

**Evaluation of 2003 BAGNC Leadership Conference
A John A. Hartford Foundation Funded Project
for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Capacity Initiative**

A Report by The Measurement Group¹

5811A Uplander Way
Culver City, California 90230
310.216.1051
www.TheMeasurementGroup.com

Table of Contents

Summary.....	1
Background.....	2
Target Audience and Invited Conference Attendees.....	2
Design of the Evaluation.....	3
Quantitative Findings from the Evaluation.....	3
Table 1: Quantitative Results from All Scholars	5
Comparison of the Ratings of Types of Respondents.....	1
Qualitative Findings from the Evaluation.....	2
Table 2: Qualitative Comments.....	4
Recommendations.....	27

Summary: The Third Annual Leadership Conference for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Capacity (BAGNC) Initiative, funded by the John A. Hartford Foundation, was held November 19-21, 2003 in San Diego, California. The goal of the Conference was to facilitate leadership development among the Scholars supported by the Hartford Foundation—the American Academy of Nursing (AAN) Hartford Scholars, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) Advance Practice Nursing Scholars, and the Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing at New York University (NYU) Scholars. Analyses of the Scholars' responses to the Leadership Conference evaluation form indicate that this Conference was an overwhelming success.

Scholars were very positive about their experience with the Conference. Scholars felt energized and stimulated by the combination of distinguished speakers, expert panels, break-out sessions, and networking opportunities. They felt exposed to a range of topics and issues and were challenged to broaden their view of the work they do and the impact that they can make as a nurse researcher. Speakers provide a number of templates for how to make an impact on the field of geriatric nursing and health policy.

The information that the Scholars received helped them increase their leadership skills within the field of geriatric/gerontological nursing. Overall, Scholars felt that they would use the information from the Conference to broaden their scope of work to include a variety of disciplines and goals. Scholars were particularly enthusiastic about exploring the policy and economic arenas. Information from the Leadership Conference would also be used to facilitate dissemination efforts and build collaborations.

There was no difference between the groups of Scholars in their overall rating of the Conference, though certain groups of Scholars differed somewhat on their ratings of a few sessions. The Conference was generally well tailored to the educational levels of the different groups of Scholars. However, the Conference can be further refined by having sessions that accommodate to the Scholars' different levels of experience with the Hartford program.

Scholars who attended the 2002 Leadership Conference reported that the 2003 Leadership Conference was equal or better in terms of increasing their leadership skills, the quality of the Conference, and the relevance

¹ Staff contributing to this report include G. J. Huba, Ph.D., Le Quach, M.P.H., Aaron Griffith, M.A., Lisa A. Melchior, Ph.D., and Rick Wollin.

to their work. These Scholars, who will be completing their tenure as Hartford Scholars, voiced a strong desire to continue to participate in and contribute to the success of the Conference.

Background: The third annual Leadership Conference for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Capacity (BAGNC) Initiative funded by the John A. Hartford Foundation was held November 19-21, 2003 in San Diego, California. The Leadership Conference agenda was designed by Angela McBride, Ph.D., and Claire Fagin, Ph.D., in consultation with the Directors of the Hartford Center of Geriatric Nursing Excellence and the Director of the John. A. Hartford Institute at New York University, all of who appeared on the program in various capacities. The BAGNC Initiative is part of a larger Geriatric Nursing Initiative of the John A. Hartford Foundation.

Target Audience and Invited Conference Attendees: The primary target audiences for the Leadership Conference were the American Academy of Nursing (AAN) Hartford Scholars, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars, and the Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing at New York University (NYU) Scholars. The AAN Hartford Scholars are comprised of two cohorts of Scholars. The 2002 AAN Hartford Scholars include 11 Pre-Doctoral, 9 Post-Doctoral Scholars, and 2 MBA Scholars who began their 2-year funding period July 1, 2002. The 2003 AAN Hartford Scholars include 12 Pre-Doctoral, 8 Post-Doctoral, and 2 MBA Scholars who began their 2-year funding period July 1, 2002. The AACN Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars are comprised of two cohorts of 33 Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars. There were 15 AACN APN Scholars who began their funding in the Fall of 2002 and 18 AACN APN Scholars who began their funding in the Fall of 2003. There were also 3 NYU Hartford Scholars. In addition to the Scholars in attendance at the meeting, there were representatives of different agencies and institutions funded as part of the Hartford Geriatric Nursing Initiative. The groups represented were as follows:

- The Director and Staff from each of the five Hartford Centers of Geriatric Nursing Excellence (Oregon Health & Science University School of Nursing; University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences College of Nursing; University of California San Francisco School of Nursing; University of Iowa College of Nursing; University of Pennsylvania School of Nursing).
- Faculty from each of 7 Hartford Geriatric Nursing Investment Program schools (Case Western Reserve University Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing; University of Michigan School of Nursing; University of Minnesota School of Nursing; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Nursing; University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston; University of Rochester School of Nursing; University of Washington School of Nursing).
- The Director and Staff from the Coordinating Center for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Excellence housed at the American Academy of Nursing. The AAN Coordinating Center administers the Scholarship Programs.
- The Director and Staff from the John A. Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing at New York University.
- The Director and Staff from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing charged with administering three parts of the Gerontological Nursing Initiative: Enhancing Gerontology/Geriatric Nursing Education in Baccalaureate Programs; Enhancing Gerontology/Geriatric Nursing Education in Advanced Practice Nursing Programs; Creating Careers in Geriatric Advanced Practice Nursing.
- 11 2002 Pre-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 9 2002 Post-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 12 2003 Pre-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 8 2003 Post-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 2 2002 MBA John A. Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 2 2003 MBA John A. Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²

² Names and Universities of all Scholars are listed in Appendix I.

- 15 2002 AACN Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 18 2002 AACN Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 3 NYU Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.
- Faculty Mentors for AAN Hartford Scholars and AACN Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars.
- An outside consultant – Dr. Angela McBride – charged with primary responsibility for the contents of the Conference in collaboration with the AAN Center.
- The Director and Staff from the independent evaluator, The Measurement Group.
- Project Officers and Staff from the John A. Hartford Foundation.
- Invited Speakers.

Design of the Evaluation. A conference evaluation form was included in the handout packet distributed to all Conference attendees. Leadership Conference attendees were asked to complete the Evaluation Form as the Conference proceeded, although by observation many individuals completed the entire form at the end of the Conference. A total of 90 forms were returned at the end of the Conference or by U.S. mail within two weeks. The Evaluation Form is shown as Appendix II to this report.

Quantitative Findings from the Evaluation. Table 1 summarizes the quantitative findings from the evaluation for all Scholars who completed an evaluation form. This includes: 10 (of the 11) Pre-Doctoral, 5 (of the 9) Post-Doctoral, and 0 (of the 2) MBA 2002 AAN Hartford Scholars; 11 (of the 12) Pre-Doctoral, 6 (of the 8) Post-Doctoral, and 1 (of the 2) MBA 2003 AAN Hartford Scholars; 7 (of the 15) 2002 AACN Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars; 15 (of the 18) 2003 AACN Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars; and 2 (of the 3) NYU Hartford Scholars. There were a number of sessions that were targeted to specific groups. In these cases, the cells for the groups of respondents who did not attend the session were left blank.

Supplemental quantitative findings are given in Appendix III for all respondents, which include the following mutually exclusive groups:

- 2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars
- 2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars
- 2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars
- 2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars
- 2003 MBA AAN Scholars
- 2002 AACN APN Scholars
- 2003 AACN APN Scholars
- NYU Hartford Scholars
- Mentor of Hartford Scholars
- HCGNE Director/Faculty/Staff
- Investment Program Director/Faculty Staff
- AACN/AAN/NYU Director/Staff
- AACN Graduate Curriculum Director/Staff
- Speakers

The supplemental findings present the full frequency distributions on each of the quantitative response variables along with frequency distributions on various background, experience, and demographic indicators collected on the Evaluation Form.

The overall pattern of findings illustrated in these numerical ratings is fairly similar for the entire group of respondents and the 8 groups of Scholars.

The quantitative results can be summarized in the following way.

- Overall, the various sessions were well received by all groups.

- There was no overall negative tendency in responses among any of the groups of Scholars. Although 2002 Pre-Doctoral, 2003 Post-Doctoral, and AACN APN Scholars tended to be more critical, the overall Conference appears to be well tailored to the needs and expectations of each of the groups of Scholars. Compared to all Pre-Doctoral and Post-Doctoral Scholars, the AACN APN Scholars did tend to view the Conference relatively more negatively, although still in a positive fashion overall.
- The session on “Interdisciplinary Collaboration” was not as highly rated as the other sessions by the Scholars (78% of all Scholars rated it “excellent” or “very good”). Scholars felt that this session provided good examples of interdisciplinary collaborations but could have benefited by providing more practical tips for how to effectively build or pursue these collaborations.
- Although most Scholars indicated that the overall Conference helped them increase their leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing, the AACN APN Scholars (both 2002 and 2003) felt that the Conference was slightly less helpful than did the other Scholars.
- Slightly more than half of the Scholars (63.2%) felt that there was sufficient amount of networking opportunities at this Conference. In addition, 85.7% of the Scholars who attended the 2002 Leadership Conference claimed that opportunities to network and interact with peers in this year’s Conference were better than last year or about the same.
- Overall, almost all Scholars (92.9%) who attended the 2002 Leadership Conference felt that the 2003 Leadership Conference was equal or better in terms of increasing their leadership skills, the quality of the Conference, and the relevance to their work.
- Overall, nearly all Scholars (92.9%) who attended the 2002 Leadership Conference cited many specific examples of the ways that the earlier Conference had helped them in the prior year.

