experience from an effective Dean were somewhat helpful – especially ideas about focusing on positive rather than negative aspects of difficult situations.
- One thing to add would be a discussion about the challenge of a 2-year Post-Doc. This is a very short time frame and advice on how to leverage those years most effectively would be useful.
- I would attend another session similar but not annually - perhaps every 3-5 years.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Excellent for new Scholars and new Mentors; repetitive for ongoing Mentors.
- Need to determine how to integrate Mentors more fully into this session, or just exclude them.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference.

C. Panel on “Using Risk-Taking/Creativity to Influence Change”

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- The case examples were particularly helpful to concretize the broad concepts and words.
- If the session had offered more concrete suggestions about risk taking, making calculated risks, or "lessons learned" from risks taken that didn't go and surviving failures, it would have been more helpful.
- I would suggest addressing or recognizing some of the day to day challenges of conducting research/maintaining a research program. I recognized the need to inspire the Scholars, but a research life is not all roses and I would like them to know that this is normal and we don't always have to be (nor are we) Martha Stewart's of research.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Uplifting session.
- Speakers were superb!
- Some presenters focussed more on platitudes, cartoons, etc.

- Charlene Harrington is the best.
- Jeannie had a presentation that can be used as an exemplar of how to define and communicate new and risk associated initiative.
- More emphasis on substance would be helpful.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference.

D. Poster Presentation and Reception (Class of 2001)

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- This session is useful for seeing where each of the Mentees is at, what their challenges have been, etc. That was helpful to me as a Mentor.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Excellent opportunity to see breadth, depth, and progress of Scholars' work, and to create networking opportunities
- Wonderful to see what the Scholars are doing- a way to share interest area.
- Posters were a good professional exercise for Scholars. (4)
- Not me but the Fellows benefit from this in terms of presenting ideas and networking.
- Good opportunity for networking. (2)

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference. The numbers in the parentheses refer to the number of comments in each category made by the Scholars.

E. Panel on "Interpersonal/Communication Effectiveness"

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Super!
- One of the best sessions.
- This session was the most informative. If we are to change the world, we need a full day with Suzanne Gordon!
- It is very helpful to have non-nurses provide their expertise and perceptions about nursing.
- Additions all focused help on interacting effectively with media, lay public.
- Is individual media training for the Fellows/Scholars possible? This has been a valuable development opportunity at leadership programs for other groups.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Excellent session-very practical information and suggestions.
- These messages can never be heard too often as there is always room for improvement in what we communicate. Individual consultation would also be invaluable.
- Having heard these speakers in the past and having heard feedback on this session-the AACN Scholars should have heard this session! It is very relevant to developing their careers.
- Mr Beilenson good-spoke to the Scholars present in a useful way.
- Ms. Gordon was shrill, condescending, and somewhat misinformed about some current statistics. She actually did not embrace or inform the audience with regard to improving the narrative, despite speaking about it. She herself is a voice for nursing, but alas, can be a very negative voice. Points were worthy of consideration, but method of delivery harsh.
- Suzanne Gordon was excellent! I suggest incorporating a longer time with her in another leadership conference.

- Dr. Kayser-Jones was excellent.
- Again, Jeanine's presentation is an exemplar.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference.

F. Panel on “Strategic Vision”

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Dr. Angela McBride was wonderful. The more concrete the information, the better. Abstract info is not all that useful.
- Dr. Baron McBride's "future think" and innovative comments were thought provoking for me.
- Would recommend having folks who are professionally trained in strategic planning combined with gero nursing leaders who use strategic planning approaches.
- More specific info on locating and using trend information/data/projections would be an excellent program.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Again, this is the type of topic where one can never hear too much. I always garner new perspectives from watching the way people put their thoughts together on these sustaining issues.
- Dr. Mathy Mezey and Dr. Angela McBride were outstanding.
- More time for discussion would have been helpful.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference.

