

Responses to Meeting Evaluation Form

John A. Hartford Foundation Stakeholders Meeting, October 2002

RESPONSES COMPILED BY THE MEASUREMENT GROUP¹

This memorandum presents the responses to a meeting evaluation form given by participants in the Geriatric Nursing Stakeholders Meeting sponsored by the John A. Hartford Foundation and held on October 1, 2002.

The memorandum summarizes the responses of 19 participants: 4 Directors of Hartford Centers for Geriatric Nursing Excellence; 7 Directors of Nursing School Geriatric Investment Program grants; and 8 Other participants (representing the American Academy of Nursing, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, the Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing at NYU).²

Tables 1 through 13 show the responses to the quantitative questions in the evaluation form. Responses are presented by three major groups in attendance: HCGNE Directors, NSGIP Directors, Other Participants. Using three categories of respondents (4 HCGNE, 7 NSGIP, 8 Other), Kruskal-Wallis tests suggest that the meeting was rated about as favorably by the three types of respondents; none of the statistical tests of differences in the degree of “favorable rating of the meeting” between groups were significant. Using two categories of respondents (11 HCGNE or NSGIP Directors versus 8 Other respondents), Mann-Whitney tests indicate that the meeting was rated about as favorably by the two categories of respondents; none of the statistical tests of differences in the degree of “favorable rating of the meeting” between groups were significant. Tables 1 through 13 break the sample down into the two groups of HCGNE and NSGIP Directors versus Other respondents (AACN, AAN, Institute) to show that levels of responses were about the same whether the respondent was associated with a “single-school” project (HCGNE or NSGIP) or national Center. We do not present the responses by the three-group breakdown because certain attributions could be made in this further breakdown which are not justified given the statistical significance tests.

Table 14 shows the responses to the qualitative questions in the evaluation form. Responses to a number of specific questions are combined together into the single table.

There were small amounts of missing data for certain questions: Table 3 has 1 missing response with Table 4 having 2, Table 6 (2), Table 7 (1), Table 9 (2), Table 10 (1), and Table 11 (2). Of particular importance, Table 13 – corresponding to the question of whether another meeting should be held in the future – had 5 missing responses.

¹ Staff contributing to this report included G. J. Huba, Ph.D.; Le Quach, MPH; Lisa A. Melchior, Ph.D.; Abigail T. Panter, Ph.D.; Carrie McGraw, B.A.

² One HCGNE Director was unable to attend the meeting and was represented by an alternate; data from that individual are not included here. One CGNE faculty member is included in the Other category because she represented an AACN program at this meeting. A small number (less than 10) of the qualitative responses were either edited or are not shown because the comments would tend to identify the respondent.

Table 1

Rating of meeting in reference to goal: To identify patterns of strengths and challenges across all JAHF geriatric nursing programs. * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

			Respondent Type		
			HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total
Rating of meeting in reference to goal: To identify patterns of strengths and challenges across all JAHF geriatric nursing programs.	Fair	Count	2	2	4
		% within Respondent Type	18.2%	25.0%	21.1%
	Good	Count	2	1	3
		% within Respondent Type	18.2%	12.5%	15.8%
	Very Good	Count	4	3	7
		% within Respondent Type	36.4%	37.5%	36.8%
	Excellent	Count	3	2	5
		% within Respondent Type	27.3%	25.0%	26.3%
Total	Count	11	8	19	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 2

Rating of meeting in reference to goal: To prioritize together how to build on collective strengths for mutual benefit. * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

			Respondent Type		
			HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total
Rating of meeting in reference to goal: To prioritize together how to build on collective strengths for mutual benefit.	Fair	Count	0	1	1
		% within Respondent Type	.0%	12.5%	5.3%
	Good	Count	3	2	5
		% within Respondent Type	27.3%	25.0%	26.3%
	Very Good	Count	6	4	10
		% within Respondent Type	54.5%	50.0%	52.6%
	Excellent	Count	2	1	3
		% within Respondent Type	18.2%	12.5%	15.8%
Total	Count	11	8	19	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 3

Rating of meeting in reference to goal: To examine the internal and environmental constraints on potential success. * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

			Respondent Type		
			HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total
Rating of meeting in reference to goal: To examine the internal and environmental constraints on potential success.	Poor	Count	0	2	2
		% within Respondent Type	.0%	25.0%	11.1%
	Fair	Count	3	0	3
		% within Respondent Type	30.0%	.0%	16.7%
	Good	Count	3	4	7
		% within Respondent Type	30.0%	50.0%	38.9%
	Very Good	Count	3	2	5
		% within Respondent Type	30.0%	25.0%	27.8%
	Excellent	Count	1	0	1
		% within Respondent Type	10.0%	.0%	5.6%
Total	Count	10	8	18	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 4

