

**Evaluation of 2005 BAGNC Leadership Conference
A John A. Hartford Foundation Funded Project
for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Capacity Initiative and the Building
Careers in Advanced Practice Nursing 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	15
Qualitative Findings from the Evaluation	16
Table 2: Scholars' Qualitative Comments on the John A. Hartford Building Academic Geriatric 2005 Nursing Leadership Conference.....	18
Conclusions and Recommendations	1

Summary: The Fifth Annual Leadership Conference for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Capacity (BAGNC) Initiative, funded by the John A. Hartford Foundation, was held November 16-18, 2005 in Orlando, Florida. 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) Advanced 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 a major success. Of particular importance, the program maximized the experience each of its major scholar constituent groups: those working on doctoral degrees in nursing, those conducting research after receiving their doctorate, and those working on master's level advanced practice degrees.

The Conference resulted in a highly positive experience for Scholars, who felt energized and stimulated by the combination of distinguished speakers, expert panels, break-out sessions, and networking opportunities. Scholars also noted that the Conference was instrumental in creating new ideas and in identifying other areas of involvement. The Conference also provided scholars with concrete advice for skills and opportunities for development.

The feedback and information obtained from the Conference enabled Scholars to increase their leadership skills within the field of geriatric/gerontological nursing. Overall, Scholars felt that they would use what they learned from the Conference to help guide their academic and career paths. Scholars also noted that this conference empowered them in assuming leadership positions, increasing participation in associations and policy activities, and pursuing grant funding. Scholars also indicated that they would use the contacts made at this conference to strengthen collaborations.

¹ Staff contributing to this report include G. J. Huba, Ph.D., Aaron Griffith, M.A., Maya Melczer, B.A., Rick Wollin, and Lisa A. Melchior, Ph.D.

Scholars who attended last year's Leadership Conference reported that the 2005 Conference was substantially better in terms of increasing their leadership skills, the quality of the Conference, and its relevance to their work.

Background: The Fifth Annual Leadership Conference for the Building Academic Geriatric Nursing Capacity (BAGNC) Initiative, funded by the John A. Hartford Foundation, was held November 16-18, 2005 in Orlando, Florida. The Leadership Conference agenda was designed by Angela McBride, Ph.D., and Patricia Archbold, DNSc, RN, FAAN, in consultation with the Directors of the Hartford Centers of Geriatric Nursing Excellence and the Director of the John A. Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing at New York University, and staff from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN). 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 five cohorts of Scholars – two cohorts that are currently funded and three cohorts that have completed their tenure as Scholars. The 2004 AAN Hartford Scholars include 12 Pre-Doctoral and 7 Post-Doctoral, with most beginning their 2-year funding period July 1, 2004. The 2005 AAN Hartford Scholars include 13 Pre-Doctoral Scholars and 11 Post-Doctoral Scholars, with most beginning their 2-year funding period July 1, 2005. The invited AAN Hartford Alumni included selected Pre-Doctoral, Post-Doctoral and MBA Scholars from the 2001, 2002 and 2003 cohorts. Invited AACN Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars included the current cohort of Scholars. Recent NYU Hartford Scholars were also asked to attend. 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 one Hartford Geriatric Nursing Investment Program schools (University of Washington).
- Principal Investigators from three Creating Careers in Geriatric Advanced Practice Nursing schools (Radford University, University of Massachusetts, Worcester, and University of Minnesota)
- 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 Co-Director 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 the Creating Careers in Geriatric Advanced Practice Nursing Program.
- 13 2005 Pre-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 11 2005 Post-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 12 2004 Pre-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 7 2004 Post-Doctoral AAN Hartford Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 32 AACN Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.²
- 2 NYU Hartford Institute Scholars. These Scholars were a primary target audience for the Conference.
- 1 2003 Pre-Doctoral AAN Hartford Alumni Scholar. This Scholar was a secondary target audience for the Conference.²

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

- 1 2003 Post-Doctoral AAN Hartford Alumni Scholar. This Scholar was a secondary target audience for the Conference.²
- 1 2003 MBA John A. Hartford Alumni Scholar. This Scholar was a secondary target audience for the Conference.²
- 2 2002 Pre-Doctoral AAN Hartford Alumni Scholars. These Scholars were a secondary target audience for the Conference.²
- 1 2002 MBA John A. Hartford Alumni Scholar. This Scholar was a secondary target audience for the Conference.²
- 1 2001 Pre-Doctoral AAN Hartford Alumni Scholar. This Scholar was a secondary target audience for the Conference.²
- 1 2001 Post-Doctoral AAN Hartford Alumni Scholar. This Scholar was a secondary target audience for the Conference.²
- Faculty Mentors for AAN Hartford Scholars.
- An outside consultant – Dr. Angela McBride – charged with the 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.
- Staff from the John A. Hartford Foundation.
- Invited Speakers and other guests.

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 73 forms were returned at the end of the Conference or by mail or e-mail within two weeks (after e-mailed reminders). 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: 8 2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 7 2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars, 11 2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 10 2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars, and 18 AACN Advanced Practice Nursing 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 are shaded.

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

- 2004 Pre-Doctoral AAN Scholars
- 2004 Post-Doctoral AAN Scholars
- 2005 Pre-Doctoral AAN Scholars
- 2005 Post-Doctoral AAN Scholars
- AACN APN Scholars
- Prior Cohorts of AAN Scholars
- Mentors of Hartford Scholars
- Hartford Program Directors/Faculty/Staff
- Speakers

The supplemental findings present the full frequency distributions on each of the quantitative response variables along with frequency distributions on various backgrounds, 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 groups of Scholars.

A few key quantitative results are listed below.

- Overall, the vast majority of the sessions were received well by all groups of Scholars. Approval ratings (the percentage of Scholars who rated sessions as having very good or excellent quality) ranged between about 80 and 95% for most substantive sessions. Sessions that tended to get the highest ratings were those that were focused on a fairly circumscribed, but important, leadership, topic. Such sessions included the mentoring for the Pre-doctoral and Post-doctoral Scholars and overviews of the Clinical Nurse Leader and Doctorate of Nursing Practice initiatives of AACN for the Advanced Practice Nursing Scholars. Conversely, two large sessions that received the lowest (and most variable) ratings from Scholars were BAGNC's session on Building Cumulative Science and AACN's session on Getting the Most Out of the GSA Conference. Qualitative comments tend to explain the differences in perceptions. The targeted sessions tended to have a small number of speakers addressing a topic of general interest from a very informed perspective whereas the more general sessions that were not as liked tended to have a much broader focus and three or more speakers. The general sessions were viewed by the Scholars as being of "uneven" quality or relevance and at times either too theoretical or too focused on the speaker's research or clinical program.
- The Mary Starke Harper Distinguished Lectureship received considerably higher ratings than other sessions (96.1% of Scholars rated it "Excellent" or "Very Good"). A few Scholars who had attended prior Leadership Conferences expressed their opinion that it was the best Mary Starke Harper Lectureship ever.
- All AACN Scholars rated "Ask the Experts: Overview of the Clinical Nurse Leader (CNL) and the Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP) Initiatives" session in the highest two categories of "Excellent" or "Very Good."
- The AACN "Getting the Most Out of the GSA Conference" session was not as highly rated as other sessions (60.0% of Scholars rated it "Excellent" or "Very Good"). Scholars indicated that the presentations were too long and inconsistent.
- Scholars did not feel as strongly that the BAGNC "Building Cumulative Science" session should be repeated in future years (59.4% of Scholars responded "Definitely or Probably").
- 98.0% of Scholars indicated that the Conference matched their expectations and they would recommend a similar conference to a peer. All Scholars who attended a previous Conference stated that this year's Conference increased their leadership skills much more than last year.
- Roughly four-fifths (79.6%) of Scholars found that the number of networking opportunities was appropriate and the setting of the Conference was conducive to networking. Furthermore, almost all Scholars (92.3%) who attended a previous Conference thought that the networking opportunities were better this year. Interestingly, when examining the ratings of the networking lunches, these formal experiences were among the sessions that were not highly rated and received a number of negative comments in the qualitative section of the evaluation. In regards to the luncheons, it is possible that Scholars who do not take the opportunity to independently network with others in less structured parts of the conference, such as breaks, poster sessions, and outside the conference meeting rooms and times, may be looking for a highly structured set of networking procedures at the luncheons. Since the luncheons tend to not be highly structured networking sessions, it is possible that those who most need to be led into networking find that these sessions do not serve as "ice breakers" for them. Nonetheless, two-fifths (40.0%) of the 2004 Scholars who had previously attended the Leadership Conference noted that the networking opportunities provided by the 2004 Conference resulted in synergistic relationships or collaborations.