Table 1: Quantitative Results from All Scholars

Respondent Evaluations of Conference Sessions

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
A1. Welcome Lunch (Bednash, Fagin, Mezey, Rieder, Shaver)											
How well did this session frame the purpose of this Conference?	Excellent or Very Good	85.1% (n=47)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=9)	66.7% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	75.0% (n=4)	72.7% (n=11)	100.0% (n=2)
How closely did the purpose (as described in this session) match your expectations about this conference?	Very Closely or Somewhat	97.8% (n=46)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	75.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=2)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	85.4% (n=48)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=10)	66.7% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	75.0% (n=4)	63.6% (n=11)	100.0% (n=2)
A2. "Orchestrating A Research Career" (McBride)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	65.6% (n=32)	--	--	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=6)	--	--	75.0% (n=4)	9.1% (n=11)	100.0% (n=1)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	81.3% (n=32)	--	--	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=6)	--	--	75.0% (n=4)	63.6% (n=11)	100.0% (n=1)
How useful was the session content for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	65.6% (n=32)	--	--	80.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=6)	--	--	50.0% (n=4)	36.4% (n=11)	100.0% (n=1)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	87.5% (n=32)	--	--	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=6)	--	--	75.0% (n=4)	72.7% (n=11)	100.0% (n=1)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	74.2% (n=31)	--	--	70.0% (n=10)	83.3% (n=6)	--	--	75.0% (n=4)	70.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=1)
A2. Poster Set-Up and Communications Consultation (Beilenson)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=3)	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	100.0% (n=1)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	81.8% (n=11)	66.7% (n=6)	100.0% (n=3)	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	100.0% (n=1)
How useful was the session content for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	72.7% (n=11)	50.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=3)	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	100.0% (n=1)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=3)	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	100.0% (n=1)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	90.0% (n=10)	83.3% (n=6)	100.0% (n=3)	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
A3. Panel I: "Interdisciplinary Collaboration" (Dunbar-Jacob, Fulmer, Grey, Hill)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	84.3% (n=51)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	81.8% (n=11)	66.7% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	80.0% (n=5)	83.3% (n=12)	100.0% (n=2)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	78.0% (n=50)	80.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	90.9% (n=11)	33.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	60.0% (n=5)	81.8% (n=11)	100.0% (n=2)
How useful was the session content for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	69.4% (n=49)	70.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	90.0% (n=10)	33.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	50.0% (n=4)	58.3% (n=12)	100.0% (n=2)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	87.8% (n=49)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=10)	33.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=4)	91.7% (n=12)	100.0% (n=2)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	82.2% (n=45)	77.8% (n=9)	100.0% (n=4)	88.9% (n=9)	60.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	75.0% (n=4)	90.9% (n=11)	50.0% (n=2)
A4. Poster Presentations and Reception (Class of 2002)											
I presented a poster at this session.	Yes	31.3% (n=48)	100.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=5)	0.0% (n=11)	0.0% (n=6)	--	0.0% (n=1)	0.0% (n=5)	0.0% (n=9)	50.0% (n=2)
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	83.7% (n=49)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=5)	72.7% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=5)	77.8% (n=9)	0.0% (n=2)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	87.8% (n=49)	100.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	80.0% (n=5)	88.9% (n=9)	0.0% (n=2)
How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	73.5% (n=49)	100.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=5)	63.6% (n=11)	66.7% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	60.0% (n=5)	77.8% (n=9)	0.0% (n=2)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	98.0% (n=49)	100.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=9)	100.0% (n=2)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	95.7% (n=46)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=3)	100.0% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	80.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=2)
A5. Panel II: "The Shaping of Policy" (Gruman, Morse, Scanlon, Wakefield)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	90.7% (n=54)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	83.4% (n=6)	78.6% (n=14)	100.0% (n=2)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	96.3% (n=54)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	90.9% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=14)	100.0% (n=2)
How useful was this session for helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	90.6% (n=53)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=10)	66.7% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	66.7% (n=6)	92.9% (n=14)	100.0% (n=2)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=53)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=14)	100.0% (n=2)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	92.3% (n=52)	80.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=11)	80.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=6)	92.3% (n=13)	100.0% (n=2)
A6. Panel III: "Hope, Optimism, and Resilience: The Move to Positive Organizing Frameworks" (Dufault, Levy, Perls, Seeland)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	75.9% (n=54)	50.0% (n=8)	80.0% (n=5)	54.5% (n=11)	50.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	100.0% (n=15)	100.0% (n=1)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	86.5% (n=52)	62.5% (n=8)	100.0% (n=4)	72.7% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	100.0% (n=14)	100.0% (n=1)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	61.1% (n=54)	37.5% (n=8)	80.0% (n=5)	36.4% (n=11)	50.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	71.4% (n=7)	80.0% (n=15)	100.0% (n=1)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	82.7% (n=52)	57.1% (n=7)	100.0% (n=5)	72.7% (n=11)	50.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	100.0% (n=14)	100.0% (n=1)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	73.5% (n=49)	42.9% (n=7)	80.0% (n=5)	40.0% (n=10)	75.0% (n=4)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	100.0% (n=14)	100.0% (n=1)
A7. Concurrent Sessions: Maximizing Hartford Opportunities (Brittis, Fagin, Franklin, Jablonski)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	80.0% (n=17)	--	--	100.0% (n=10)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--
How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	88.9% (n=18)	--	--	90.9% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--
How useful was the session content for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	88.9% (n=18)	--	--	90.9% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	94.4% (n=18)	--	--	90.9% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	83.3% (n=18)	--	--	81.8% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
A7. Concurrent Sessions: Getting the Most Out of Your Master's Program (Foreman, Sullivan-Marx)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0% (n=16)	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	--
How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	87.5% (n=16)	--	--	--	--	--	--	80.0% (n=5)	90.9% (n=11)	--
How useful was the session content for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	81.3% (n=16)	--	--	--	--	--	--	60.0% (n=5)	90.9% (n=11)	--
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=16)	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	--
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	80.0% (n=15)	--	--	--	--	--	--	80.0% (n=5)	80.0% (n=10)	--
A7. Concurrent Sessions: What Do We Know That Is Ready For Practice (Beverly, Strumpf)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	80.0% (n=15)	100.0% (n=4)	75.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	50.0% (n=2)	66.7% (n=3)	100.0% (n=2)
How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	64.3% (n=14)	100.0% (n=4)	50.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	50.0% (n=2)	0.0% (n=3)	100.0% (n=2)
How useful was the session content for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	66.7% (n=15)	75.0% (n=4)	75.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	50.0% (n=2)	33.3% (n=3)	100.0% (n=2)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	80.0% (n=15)	100.0% (n=4)	50.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	100.0% (n=2)	66.7% (n=3)	100.0% (n=2)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	78.6% (n=14)	100.0% (n=4)	66.7% (n=3)	--	--	--	--	50.0% (n=2)	66.7% (n=3)	100.0% (n=2)
A7. Concurrent Sessions: Building Hope: A Workshop (Carter)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=3)	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--
How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	60.0% (n=5)	33.3% (n=3)	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--
How useful was the session content for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	40.0% (n=5)	33.3% (n=3)	0.0% (n=1)	--	--	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	80.0% (n=5)	66.7% (n=3)	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	80.0% (n=5)	66.7% (n=3)	100.0% (n=1)	--	--	--	--	--	100.0% (n=1)	--

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
A8. The Mary Starke Harper Distinguished Lectureship (Florence Wald, RN, FAAN)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	81.6% (n=49)	100.0% (n=8)	80.0% (n=5)	90.9% (n=11)	80.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	50.0% (n=12)	--
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	92.2% (n=51)	100.0% (n=8)	80.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	75.0% (n=12)	100.0% (n=1)
How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	80.0% (n=50)	100.0% (n=8)	80.0% (n=5)	90.9% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	45.5% (n=11)	100.0% (n=1)
How useful was the session content for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	88.2% (n=51)	100.0% (n=8)	80.0% (n=5)	90.9% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	66.7% (n=12)	100.0% (n=1)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=50)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	100.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	100.0% (n=12)	100.0% (n=1)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	96.0% (n=50)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	90.9% (n=11)	100.0% (n=1)
A9. Panel IV: "The Economics of Care Giving" (Archbold, Jones, Kayser-Jones, Maas)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	78.8% (n=52)	88.9% (n=9)	75.0% (n=4)	90.9% (n=11)	75.0% (n=4)	--	100.0% (n=1)	57.1% (n=7)	71.4% (n=14)	100.0% (n=2)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	84.9% (n=53)	88.9% (n=9)	75.0% (n=4)	90.9% (n=11)	100.0% (n=4)	--	100.0% (n=1)	71.4% (n=7)	80.0% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	81.5% (n=54)	77.8% (n=9)	75.0% (n=4)	81.8% (n=11)	80.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	80.0% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	94.4% (n=54)	100.0% (n=9)	100.0% (n=4)	90.9% (n=11)	100.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	93.3% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	92.3% (n=52)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=4)	90.9% (n=11)	100.0% (n=4)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	86.7% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)
10A. Endnotes: Reflection on Leadership (Bolton)											
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	92.9% (n=42)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=3)	100.0% (n=9)	80.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=4)	80.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=2)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	95.3% (n=43)	87.5% (n=8)	100.0% (n=3)	100.0% (n=9)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=4)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=2)
How useful was this session for helping you <u>increase</u> your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	83.3% (n=42)	87.5% (n=8)	66.7% (n=3)	88.9% (n=9)	80.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=4)	70.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=2)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=42)	100.0% (n=7)	100.0% (n=3)	100.0% (n=9)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=2)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	97.6% (n=41)	100.0% (n=7)	100.0% (n=3)	100.0% (n=9)	80.0% (n=5)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=2)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
10B. Please Give Us Feedback About the Conference as a Whole											
How relevant was this leadership conference for you work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	86.0% (n=57)	90.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	73.3% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)
How well did the conference match your expectations?	Very Closely Match or Somewhat	100.0% (n=56)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	100.0% (n=14)	100.0% (n=2)
Would you recommend a similar conference to a peer?	Definitely or Probably	94.7% (n=57)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	93.3% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)
How would you rate the conference quality?	Excellent or Very Good	91.2% (n=57)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	80.0% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)
How likely are you to use the information from the conference?	Very Likely or Somewhat Likely	98.2% (n=57)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=7)	100.0% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)
How valuable was the overall conference for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant/scholarship?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	86.0% (n=57)	90.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=5)	90.9% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	73.3% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)
How useful was the overall conference in helping you increase your leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing?	Extremely Useful or Very Useful	82.5% (n=57)	100.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=5)	81.8% (n=11)	83.3% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	71.4% (n=7)	73.3% (n=15)	100.0% (n=2)
How appropriate was the number of networking opportunities provided at this conference?	Just Right	63.2% (n=57)	40.0% (n=10)	60.0% (n=5)	36.4% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	71.4% (n=7)	80.0% (n=15)	50.0% (n=2)
How conducive was the setting of this conference to networking?	Extremely or Very	80.4% (n=56)	77.8% (n=9)	60.0% (n=5)	81.8% (n=11)	100.0% (n=6)	--	100.0% (n=1)	85.7% (n=7)	80.0% (n=15)	50.0% (n=2)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
How appropriate was the combination of panels, concurrent sessions, networking receptions, and other sessions at this conference?	Just Right	81.6% (n=49)	88.9% (n=9)	100.0% (n=5)	66.7% (n=9)	66.7% (n=3)	--	100.0% (n=1)	83.3% (n=6)	85.7% (n=14)	50.0% (n=2)
10C. Please Think Back to Last Year's Conference											
The overall quality of this year's conference was:	Better than last year or About the same	92.9% (n=14)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
The overall relevance of this year's conference to my work was:	More relevant than last year or About the same	92.9% (n=14)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
The opportunities for networking and interacting with peers in this year's conference were:	Better than last year or About the same	85.7% (n=14)	80.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
This year's conference increased my leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing	More than last year or About the same	100.0% (n=14)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Did you use any information from last year's Leadership Conference over the course of the year?	Yes	92.9% (n=14)	100.0% (n=10)	75.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2002 MBA AAN Scholar	2003 MBA AAN Scholar	2002 AACN APN Scholars	2003 AACN APN Scholars	NYU Hartford Scholar
Did the networking opportunities provided by the 2002 Leadership Conference result in any synergistic relationships or collaborations during the year?	Yes	61.5% (n=13)	44.4% (n=9)	100.0% (n=4)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Comparison of the Ratings of Types of Respondents.