Rating of meeting in reference to goal: To identify key, shared initiatives and specify plans to carry them out. * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

			Respondent Type		
			HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total
Rating of meeting in reference to goal: To identify key, shared initiatives and specify plans to carry them out.	Fair	Count	1	1	2
		% within Respondent Type	11.1%	12.5%	11.8%
	Good	Count	5	2	7
		% within Respondent Type	55.6%	25.0%	41.2%
	Very Good	Count	3	4	7
		% within Respondent Type	33.3%	50.0%	41.2%
	Excellent	Count	0	1	1
		% within Respondent Type	.0%	12.5%	5.9%
	Total	Count	9	8	17
		% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5

How likely are you to use the information about patterns of strengths and challenges across all JAHF geriatric nursing programs to improve your JAHF project? * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

			Respondent Type		
			HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total
How likely are you to use the information about patterns of strengths and challenges across all JAHF geriatric nursing programs to improve your JAHF project?	Not Sure	Count	2	2	4
		% within Respondent Type	18.2%	25.0%	21.1%
	Somewhat Likely	Count	4	1	5
		% within Respondent Type	36.4%	12.5%	26.3%
	Very Likely	Count	5	5	10
		% within Respondent Type	45.5%	62.5%	52.6%
Total	Count	11	8	19	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 6

How likely are you to use the information about building on collective strengths for mutual benefit to improve your JAHF project? * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

			Respondent Type		
			HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total
How likely are you to use the information about building on collective strengths for mutual benefit to improve your JAHF project?	Not Sure	Count	0	2	2
		% within Respondent Type	.0%	25.0%	11.8%
	Somewhat Likely	Count	4	0	4
		% within Respondent Type	44.4%	.0%	23.5%
	Very Likely	Count	5	6	11
		% within Respondent Type	55.6%	75.0%	64.7%
Total	Count	9	8	17	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 7

How likely are you to use the information about internal and environmental constraints on potential success to improve your JAHF project? * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

			Respondent Type		
			HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total
How likely are you to use the information about internal and environmental constraints on potential success to improve your JAHF project?	Very Unlikely	Count	1	1	2
		% within Respondent Type	10.0%	12.5%	11.1%
	Not Sure	Count	2	2	4
		% within Respondent Type	20.0%	25.0%	22.2%
	Somewhat Likely	Count	5	4	9
		% within Respondent Type	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	Very Likely	Count	2	1	3
		% within Respondent Type	20.0%	12.5%	16.7%
	Total	Count	10	8	18
		% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 8

How likely are you to use the information about key, shared initiatives and plans to carry them out to improve your JAHF project? * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

			Respondent Type		
			HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total
How likely are you to use the information about key, shared initiatives and plans to carry them out to improve your JAHF project?	Not Sure	Count	1	1	2
		% within Respondent Type	9.1%	12.5%	10.5%
	Somewhat Likely	Count	4	1	5
		% within Respondent Type	36.4%	12.5%	26.3%
	Very Likely	Count	6	6	12
		% within Respondent Type	54.5%	75.0%	63.2%
Total	Count	11	8	19	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 9

How helpful was the Monday night pre-meeting session and the information provided? * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

		Respondent Type			
		HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total	
How helpful was the Monday night pre-meeting session and the information provided?	Slightly Helpful	Count	0	1	1
		% within Respondent Type	.0%	14.3%	5.9%
	Moderately Helpful	Count	3	2	5
		% within Respondent Type	30.0%	28.6%	29.4%
	Very Helpful	Count	4	3	7
		% within Respondent Type	40.0%	42.9%	41.2%
	Extremely Helpful	Count	3	1	4
		% within Respondent Type	30.0%	14.3%	23.5%
Total	Count	10	7	17	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 10

How helpful was the Stakeholders Meeting in terms of helping you identify some of your project's strengths that you had not previously recognized? * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