Table 1: Quantitative Results from All Scholars
Respondent Evaluations of Conference Sessions

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
A1. Welcome Lunch (Archbold, Hougham, & Disch)							
How well did this session frame the purpose of this Conference?	Excellent or Very Well	93.9% (n=33)	100.0% (n=8)	80.0% (n=5)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=10)	
How closely did the purpose (as described in this session) match your expectations about this conference?	Very Closely or Somewhat	100.0% (n=31)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=8)	
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	96.9% (n=32)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=5)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=9)	
A2. Orchestrating a Research Career (McBride)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	90.0% (n=20)			90.0% (n=10)	90.0% (n=10)	
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	90.0% (n=20)			100.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=10)	
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	80.0% (n=20)			90.0% (n=10)	70.0% (n=10)	
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	94.7% (n=19)			100.0% (n=10)	88.9% (n=9)	
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	64.7% (n=17)			66.7% (n=9)	62.5% (n=8)	
A2 .Poster Set-up and Communication Consultation (Beilenson)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	92.9% (n=14)	87.5% (n=8)	100.0% (n=6)			
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	78.6% (n=14)	75.0% (n=8)	83.3% (n=6)			

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
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	78.6% (n=14)	75.0% (n=8)	83.3% (n=6)			
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=14)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=6)			
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	78.6% (n=14)	87.5% (n=8)	66.7% (n=6)			
A2. Creating Careers Welcome session (Sullivan-Marx, Davis, Kingsborough, & Latimer)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	86.7% (n=15)					86.7% (n=15)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	86.7% (n=15)					86.7% (n=15)
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	80.0% (n=15)					80.0% (n=15)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=15)					100.0% (n=15)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	86.7% (n=15)					86.7% (n=15)
A3. Panel I: "Reflections on Leadership: Rules to Live By" (Regenstreif, Disch, Mezey, & Williams)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	84.0% (n=50)	100.0% (n=8)	66.7% (n=6)	77.8% (n=9)	90.0% (n=10)	82.4% (n=17)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	86.0% (n=50)	87.5% (n=8)	66.7% (n=6)	88.9% (n=9)	90.0% (n=10)	88.2% (n=17)
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	74.0% (n=50)	75.0% (n=8)	66.7% (n=6)	66.7% (n=9)	70.0% (n=10)	82.4% (n=17)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	92.0% (n=50)	100.0% (n=8)	66.7% (n=6)	100.0% (n=9)	90.0% (n=10)	94.1% (n=17)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	71.4% (n=49)	100.0% (n=8)	50.0% (n=6)	66.7% (n=9)	44.4% (n=9)	82.4% (n=17)
A4. Poster Presentations and Reception (BAGNC Class of 2004)							
I presented a poster at this session.	Yes	29.4% (n=51)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=7)	0.0% (n=9)	0.0% (n=9)	0.0% (n=18)
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	72.0% (n=50)	100.0% (n=8)	83.3% (n=6)	77.8% (n=9)	77.8% (n=9)	50.0% (n=18)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	75.5% (n=49)	87.5% (n=8)	80.0% (n=5)	77.8% (n=9)	77.8% (n=9)	66.7% (n=18)
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	59.2% (n=49)	87.5% (n=8)	33.3% (n=6)	66.7% (n=9)	66.7% (n=9)	47.1% (n=17)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	98.0% (n=49)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=9)	100.0% (n=9)	94.1% (n=17)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	85.7% (n=49)	87.5% (n=8)	83.3% (n=6)	88.9% (n=9)	88.9% (n=9)	82.4% (n=17)
A5. Panel II: "A 2020 View of the Geriatric Nurse of the Future" (Young, Lyder, Mentes, Nelso, & Safriet)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	73.6% (n=53)	75.0% (n=8)	57.1% (n=7)	70.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=10)	77.8% (n=18)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	77.4% (n=53)	50.0% (n=8)	57.1% (n=7)	80.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=10)	94.4% (n=18)
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	49.1% (n=53)	37.5% (n=8)	57.1% (n=7)	50.0% (n=10)	70.0% (n=10)	38.9% (n=18)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	84.9% (n=53)	87.5% (n=8)	57.1% (n=7)	90.0% (n=10)	70.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=18)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	71.2% (n=52)	62.5% (n=8)	50.0% (n=6)	70.0% (n=10)	50.0% (n=10)	94.4% (n=18)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
A6. Panel III: "Diversity and the Aging of America" (Beverly, Estes, Tripp-Reimer, & Wykle)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	84.0% (n=50)	87.5% (n=8)	66.7% (n=6)	90.0% (n=10)	88.9% (n=9)	82.4% (n=17)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	82.4% (n=51)	87.5% (n=8)	71.4% (n=7)	90.0% (n=10)	88.9% (n=9)	76.5% (n=17)
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	72.0% (n=50)	62.5% (n=8)	66.7% (n=6)	90.0% (n=10)	66.7% (n=9)	70.6% (n=17)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	90.2% (n=51)	100.0% (n=8)	71.4% (n=7)	90.0% (n=10)	77.8% (n=9)	100.0% (n=17)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	83.3% (n=48)	100.0% (n=8)	66.7% (n=6)	90.0% (n=10)	66.7% (n=9)	86.7% (n=15)
A7. Networking Luncheon for BAGNC Scholar/Mentors/Alumni							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	71.9% (n=32)	87.5% (n=8)	50.0% (n=6)	50.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=8)	
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	65.6% (n=32)	87.5% (n=8)	50.0% (n=6)	40.0% (n=10)	87.5% (n=8)	
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	58.1% (n=31)	75.0% (n=8)	50.0% (n=6)	33.3% (n=9)	75.0% (n=8)	
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	81.3% (n=32)	87.5% (n=8)	83.3% (n=6)	70.0% (n=10)	87.5% (n=8)	
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	87.5% (n=32)	87.5% (n=8)	83.3% (n=6)	80.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=8)	
A7. Networking Luncheon for AACN Scholars							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	72.2% (n=18)					72.2% (n=18)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	83.3% (n=18)					83.3% (n=18)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
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	61.1% (n=18)					61.1% (n=18)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	88.9% (n=18)					88.9% (n=18)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	88.2% (n=17)					88.2% (n=17)
A8. The Social Contract: Mentor and Mentee (McBride, Tripp-Reimer, & Strumpf)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	93.1% (n=29)	100.0% (n=6)	80.0% (n=5)	88.9% (n=9)	100.0% (n=9)	
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	89.7% (n=29)	83.3% (n=6)	80.0% (n=5)	88.9% (n=9)	100.0% (n=9)	
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	89.7% (n=29)	100.0% (n=6)	40.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=9)	100.0% (n=9)	
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	93.1% (n=29)	83.3% (n=6)	100.0% (n=5)	88.9% (n=9)	100.0% (n=9)	
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	78.6% (n=28)	66.7% (n=6)	60.0% (n=5)	75.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=9)	
A8. Translating Research to Practice (Sullivan-Marx, Beck, Kirkpatrick, Quinn, & Resnick)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	75.0% (n=20)			100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=1)	72.2% (n=18)
How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	70.0% (n=20)			100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=1)	66.7% (n=18)
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	47.4% (n=19)				100.0% (n=1)	44.4% (n=18)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	85.0% (n=20)			100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=1)	83.3% (n=18)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	83.3% (n=18)			100.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=1)	81.3% (n=16)
A9. The Mary Starke Harper Distinguished Lectureship (Claire Fagin, PhD, RN, FAAN)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	84.3% (n=51)	87.5% (n=8)	100.0% (n=6)	77.8% (n=9)	100.0% (n=10)	72.2% (n=18)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	96.1% (n=51)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=6)	88.9% (n=9)	100.0% (n=10)	94.4% (n=18)
How valuable was this session for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	82.4% (n=51)	75.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=6)	66.7% (n=9)	100.0% (n=10)	77.8% (n=18)
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	86.3% (n=51)	87.5% (n=8)	100.0% (n=6)	88.9% (n=9)	100.0% (n=10)	72.2% (n=18)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	94.1% (n=51)	100.0% (n=8)	100.0% (n=6)	88.9% (n=9)	100.0% (n=10)	88.9% (n=18)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	94.0% (n=50)	85.7% (n=7)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=9)	100.0% (n=10)	88.9% (n=18)
A10. BAGNC "Maximizing Hartford Opportunities" (Archbold, Franklin, & Hougham)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	86.4% (n=22)	50.0% (n=2)	50.0% (n=2)	100.0% (n=8)	90.0% (n=10)	
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	86.4% (n=22)	50.0% (n=2)	50.0% (n=2)	100.0% (n=8)	90.0% (n=10)	
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	77.3% (n=22)	50.0% (n=2)	50.0% (n=2)	87.5% (n=8)	80.0% (n=10)	
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	95.2% (n=21)	50.0% (n=2)	100.0% (n=2)	100.0% (n=7)	100.0% (n=10)	
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	77.8% (n=18)	50.0% (n=2)	100.0% (n=2)	100.0% (n=6)	62.5% (n=8)	