Scholars vs. Non-Scholars. The responses of the eight groups of Scholars—2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars, 2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars, 2003 MBA AAN Scholars, 2002 AACN APN Scholars, 2003 AACN APN Scholars, and NYU Hartford Scholars—were compared to responses of non-Scholars: Mentors of Hartford Scholars, HCGNE Director/Faculty/Staff, Investment Program Director/Faculty Staff, AACN/AAN/NYU Director/Staff, AACN Graduate Curriculum Director/Staff, and Speakers. The responses made by these groups about the individual sessions of the Conference were compared using an appropriate nonparametric statistical test (Mann-Whitney). Of 72 comparisons, 8 were found to be different using $p < .05$ as a level of significance. The following differences were observed:

- Scholars were more likely to indicate that the poster presentation session was relevant for their work than were non-Scholars ($p = .030$).
- Scholars tended to rate the poster presentation session as more useful for helping increase their leadership skills than did non-Scholars ($p = .005$).
- Scholars were more likely to express that the poster presentation session should be repeated in future years than were non-Scholars ($p = .027$).
- Scholars were more likely to say that attending another session similar to the poster presentation would be useful than were non-Scholars ($p = .008$).
- Scholars were more likely to express that the session “Hope, Optimism, and Resilience: The Move to Postitive Organizing Frameworks” should be repeated in future years than were non-Scholars ($p = .016$).
- Scholars were more likely to report that the concurrent sessions were more relevant for their work than were non-Scholars ($p = .016$).
- Scholars found the concurrent sessions more useful for increasing their leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing than did non-Scholars ($p = .047$).
- Scholars were more likely to express that the concurrent sessions should be repeated in future years than were non-Scholars ($p = .016$).

Pre-Doctoral Scholars vs. Post-Doctoral Scholars vs. AACN APN Scholars. Additionally, the responses of the eight groups of Scholars—2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars, 2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars, 2003 MBA AAN Scholars, 2002 AACN APN Scholars, 2003 AACN APN Scholars, and NYU Hartford Scholars—were grouped into three Scholar groups: Pre-Doctoral Scholars, Post-Doctoral Scholars, and AACN APN Scholars. The responses made by these three groups about the individual sessions of the Conference were then compared using an appropriate nonparametric statistical test (Kruskal-Wallis). Of 72 comparisons, 13 were found to be different using $p < .05$ as a level of significance. The following differences were observed:

- Compared to AACN APN and Post-Doctoral Scholars, relatively more Pre-Doctoral Scholars reported that the purpose, as described at the “Welcome Lunch” session, closely matched their expectations about the Conference ($p = .010$).
- AACN APN Scholars indicated that the “Orchestrating A Research Career” session was less relevant for their work than did Pre- and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p < .001$).

- AACN APN Scholars rated the “Orchestrating A Research Career” session as lower quality than did Pre- and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p = .004$).
- Post-Doctoral Scholars found the “Orchestrating A Research Career” session content more less useful for increasing leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing than did AACN APN Scholars and Pre-Doctoral Scholars ($p = .005$).
- AACN APN Scholars were less likely to indicate that the “Orchestrating A Research Career” session should be repeated in future years than were Pre- and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p = .005$).
- Pre-Doctoral Scholars found the “Poster Set-up and Communications Consultation” session content less useful for increasing their leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing ($p = .015$) than did Post-Doctoral Scholars.
- Pre-Doctoral Scholars indicated that the “Hope, Optimism, and Resilience: The Move to Positive Organizing Frameworks” session was less relevant for their work than did AACN APN Scholars and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p = .002$).
- Pre-Doctoral Scholars rated the “Hope, Optimism, and Resilience: The Move to Positive Organizing Frameworks” session as lower quality than were AACN APN Scholars and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p < .001$).
- Pre-Doctoral Scholars were less likely to believe that the “Hope, Optimism, and Resilience: The Move to Positive Organizing Frameworks” session should be repeated in future years than were AACN APN Scholars and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p = .009$).
- Pre-Doctoral Scholars attending the “Hope, Optimism, and Resilience: The Move to Positive Organizing Frameworks” session found attending a similar session in the future to be less useful than did AACN APN Scholars and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p = .002$).
- AACN APN Scholars rated the “Mary Starke Harper Distinguished Lectureship-by Florence Wald, RN, FAAN” session as less valuable than did Pre-Doctoral Scholars and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p = .042$).
- AACN APN Scholars were less likely to believe that the Leadership Conference was relevant for their work than were Pre-Doctoral Scholars and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p = .019$).
- Pre-Doctoral Scholars thought that the number of networking opportunities provided at this Conference was less appropriate than were AACN APN Scholars and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p = .024$).

Qualitative Findings from the Evaluation. Table 2 summarizes the qualitative findings from the evaluation for all Scholars who completed the Evaluation Form. The comments made by all other respondents—Speakers, Mentors, Directors, Faculty, and Staff—are presented in Appendix IV.

- Several general themes emerge from these comments that might be addressed in future conferences.
- In general, the participants were extremely positive about the Leadership Conference. Scholars were “inspired” by the Conference. As with the quantitative ratings, these comments point out that the Conference was a success.
- Overall, Scholars felt that they would use the information from the Conference as a spring board for pursuing innovative strategies for making an impact on the field of nursing. This Conference provided examples of and motivation for thinking more broadly about the work that they do; understanding the benefit of pursuing interdisciplinary work; appreciating the interrelationship between nursing, policy, and economics; and actively pursuing and taking advantage of opportunities. The Conference was able to

present a vision of the future of nursing while maintaining the heritage of the profession's past accomplishments.

- The Scholars especially appreciated the diversity of expertise, experiences, vision, and presentation styles that the speakers brought to the Conference. The examples and anecdotes that the speakers presented from both their professional and personal experiences enhanced the potency of the messages; it illustrated abstract concept with concrete situations/examples. Scholars were very receptive to messages conveyed in this manner. This finding is identical to one from the 2002 Conference.
- Scholars felt that the opportunity for dialogue between the audience and speakers greatly enhanced the presentation. Scholars felt that they benefited greatly from the exchange of ideas and the chance to contribute to the sessions. As a result, many expressed the desire to dedicate a greater proportion of the session to questions and answers to facilitate a fuller discussion of ideas that were stimulated by the session.
- Scholars valued the networking opportunities at the Conference. Less structured sessions, such as the Poster Presentations and Concurrent Sessions, were especially successful in facilitating networking among Scholars, and between Scholars and Leaders in the field. Scholars indicated that they would have like to have more of these networking opportunities, especially among their peers.
- The Concurrent Sessions were a good step towards having more targeted sessions. Namely, smaller groups gave participants more opportunities to voice their views and to engage in in-depth discussion. Scholars found the chance to share information about opportunities and expectations useful.
- Some Scholars felt that they would have benefited from hearing from Hartford Scholar alumni. Such a presentation would give the current Scholars examples of the academic and career trajectory of Hartford Scholars. Scholars reported that they would like to learn from the experience of their predecessors.
- Scholars were pleased with the amenities. There were no major complaints about the physical layout, food, or facilities. However, some Scholars felt that the schedule was too full. For example, there were comments regarding the overwhelming nature of the speakers, presentations, and networking that took place at the Welcome Lunch. Scholars also preferred more frequent breaks. The evaluators independently came to the conclusion that the meeting seemed "more dense" Than the 2001 and 2002 Conferences.

Table 2: Qualitative Comments

A1. Welcome Luncheon (Bednash, Fagin, Mezey, Rieder, Shaver)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- The warm and welcoming effect of these nurse leaders was the most important aspect of this panel and it certainly came through! Thank you for this gift of scholarship and fellowship.
- For all sessions-need to limit questions to be sure there is a limit to respond to them.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Good start. Felt welcomed and special.
- Very nice opening session to set tone for Conference.
- Dislikes changing, etc. Distracted from words of welcome. Excellent to show breadth of JAHF programs and to introduce to these leaders.

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Great overviews about the Conference's goals. Nice opportunity to meet others at your table.
- Enjoyed the networking at lunch.
- It was an excellent opportunity to see and be exposed to the leaders of our new community.
- Difficult to listen, watch and eat at the same time.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- This was a fine beginning.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- Great session. Gave me a chance to settle in and get a feel for the next 3 days. Also to see a face with the name.
- Having come to the Conference by myself-I felt warmly welcomed by the Hartford Foundation and AACN.
- Was geared toward Pre-doc, Post-Doc Scholars. It did not address Masters' program students at all. This session did not provide an overall outline for the Conference leaving many of us wondering why we were here.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- I think it would have benefited new Scholars to have at lunch, leader at each table to facilitate introductions, sharing, etc.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- Very welcoming to someone who has never attended.
-

A2. "Orchestrating a Research Career" (McBride)

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Dr. McBride is wonderful-pragmatic and inspirational- a sometimes difficult balance to maintain. Good use of humor and personal experiences. Very enjoyable and useful.
- What a wonderful presentation. Dr. McBride is excellent at providing a template for a research career. Thank you.
- This section was extremely helpful. I learned a lot of strategies for the present and for the future to use to increase my level of success.
- Session was very good, but most appreciable to first year Scholars.
- Dr. McBride was engaging. However, the whole talk was framed from a generational perspective, the relevance of which I question in 2003.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Best session of the Conference.
- Really good presentation.
- These thoughts are so important. Like church they bear repeating. Energized me and made me want to move forward.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- Well articulated, well organized intent.
- She was great, very enthusiastic and her lecture was quite helpful. Dr. McBride was very knowledgeable and her hand-outs were helpful to share with the class when I get back.
- Ms. McBride starts very strong and energetic, then she lost her place in the slide show, seemed very puzzled for a while, then she never regained her momentum again until the very end.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- I am a GNP-however the speaker was amazing and much of the content I could apply even though I am not planning on a Ph.D. or research area-wonderful speaker.
 - Yes I would attend but if I was forward more towards the early years and you've received tenure-something like "you've got tenure-now what!"
 - I am a GNP student with long term goals of being in research. I found that the info was helpful in getting my focus right for future endeavors. But I also found relevant info for use in my present career.
- Not as applicable to those attendees who are not intending to pursue doctoral studies-some focus on other roles for GNP would give header relevance or another session aimed at the clinical practitioner not Ph.D. research.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- Yes I would attend but if I was forward more towards the early years and you've received tenure-something like "you've got tenure-now what!"