		Respondent Type			
		HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total	
How helpful was the Stakeholders Meeting in terms of helping you identify some of your project's strengths that you had not previously recognized?	Not at All Helpful	Count	0	1	1
		% within Respondent Type	.0%	14.3%	5.6%
	Slightly Helpful	Count	1	2	3
		% within Respondent Type	9.1%	28.6%	16.7%
	Moderately Helpful	Count	4	2	6
		% within Respondent Type	36.4%	28.6%	33.3%
	Very Helpful	Count	6	2	8
		% within Respondent Type	54.5%	28.6%	44.4%
Total	Count	11	7	18	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 11

How helpful was the Stakeholders Meeting in providing strategies for overcoming some obstacles that your project is facing? * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

		Respondent Type			
		HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total	
How helpful was the Stakeholders Meeting in providing strategies for overcoming some obstacles that your project is facing?	Not at All Helpful	Count	1	1	2
		% within Respondent Type	11.1%	12.5%	11.8%
	Slightly Helpful	Count	3	2	5
		% within Respondent Type	33.3%	25.0%	29.4%
	Moderately Helpful	Count	3	3	6
		% within Respondent Type	33.3%	37.5%	35.3%
	Very Helpful	Count	2	2	4
		% within Respondent Type	22.2%	25.0%	23.5%
Total	Count	9	8	17	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 12

How successful was the Stakeholders Meeting in promoting collaborative efforts between your project and other JAHF projects? * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

		Respondent Type			
		HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total	
How successful was the Stakeholders Meeting in promoting collaborative efforts between your project and other JAHF projects?	Slightly Successful	Count	2	0	2
		% within Respondent Type	18.2%	.0%	10.5%
	Moderately Successful	Count	2	3	5
		% within Respondent Type	18.2%	37.5%	26.3%
	Very Successful	Count	5	3	8
		% within Respondent Type	45.5%	37.5%	42.1%
	Extremely Successful	Count	2	2	4
		% within Respondent Type	18.2%	25.0%	21.1%
Total	Count	11	8	19	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 13

Should another Stakeholders Meeting be held in the future? * Respondent Type Crosstabulation

		Respondent Type			
		HCGNE or NSGIP	AACN or AAN or Institute	Total	
Should another Stakeholders Meeting be held in the future?	Probably Yes	Count	4	3	7
		% within Respondent Type	44.4%	60.0%	50.0%
	Definitely	Count	5	2	7
		% within Respondent Type	55.6%	40.0%	50.0%
Total	Count	9	5	14	
	% within Respondent Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 14