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
A11. BAGNC "Building Cumulative Science" (Fagin, Archbold, Kayser-Jones, Maas, & McBride)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	59.4% (n=32)	57.1% (n=7)	71.4% (n=7)	37.5% (n=8)	70.0% (n=10)	
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	56.3% (n=32)	71.4% (n=7)	71.4% (n=7)	25.0% (n=8)	60.0% (n=10)	
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	51.8% (n=31)	57.1% (n=7)	57.1% (n=7)	25.0% (n=8)	66.7% (n=9)	
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	59.4% (n=32)	57.1% (n=7)	85.7% (n=7)	37.5% (n=8)	60.0% (n=10)	
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	53.3% (n=30)	42.9% (n=7)	71.4% (n=7)	28.6% (n=7)	66.7% (n=9)	
A12. BAGNC Endnote: "Reflections on Leadership" (Wallhagen & Wykle)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	73.7% (n=19)	80.0% (n=5)	50.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=3)	71.4% (n=7)	
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	90.0% (n=20)	100.0% (n=5)	80.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=3)	85.7% (n=7)	
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	73.7% (n=19)	80.0% (n=5)	50.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=3)	71.4% (n=7)	
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=19)	100.0% (n=5)	100.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=3)	100.0% (n=7)	
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	88.9% (n=18)	100.0% (n=4)	75.0% (n=4)	100.0% (n=3)	85.7% (n=7)	
A13. AACN "Ask the Experts: Overview of the Clinical Nurse Leader (CNL) and the Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP) Initiatives" (Stanley)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	100.0% (n=17)					100.0% (n=17)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	100.0% (n=17)					100.0% (n=17)
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	88.2% (n=17)					88.2% (n=17)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=17)					100.0% (n=17)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	81.3% (n=16)					81.3% (n=16)
A14. AACN "Getting the Most Out of the GSA Conference" (Sullivan-Marx)							
How relevant was the session for your work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	60.0% (n=10)					60.0% (n=10)
How would you rate the session quality?	Excellent or Very Good	60.0% (n=10)					60.0% (n=10)
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	50.0% (n=10)					50.0% (n=10)
Should this type of session be repeated in future years?	Definitely or Probably	100.0% (n=10)					100.0% (n=10)
Would attending another session similar to this one another time be useful for you?	Yes	60.0% (n=10)					60.0% (n=10)
B. Please Give Us Feedback About the Conference as a Whole							
How relevant was this leadership conference for you work?	Extremely Relevant or Very Relevant	87.5% (n=48)	100.0% (n=6)	83.3% (n=6)	88.9% (n=9)	90.0% (n=10)	82.4% (n=17)
How well did the conference match your expectations?	Very Closely Match or Somewhat	98.0% (n=49)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=6)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=17)
Would you recommend a similar conference to a peer?	Definitely or Probably	98.0% (n=49)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=6)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=17)

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
How would you rate the conference quality?	Excellent or Very Good	91.8% (n=49)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=6)	70.0% (n=10)	90.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=17)
How likely are you to use the information from the conference?	Very Likely or Somewhat Likely	93.9% (n=49)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=6)	90.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=10)	100.0% (n=17)
How valuable was the overall conference for helping you meet the goals and objectives of your JAHF grant/scholarship?	Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable	89.8% (n=49)	100.0% (n=6)	83.3% (n=6)	90.0% (n=10)	90.0% (n=10)	88.2% (n=17)
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	81.6% (n=49)	100.0% (n=6)	83.3% (n=6)	80.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=10)	76.5% (n=17)
How appropriate was the number of networking opportunities provided at this conference?	Just Right	79.6% (n=49)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=6)	60.0% (n=10)	60.0% (n=10)	88.2% (n=17)
How conducive was the setting of this conference to networking?	Extremely or Very	85.7% (n=49)	100.0% (n=6)	66.7% (n=6)	90.0% (n=10)	90.0% (n=10)	82.4% (n=17)
How appropriate was the combination of panels, concurrent sessions, networking receptions, and other sessions at this conference?	Just Right	71.4% (n=49)	71.4% (n=7)	100.0% (n=6)	30.0% (n=10)	80.0% (n=10)	81.3% (n=16)
C. 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	92.3% (n=13)	83.3% (n=6)	100.0% (n=7)			
The overall relevance of this year's conference to my work was:	More relevant than last year or About the same	84.6% (n=13)	83.3% (n=6)	85.7% (n=7)			
The opportunities for networking and interacting with peers in this year's conference were:	Better than last year or About the same	92.3% (n=13)	83.3% (n=6)	100.0% (n=7)			
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=12)	100.0% (n=6)	100.0% (n=6)			

Variable	Indicator	All Scholars	2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars	2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars	AACN APN Scholars
Did you use any information from last year's Leadership Conference over the course of the year?	Yes	83.3% (n=12)	83.3% (n=6)	83.3% (n=6)			
Did the networking opportunities provided by the 2004 Leadership Conference result in any synergistic relationships or collaborations during the year?	Yes	40.0% (n=10)	50.0% (n=4)	33.3% (n=6)			

Comparison of the Ratings of Types of Respondents.

Scholars vs. Non-Scholars. The responses of the seven groups of Scholars—2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars, 2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars, 2003 AACN APN Scholars, 2004 AACN APN Scholars, and 2005 AACN APN Scholars—were compared to responses of non-Scholars—Mentors of Hartford Scholars, Hartford program directors, faculty, or staff, speakers, prior cohorts of AAN Scholars and unspecified respondents. The responses made by these groups about the individual sessions of the Conference were compared using an appropriate nonparametric statistical test (Mann-Whitney). Of 92 comparisons, 6 were found to be different at the $p < .05$ level of significance. The number of significant results is about what would be expected by chance. The following differences were observed:

- More current Scholars than non-Scholars thought that attending another session similar to the “Wednesday Afternoon Concurrent Session” would be useful ($p = 0.048$).
- Scholars tended to agree more than non-Scholars that the panel “Reflections on Leadership” should be repeated in future years ($p = 0.002$).
- Non-Scholars rated the quality of the “Poster Presentations and Reception” higher than did Scholars ($p = 0.029$).
- Non-Scholars rated the relevance of the Mary Starke Harper Distinguished Lectureship for their work as greater than did Scholars ($p = 0.042$).
- Non-Scholars rated the quality of the Mary Starke Harper Distinguished Lectureship higher than did Scholars ($p = 0.016$).
- More non-Scholars than current Scholars thought that attending another session similar to the BAGNC “Building Cumulative Science” would be useful ($p = 0.021$).

Pre-Doctoral Scholars vs. Post-Doctoral Scholars vs. AACN APN Scholars. Additionally, the responses of the seven groups of Scholars - 2004 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 2004 Post-Doctoral Scholars, 2005 Pre-Doctoral Scholars, 2005 Post-Doctoral Scholars, 2003 AACN APN Scholars, 2004 AACN APN Scholars, and 2005 AACN APN 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 92 comparisons, 11 were found to be different at the $p < .05$ level of significance. The following differences were observed:

- Compared to Pre-Doctoral Scholars and AACN APN, relatively fewer Post-Doctoral Scholars felt that attending a future session like “Reflections on Leadership: Rules to Live By” would be useful ($p = 0.042$).
- AACN APN Scholars were most likely to report that attending a future session like “A 2020 View of the Geriatric Nurse of the Future” would be useful ($p = 0.016$).
- AACN APN Scholars were least likely to indicate that the Thursday afternoon concurrent sessions were relevant to their work ($p = 0.006$).
- AACN APN Scholars rated the Thursday afternoon concurrent sessions as lower quality than did other type of scholar participants ($p = 0.008$).
- AACN APN Scholars felt that the Thursday afternoon concurrent sessions were less useful in increasing leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing than did Pre- and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p < 0.001$).