A2. Poster Set-up and Communications Consultation (Beilenson)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- The feedback was so valuable that I suggest having John first review all the posters and then talk to us as a group as we visit all the posters so we can benefit from everyone's feedback from John. Send out examples (pictures) of excellent posters in advance of the session with the poster instructions.
- Feedback was helpful, but it was difficult for them to have enough time for all the Scholars. Perhaps better to have posters up early for (John)? -then spend the session as a group (i.e. posters) comparing, contrasting, and suggesting comments.
- John had great comments-however we really weren't sure about what we were supposed to do. If John could have reviewed the posters ahead of time and the comments about posters that really were artistically good and were organized well. That would have allowed more time to discuss issues without feeling defensive about your work.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- John is so "user friendly" and very personable and helpful. He has much finesse in giving both good and critical comments.
- Clarify expectations regarding developing a poster for the next cohort of Scholars. Several 2002 Scholars were unaware of this session; I too, was not certain about whether or not there would be a poster session.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- Involve faculty (mentors) to critique side by side with John so they hear what he says. They take it back and share with students most important message: put conclusion in title as a hook

A3. Panel I: "Interdisciplinary Collaboration" (Dunbar-Jacob, Fulmer, Grey, Hill)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- I really want this topic presented but in a much more defined and focused way. For example pick one or two issues like nurses in a politically charged team where role of nursing is not understood nurses as leaders in organizations where they represent an entire multi-disciplinary team...and other topics to focus on. Speakers need to communicate with each other ahead of time.
- The topic was great, but the manner of presentation did not lead to intellectual discussion. Would like to hear what people are doing in interdisciplinary groups. Current research at U Penn should have results for next conference- ethnography on multidisciplinary research groups out of the HCGNE-MANY (Naylor)?
- Yes-if the focus was on really good strategies and examples of forging collaborations with those outside of healthcare. How do I even find an economist and then why will they want to work with me-how do I facilitate that process? What if I want to work with an anthropologist, an Indian tribe leader, or an actuary? What are the possibilities and how can I make it work.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Excellent leaders who gave/presented clear stories and take home messages. For example, Dr Fagin "when a door opens walk through."
- Good and useful content.
- This session was a set of case studies of these women's work. Hill provided the most useful data- that was balance and provided recommendations that one could adapt. The panel would have benefited from a member who was from another discipline-we need to know both sides of the collaboration picture.
- Would be useful to also focus on interdisciplinary collaboration at local level and not only nationally.

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Enjoyed the session that it was a comprehensive treatment of the subject. Having been in NSG and worked interdisciplinary projects/teams/etc. Feel I was aware of many strategies and concepts discussed.
- Ms. Hill especially spoke to my personal experience of serving on male dominated boards. Her insights and hints for success will be carried forward from a position of strength. Thank you.
- This session was very energizing for me. These speakers really stretched my thoughts as the ways nurses can be leaders in large organizations and in our own communities. I plan to return to my home institution and begin exploring ways to build my collaborative efforts with other disciplines.
- The attention to interdisciplinary collaboration is invaluable. I applaud the dedication of a session to the topic but I think it could be enhanced by expanding the focus of collaboration to include other disciplines. Collaboration between MD and RN. It is also greater than organizational work. It would be great to see that included.
- I felt this section was very informative; however, beyond my current role as a student. I do try to plan to incorporate "trans-disciplinary" work in the future and feel that this section provided a good background to prepare for this.
- Maybe more practical tips for pre-docs.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- I enjoyed hearing the stories of these fine role models.
- This session was very inspiring about long term possibilities for impacting the field. I think it was hard to come up with questions because it is further off in the future than what the Scholars are working on now, so while inspiring did not generate discussion-we were in for!
- Would be helpful to participants if presenters talk about their mentoring role-how have they mentored others? Exact examples would be helpful!
- Need to manage questions and response time better.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- A powerhouse present panel.
- Very impressive array of nurse leaders. Wish there had been more time for them to speak extemporaneously.
- Dr. Fulmer's talk was extremely positive and informational. The other speakers focused more on bragging about what they had accomplished more so than how we can utilize any skills they used to obtain their achievements. Overall, it was helpful to hear that serendipity accounts for many opportunities. The focus of panel was not really related to gerontological nursing. Although I found it quite interesting, it did not seem to fit under the heading.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- Dynamic speaker-excellent exchange about how they got to where they are. A photo with these leaders would have been terrific! I wanted to get their autographs-I think encouraging this would be very motivating for new Scholars!
- Appreciated May's challenge to be active and involved and ask questions.
- The panel gave varied input, but the complementary input on "team work". It helps me as a grad student to start my career being aware of and sensitive to the disciplines around me.
- I feel any work with interdisciplinary team building is crucial in this topic.
- I felt very intimidated to ask a question. When I later asked a question to (one speaker), she was very demeaning towards me.
- The session could/should be repeated if the session did not close as it did this year. There were limited questions because (I feel) the panel did a lot of discussing there careers (more biography) than "key points".

A4. Poster Presentations and Reception (Class of 2002)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- John was great. I would have liked to see more of the mentors and Hartford directors going around to see the posters. I only saw a handful of them come to see the posters and talk to the Scholars.
- John was extremely helpful.
- Excellent networking, and practice in presenting my research.
- Many nurses stopped at my poster session. They asked important questions and I was able to answer these questions! This session also served as networking, with exchange of business cards and other info, re: their interests within their practice.
- Please add a section where alumni from other previous years can present their work which was funded by Hartford.
- Needed more time.
- Have a section for alumni posters so we can see the progress of other Scholars.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- I was looking for push pins-some were available- I used to have my own! Lighting was o.k. in the room. Wonderful experience.
- Love to make the change to my poster and be re-evaluated at a later session.
- I did not have a poster to present. Suggest that in 2004, 2003 Scholars have a reunion reception. Also suggest that the abstracts of completed 2002 Scholar work be completed and distributed.
- See previous note. Re: clarifying invitation to participate in this session.

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Good networking opportunity.
- It was a great opportunity to talk with Scholars a year into their program to see their accomplishments.
- It was a fantastic opportunity for networking.
- Maybe longer-didn't have opportunity to see everyone's work.
- I wondered if poster might be grouped by "level" of research - e.g. Pre-docs not yet collecting data vs. post-docs studies underway, etc.-(maybe even topically?)

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- It was nice to see the work that prior Scholars have accomplished and to network with others in similar research areas.
- The networking was very valuable.
- It was wonderful to see the work of others. I also was happy to practice critique of others work.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- This was a nice event that gave me an opportunity to talk with others about problems encountered in my practice. I was also able to discuss with each researcher how their research applied to my practice. I like being able to talk with the researchers.
- Would like to see a study on human list of care.
- The posters were very professional, but many of us have done posters, so it was nothing new in terms of leadership skills.
- The busy reception atmosphere is not the best for getting much information from the posters. Too crowded and hard to get to speak to presenters. Overall noise level way too high for me to learn anything. I'll go back when it's quieter and I can concentrate.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- Great! Very informative and exciting.
- I am a Master's student-this was a great way for me to get a better sense of the actual process of doing research-the nuts and bolts of research.
- It was helpful to have interaction with people engaged in research projects with older adults.
- This session could be enhanced if there was a preceding discussion on "how to" make an effective poster to communicate your study. It was interesting and helpful to walk through and discuss study results with the poster presenters.
- It would also be great to highlight innovative solutions in geriatric care: PPTS, innovative programs to exemplified "best practices" a unique practice in geriatric care. It would have been great to put Lynette Jones-Baucke's product at the outer presentation.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- It was fun to interact and dialog with others on my topics.
-

A5. Panel II: “The Shaping of Policy” (Gruman, Morse, Scanlon, Wakefield)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Excellent presentation and topic! Great questions, perhaps sessions like this (hot topics) should have more time for discussions/questions vs. others that may be purely informative (like interdisciplinary session).
 - This was superb-excellent and well balanced presentations=very cogent and salient information. Every speaker was effective.
 - I definitely am glad you included this. I think that this topic should be incorporated into both our curriculums and also information we receive from many in emails re: policy has been great at spreading the word.
 - I wish Mary Wakefield would have had more time to present. She is a prototype role model of a powerful nurse in politics. Catherine Dodd, Nancy Pelosi's staff leader, is a nurse and Ph.D. student of health policy and sociology at UCSF-would be a good person to speak-she's very dynamic as well.
-

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Thanks for the wonderful opportunity to moderate this session. All panelists were receptive to conference calls and in negotiating their role to me.
 - Excellent and entirely new world.
 - Fantastic presentations! Need more time for audience participation.
-

• 2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Excellent session!
 - This section really got me thinking (excited about) on area of nursing that is little talked about, but I now realize is so important. I would like to hear more about this subject.
 - All the panelists were fantastic. Dr. Gruman in particular was incredibly articulate and thought provoking.
 - Perhaps present an 'advanced' content workshop with some examples on how people have adapted research finding for policy.
 - Possibly-include more basic "first steps" for new leaders.
 - In all sessions needed more time for questions and answers. (One speaker) was interesting but I would appreciate a slower rate of speech-I personally feel "hammered" by her presentation style.
 - There is always more to learn.
-

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Excellent speakers with different perspectives on important topic.
 - Very good and helpful even for researchers focused on topics that will likely not influence policy.
 - I especially like the information from the non-nurse presenters. Hearing information from outside the nursing paradigm is very helpful.
 - Manage questions and responses better.
 - Recommend higher level of depth and sophistication (Ratings of individual speakers.) Q&A session was artificial a knee jerk reaction to previous day's scolding.
-

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- Dr. Wakefield's talk included the most relevant information for those of us who do not have any experience and policy reform.
- It was interesting to hear the panelist opinion on the topic. I found Wakefield to be very knowledgeable with her field. I wish the questions would have been addressed one by one to hear their feedback on the questions. They probably allowed too many questions with not enough time to get to answering them.
- Very dynamic presentation- and quite useful-although I had some hope in including QOL issues for the elderly. My question was not answered.
- There were so many questions at the end-many of them the same-that the panel was unable to get to more than one of them.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- The speakers' personal stories were more helpful than just lectures. The small group discussions gave me a chance to process the info and meet new people.
- Dr. Gruman is a very clear effective speaker. As well as David Morse. He provided good information on effective policy making for field of work. Tied how nurses impact policy.
- Dr. Wakefield was wonderful and motivating.
- Mary Wakefield was very inspirational and dynamic-great speaker!
- This was the best session-Dr Wakefield was dynamic as well as David Morse and the others. I also would have liked to have my photo taken with these dynamic people.
- I have an interest in affecting policy-this session was helpful-very-great speakers and content.
- Although all the speakers were passionate and eloquent, I especially liked the presentation of Ms. Wakefield.
- Need time for panelists to address the audience questions-would have greatly enriched the session.
- I suggest changing the Q&A opportunities. Following Mezy's challenge to ask questions- may people did... However, only one or 2 questions were actually answered. While there may be some value in hearing the questions from the audience, I would prefer more balance between time for questions and time for answers.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- Most important message; do the work, contribute and invest in non-nursing organizations. I teach students re: health policy and those ideas were helpful.

A6. Panel III: "Hope, Optimism, and Resilience: The Move to Positive Organizing Frameworks" (Dufault, Levy, Perls, Seeland)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Another superb and well balanced session with excellent speakers =very high caliber work.
- Incredible, but do need more time for provocative presentations like this. Good to have the workshop as a follow-up to this session!
- Not sure how this helped my leadership learning.
- Did not make the connection and leadership.
- This could have been an extremely useful session, but the speakers were not dynamic. For a topic such as "hope" both cognitive and heart centered examples are necessary.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Each presenter put a scholarly "face" to a soft topic, very interesting. Made me think about how important it is to stay connected with our patients while we do our research activities.
- Learned much; particularly regarding the impact of perceptions.
- Next time-carry to next step-"selling" this framework to founders and policy makers.
- (One speaker's) slides were good but her presentation style was poor. Rest was outstanding!!