G. Concurrent Sessions

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Integral to the success of this program.
- Extremely helpful. (3)
- Great opportunity to share with others.
- I think it was helpful to connect us to each other. I had several private conversations later - that stemmed from this session.
- The quality and usefulness of a session such as this depends on the session moderators. Drs. McBride and Fagin were excellent in this capacity.
- I don't think that you enhance the mentorship skills of a diverse set of Mentors (in terms of their own career trajectories) by having senior leaders lecture to the room - not at all conducive to discussion.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Wonderful discussion-excellent reminder of the many layers of mentorship-different levels of students, varying experience of Mentors, overall helpful sharing of ideas and issues.
- Ditto! Mentors need safe harbor and sustenance too.
- I think the discussion was interesting and some participants commented that it was helpful.
- Good to share concerns- helpful to have people who have been preceptors-mentors share strategies for working with Mentors.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference. The numbers in the parentheses refer to the number of comments in each category made by the Scholars.

H. Conversation with a Geriatric Nurse Heroine: Dr. Mary Starke Harper

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Hearing the stories of courageous leaders is very interesting.
- The opportunity to hear from one of the greats in gero nursing was outstanding. She was inspiring and through the example of her life and career, I learned more about characteristics of effective leaders.
- Inspiring and uplifting - Dr. Harper is a true leader.
- What a great example of someone who is nursing.
- I was very inspired by her presentation and have thought of her often since. She is a wonderful role model of successful aging, a nurse, and a woman. I cannot say enough about how impressed I was.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Very inspirational! Thought producing
- This is an excellent idea-to have a strong nurse leader discuss her career and her "take" on important issues in geriatric nursing. This can be inspirational, no matter what the person chooses to talk about. I'm glad the master's scholars were there to hear it.
- A true inspiration; one of a kind. Who could top this?
- Mary was inspirational (2)
- Mary is a person of unusual courage. I think her story was both moving and inspirational.
- Provided a superb example of the development of an exemplar leader-presentation - was provocative and inspirational
- Loved this one! Please invite her again.
- I'm not sure Dr. Harper was the best choice of a pioneer. She is a wonderful person and general speaker, and a significant contribution to nursing, but the disjointed monologue didn't do honor to Mary's legacy, nor did it meet audience needs. Facts muddled-it was painful at times to see Dr. Harper exposed in this way. On the other hand, one couldn't walk away without marveling at what she overcame and accomplished.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference. The numbers in the parentheses refer to the number of comments in each category made by the Scholars.

I. Panel on "Inspiring and Leading Change"

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Wonderful use of metaphor.
- Got diverse perspective, sensitized to issues, reflect.
- Irreverent thoughts were useful as her real life anecdotes of what worked and what did not work; personal reflections and blending of evolving ideas incorporating personal with professional growth and developments as a leader.
- The session was very anticlimactic after the previous two days. Dr Fagin's comments were very relevant. The other 2 speakers, unaware of what went before them, made lesser comments of what had already been splendidly addressed. The ending session needs to be more of an enthusiastic send off rather than discussion of generalities.
- Would depend upon how it was structured. More concrete examples (? use studies) of inspiring and leading changes that perhaps are analyzed in some systematic manner – e.g. by a fellow/mentor/pair and presented as a springboard for discussion.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- The best! Really.
- Fabulous!!! Inspirational! (2)
- Exemplars were educational.
- Embraced all levels and needs in audience.
- Wonderful interdiscipline perspective on leadership.
- They were the most useful talks at the meeting/ they directly addressed the leadership, what it means, how to achieve it.
- I particularly liked hearing the names of authors and others who inspired the speakers- this can be very useful information.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference. The numbers in the parentheses refer to the number of comments in each category made by the Scholars.

J. Endnotes: Reflections on Leadership in Gerontology

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Among my favorite sessions. Very creative!
- Wonderful use of analogy and metaphor.
- Thought-provoking.
- Wonderful summary, thoughtful.
- Great way to wrap-up meeting.
- Timing bad for this session, not a good ending.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Excellent endnote.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference.

K1. Using Leadership Conference Information

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Mary Starke Harper is a living example that I will model myself after.
- Angela McBride's talk provided many hits of information I will use/ sustaining optimism is one I have been reflecting on.
- Dr. Fagan's poise and good humor as well as her thoughtful comments were very useful. Her graciousness will provide an example for me as I lead in the future.
- Better communication of my message.
- Will be more deliberate about using the 4 pillars of effective communication discussed by John Bielensohn.
- Distill notes from communications effectiveness and generate strategy for interacting with media.
- Will actively seek out opportunities to talk with the "media" about my research.
- Contacts with others; opportunity to reconnect with colleagues and begin to develop new connections -> partnerships and teams.
- New networking expected to lead to collaboration- have scheduled a discussion with one person.
- Will develop proposal for geri center funded by Hartford.
- Will pursue some of the info/data on trends for positioning a new research project.