- Post-Doctoral Scholars found the Mary Starke Lectureship more relevant for their work than did Pre-Doctoral and AACN APN Scholars ($p = 0.037$).
- Post-Doctoral Scholars indicated that the Mary Starke Lectureship was more valuable in meeting the goals and objectives of their JAHF grant than did Pre-Doctoral and AACN APN Scholars ($p = 0.014$).
- Post-Doctoral Scholars indicated that the Mary Starke Lectureship was more useful in increasing leadership skills within the field of gerontological/geriatric nursing than did Pre-Doctoral and AACN APN Scholars ($p = 0.037$).
- Post-Doctoral Scholars felt that “Building Cumulative Science” was more relevant to their work than did Pre-Doctoral Scholars ($p = 0.009$).
- Post-Doctoral Scholars rated “Building Cumulative Science” as higher quality than did Pre-Doctoral Scholars ($p = 0.022$).
- Relatively fewer Pre-Doctoral Scholars thought that the combination of panels, concurrent sessions, networking receptions other sessions was appropriate compared to AACN APN and Post-Doctoral Scholars ($p = 0.023$).

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 are presented in Appendix IV.

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

- For most part, Scholars were very satisfied with the Conference this year, being energized and empowered by the lucidity of ideas conveyed by the speakers. Scholars indicated that they were presented with excellent information and feedback about how to be successful and proactive in this field. Scholars noted that they will use information learned at the Conference to produce better presentations which communicate research more effectively, to build a program with a geriatric focus, to develop strategies and/or visions statements to advance professional growth, and to set leadership goals.
- In addition, Scholars found the opportunity to network with other scholars most vital in sharing what others have been doing in the field of gerontology. As a matter of fact, a few suggested that more time was needed for “Scholars-only” sessions. Scholars also suggested that it would have made more sense if they were grouped according to research interests instead of geographical proximity in some of the sessions. Nevertheless, some Scholars were elated to learn that help is available from other professionals.
- In general, Scholars appreciated that the Conference speakers were more pragmatic in their approach to explaining policy and other geriatric-related issues, often sharing their personal and professional anecdotes. This worked especially well in demonstrating abstract theories by interspersing the presentation with concrete examples.
- Scholars also expressed that the presentations could have been more effective if they were interactive, with emphasis on Q & A sessions. Some expressed that an “out-of-box” brainstorming session was needed. Other Scholars who have attended previous conferences felt that the presenters were repetitive, recycling the same information from last year and amongst one another. Some were also critical at what they viewed as a lack of PowerPoint competence by some of the speakers.

- Some Scholars were distracted by noise coming from other rooms, drowning out the speakers. Scholars also requested longer breaks between sessions where they can have a more casual get-together with other Scholars.

Table 2: Scholars' Qualitative Comments on the John A. Hartford Building Academic Geriatric 2005 Nursing Leadership Conference

A1. Welcome Luncheon (Archbold, Hougham, & Disch)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good networking opportunity.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For better networking it would be nice to have a list of all participants, their program research, and their e-mail addresses so we can make sure to network with those in our area of interest. This would facilitate networking. • I really liked having a chance to talk to some of the other first year fellows.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I had an assigned table but there were not enough seats when I arrived at the table. Seat mentors and mentees together if there are assign seats in the future. • Good networking opportunity. • Dr. Archbold's presentation to the new scholars was very inspiring.

A2. Orchestrating a Research Career (McBride)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wonderful speaker with a very warm sense of humor. • Would like to have a copy of the PowerPoint presentation. • Lots of good info and gems!! • Shouldn't touch on topics/issues and how to do it. • How do scholars become leaders? Deal with current local issues in academia and practice. What are issues that people are facing?
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest panel of post JAHF post docs, to discuss how they have crafted successful career starts. Could include senior representatives on panel to do the same. Make session more interactive. • May need to break out into Predoc/Postdoc groups to meet different needs of scholars. • Dr. McBride is a wonderful speaker. It was a pleasure to be at her talk. • Dr. McBride's words of wisdom about how to have a successful career were very much appreciated! • It was repetitive info for those of us returning as post docs.

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

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was the most helpful session, thank you. • Add sample posters to handouts with critique. This may be helpful to attend the previous year and apply principles to poster production for the next year's presentations. • Excellent feedback and poster development with presentation. • I appreciate comments on the appearance of the poster. It would have been nice to have critique on the science of the poster. A competition perhaps.

A2. Creating Careers Welcome Session (Sullivan-Marx, Davis, Kingsborough, & Latimer)

Attendee Type	Comments
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cecile's story was very inspiring!

A3. Panel 1: "Reflections on Leadership: Rules to Live By" (Regenstreif, Disch, Mezey, & Williams)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none">I stayed for the beginning and then left because it didn't seem like it was going to be useful.I always appreciate a candid and realistic presentation.Timing was bad! First speaker flipped through slides so fast I couldn't enjoy them.Missed opportunity to address DNP in a "leadership" kind of way. I want to see up-to-date leadership issues, "how to" advice not mere reflections of what leadership is. Most of us already know.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Some of this was repetitive from last year. It is helpful to know the rules, but I would really like to know how to get into the game; where does that fit in when you are focusing on building independent contributions but see needs for immediate.Mezey and Disch were fabulous! I could listen to both of them all day-their aspects of the session were not as inspiring/useful.Somewhat similar to previous presentation (orchestrating a research career).I learn so much from listening to gero nursing leaders.It could have been consolidated.What an enjoyable session! Thank you for allowing us to ask questions of the panel.
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Great speakers-very informative and motivating.Mathy Mezey rocks!!She sums up leadership and self-care in being a leader.

A4. Poster Presentations and Reception (BAGNC Class of 2004)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar	
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It's good to know what colleagues are doing.• JD speaker was "real".• Wonderful opportunity to network.• OK to show what is out there need to touch on issues of use in gero population.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar	
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Important session for networking.• Please be sure that the speakers present before conference participants eat.• Participants' noise level was off at a disrespectful level.• Very good. Excellent posters.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unfortunately the audience did not seem to realize there would be remarks at the beginning so lots of people were talking and drowning out John Beilenson.• It's a great session for interacting with other scholars and networking.• Great exhibit, interesting topics of research.
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gave me great ideas regarding presenting my own work.• There were so many posters I was bound to find where my inspiration of geriatrics was.• More posters would be nice.• Very nice reception.• There so many posters I was bound to find where my inspiration of geriatrics was.

A5. Panel II: “A 2020 View of the Geriatric Nurse of the Future” (Young, Mentes, Nelson, & Safriet)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar	
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The direct application strategies for this technology was minimal. Panel was great: Barbara Safriet was fantastic-added a provocative and stimulating point of view. Audrey Neslon was also a key panelist-Courtney Lyder was also excellent
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The direct/good question and answer session. Barbara was exceptional. Dr. Lyder was also an exceptional speaker-both very humorous. Appreciated the pragmatic policy suggestions from Dean Safriet. Also, there were 3 people in audience who I met that do research in assistive devices technology. Found much repetition in the presentations except for Safriet who was able to shed light on "lined-experience" as it may direct and effect future directions. Knowledge about future biotechnology helps us think outside the box. We are a small enough group that I think it could have been better done as a dialogue or a seminar type session. All practitioners and researchers should be cognizant & proactive in policy. Next time put up more research, issues, cutting edge research...inform us of issues!
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar	
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More information about cost and funding mechanisms for technological, innovative research designs that will influence practice and client care. First & last presenters were good. Each speaker provided a unique and personal view of the future of geriatric nursing. This session would have been much more helpful if it had included more about how we as leaders can influence the future. The panel included very distinguished experts. Thank you. A lot of information e.g. about the graying of America, technological advances is not new to the JAHF audience. What about an award for the best poster? Safriet was fantastic.
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Lyder and Barbara Safriet were outstanding. Should be a small 10-15 min break in between speakers. As we progress in our development of new technologies, this topic will be increasingly important. Very illuminating. Nelson, Lyder and Safriet were great. Speakers were rushed. Hard to sit through all speakers and questions. Needed a short break. Dr Mentes PowerPoint presentation could use some significant improvement. (verbal content was OK).