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- I thought this section was a great overview of an area of research that I was not too familiar with. I now realize the benefit of such research and how these concepts influence elderly persons.
- Another fascinating panel with thoughtful, creative, relevant Scholars. They provoked a lot of brainstorming. Consideration of old issues in novel ways.
- Enjoyed very much!
- Interesting content-I had a little more difficulty making a direct link to my leadership role. I have long understood and supported the value of hopes and hardiness (resiliency) in geriatric care-but tie it more directly to this solely.
- I did not see the relevance of this topic. Particularly to advancing leadership skills.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Speakers show passion-great job of setting the stage for further discussion after the session.
- Absolutely essential. I chose to work with those at VAMS because they do approach aging from this optimistic paradigm. It is essential for society to move this agenda forward.
- While interesting, this was just not in any particular area of interest/work.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- Excellent.
- I found this session to be the most interesting and inspiring. Dr. Seeland moved me to tears with her patient stories. I am definitely going to do some reading about the importance of hope as it relates to healthy aging-my interest area.
- Would like to see more presentations of key topic. This topic is relatively new to me and instantly became interested in learning now about it and I am considering writing my comp. paper about hope...on living in NH.
- I feel the speakers were very beneficial but really didn't have the time to answer questions that were asked. Maybe in the future break down the panelists in different rooms to answer questions and give people more one-on-one time.
- Very eloquent speeches-may have been better in an amateur group.
- I would have liked to see more emphasis on "hopelessness vs. despair" in the elderly.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- The presentations by Becca Levy, Thomas Perls and Irene B Seeland were very informative and impressive.
- Again, the small group discussions were great. The Q&A session wasn't long enough. I never guessed that this topic would have such an impact on me.
- Very good session on important topics to our field.
- This was more on the nursing I know. As a hands-on provider this was helpful!!
- Wonderful.
- Great panel and interesting info.
- I attended the workshop and got more out of this smaller group. I would have liked more info from Dr. Perls; what factors influence/improve life to 100. He was an excellent speaker.

A7. Concurrent Sessions: Maximizing Hartford Opportunities (Brittis, Fagin, Franklin, Jablonski)

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Set aside time and space for group of Scholars to meet together on own.
- Getting to know my peers was wonderful-exactly the point of my pursuit of this scholarship.
- A great forum for discussion and meeting other Scholars!
- Designed for first year Scholars.
- More break outs with Scholars might be helpful, although everything was outstanding.
- It was a bit disarming to enter what I thought was going to be an orientation session and be faced with a question that really requires a lot of thought-without it being placed in context. Dr. Fagin immediately remedied this. It would have been helpful to hear that context prior to posing the question. It would also be helpful to be able to meet and interact with our class early on in the Conference. There was so much structured time; it left little room for conversation.
- Would appreciate similar session next year for 2003 Scholars. Also would have appreciated brief overview of purpose of session/or instruction (heads up) as to how to prepare for session.
- Session format was not as expected. More useful if it was information sharing to the group about opportunities and expectations. It would also be helpful if the Scholar groups could meet the 1st day of the Conference rather than in the middle.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- It is important for Scholars to connect with the foundation and understand expectations. Very supportive session.
- This session should be structured so as to inform the Scholars of the rich resources of JAHF and how to use the resources information sharing among Scholars occurred that evening at dinner-recommendation: encourage Scholars to meet over dinner on day one so they will have greater opportunity to network during the Conference.

A7. Concurrent Sessions: Getting the Most Out of Your Master's Program (Foreman, Sullivan-Marx)

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- Very motivational panel of speakers.
- I enjoyed this session as the one most relevant to my career. I very much enjoyed hearing from other AACN Scholars and meeting the staff involved in this area. I would like more sessions like this in the future.
- Dr. Sullivan Marx was very knowledgeable about Medicare and policy. My concern after getting into my MS program was the fact that CNs in PA do not have a practice of guarding and protecting in practice. I personally feel drawn to changing that so that we do have a nurse practitioner. I found that I need to become very knowledgeable about policy and the pros & cons of getting and practice all.
- This session would have been wonderful at the beginning of my masters program. Now I have two quarters left. The speakers were wonderful however and it was good to be able to thank the Hartford Foundation for helping me.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- I can't say enough. What a difference it has made in me to be labeled a "leader" and to be given support and training to live up to that expectation! I came away with new career ideas and increased optimism.
- Excellent way to see and understand how the NP fits into the framework that has been present.
- Smaller group gave an opportunity for all the participants to air their views or make comments. It should be noted that all the attendees were impressed with the Hartford foundation's work and want this to continue.
- The smaller group allowed for discussion-which I enjoyed and found useful.

A7. Concurrent Sessions: What Do We Know That Is Ready For Practice (Beverly, Strumpf)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- This session validated and emphasized the contextual imperatives of integrating research into a real-time setting the logistics all seldom so appreciated.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Excellent "real-life" experiences. Both presenters made me consider issues that might aide in my work. Issues I had not considered before-but will now be better prepared to face. Opportunity for audience discussion and debate was great.
- I really appreciated this session which addressed both positive and negative factors.
- This was an interesting topic with two experienced women telling us their stories of how research had been incorporated into practice. The title of the session and the content were not consistent. I had expected to learn "what" and was told "how" by two women with great experiences.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- This session could have been organized much better. A large majority of the time was spent discussing a research project that had been done very poorly. Instead, the focus should have been how we can translate evidence into practice, or what new geriatric evidence is approaching readiness for practice.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- It was interesting to hear the barriers and opportunities to applying EBP in healthcare settings. Another session could be about "process" in regards to going about implementing EBP in organizations.
- I felt there was more of a discussion on research studies and the best approach for doing an implementation study but I took very few tools away as a future GNP.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- This was the best session.

A7. Concurrent Sessions: Building Hope: A Workshop (Carter)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- This work shop helped me improve my emotional strength. Being emotionally sound improves my ability to help my clients/patients and research participants to resolve or manage emotional issues in their lives, and which improves their ability to prevent or manage diseases. Please include more of such sections that address emotional issues.
- This could have been an extremely useful session, but the speakers were not dynamic. For a topic such as "hope" both cognitive and heart centered examples are necessary. Dr Seeland was the only one who combined these aspects. Keep the topic but secure different speakers-keeping Seeland.
- Might be good to first address any questions from the morning session and then present new information.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Provided tools and perspectives for building hope but little on policy or funding implications.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- The workshop was great-it was a small group-more interactive.

A8. The Mary Starke Harper Distinguished Lectureship-Florence Wald, RN, FAAN

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- What an inspiring session! It was encouraging to see the career of such a luminary in nursing and how she overcame and excelled in her career. Not only was I able to meet Florence, an opportunity not possible without this Leadership Conference, but I hope to visit her in Connecticut to further the conversation.
- Incredible.
- The "living history" of nursing once again came to life and made us all provide to be nurses.
- I think it was really nice that Mrs. Wald went to all the sessions.
- These are amazing opportunities to hear the stories of remarkable careers of remarkable women.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Inspiring!
- Hosting of nursing pioneers like her and hear their stories. I truly enjoyed this reflective journey. Thank you.
- This was wonderful. A live oral history; so important to have a way to pay tribute to one who has done much.
- Important to appreciate our roots-not clear how I will use this-appealed to my affective self more than cognitive.
- This is one of the most enjoyable sessions. It is wonderful to hear the stories of people who have made an impact on health care in this country.

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Wonderful. The historical perspective is so important and valuable. This was the highlight, overall, of the entire program for me.
- I think it is so important that an aspect of nursing history be present at each meeting. So many nurses have limited knowledge of our professions' heritage and could really benefit from more knowledge/exposure in this area.
- So exciting to meet a distinguished and great nurse! Very helpful and inspiring to hear her story.
- An honor to be there.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Enhances appreciation of our history.
- This was a memorable experience that alone makes this Conference one of the most valuable in shaping my goals and objectives.
- A great honor to listen to this great woman. Thank you. Thank you.
- Superb!!

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- It was magnificent and inspiring to see a living legend discussing her experiences in nursing. Her achievements made me want to achieve more.
- Florence Wald is great! I really enjoyed this session because it's wonderful to see an 86 year old woman speak about her life. It's so refreshing to listen to her life story and how one nurse can make a difference. All during her life she never thought she was making such huge contributions. Even at her age she is giving ideas for further research-it's wonderful!
- What a wonderful opportunity to hear from Florence Wald the story of her life-her dreams, her accomplishments-absolutely spellbinding. I spoke with Florence just prior to the interview-she is a tremendous example for all of us!
- Very enjoyable. Stories about nursing history and those early leaders who paved the way for us today are much appreciated.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- I don't think the session had direct relevance to practice although it hinged more on history which may have significance as to the development of nursing. And to current practice it was not very informative.
- Very inspiring.
- It is a privilege to hear her talk. I enjoyed her rich history in nursing. Very inspirational.
- It is good to be here a historical perspective as to where we have come from as a profession.
- Very moving and wonderful account-amazing woman.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- Very inspirational-we should re-visit our history and recognize our heroines more often.

A9. Panel IV: "The Economics of Care Giving" (Archbold, Jones, Kayser-Jones, Maas)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Again-superb, diverse, salient and compelling. So glad to see this integrated so well this year.
- Project drives innovation-what a great comment and how true as usual Dr. Kayser-Jones puts a human face on a topic that defies understanding from an economic perspective.
- Jeanie Kayser-Jones was excellent. CNs \$ were left out of cost/benefit analysis.
- Great session!
- Topic was important-but similar to the first session. Its presentation was not as effective. Most effective messages came from Kayser-Jones and Jones.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Economics is an entirely new concept. I appreciated the diverse perspectives.

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Excellent!
- Helpful, relevant.
- Pat and Meridean (actually all panelists!) Did a fine job of presenting key aspects of economic aspects of nursing care research. I agree that health services research is a key issue for us all.
- It was unfortunate that a health economist was not a primary speaker for this session-I do not think the goals for this session were met with the exception of Dr. Archibald.
- I found the format of the Q&A session frustrating during all the sessions. I would much rather hear a response to questions than a slew of questions without answers. The group just seems too big for this format. This session was better in this regard in that Liz kept questions on the board and there was time for answers.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- This must be linked to policy. Very powerful information.
- (Ratings of individual speakers.) I hope we offer this next year and change in speakers.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- Nurses never really think about money, very important. Thank you.
- I liked Dr. Jones talk-especially her point that we can not rely solely on government to take care of older adults. Also, Dr. Kayser-Jones' call to quantify the cost of human illness and suffering in addition to the economic cost of healthcare was excellent.
- Since I worked in nursing homes, hospitals and home health care, some of the panelists were interesting. It brought up some questions whether the nursing home that research could be definitely done. There was talk on quality vs. quantity of life and I feel that would be a great topic in future discussion especially the impact on the cost of nursing homes.
- Economics unfortunately is not where my interest lies-however I do recognize its importance. (Ratings of individual speakers.)

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- The economics of healthcare are important considerations in practice so the value of this presentation cannot be emphasized enough.
- Dr. Kayser-Jones did an awesome job of bringing up the human cost of illness.
- I enjoyed Lynette Jones talk on research-product. Dr. Kayser-Jones' talk was excellent! Dr. Maas brought up some good points on mass customization and use of internet.
- Encouraged to see some practiced applications, especially enjoyed Archbold's discussion.
- Appreciate that the panel had time to answer the questions from the audience.
- Economics and nursing is important but feels like new grounds/territory for me.
- This session didn't help me at this point in my career, I'm a GNP student, but it does make me aware of future issues I'll face in funding and research.
- Questions to consider: 1) role of adequate staffing/good working conditions for nurses to reducing hospital patient care costs and pain and suffering. 2) crisis of the noninsured and underinsured, what is our role? 3) role of profit motive in corrupting health care: on the face of our health care crisis and symptom, it was unbelievable to hear a speaker making the blanket stunt "profit is good"!