- Lessons learned integrated into my research program-team building being on message.
- Helping to encourage growth in my research team members.
- I will be able to use information from mentoring session in terms of ways to mentor a group of students and how to keep them on target.
- Working more effectively as a Mentor to Scholars in this program as well as to junior faculty.
- Better job with future Post Docs to envision how to use 2 short years effectively.
- Suggestion of additional strategies/models to use for mentoring-have two specific strategies to use this year.
- Will use specific ideas and suggestions from the mentoring session with my mentee/advisees.
- Facilitating doctoral and masters' students' growth.
- Will encourage students/faculty at other levels to participate/apply for awards.
- Will encourage other doctoral students to apply for Pre-Docs Hartford fellowships.
- Identify more ways to get MSN/GNP students in contact with senior faculty to discuss the students' ideas.
- Link the Scholars at my institution regularly through a journal club or some other kind of meeting.
- The conference inspired me to begin reading books on leadership to better develop my own leadership skills.
- Begin op-ed letter/column file and consider developing this as an exercise for students.
- Walking the walk.
- Metaphors.
- Creativity.
- Add more small group discussions. For example, the Mentor/Mentee sessions were great. Some smaller group semi-structured discussions might be useful.
- The Europeans have a very useful structure for meetings such as this that might have some merit for the Hartford meetings. After lunch (and morning meetings), there is a group activity scheduled. For instance, a 2-3 hr. Segment was allotted for a group hike in the Swiss Alps, a walking tour of a town, etc. This shared activity was fabulous for networking and cohort-building. It's easier for "neophytes" to interact with "giants" when you're both huffing and puffing up a mountain, plus it's fun, interesting, and healthy. Then there was a group dinner and evening meetings. It might be useful to incorporate one such activity into the 2.5 day conference as an effective networking and cohort-building exercise/activity.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Inspiration that I can do what I hope to do.
- Networking with colleagues that will enhance my ability to lead in the future.
- Met leaders that I can use for advice/mentoring.
- Met others who will collaborate on research.
- Continue to identify leveraging ideas with peers and colleagues.
- Leadership skills for the rest of my career.
- Excellent to identify trends emerging and new leadership.
- Leadership/team building concepts.
- Excellent ideas for ongoing leadership seminars at home University.
- Leadership attributes-research case studies provided excellent examples of providing applications of concepts presented.
- Team building-be sure that team is working together-sum of parts or greater than the whole- work to build team participation and work.
- I will review my current strategies for team building using the wisdom shared in the final session.
- I will refine my approach to mentoring a variety of individuals at several levels from Baccalaureate to Post-Doc.
- Gained perspective of MSN Scholars on the challenges of completing a Masters-useful for curriculum development.
- Provide additional info to Scholars-examples and requests came up in concurrent sessions.
- I will attend more consistently to public communication of our work and to its policy implications.
- Need to increase visibility of program-gerontology in the University and community.

- Develop a sound-bite about projects and my role.
- Will pull together a home health issue group similar to Charlene's nursing home group, to discuss recommendations for policy.
- Stay on message.
- Practice being creative.
- Will read suggested books.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference.

K2. Helpful Sessions that Were Not Included

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- "How To Build On Personality Style To Be An Effective Leader."
- More specific skill building and resource information.
- More emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration.
- Session on Funding Opportunities. (2)
- More specific information on business planning for innovative projects - leveraging funding; strategic planning; lessons learned from more established control.
- Involving Mentors in a panel about their experience in preparing an effective grant application/developing a program of research.
- Several Scholars need to talk about how they have communicated, taken risks, been creative, developed their leadership skills - possibly something that addresses historical aspect.
- Applying for a Post-Doc.
- Pitfalls in working with research teams and concrete suggestions for preventing and addressing them.
- More presentations relating to communication to the media. Suzanne Gordon's talk was extremely valuable/ I thought she only had time to give us superficial information. I wanted more!