A6. Panel III: “Diversity and the Aging of America” (Beverly, Estes, Tripp-Reimer, & Wykle)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar	
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absolutely the top session.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tripp-Reimer had excellent points regarding cultural humility. Dr. Estes had great material and perspective but perhaps a bit too much detail. Absolutely excellent session. Dr. Tripp-Reimer had excellent content. Less statistics and more action plans needed! Brainstorm "out of the box" solutions. Not enough time for each presenter. I would have preferred two presenters, each with more time. Dr. Wykle had a great presence and good remarks separate from others. But her slides were more elementary than the audience I thought. The stories she peppered the talk with were great, very illuminating. Involve us in brainstorming. Would like specific info on how to become politically active.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar	
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent panel. Excellent. Excellent presentations.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about recruiting ethnic elders into research; funding tips; top priorities. Final presentation was primarily review. I appreciated Dr. Estes' update of the current scene. The luncheon felt over programmed to me. We were all so fried after the intense morning session. Nobody seemed to want to do the assigned tasks on the handout.
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very interesting. Robert Binstock PhD (Case Western Reserve) excellent speaker on public policy. Offer some solutions along with the problem. Should include examples of programs that have increased diversity or been successful. Bring back May Wykle!

A7. Networking Luncheon for BAGNC Scholars/Mentors/Alumni

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Didn't think the set up by the region was helpful. I already knew everyone at my table.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new scholars should sit together in order to foster a network among the cohort. • I thought it was kind of silly that we were grouped geographically. • Maybe group according to research interests, i.e. caregiver, technology, dispatchers, etc. • I think organizing it by focus/interest area (medication adherence, dementia, physiological/acute care) would be more conducive to completing the activities you requested. • Objectives listed on paper directed conversations beyond name recognition -- establishing strategies to improve cohesiveness within group. • Table assignments by research interest would have been more helpful than by geographic proximity. • My school/area is well-represented here & I already know the people from my area! I could have benefited much more from meeting scholars within my cohort earlier or being grouped as scholars, mentors, etc.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would suggest something similar for new cohorts to network at their first leadership meeting. This would enhance communication throughout the 2 year fellowship. • Groups will be more beneficial if allocated by research interests/programs.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop mechanism for follow-up from networking; put all the people from a region at tables together (verses 2 tables for a region) so we can network with all the regional scholars. • Our group planned to submit a gero pre-workshop or symposium to the Midwest Nursing Research Society. • Who and how was supposed to "take charge" of that was unclear. Everyone was chatting and networking without the form/handout. • The idea of a regional networking session is great. I think it would be more appropriate during a time slot (e.g. instead of a PowerPoint panel). • Excellent opportunities for networking.

A7. Networking Luncheon for AACN Scholars

Attendee Type	Comments
AACN Hartford APN Scholar 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More circulation and initiation of the conference leaders would have been helpful. • It was a relaxed environment to network in. • I really enjoyed it!! • I enjoyed meeting and talking with new people. • Would be much more useful if all groups were together. • Helped me to branch out.

A8. Thursday Afternoon Concurrent Session-Social Contract: Mentor and Mentee (McBride, Tripp-Reimer, & Strumpf)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best session in conference-excellent small group discussion. • My academic program has covered this material well so the session was quite redundant for me and my mentor. • Maybe this session could be 1 hour or 1.5 hours in length instead of 2 hours.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am pleased and blessed to have a great mentor. • For some seemed useful, for some redundant. • Dr. McBride was excellent. • Very valuable. • Good number of participants in group.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When making up form leave room for last minute additions if needed. I attended the alumni session, which was an excellent session.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent session; Dr. McBride was an excellent facilitator. The handout is extremely helpful. • Great discussion. • Very useful session. I suggest devoting set time for mentor and mentee. • Dr. Neville Strumpf was an outstanding coordinator of the session. • It would be helpful not just to discuss the mentor/mentee relationship but also mentoring environments and institutional structure and culture that promotes/inhibits mentoring.

A8. Thursday Afternoon Concurrent Session-Translating Research to Practice (Sullivan-Marx, Beck, Kirkpatrick, Quinn, & Resnick)

Attendee Type	Comments
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very long-really long sessions need a break in the middle (2-hrs too long). • Outstanding and clear, focused and user friendly. • It seemed to be just a presentation of research, I would refer advice on evidence based practice-how to do it • Resnik's presentation was especially helpful. • Brought it all together. • A break should be given half way through.

A9. The Mary Starke Harper Distinguished Lectureship – Claire Fagin, Ph.D., R.N., F.A.A.N.

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar	
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent session! This should continue for years to come. • I have looked forward to this program both years at the conference. It's a wonderful time to see the "human-side" of nursing leaders.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again, appreciate a candid presentation! • Interesting, well done! • The conversational nature worked very well. • A truly wonderful opportunity.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar	
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspiring.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fantastic! A once in a life time opportunity. A DVD should be made of this interview and every new nursing student in the U.S. should see it. I would purchase it to watch again for personal motivation. • Could we nominate someone for this? • This program was the highlight of the entire conference. • This in one of my favorite elements of the conference. It is inspiring and encouraging to learn from those who have gone before us on the journey and leadership. • What a lovely and informative interview with Dr. Fagin. I would love to purchase the audio/video for my leadership courses. • The networking opportunities at the reception are always invaluable as well.
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great-true hearing a "living legend" • She was very inspiring. • What a great inspiration to all of us. • Good personal insights. • This was a very inspiring session. Thank you. • Excellent.

A10. BAGNC “Maximizing Hartford Opportunities” (Archbold, Franklin, & Hougham)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar	
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We really didn't have a session-networking was great.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So nice to network. • Really appreciated the facilitated networking. • Having the breakfast on Thursday morning would have been more useful to identify scholar cohort earlier. • Should have had intro of scholars at beginning of conference. • My cohort would like to have this as our first event of the conference.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar	
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave more time for Q&A please. Great to meet the administrative and measurement people face to face. • Consider a session/time allotment for just scholars-without mentors/others. • Suggest setting aside sometime networking scholars and similar interests. • Patti did a wonderful job of providing an overview of the program. I enjoyed the presentation of Gavin regarding history of Hartford. • The opportunity to get to know my cohort was great but that opportunity was truncated by the presentation of information I have already absorbed. • Would like to have 2006 date of activities to plan for next year of possible e.g. communication workshop etc.

A11. BAGNC “Building Cumulative Science” (Fagin, Archbold, Kayser-Jones, Maas, & McBride)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good historical background but vision for the future seemed to be minimized. • Dr. Archbold and Dr McBride's presentations were the most hopeful. I thought it was very interesting that Ken brought up the teaching expectations/research expectations from a faculty point of view. Meeting both of these needs should be addressed by. • This group next year-especially the collaborations between research universities and teaching universities/colleges. This should be promoted and encouraged.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5 hours is too long to sit without a break. This session focused on the schools and what the schools do, not really on how they have built cumulatively with others. Dr. McBride was great. I was surprised that Dr. Maas was not a more polished public speaker. • McBride was interesting, but the other ones seemed aimed at an audience of funders, not of researchers. • Very difficult to be engaged with this information. • Cannot emphasize how helpful it is to know what others are studying. • Inconsistent among presenters. • Shorter session and similar content. • Presentations were a bit long. • Appreciated learning research interest of various researchers. • This was way too long-winded. I think the same info could be covered much more succinctly. • Good to know who's doing what. Can't this just be a handout?
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helpful in stimulating ideas for development of gero programs in university settings without a formal CGNE programs in place. • Some of the speakers were not as effective. • Outstanding! Very, very, helpful. • Important and excellent overview.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. McBride's discussion was the most relevant; Dr. Kayser-Jones was very motivating. It was an excellent opportunity to see how the HCGNE's have contributed to gerontological nursing science. I would have liked more information about "how to" get. • Dr. McBride is a true visionary, please continue to invite her to speak and help us think. • This session was very informative to understand how the centers of excellence have developed. Thank you. • Interesting to hear about but I don't quite understand it's relevance to me as a scholar...I could get this information through other means.