NYU Hartford Scholars

- Important information for us to consider. Should health care economics be considered for undergrad programs? Nurses would think differently.

A10. Endnotes: Reflections on Leadership (Bolton)

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- I loved how she synthesized all the concepts from the previous days of the Conference sessions!
- What an incredible synthesis of our Conference. In total, not only did I find the Conference stimulating, but it was like a puzzle-filling in the pieces of my work that are missing-coloring in the picture of my future in gerontological nursing.
- Definitely bring this speaker back.
- What a dynamic and inspiring leader! Beautiful talk.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Wow! What a dynamo.
- A refreshing presentation. Very motivating.

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Wonderful summary and conclusion.
- Great conclusion and summarization for the Conference.
- Very inspiring. Thank you.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Excellent panel diversity for thoughtful dialogue.
- A wonderful speaker. Thank you.
- Wonderful!!

2003 MBA AAN Scholars

- Powerful speaker, dynamic and all encompassing in her broad overview of this awesome experience.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- Linda is a superb speaker and outstanding leader in nursing. She was one of the first people I met at the luncheon (welcome) I found her engaging, supportive, and funny! Great endnote speaker.
- Excellent! All of the information from the leadership Conference was sufficiently stated in an eloquent talk by Dr. Bolton. She high lighted points that were important to all the APNs.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- Have had a lot of information about leadership but it is always nice to get different perspectives on this topic. So I will always still attend such sessions because there is always something to learn.
- I appreciated the summary of all the topics. The speaker did an excellent job of tying all of the topics together.
- Excellent in tying the topics of the Conference in a cohesive way. I will use some of these concepts in my leadership project for school.
- Excellent point.
- Summaries are useful. This speaker stated all nurses could be leaders, even novice nurses, etc. However, Conference as a whole did not really address leadership in community/clinical setting, but overwhelmingly in academic setting.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- One of the best sessions-she pulled together everything so well-up to the last minute-very inspirational.

B10a. How Conference Information Will be Used to Increase Leadership Skills

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Increase cost and policy implications in my research. Connect with a few of the other Scholars to write papers that tie our research together. Not be as afraid to stand up and ask questions.
- Increase my ability to be public policy change agent by getting books recommended.
- Policy: I am in contact now with Mary Wakefield arranging some opportunity to "internship" with her economics: I am going to change the design of my dissertation to include economic information. From the networking opportunities: I will be visiting U of Washington faculty and OHSU to speak with people about my research.
- The policy session gave me specific ideas on how to amend my dissertation to strengthen the policy implications. The interdisciplinary session reinforced my choice to continue down a broad path in addressing EOL care, not restricted to a pure nursing focus, but one that helps older adults. The hope session gave me ways to reinforce the use of an alternative focus in doing my research. I added several pieces of information from the sessions that were added to my dissertation proposal. They greatly strengthened the picture of my work.
- Reconnect with legislators. Enable clearer articulation of health care issues on an interdisciplinary level.
- I will use the hope building skills to improve the ability of my clients to cope with chronic diseases. I will incorporate the assessment of hope in my future research projects. I will incorporate cost analysis in my future research projects.
- The speakers on public policy have already inspired a contact with work in my state. The economics session have inspired me to "be availability" and to pursue "open doors" and to "open doors" even when time seems already spent.
- Compute coursework-LATCE comps. Develop pre-doc for submission this spring. Begin dissertation.
- Include cost analysis in dissertation. Try to influence immigrant health policy concerning Hispanic elders. Try to influence the US PHS nurses and NP in better understanding the need of immigrant elders (change practice).
- Poster feedback will help me create more effective posters. Introduction to some of the economic concepts helped me with more strategies to use in research including economic indicators. The networking sessions were extremely beneficial and allowed me to forge relationships that I hope will result in long term collaboration and mutual support.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Purposefully seek out a partner (client) to help tell story develop a strategy for convincing others of the need for health promoting interventions in older adults seek out at least one interdisciplinary partner to promote health issues in older adults.
- Will actively work at finding ways to disseminate work to stakeholders. Plan to collaborate-trans-disciplinary. Will try to open closed doors and walk through open ones.
- Certainly will consider policy in all projects in future. Will consider economics of my projects early in conception to decide if they are fundable.
- Tips from panelists will help me as I strategize ways to change current policy re; care of NH residents I am thinking about applying the economic to my next research papers which might be within GHC model-look at cost effective interests, cost savings-cost analysis
- Knowledge of centurions-I will read the text and use it as the basis for lectures. Poster critique was quite good-I will use this info in session designed for the authors to stand by the poster. Contacts with major leaders-I will call them and use them in my career.

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Follow up on resources speakers referred to (e.g. web sites, books) network with Scholars with similar interests.
- I will no doubt be in touch with other Scholars whom I have shared interests. I will definitely think further about how to build economic indicators into my longer range research questions. I will make time to better fulfill my existing roles with specialty organizations to foster nursing inclusion and input.
- Look at NIC/NOC to see how some nursing interventions could have cost and what software developers are using NIC/NOC as an MBA already, I am thrilled to know cost effectiveness analysis is encouraged by the Hartford Foundation-I will pursue for dissertation connect with healthcare economist via my mentor.
- Consider adding economic measurements to research. Continue to forge interdisciplinary collaborations. Begin/continue dialogue with mentor re: plans for pos-doc training.
- Take information from policy sessions and economic panel to foster confidence in legislative efforts.
- The policy panel gave me great ideas for how to better frame my research questions so that they are more likely to influence policy. The economic panel showed the importance of thinking about the cost of interventions. I'm likely to use this information in the future when planning research. Most importantly, it was important to learn skills for networking. After this Conference, I feel more confident in my ability to talk to and network with this community.
- Policy panel gave insight of specific sources and techniques to increase effectiveness. Networking-multiple people knew of unpublished studies and researchers in my area I would have otherwise never know.
- Increase use of "story telling" (in conjunction with statistical data) to attempt to influence geriatric policy makers and administrators ask more questions, make comments at professional Conferences.
- I don't think it was too didactic or too participatory-it was ill-fitting given the audience size. I appreciate the value of small group discussion but there was not enough time. It's helped me identify and make initial contacts with potential post-doc opportunities. It's helped me identify potential speakers for events that I organize (e.g. Sigma Theta Tau induction ceremony) .
- Seeing/meeting/hearing current nursing leaders outside of our institutions. Orchestrating a research career-practical, encouraging-as well as vision for the future. I am going to take my current "responsibility" of being a leader more seriously even though I am at the beginning of my research career. (pre-doc)

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Collaboration of colleagues mechanisms of the post-doc motivation to write-write-write.
- Made connections with nurse on parts that I will work with/consult with in future. Developed working relationship with a collaborator for a project. Able to solidify personal career goals for next few years based on discussions/presentations/time to focus on this issue.
- Recognize what stage (key transition phase) I am in and when I need to move through my career (i.e. program development, development of my field, etc.) Take pictures during any data collection and tell stories about my focus area during presentations (and possibly writing)-get back "story telling as best practice". Maintain and expand my trans-disciplinary relationships-poll together the individuals at my university with similar interest/research focus and meet regularly.
- Encourages us to active participation. This is extremely important for me personally. I have the names of at least three people I will contact personally to help with my K award project. Dr. Bolton's comment. Do the right things and be nice.
- The concept of "incremental change" occurring in increasingly larger increments (McBride's lecture)-helpful in acknowledging change process and associated activities retrieve articles/readings by David Morris; Andy Goodman; Cutliffe (Hope), Miller (Archbold's talk), Mark Hornbrook (Archbold's session), and work by Jessie Gruman will contact 2-3 of speakers for further information.
- I will use Dr. McBride's building a research career as the model to shape my program of gerontological research media contact with geriatric leader who had agreed to review my grant re-submission. Spoke with 3 pre-docs about opportunities at my university.

2003 MBA AAN Scholars

- Building and sustaining nurturing relationships with nursing leaders and researchers in the future of nursing. Provides me with a new depth and breadth of knowledge with which to reflect on and utilize to grow and develop within the profession. The chance to network with Angela McBride during the reception Wednesday night provided an opportunity to pursue greater development by investigating IOM and public policy fellowships.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- Incorporating public/policy making; catalysts for health policy "cost, access, or quality" into my practice; realizing factors which may affect how my practice is now. Hope and resilience-realizing "dynamic life source"; use of it/realization of how it affects the patient's status and outcome research-maximize use of research into my setting; to do my own research.
- Information provided by speakers has given perspective I have not previously had with regard to the economic side of nursing. Information provided by panels at conferences has given me an edge over other students and placed me in more of a mentor role. The Conference has made me want to recruit others into my area of advanced practice nursing-it just seems more exiting.
- I learned more about policies and Medicare components of APN. I learned to do my homework on the pros and cons of getting a scope of practice for the CNS in PA before I pursue it. I also learned a little more about selling yourself as an APN in geriatrics. It's alright to feel like a novice in the beginning because it's a new career from what I was used to. During the poster presentation I talked with a pre 2002 about end of life nutrition and learned about ways such as no food and water keeping the pt hydrated and I was taught and had misperceptions of the two.
- The importance of a mentor! In orchestrating research career, I became aware how one of my instructors has been instrumental in my educational choices. Shaping of policy-Mary Wakefield's approach-not being afraid to take on new tasks what do we know that is ready for practice? Neville Strumpf- how to overcome problems of knowledge dissemination-exposure, experience, expertise and embedding.
- Consider the catalyst of health policy in clinical practice for better outcome. Use new acquired knowledge in providing care and advocate nursing collaborating in interdisciplinary manner providing hope to my patients and staff as essential part of my role as a nurse manager.
- Dr. Wakefield's point that policy work can be done on a continuum was helpful for those of us who feel somewhat overwhelmed by all the roles of the APN. It also reinforced just how important policy reform is. The talk on hope for patients, especially hope at the end of life was wonderful. It was a good reminder that all people need hope, and it does not matter what gives them hope. Dr. Fulmer's point about collaborating with others while still being nice was great. She stated we can still get our viewpoints heard if we say it in a way that will be received.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- Public policy-open the eyes of students. How complicated and broad it is but it helps to know. Psychosocial/mental-remind the students nursing also include mental, social psyches and disease. Economics-very helpful topics. Thank "Hartford" for providing financial-networking and various resources for all GSA members, students, and all other students outside GSA Hartford.
- Many speakers discussed nurses being able to affect policy and change. Hearing Mrs. Wald's story about how she started hospice call was a great example. Thinking positively about older adults instead of being diseased-focused. I found one study while doing my literature review that changed the focus of my study to include overcoming and moving beyond the losses associated and heart failure how the concept of hope could be present in different stages and roles including death.
- I gained insight into how to frame my ideas to have more of an effect on policy-making (i.e. Dr. Wakefield) I will remember with my parents that the idea of hope is very important and to be sensitive with this idea. I will remember that one can manage career and family through promises at different times and hard work. (according to Florence Wald) .
- I was very impressed with how nurses can shape health policy. Shape to become more active in this on the local and state level. I purchased some tapes on (HYSE)? Workshop to help build my skills in promoting optimism in nursing with points early. More ad and elderly in ITC families. Realized it is important to focus on the economics of caregiving and how to better incorporate ways to point out the economics of certain interventions.
- Continued involvement in local politics-even small changes are important. Recognition of larger groups that can be contacted for increased involvement at a higher political level. Some ideas for ways to interact with researchers regarding clinical issues I have and research them today.
- Cost benefit analysis recognition of the importance of giving people hope instead of being aloof with the approach toward end of life.
- Increased awareness of some aspects of health care costs-the info on publicly available data will be useful to me in the coming week.
- GNP need and expanding role networking importance.
- When initiating a new EBP in an organization or health setting I will build relationships with various key players to get the "buy in" for the change. When involved in research I would disseminate in results using various media (internet, popular press, writing legislation, etc.) I will incorporate economic indicators into research as to demonstrate cost effectiveness of the intervention in relationship with the times.