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Content-wise, I have nothing further to suggest. Program-wise, I might include opportunities to practice skills addressed. Maybe differently for various levels of experience.
- Sessions that manage to address the layers of needs and levels of development (e.g. MSN vs post-PhD) to new Mentor vs seasoned Mentor, to Scholars from non-center schools to Scholars from Center Schools (needs and experiences are very different).
- Ways to build teams with individuals not traditionally thought of or included in "health" care team.
- Expand on topic of building collaboration research partnerships.
- Building the Scholars research agenda and program of study.
- Taking research-knowledge and create "products" that will help older adults live independently or increase quality of life.
- More opportunities for Hartford program administrators - we were left out on many activities.
- Expectations of TMG and Hartford reports that we submit.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference. The numbers in the parentheses refer to the number of comments in each category made by the Scholars.

L1. Information Used from 2001 Leadership Conference

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Used information to initiate a strategic planning process to increase visibility of our Center and JAHF program.
- Career development discussion has been used in mentoring.
- Used contents from Angela McBride's presentation to better understand my faculty colleagues and how to motivate them in their stage of leadership.
- Used instrument from and for nurse researcher.
- Contacted nurse researcher for consultation on great application.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Continued dialogue re: areas of mutual interest with CGNE directors.
- I adopted or modified suggestions of peers in refining our programs in gerontological nursing, leading to the establishment of a formal center on frail and vulnerable elders at our University.
- I used Angela's stage model in a presentation addressing faculty development and structuring a plan for strengthening research in our school.
- Identified opportunities for the future of our Pre/Post Docs when they complete their programs.
- Met with a 2001 Pre-Doctoral Scholar about her research program.
- Hosted a 2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholar for 2 weeks during the summer of 2002 to help her develop her dissertation proposal.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference.

L2. Synergistic Relationships/Collaborations Resulting from 2001 Leadership Conference

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Sharing thoughts.
- Claire Fagin provided consultation to our school that resulted in significant improvements in the school communications.
- Consultation on grant application.
- Follow-up phone contacts and discussions.
- Helped in guiding mentee in terms of possible collaborations for her research.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Communication with colleagues to work on common problem!
- Project directors of NSGIP meeting-discussions of possible joint projects.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference.

M1. Ideas for Other Living Legends

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Cornelia Beck
- Geraldene Felton
- Although she is not a gerontological nurse, Sue Hegyvary.

- Muriel Ryden
- I would be interested in hearing reflections of leaders from key successful projects in gero nursing – e.g. RWJF teaching nursing home project.

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Benner
- Irene Burnside
- Butler
- Carneegie
- Linda Kaeser
- Styles
- May Wykle (2)
- Perhaps consider having mentees of Mary Opal Wolinin (Linda Phillips) and Doris Schwartz (Neville Strumpf, Lois, Mathy Mezey) give tributes to them?

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference. The numbers in the parentheses refer to the number of comments in each category made by the Scholars.

M2. Feedback for 2002 Leadership Conference

Mentor of Hartford Scholar

- Excellent conference. (2)
- Excellent hotel/facilities!
- Would like to have heard more interactions between Scholars and mentors rather than panelists alone. Didactic sessions often were too general to be very helpful.
- More breaks please!

Director/Faculty/Staff

- Excellent in every way.
- This was the best conference I have attended in many years.
- Great presentation!
- Many positive and productive aspects.
- Overall, an excellent conference for the Scholars, and equally informative for Mentors and others in attendance
- There was an acceptance of each attendee, wherever they were in their career.
- I really enjoyed time where specialty groups could meet and share ideas (breakout groups).
- More opportunities for Hartford program administrators, and seminars on "managing a successful grant program." (administrative issues.)
- I know lunches and meals are expensive-and I appreciate how many there were at this conference- these were excellent for networking- very valuable.
- For cost effectiveness, this program could be shortened/compactd to 2 full days.

Note. From the Conference Evaluation of the 2002 BAGNC Leadership Conference. The numbers in the parentheses refer to the number of comments in each category made by the Scholars.