A12. BAGNC Endnote: “Reflections on Leadership” (Wallhagen & Wykle)

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A concise and well concerned. • Overall, good length.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many universities are still not enhancing geriatric capacity or engaging students. • Nice job of pulling things together. • I really enjoyed Dr. Wykle's sense of humor!

A13. AACN “Ask the Experts: Overview of the Clinical Nurse Leader (CNL) and the Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP) Initiatives” (Stanley)

Attendee Type	Comments
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nice to know what we have to look forward to. • This should only be open to AACN scholars-there was a lot of attitude/anger from professional who felt differently than Joan Stanley/AACN about CNL/DNP roles. • The 2 roles could be better explained by a session like "a day in the life of a CNL/DNP," which would describe the actualization of the role. • I am still very unclear of the differences between the degrees current and future. • This was especially relevant and helpful to me.

A14. AACN “Getting the Most Out of the GSA Conference” (Sullivan-Marx)

Attendee Type	Comments
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was not attending the GSA conference.

B25. How Conference Information Will be Used to Increase Leadership Skills

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networking opportunities. • Received personal advice on beginning career post-Hartford: interview, research, program leverage. • Produce poster presentations which communicate research more effectively. • Use the ideas to build a program with a geriatric focus. • Better communication skills and poster presentations. • Policy issues-leverage to become invited to the table where decisions are made. • Become integrally involved in curriculum revision which is rich in geriatrics. • Networked with acute care/gero investigators. • Increase networking in gerontological nursing at my home university.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspired me to set leadership goals. • The stages presented by McBride in "orchestrating a research career." • Networking! I was thrilled to find colleague with similar interests. • There really is no new info gleaned from the didactic sessions. • Will work with acute care folks to create an e mail list and critical care focus (share drafts etc). • To provide and extend networking with other leaders. • Developed strategies (vision statement) to advance regional GNP group in professional growth. • Will plan a poster for an upcoming conference. • Inspired me to lead "as if I was a star" (Thanks May Wykle). • Contact with Barbara Resnick. • I will use the pragmatic info on how to build a career. • A shame that so much talent was present and not tapped. Would like to here more about do's & don'ts people have learned along the way. • Will explore communication with Liz Capezutti regarding NICHE conference. • Use skills to increase cohesiveness and refine direction of professional organization geriatric task force. • Established meeting with experienced researcher whom I met networking.

B25 (continued). How Conference Information Will be Used to Increase Leadership Skills

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2005 (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Got to know Jody Clipp. • I feel I have an even better relationship with my mentor now. • How do we move to next step as gero leaders. Clare Fagin shared the most and I did learn tidbits about "how to" from her life story. • Coordinate formation of geri research support/sharing group at the university. • Decided to meet more often with mentor - agreed with mentor on a schedule. • Incorporate research info at work via journal club, etc. • Plan to organize a project gero. Content ideas to manager-cno at my hospital. • Join some kind of local AP group. Will network via e-mail with nurses I met.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networking. • Curricular development. • Structuring research. • Poster presentations' development. • Building gero scholars at my university. • Communication skills. • Network with other Hartford scholars at other schools. • Think about multiple ways to advertise research products. • Provided support for investing in theoretical work to advance gero nursing.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop peer-review process with other regional scholars. • Networking will help me in my development. • Orchestrating a research career and "rules to live by" were very helpful to think and develop strategically my research career. • Contact at least one person I met there. • Orchestrating a research career is important for me to plan my career starting my post doc and even after my post doc. • I met 2 people with whom I'm working on a GSA symposium. • Networking with senior/junior faculty at various institutions. • Dr. McBride's presentation on career path will assist me to stay focused on activities that will help me get tenure. • I will follow up over e mail the connections I have made with faculty and prospective collaborates and employers. • Work with own school of nursing on stages of development. • The technology use in gerontology was thought provoking and information was also relevant to my current research. • Reference 1 publication-have decided to re-think authorship. • Mentor and mentee session helped me know how other mentee interacts/works and their mentors and know what are mentors' expectations in general/ or specific. These will be helpful for me to establish a good long-term relationship between me and my mentor • Will make my presentation style to mimic closely wonderful speakers at this conference. • I networked with another post doc scholar who is focusing on a similar area. We exchanged business cards. • Build pre doc capacity at home institution. • The social contact of mentor and mentee section helped to clarify the expectations and responsibilities as mentee. • This will also help me to think about my future mentorship for next generation. • I met many gero nursing leaders and will now be comfortable accessing the future. I networked with several gero nursing from my BSN/MSN program.

B25 (continued). How Conference Information Will be Used to Increase Leadership Skills

Attendee Type	Comments
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I now realize help is available and other professionals are eager to help. • I will use the info to direct my future education. • I will be more confident in myself as a leader. • To push for more geronursing in-services at work. • To join a geronursing professional organization. • To sit on local committees regarding seniors. • Discussing the future of geriatric nursing. • I am going to propose an APN gero-focused role be added to the hospital I work at so I can become a leader in this area and improve quality of care for elders at my hospital. • Think outside the box. • I just feel very empowered by being included in this conference, the speakers are inspirational. • Follow up correspondence with peers and colleagues helpful to my career as an AACN scholar. • Use knowledge to apply in work setting. • Use of fall prevention program ideas on our unit. • Better knowledge of DNP-explain to others in the field. • Utilize contacts for mentoring. • Encourage minorities to apply for advance degrees. • Use evidence based findings in the clinical area. • It has increased my confidence and feeling of importance. I have no specific examples. • Use knowledge in leadership to promote changes in geriatric settings at work & clinics. • Networking and ideas to conduct future researches. • Bring up ideas about new technology to unit manager. • Decrease fear of change. • Increased knowledge of websites-assist with my education. • Encourage RN to choose gerontology for their path in nursing given the projected number of elders in the future. • Focus on possibilities and not perfection. • I just feel inspired and empowered. • As a geriatric NP student and later as a GNP certified. • Knowledge to present at forums/presentations. • Try and get a subscription to geriatric journal for my AC2 unit such as American geriatric society. • Focus on increasing diversity. • Review research articles mentioned to increase knowledge of research process. • Further teaching of new innovative technologies available. • Practice with continued cultural considerations. • Continue to be a leader with constructive feedback & an open mind. • I will join a committee at my hospital. • I will try to identify needs where I work and work for change. • Network more. • New research/EBP at various universities. • Networking, new contacts. • To identify a program for further studying at the doctoral level.

B26. Helpful Sessions that Were Not Included

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List research field/topic per scholar in program. • Increase active participation and networking with sessions. • I would have liked minority nurse representatives, NIH, presentation to apply T32. • 2004 leadership conference had a panel on public policy that was extremely interesting & informative. • Designate pre/post doc scholar on program/name tags. Interest group sessions. • Using topic focused sessions to foster networking discussions. Mentoring session was excellent; it might be helpful to get questions to answer prior to session to increase richness of discussion. • Instructions to get funding for dissertation.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a session with just new scholars. • A break out session for new scholars to discuss with 2nd year scholars about how the next year will go. • More facilitated networking opportunities among scholars. • Leadership conference-I felt much was off the cuff & superficial. • I think asking sandy summer from the center of nursing advocacy to speak about image of nursing and how we can each promote and sustain an image of nursing, especially if she tied it in to the image of gero nursing e.g. • Introduction of scholars at the beginning. • More time with nurses and leaders in research areas.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. McBride's vision talk was insightful and helpful to those of us returning to universities at pre stage 1 research. I see a responsibility to Dev. Geriatric nursing at my institution. I now have the outline and would like a nuts and bolts approach to enhance the outline. • I appreciated all the networking/mentor-mentee sessions. So nothing because this previous weaker link was taken care of.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See previous comments. • Clarifying your research question. • It would be nice to include information (position, research interests, and contact numbers, etc.) Of all the mentors in the program book so that a fellow can identify experts relevant to her/his research and increase networking with them. • More time for question/answers/group discussion. • I would love to become knowledgeable or a new leader regarding which nursing leaders are where and what their major programs of research are -- maybe handout something like the "building cumulative science" presenters had in several of their slides. • Overall, I have enjoyed this conference more than the other two I have attended. These two and a half days are overbooked; the sessions are non-stop. • An overview of the schools' researchers and their work. • Has the organizing committee ever considered more sessions that are less symposium style and more roundtable? E.g. brainstorming strategies to influence policy and practice.