- Interdisciplinary leadership -I can see myself in other leadership roles that aren't limited to the nursing field. I will be more vigilant about planning my career and walking thru open doors. I plan to get involved in a local nursing organization, and volunteer on committees so that I can learn leadership skills.
- To create connections to allow for interdisciplinary collaboration. Including stories in presenting data to connect with various people. Speak on the level of intended audience to be effective in what I'm doing.
- Value of networking and connecting to specialist in area of interest, very useful strategy. Hope-greatly enhanced my concepts of hope, especially in terminal patient, and how to think about hope, help patients.
- Future communication with other geriatric primary care providers.
- It gave me the confidence that I am and can continue to be a gerontology nurse leader. One of the panels gave me a new appreciation for the age bias we have come to accept-even one that I have supported and encouraged. I know I'll think twice about how I frame aging. The business information was something that I needed to know but would not have selected on my own. It's important and useful.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- How to transfer research into practice identify ways in which my research or future research will input policy.
- Reinforce to me that I need to stay involved with AARP and league of women voters and Alz. Assoc. To forge relationships, I'd work to have future positions at authority. Share stories with legislators about caregiving of grandmother and as a nurse. Get Clifford Jordan's book re: change agent-review and bone up on theory. Process-share with my students: use as I promote health policy change effecting elderly citizens of my state.

B10b. Helpful Sessions that Were Not Included

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Media training; use LARGE datasets for research; use of standardized nursing language in research; speaking opportunities; find ways to have the Scholars and mentors from the previous years offer help and support for the new Scholars and mentors. We need more opportunities that are formal to work with one another.
- Media training; getting the most out of your pre-doc and post-doc sessions-they were helpful last year; include a "where are they now" session for alumni. Include more emphasis on diverse populations-trans-cultural nursing; health disparities among minority groups.
- Media training-how to be interviewed, how to do TV and radio spots, writing key messages, handling difficult questions and staying on message. There needs to be a forums for alumni and for each cohort to network formally-not having that set up formally-not having that set up formally for the 2002 Scholars has been limiting.
- Ethics, legal issues on geriatric nursing.
- Grant writing.
- Sessions with 2002 cohort (posters were great, but would like more). Allow session for future years, of 2002 Scholars: have the opportunity to showcase our work in the leadership materials 2004. Ideas of how to keep the 2002 cohort together as a group via electronic methods, allow receptions, speaking/(protesting)? Opportunities.
- How budget and teams are created within large grants-processes that seasoned leaders/researchers use.
- It is very intimidating to combine professional life with family life. Please plan sessions that will help women and young professional/leaders to do a better job and both and in order to live a healthy balanced life. Thanks.
- The second day was too packed-too much sitting for hours in a row for an older body. Need a little more break time to network more.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Alumni reception: last day for past and present Scholars compile abstracts of finished projects-disseminate.
- Each cohort needs a structured time to present their work and share their thinking about their research, project, etc. While we have made 1 or 2 or 3 long term relationships, more could be established.
- Meet on Friday before GSA because that precludes our attendance at GSA pre-Conference sessions.
- Recommended title: negotiating academe-critical/key tips for post-docs to shape policy as a new faculty especially in light of not knowing the institutionalized memory or milestones-who/when to contact-context of meetings.

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- The topics of speakers were great. The amount of time dedicated to Q&A was largely insufficient-perhaps because speakers each "ran over." use of the laptop to list questions was great. Finally-sometimes I don't have a question-it's not a matter of lacking either courage to ask or skill in formulating a query.
- Just about right.
- A session discussing tips for grant writing, how to seek funding or how to write for publication may be useful.
- Networking is specific areas of research (for example-arrange tables at lunch for those in dementia/oncology/long-term care policy, etc) .
- Increase formal involvement of mentors-these are well known. Expert nurse researchers-have a panel, including them and the development of their research careers.
- More downtime with other Scholars and faculty.
- Session-that provides info re: other leadership opportunities. Media training/instruction for media opportunities re: Hartford.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- I can think of nothing.
- Information and networking between the 5 centers and how the work together as well as complement each other. Influence of leaders across the U.S. vs. predominantly east coast.
- It would have been helpful to have the various groups (post-docs, pre-docs, etc) meet together for a get-to-know-you session at the beginning of the Conference to facilitate some group cohesion through the program aid for the next year and a half.
- A panel of past Scholars on how they have gotten further funding or strategies for getting future funding.
- The JAHF resources available to Scholars; the evaluation model for the HGNI and for pos doc Scholars-this did not occur at this meeting, ran out of time during day one session economic analysis-bring Mark Hornbrook (per Archbold recommendation) to discuss strategies-pitfalls in use of economic analysis; Dr Nancy Watson- to discuss both her AHRG grant and funding thru AHRG and use of best evidence-and how/what she recommend.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- More small group discussions.
- First, I was able to go both years during MA program because it definitely made me more excited about becoming an APN. During my first year it seemed that I was just taking classes and not really understanding why especially. But I know now it's up to each of us to make a difference.
- It would be helpful to have concrete information on how to translate research into evidence-based practice. Sessions were held for this purpose, but they simply addressed the fact that this needed to be done rather than how to do so.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- Everything was tied together nicely, meaning the concepts behind all of the panel's. It would be nice to have had more time to get questions answered in some sessions.
- Would like to see the larger health care system issues addressed-and work to help to develop an action agenda for nurses in this regard.
- Explanation/info for ANP/GNP career opportunities.
- Nursing politics, internet surfing-links to info on policy, economics, etc.
- More fun and time for fun. The sessions ran 2.5 hours and no bathroom breaks (in most cases) .
- Any workshop on clinical practice would have been helpful. It seemed as if most of the workshops were not geared to our planning or primary care careers. A workshop on how to effect one's small clinical practice would have been beneficial!!! Build on : #1 policy making (very important) #2 interdisciplinary work (how to understand each other better) #3 posters (very interesting) .
- Possibly an entrepreneur session-or just starting personal businesses.
- How to implement what's in research to a clinical setting.
- Smaller workshops, meeting a leader at the luncheon early on that would be a contact/mentor for the upcoming year. This would change on a yearly basis. I would encourage more sharing-it appeared that people stayed in within the groups/universities. They were associated with smaller interactive sessions, important web site info.
- I would appreciate contact directed at the NP's-more specific info regarding how to interact and n/t research and policy.

- These sessions were very focused on the Ph.D. and researcher-would be more helpful and more concretely applicable to spend more time on the role of the clinical practitioner ND nursing leadership. The Ph.D. is not the definition of leadership in nursing, but seems presented as such. What about role of advanced practice nurses in comments and not in academia? Please address in future.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- Helpful to have had a brief bio on the participants-their clinical experience and program of research.
- Building coalitions with consumers to effect change 2. Exposure to lobbyists-discussion about timing and external factors that contribute to moving legislation forward 3. How to identify a legislator who would work with to help write bills.

C10a. Information Used from 2002 Leadership Conference

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Made a media contact with the local nursing newspaper which resulted in ideas for the editor to have a feature article on geriatric nursing. Unfortunately I was not quoted as I was out of town during the interviews.
- Used relationships that were developed last year. I have found doctoral students are very busy surviving-we will support one another and seek one another out in meetings. Attended conferences-identified myself as a Hartford Scholar and immediately other participants recognize you as "real." being a Scholar brings legitimacy and value to your work. Obligation I have to be successful so that Hartford's investment "in me" is recognized.
- From Suzanne Gordon's lecture-wrote letters to local newspaper; read her book form silence to voice listened closely to John's comments last year on posters and used those comments in developing my poster.
- I don't remember concrete examples but I know I integrated the experiences and cognitive learning from last year.
- I am struggling to remember "concrete" examples. I know I came away believing more strongly in my work and knowing that I could accomplish what I planned and more. I will email you specifics when I return home and review last year's program. Came away with and used tips from Suzanne Gardens concerning interpersonal communication and how to "frame" nursing. Some suggested topics were put into our gero Scholars meetings.
- Actively contacting new persons whom I met to discuss possible projects (joint).
- Mary Starke Harper inspired me to keep going in my efforts to a leader. I have built very effective relationships with Hartford Scholars. We support one another in both our professional and personal lives.
- Inspired me overall to see beyond curricular studies and envision an exiting future as a geriatric NSG Scholar. I needed that the role modeling of national leaders is truly inspiring. Content was not as strong last year.
- Thanks to Dr. Bednash's recommendation over lunch last year. I just submitted a manuscript to the journal of professional nursing on genetic nursing competencies. I am learning to integrate gerontology content and issues into my work in other areas.- i.e. specific sections in two articles I submitted for publication this year. I applied the knowledge by submitting an abstract related to gerontology not only to GSA but to the oncology nursing society- which represents a change in focus.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Contacted a columnist with large newspaper. Began to establish relationship. Strategized and prioritized how to move program of research forward.
- Lectures papers advising students.
- Considered many comments and thoughts presented when making decisions about how to spend/organize my time and energy on scholarly work.

C10b. Synergistic Relationships/Collaborations Resulting from 2002 Leadership Conference

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Invited a Scholar to one of our regional research conferences that was at my university this past summer. Helped to connect a colleague of mine with a 2001 Scholar for job prospects.
- Follow-up with a few Scholars concerning some information (research studies/results) that we discussed (emailed references). I communicated via email with a faculty member in EOL concerning critique of my work and additional results.
- Assisting with a BAGNC Scholars to find a research site on the east coast (she is on the west coast) discussing a joint project with a post doc. Scholar with similar research focus-some delay since I need to complete the Ph.D. first. Corresponding and getting some answers from a seasoned researcher on equipment I may use in my dissertation.
- I was able to connect with another person doing work in decision making. I was able to make more effective use of my time at GSA last year with the information I gained. The benefits from the knowledge, inspiration (i.e. Mary Starke Harper and others) and networking permeate one's work and cannot always be quantified.
- Those relationships are developing and will become more important over time. As doctoral students finish programs of study and move on I have no doubt we will call upon one another.
- Not yet because I have been focused on completing my Ph.D.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Collaborated and interacted with peers Scholars to discuss and address concerns and issues.
- Collaborative for NI DHSS in Trenton, NJ. Further collaboration and the NJ department of health and senior (DHSS) in Trenton, NJ working with other post-doc Scholars.
- Better knowledge/relationship with those in my own institution-collaboration Hartford relationships have led to selection of AJN book of the year in gerontological NSG. I was invited to contribute a paper on aging for a specialty journal-this is a relatively new focus for me.
- Met the mentor of another post-doc whose research agenda closely resembled mine. Now talk with her and will visit her in spring 2004. Asked leaders I got to know at conference to be consultants on grand proposals.