B26 (continued). Helpful Sessions that Were Not Included

Attendee Type	Comments
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational choices with geriatric nursing or opportunities. I would have liked to have received more info regarding the Hartford organization and the roles that the scholars could participate in now or in the future. • I don't feel that the translating research into practice was done very well. • I would like to participate in a formal mentoring program & thought there should have been an opportunity to be introduced to persons who are willing to be mentors. • The only good speaker was Cornelia Beck. This lecture could be more specific with "how-tos." • Examples of programs and institutions that have been successful with recruiting and retaining minorities in nursing. • Nothing-great mix of topics. • Public speaking skills. • More on diversity. • Heat-this place was too cold to concentrate! • Organizational skills for MSN students. • An informal outing as a group would be nice.

C29. Information Used from the 2004 Leadership Conference

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct information and the panel on policy for changing policy in my state. • Affiliated and received assistance from our HCGNE. • Orchestrating research career-explored next steps beyond dissertation. • Networking with co-mentors. • I paid more attention to the importance of how nursing could impact public policy issues. • Encouraged newer doctoral students to gerontology. And possible Hartford scholar application process. • Looking more closely at IOM study and integrating principles into BSN curriculum. • Past examples of leadership qualities that worked for the geriatric leader. • Used advice on developing self as a leader and although I am still a doctoral student-others come to me for advice and assistance. • Being able to be courageous in seeing your own goals and not being afraid to speak of your own vision in geriatrics.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposure to policy experts engendered a focus I include in development of my intervention study. • Integration of information related to geriatrics in didactic scholarly activities. • Mentor-mentee relationships. • Used strategies given to submit 2 grants. • Was motivated to write a manuscript for "the gerontologist". • It did more networking than I had done in the past.

C30: Synergistic Relationships Resulting from the 2004 Leadership Conference

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration and cohort. • Only sit together="outside" scholars before conference began. • Created relationships with other gerontology oncology nurses which lead to other connective relationships-outcome-invited article on specialty area. • Collaboration on a publication (in progress). • Mentorship from a faculty from another institution. • Post-doc opportunity.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included consultant in research activities after contact established in 2004 leadership conference.

C38. Ideas for Other Living Legends

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ben Carson, MD; Retangh Dumas, PhD, FAAN. • You had all the greats that I wanted to see here this year. • Charlene Harrington. • Dr. Mathy Mezey, Dr. Barbara Resnick. • Harold Koenig - Duke University. • Neville Strumpf.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vernice Ferguson. • Neville Strumpf. • Dr. Ebersole.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathy Mezey, Carol Hogue. • Cornelia Beck. • Joyce Collins, Joan Lynaugh, Vernie Ferguson. • Neville Strumpf. • Kitty Buckwalter; Marilyn Pantz.
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Feldt. • Contact National Black Nurses for speakers. • Robert Binstock - Case Western Reserve University-an expert on politics, policy, social security, medicare/medicaid and the effects of these things on the elderly. • Dr. Virginia Burggraf from Radford University. We call her "the arsonist" because she always lights fire under us! • Robert Binstock - Case Western Reserve University-expert in medicare and medicaid.

C39. Other Speakers and/or Topics Recommended

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be nice to invite alumni fellows to get a sense of where they are now-from just 1 year out to 3-4. • Dr. Claudia Beverly to present info on the southern gerontological nursing coalition as a model for others. • Building collaborative science with gerontology and other specialties i.e. cardiovascular/wound care/skin care/oncology/neuroscience-move towards discussion of interdisciplinary research collaboratives. • NIH, NRSA speakers for funding. • Topics-grant writing tips, opportunities for funding. • Men in nursing and their contributions.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I also think it could have been achieved in 2 days and that it is a lot to ask the mentors to one to. • Less speaking, more interactivity. • Speakers are good. Need to get them involved & more break out groups. • I think asking sandy summer from the center of nursing advocacy to speak about image of nursing and how we can each promote & sustain an image of nursing, especially if she tied it in to the image of gero nursing e.g. • Reduce number of speakers on geri in the future (they tended to be repetitive). • A political or advocacy session might be a useful "centerpiece" for the conference.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Beilenson-teach communication/speaking skills "how to make your point". • Would be interesting to have a panel of people who had successful research programs, but developed them differently; hear about work practices of highly productive research teams.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to hear more about implementation. How leadership happens. • Topics: networking/building team/collaboration/communication skills/time management skills-how can we work smart? • What if you could get small grant funds so that someone considering a career in geriatric nursing could win a trip to the leadership conference? • Brief budget management workshop for grants. • As leaders, it's important to understand the broader context in which we move. Interactive sessions related to professional issues, e.g. the ANP and their relationship to geriatric nursing researchers/teachers would be stimulating and helpful.
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immigrant health/culturally-sensitive care. (to add to issue of diversity).Politics and understanding of business so that nurses control their futures. Education alone is not enough. • Robert Binstock, Ph.D. (Case Western Reserve University) does an excellent job on public policy and aging. • Getting published. • More interdisciplinary speakers. • More on care at the end of life, palliative care, or managing chronic illnesses and co-morbidities. • Politics topic-how to make change in politics. • Politics and understanding of business so that nurses control their futures. Education alone is not enough.

C40. Additional Feedback

Attendee Type	Comments
AAN Hartford Pre-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great conference! Gained so much concerning leadership and personal motivation-ideas for that aim. • It would be helpful to have a networking list with Hartford scholars and work place and position, and university where education taking place. This will increase networking. • Great.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I cannot even choice how privileged I feel being here. Thank you, thank you, thank you for such a wonderful opportunity. • I think it was too didactic. The most valuable parts were the structured networking and the casual networking. I think the sessions should be more discussions. • Nice work-look forward to next year. • The first day of conference needs to be a wow! Energetic! Thought provoking session. • Thank you very much. It would also be very helpful to post/share a list of the fellows/their school/their mentor/their school and the fellow's area of interest, along with contact information, one list that ties everything together. • Perhaps something related to "where" e.g. settings where geri research and practice are making studies or how needs. • Would be nice on name tags to have affiliation university noted. However, it is refreshing to attend a conference where name top have no credentials. • Would like to know who other CNS students are and defining CNS role for NPS a good idea. • Re: hotel-the pool was only open 7am-7pm which is essentially only during the conference sessions. The gym cost \$10 a day on top of the room rate. Next year it would be great if the hotel could have a pool that is open earlier/later and or a free gym. • Most of us already know leadership principles. • How about adding a breakout session-research oriented functional measures? • How to enroll/attract more minorities into our studies? • Would be nice if we could do a shorter, more informal mid-year activity to keep up motivation & contacts. • Big problem with Peabody - no room available for first night. • Their weak customer service in negotiating to get a room was disappointing. • Would like to see short introductory sessions with cohort at the beginning of the conference. • This simple strategy promotes a milieu for cohesiveness of nursing regardless of career.
AAN Hartford Post-Doctoral Scholar 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would benefit all participants if questions were framed briefly (the "elevator speech" or "2 minutes with the president" concept). • Thank you for the increased networking opportunities. It is more important for developing the network, especially for new cohorts entering. Time with cohort could be increased to allow a change of info on expertise and research interests. • Thanks, the hotel was fabulous.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to hear about how nurses build an interdisciplinary team. • It was excellent-I felt home here. • Can this conference be held in the hotel same as GSA next time and in the future? • The hotel was exquisite! Food and reception were wonderful. • The venue was great -comfortable, great food, conducive to interaction. But I have not been able to go outside once. • I so appreciate the support and nurturing during the conference from the Hartford staff and the nursing leader. • Longer breaks between sessions to go and get coffee with a fellow scholar would be wonderful.

C40 (continued). Additional Feedback

Attendee Type	Comments
AACN Hartford APN Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Great job-thank you.• I thought that meeting such important leaders was very inspiring and has made a huge impact on what I hope to do in the future.• It was very nice!• First time attending.• I hope to return.• The speakers were great.• Minorities do exist in advance practice. It would be nice to see them at these conferences too.• Outstanding.• I liked when the AACN scholars had our own sessions. When we are with the whole group, much of the info/content is beyond our comprehension at this time. Many of the Pre/Post doc students talk down to us. We need to feel comfortable asking questions.• We don't want to be seen as uneducated.• Thank you for business cards.• I wish we could have had the roles of CNS & NP defined for those who did not understand.• I had a few NP persons that asked me, "what exactly does a CNS do and why are you not going to be a NP?"• More breaks to get up and move around.• More independent time to enjoy ourselves and network independently.• More group interaction (small groups) would have been very helpful.• This has been one of the most positive professional experiences I have ever had.• It was very organized and extremely nice.• Thank you so much.• I would love to come next year.• Keep Barbara Safriet coming!

Conclusions and Recommendations. The following conclusions and 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 as well as from the earlier 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 Leadership Conferences.

- Overall, the Conference was received extremely well, successfully meeting the needs of the attendees. Scholars noted that they will use the information obtained at the Conference to produce better presentations that communicate research more effectively, to build programs with a geriatric focus, to develop strategies and/or visions statements to advance professional growth, and to set leadership goals. While each of the prior Leadership Conferences had been a strong event with the conference evaluations among the highest ever seen by the evaluator, this conference overall seemed to benefit greatly from the four prior iterations. The 2005 Conference appeared to have been viewed as balanced, well organized, valuable, and practical by virtually all participants. Lessons learned in the prior conferences were well applied in this conference.
- During the past several years, the leadership focus of this Conference was somewhat less evident than in the first two years. In general, this Conference directly addressed the concerns of all levels of Scholars and became much more direct in conveying the message that each Scholar has the ability and responsibility to lead in the field of nursing. Unlike the past two years, the panel sessions spent the bulk of their time addressing very concrete issues of career development and emerging leadership within the field of geriatric nursing. After a lapse of several years, we infer that this year virtually all of the Scholars left the Conference with a sense of being “anointed as a Leader” with all of the responsibility that such a status entails. All types of current Scholars (whether working at the Masters, Doctoral, or Post-doctoral level) seemed aware that they had been identified as future leaders in this field with both a very broad set of opportunities available to them and responsibilities to the field. This 2005 Leadership Conference was much more successful than the 2002 through 2004 Leadership Conferences in integrating the Advanced Practice Scholars into the overall conference.
- In the prior (2004) Evaluation Report on the Leadership Conference we stated that, “Scholars were educated by a number of innovative ideas and concepts, especially around the areas of policy, research, career development, and informatics at this Conference. Though these concepts were perceived as very helpful to most Scholars, the content of the sessions was often not applicable to a portion of audience because the audience was so varied in terms of their academic and professional standing and trajectory. Scholars varied from more advanced researchers at the post doctoral level to new doctoral students to clinically focused advanced practice nursing students. As a result, there were differences in expectations for the Conference and perceived usefulness and relevance of session topic and content. The task of developing a conference tailored to such as broad audience is very difficult and should be closely examined.” The design of the 2005 Leadership Conference very effectively addressed the issues that were raised in the past and created a conference that appears to have been equally effective for participants at many different levels and stages in their careers. This is an incredibly complex conference because of the differences in career stage among the participants; the organizers did an exceptionally effective job of developing effective tracks through the conference that maximized the experiences of all participants. This Conference should serve as the template for future conferences.
- Scholars found the networking opportunities to be one of the most important activities of the Conference. They immensely valued the time given to interact with peers who shared similar experiences and with leaders in the field who provided guidance and motivation. Every year, the significance of networking opportunities and the desire to have more of these opportunities are recurring themes for the Conferences. Future sessions should work to provide more opportunities that facilitate networking for Scholars. On the other hand, it should be recognized that some individuals need to have more structured networking opportunities than others for a variety of reasons ranging from prior contacts in the field, personality factors, and having a mentor present and willing to make introductions to other individuals. The networking opportunities at the current conference tend to favor extraverted individuals from the larger academic centers with mentors present. Some thought might be given to informal discussion sessions that have round-table discussions facilitated by key nursing

leaders that encourage scholars to share experiences with one another and with experts in the field. Especially effective discussions might be ones in which various nursing leaders meet at round tables with groups of a dozen Scholars to discuss different career and lifestyle decisions they have made and the consequences of those decisions. Other discussion topics could include different mistakes leaders made in their career that they would like to “do-over,” tricks to getting grant proposals and manuscripts “out the door,” methods for balancing clinical and research interests, and successful ways to develop professional networks within geriatric nursing and interdisciplinary settings.

- The presence of successful role models, such as Dr. Claire Fagin, Dr. Angela McBride, Dr. Patricia Archbold, Dr. Mathy Mezey, Dr. Geraldine Bednash, Dr. Joan Stanley and Dr. Mary Wykle made a huge impact on the Scholars. These leaders’ ability to inspire, excite, and validate is an important element of the Conference that should be replicated and expanded in future conferences. At each of the five Leadership Conferences, the presence of so many senior leaders in all of the sessions created an air of electricity for many of the Scholars. This sense of excitement and wonder continued at this Conference and was enhanced by what was seen by the attendees as a very interesting and relevant program.
- A minor “issue or problem” with the three previous Leadership Conferences (those in 2002, 2003, and 2004) was that a large number of Advanced Practice Nursing (Master’s) students were added to a Conference that was originally conceived for, and focused upon, the Pre-doctoral and Post-doctoral Scholars of the BAGNC Program. Between 2002 and 2004, the program was adjusted in several ways to accommodate to the educational and clinical practice career issues of this large group of attendees, but the Conference continued to be viewed somewhat less positively by this group for a number of reasons. These reasons included the primarily academic content of the bulk of the sessions, the types of speakers at the conference, and the lack of a clear track through the conference that would address major career and practice concerns of the Advanced Practice Nursing students. Over the years, different models were tried to fully integrate this group and in each of the prior conferences certain issues were addressed, always making the conference more relevant for this group. This year, because of the exceptional planning skills of the conference organizers (Dr. Angela McBride and Dr. Patricia Archbold) as well as the Director (Dr. Geraldine Bednash) and staff of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, this year’s conference was perceived as being as relevant and targeted to the Advanced Practice Nursing students as to other participants. The logistical issues of “tracking” these participants through plenary and break-out sessions were solved, and most importantly, AACN and the Conference Organizers identified a group of speakers who could present relevant and critical information about geriatric nursing leadership within a practice environment that was viewed as positively as the more traditional academic content of the prior conferences. The result is that the Advance Practice Nursing students rated the conference as being of exceptional quality and great relevance to their program of studies and future careers. Among the most highly rated sessions of the program were those targeted to this group, including an especially well-received session on future directions in nursing practice leadership conducted by Dr. Joan Stanley. Interestingly, the networking sessions for the APN Scholars – a problem in the previous three conferences – were viewed more positively by this group this year than did Pre- and Post-doctoral Scholars of their sessions, in part because there may have been slightly more structure in the networking opportunities for the APN group than for the Pre-doctoral and Post-doctoral Scholars. We judge one of the greatest successes of this Conference to have been the full integration of the APN Scholars into the overall Conference and the development of an exemplary program for them. In the past two Leadership Conferences, at times it appeared that the conference might be too big and splitting the conference into pieces could be appropriate. The problem of perceived size and differential relevance was solved this year, largely because of the efforts of Dr. McBride and the AACN staff and suggests that the conference should continue with its current integrated model.
- In the prior (2004) Evaluation Report on the Leadership Conference we stated that, “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 Fourth Conference definitely “felt” larger and less personal than the first three Conferences and was more like a traditional scientific conference than the 2001, 2002, and 2003 Leadership Conferences. As the Leadership Conference expands in size (or even

stays as large as it was in 2003 and 2004), 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 2004 provided less of this type of interaction than was present at earlier Conferences.” Again we note that the design of the 2005 Leadership Conference extremely effectively created multiple paths through the conference so that all types of participants were challenged, came together for common general topics but split apart for specialized sessions appropriate for their own level of career concerns, and had the opportunity to meet with senior leaders in the field most relevant to their own programs of study and scholarship. The 2005 Leadership Conference effectively addressed all of the major logistical problems of the prior large conferences and was evaluated more positively by all participants than any conference since the first one which was quite small and focused by comparison.