D10a. Ideas for Other Living Legends

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Betty Newman or one of the other nurse theorists who are still alive.
- Ruth Tapper, EDD, RN, FAAN, Florida Atlantic University.
- Claire Fagin
- Donna Diers, May Wyckle

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Jean Kayser Jones and Meridean Maas
- Claire Fagin

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Neville Strumpf.
- Loretta Ford.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Meridean Maas and Geraldine Felton

2003 MBA AAN Scholars

- Nurse executives who may be using strategies to bridge the gap between nursing research and nursing business, with an eye to the system of healthcare.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- No

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- Dr. McDougal-University of Texas has some interesting research with dementia and reducing medical error.
- I did know much living legends in geriatrics nursing but I met and heard a lot these two days. They are all my role model. Thank you.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- Thelma Whells-pioneered interdisciplinary ND international work in gerontological nursing.

D10b. Feedback for 2003 Leadership Conference

2002 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Yet another door that Hartford has opened and I happily walked through looking (and finding) many more open doors.
- Far superior to last year.
- This is just an observation. When I look in the leadership Conference handbook I noticed the photos: many are white women. I would encourage you to try to increase the diversity of next year's panel.
- We would like to arrange an alumni reception on other event on the Friday of GSA's opening to help keep the network of alumni active. Could we arrange to have other Hartford Scholars from other disciplines attend to our trans-disciplinary networks.
- Have an alumni reception include a where are they now section in next years program booklet-highlighting accomplishments of Hartford alums.
- I am glad there is a newsletter and web site. Please include info/abstracts of pre and post doc research. Please help us develop comprehensive alumni communication system chat room on web site, boards for research postings, funding opportunities, URL, links.
- Please make sure that the conference rooms are not too cold.
- I appreciate the lead into GSA, but it is a hard time of the school year to be gone for a full week-is ok, but please "speak softly and be nice" when we struggle a bit to get here. I am so very grateful to the Hartford foundation and don't want to complain, so don't take this the wrong way. Just try to be a tad more patient with us and maybe repeat instructions we need to have a few more times during the year as we bet very, very busy between work, school and prof. Activities.

2002 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- A sincere thank you for a wonderful conference. We can never begin to know the time and effort expended on our behalf.
- Please provide a JAHF alumni(ae) reception immediately prior to start of GSA, i.e. Friday afternoon. Would like an up-to-date e-mail address list of cohort Scholars.
- Please arrange for an alumni meeting on Fridays. We also need a distribution list.
- Newsletter needs to include abstracts of Scholars work; could structure a Scholar to Scholar critique approach that would build stronger bonds for post-funding; need to provide session on grant-writing/funding could luncheon seating be arranged to purposefully structure interaction-perhaps with a challenge/task to meet new speakers during "networking" luncheon.
- Would like time for 2nd year Scholars to meet-some content on-"now what." would like alumni time next year. Being a leader on a faculty-how to lead a group of women for example. Deal with reactions to my progressing career. Tips on administrating major projects, e.g. budget and personal issues.

2003 Pre-Doctoral Scholars

- Thank you so much for the opportunity to be here.
- Would like to have some 'scheduled' time at Conference and mentor to discuss how the topics apply to current situations.
- Stated goals for most sessions were not adequately met. The intent was good but content was vague and shallow. More small group concurrent sessions specific to areas of interest or themes of Conference, i.e. policy, economic, collaboration.

2003 Post-Doctoral Scholars

- Thank you for a superb conference! Special thanks to Patty Franklin.
- Thank you for this wonderful opportunity and inspiration.
- Thank you so much. I will do my utmost to live up to the changes I have received.
- Liked panel format but too many questions asked without answers-need to either allow more time for panel to answer questions and limit number of questions.
- Thank you for posting all ppt etc. on the website.; the Q&A sessions became contrived and artificial; recommend all day session for analyzing (large datasets) or to post information on use Pat Archbold and health economist as team for a session in health economics.

2003 MBA AAN Scholars

- It was great, thank you.

2002 AACN APN Scholars

- I would like to thank the Hartford Foundation for giving me the chance to advance my education in nursing. For reasons I don't need to go into, I would probably not be able to continue my nursing profession.
- Overall the Conference is excellent and good to prepare us to be a better leader in advancing the nursing profession. Thank you very much for this opportunity.
- More networking opportunity-no need for speakers at meals.
- This Conference was geared primarily to Ph.D. practice. Also, when their questions at the end of the session, questions should be answered one at a time. Otherwise, they were all question sessions, rather than question and answer sessions.
- Allow more time for question/answer sessions at the end of panel discussions.
- I felt, as an AACN Scholar, rather than minimized and unimportant at this Conference. Aside from the Thursday panel, noon session and the receptions, everything seemed geared to the pre and post docs. Masters Scholars were rather excluded in the panel discussions. We are important! We are the ones putting research into the practice! How about some panels geared toward our clinical focus.

2003 AACN APN Scholars

- As a student Scholar, I am very appreciative of the funding I am receiving. I would not be in the masters program without your support.
- I thank Dr. Wald for providing and sharing her personal experience including her career choice, family life and personal struggling events. Thank you so much for offering this opportunity to meet all these role model feel of love and passion. It convinced me that I am in the right track and I am not alone.
- Thanks to the Hartford Foundation for making this possible for so many people. I hope they do not relent on their efforts. Thanks also to the staff of AACN. You are doing a marvelous job.
- An excellent start but I would encourage more mentoring with leaders and Scholars. We should have their numbers, emails. If Scholars had specific field of interest they should meet with the leaders present. Claire Fagin is very inspiring. Very research focused-would have wanted discussions of excellence in practice. Also how leaders do what they do, balance family. It is awe inspiring. Would like.
- This Conference was interesting but I would be unlikely to attend in the future unless I felt the content would be more applicable to and address the concerns of the nurse who is not a researcher. I do not foresee my leadership role as originating from academia for myself. Nurses in the field can be leaders also.
- Again-I think we should be addressing the very large issues of leadership-including the political arena. Please-no more plastic folders that will end up in the landfill.
- Temperature unpleasantly cold. Need less frequent but larger breaks.

NYU Hartford Scholars

- I really enjoyed the Conference, but hope that future conferences could include some sessions for nurse researchers who are at the intermediate stage of their career- i.e. approaching tenure or just recently tenured. Didn't like having speakers over lunch on day 2-there was no time for networking and the info was not useful.
-

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

- In general, the Conference was perceived as an excellent one. While fine-tuning may make it “better,” the basic concept of the Leadership Conference was extremely well-received and does not need to be changed in drastic ways. In general, this Conference is a very successful one that addresses and meets the needs of those who attend it.
- From the standpoint of the attendees, the leadership focus of this Conference was somewhat less evident in this Conference than in previous years. In general, this Conference was more substantive in terms of content and dedicated less time conveying the message that each Scholar has the ability and responsibility to lead the field of nursing in general and mentor other nurses in particular. This may be a result of speakers who are outside of the initiative are not told to explicitly give that message. From the pattern of responses to the evaluation forms, we infer that this year the Scholars did not leave the Conference with the quite same sense of being “anointed a Leader” and all of the responsibility that it entails as they had in prior years.
- The Conference introduced Scholars to a number of innovative ideas and concepts, especially around the areas of policy, economics, and hope and optimism. These concepts were new and appeared abstract to many Scholars. The sessions may be improved by incorporating more practical components to show the Scholars how to pursue these new areas. The Scholars, in particular, wanted to know about “how” to create policy and influence policy-makers, “how” to build cross-disciplinary teams, “how” to conduct economic analyses.
- Scholars greatly appreciated the opportunity to ask question and have their questions addressed by experts. However, there was a sense that there was not sufficient time allotted for question and answer, and that some of the questions posed were not addressed. Future sessions should consider ways to handle the question and answer component. Some of the mentors and other non-Scholars in attendance felt that the large number of questions may have resulted from a specific challenge issued at the initial large session by one of the nursing leaders and that there should actually be some instruction given to the Scholars in the introduction to the Conference about when to ask questions and how to pose questions that can be easily answered by speakers.
- The content of the sessions seem to focus around the career of the nurse researcher. The overall Conference may balance this by offering clinical sessions to address the nurse’s simultaneous role as a nurse practitioner. Some Scholars commented that they would have appreciated some clinical content; this was especially true for the APN students who did not always see the relevance of the research-related content.
- The Scholars were very receptive of small group sessions, especially when they felt that the sessions provided a chance to form networks or meet nursing leaders. They felt these types of sessions allowed for greater discussion and exchange. Specifically, Scholars wanted opportunities to meet with peers within the same cohort and in similar academic/career levels.
- The presence of supportive and successful role models, such as Florence Wald, Dr. Mary Wakefield, Dr. Claire Fagin and Dr. Angela McBride, make a great impact on the Scholars. They have the ability to inspire, excite, and validate. This is an important element of the Conference that should be replicated and expanded in future conferences. There was somewhat less of an emphasis in this Conference on such interactions than there had been in prior years, and restoring the number of these inspirational opportunities to the level of the first two Conferences would probably be viewed very favorably by the Scholars.
- One group of Scholars – those from the AACN-administered APN Scholarship Program – viewed the Conference somewhat less favorably than did the Scholars from the AAN-administered Pre-Doctoral

and Post-Doctoral programs. While there is no doubt that the Conference content is largely slanted toward the nurse researcher pursuing a doctoral level career, we also believe that the APN Scholars may have been less prepared for the content, flow, and activities of the Conference. The APN Scholars may have a greater appreciation for the Conference and make better use of the opportunities it provides if they are formally prepared about how to approach the sessions and the take-home messages for a nurse-practitioner or nurse administrator.

- An effort should be made to continue the involvement of Hartford Scholarship Alumni. Current Scholars reported that they would have liked to hear from Hartford Scholar Alumni to learn about their unique experiences. The 2002 Scholars that will be graduating from the program noted that they would like to continue their involvement with the Conference. Hartford Scholarship Alumni appear to be a willing and desirable resource for future conferences.
- While at the same time there is increasing pressure to expand the size of the Conference – for instance, by including alumni and their mentors – the Third Conference definitely “felt” larger and less personal than the first two Conferences and was more like a traditional scientific conference than the 2001 and 2002 Leadership Conferences. As the Leadership Conference expands in size (or even stays as large as it was in 2003), it might be necessary to develop somewhat better ways of having “tracks” through the conference with more concurrent sessions where Scholars could select topics of special interest and be in smaller sessions with more interaction. Much of the value of the Leadership Conference to Scholars lies in the opportunity to meet leaders, be inspired by them, and ask how a leader knows how to make a decision or pursue an opportunity. Because of the size of the conference, the format in 2003 provided less of this type of interaction than was present at the 2001 and 2002 Conferences.
- As a final point, it should be noted one more time that the Conference was extremely successful.