Qualitative Responses to Evaluation Questions from all Respondents

Explain how/why you would (or would not) use the information provided about each of these four topics to improve your JAHF project.
• To continue the conversation with those sharing mutual goals to broaden the larger agenda/movement. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• Topics do not reflect what I got out of the day. But I expect to use information directly in my program. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• (a) We could use ideas of other projects to enhance our web-based learning; (b) now I see that there is a collective strength re: course development to be taped. (c) I'm less sure about how to use these ideas; (d) web-based learning is not a major focus of our project but might be useful anyway. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• Because of the narrow scope of my project, we did not discuss specific strategies that I can immediately use. Future activities were planned that should be very productive. I did leave with some ideas about project modification. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• I'm just beginning to understand how all this might fit together. I'm very interested in the listserves and having faculty from my school participate with faculty from all the other schools on issues of concern. This way our faculty will develop their knowledge and skills and see they are connected to a larger movement in geriatric nursing. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• Improve project by collaboration with others who have issues similar to ours or other resources. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• It was very helpful to understand the various approaches and strengths and to identify collaborative opportunities. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• The depth of our analysis did not leave me with a clear enough picture to accurately say. I am quite likely to go back and review this information more carefully with regard to connection to my own program and to derive ways to use this with more limited scope to the mutual benefit of selected partners. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• I am quite familiar with the other Hartford initiatives; therefore, not much new knowledge for me; however, where to look for collective strengths and sharing was very helpful and useful. <i>(Other)</i>
• I do not think that the discussion adequately covered the individual strengths and weaknesses or looked specifically at outside causes, the meeting did not follow these goals. People feel overworked and don't want more to do. <i>(Other)</i>
• Why - more concrete information shared, that can be utilized in developing strategies; data demonstrates who needs what; buy in from group to work in concert - reach out across institutions. How - facilitate directed communications/connections between parties tailored follow up on activities and suggested/encouraged partnerships. <i>(Other)</i>
Explain how/why the Stakeholders Meeting was helpful (or not) in identifying project strengths.
• It became even more obvious what a strong role the project has. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• The summary prepared by TMG was especially useful in framing Day 2. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• Focus was on big picture and little discussion occurred about individual projects. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• Able to identify areas of strength in the different programs and who might be best to work within each of the areas. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• Could see what we are doing that is unique to our initiative and ways we might share it with other projects. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• Face to face discussion allowed more efficient and in depth discussions regarding issues common to all. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• The summary of the meeting project form and the related discussion helped me validate what I thought was a strength. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• I gained insight into areas where we are ahead or further developed than others and vice versa. As an NSGIP project this was the first exposure I had to the scope of the various CGNES, although I was well acquainted with the programs of the Institute, the Coordinating Center and the AACN. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• It was helpful from the perspective of learning about different initiatives or different approaches to similar issues. This was accomplished more in informal networking than the formal content which had a different focus. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• I did not see this as the focus of the meeting. The sharing and opportunities were more central in my view. <i>(Other)</i>
• We have a fairly accurate view of what we do well and our scope of work. <i>(Other)</i>
Explain how/why the Stakeholders Meeting was helpful (or not) in providing strategies for overcoming obstacles.
• The largest obstacles for collective leveraging remain human and financial resources - and for all projects, these are fixed. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• We need people resources - it is very clear that it will take time to develop them which will take time. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• Question doesn't fit. Strategies good for field. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• But only in the short run. I expect that the various work groups will yield even more strategies. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• I'm not really able to address this other than to feel a bit better that we are not as far behind as I thought. There is comfort in knowing all schools are having a slow start-up. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• Just a start of other discussions. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• Spent a good amount of time identifying potential areas of overlap where there might be a potential to work together - not much time on developing strategies. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• The variety of ways various projects are tackling problems was helpful. It stimulated more creativity in my thinking about the possibilities of our Hartford work. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• Useful information about activities across programs and individual emphases and accomplishments. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• The Monday evening summary did provide us with an excellent review of challenges expressed by the group. I don't think we talked about many specific strategies for overcoming obstacles within the investment programs. <i>(NSGIP)</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why - more concrete information shared, that can be utilized in developing strategies; data demonstrates who needs what; buy in from group to work in concert - reach out across institutions. How - facilitate directed communications/connections between parties tailored follow up on activities and suggested/encouraged partnerships. - Candid comments plus willingness to volunteer on joint areas of interest - very helpful. Can target these groups with supportive activities and resources. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The opportunity for the 3 organizing centers to work together and the notion of looking for opportunities sites to work together on areas where we would reduce duplication, for example web based courses were helpful outcomes of the meeting and should yield some important results. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We must still communicate to 50 schools: the essence of the meeting; the need for common message; the need for collaborative work groups; etc. <i>(Other)</i>
<p>Explain how/why the Stakeholders Meeting was successful (or not) in promoting collaboration between projects.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tremendous outcome re: volunteering for collaboration. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think the roles and collaborative efforts between and among projects is blurred - or maybe the locus of control has been better identified. I am concerned that coordinating activity is at the national level without more grass roots participation. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certainly, hearing where overlap existed, or where goals were mutual, was helpful. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborating started at the meeting with several other projects in terms of simply discussing and helping each other with shared problems and concerns. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing and enhancing relationships with other project directors and staff. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Face-to-face contact always facilitates discussion. From this discussion it was agreed that we would talk further and meet at the leadership conference. A plan was devoted for interaction with similar JAHF initiatives at AACN and the Institute. This seems to have excellent potential. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Would have liked more time to work on actual collaborative ideas once areas had been identified; (2) Open dialogue and a willingness of all participants to share ideas and collaborate - getting to know one another. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Again, it is too soon to tell full impact. I certainly have more ideas about this now and more avenues for approaching collaboration. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having time to get to know faculty from other sites - face-to-face and not by telephone, I think will pay off in the long run with collaboration even though it is not clearly apparent. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I appreciated the opportunities for both formal and informal in-person connections. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good to get to know some of the people a bit better. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal collaboration among 3 coordinating centers; web-based course development; development of common message. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great start - challenge will be in follow up. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The in-person interactions were central to the success of them. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The opportunity for the 3 organizing centers to work together and the notion of looking for opportunities sites to work together on areas where we would reduce duplication, for example web based courses were helpful outcomes of the meeting and should yield some important results. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be very successful if all entities continue to support and participate at a high level. We need to share info with our awardees and get additional individuals involved to promote collaboration. <i>(Other)</i>
<p>Please list up to three aspects of the Stakeholders Meeting that you found to be most useful for furthering the goals of your JAHF project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Talking with other program/project directors about their projects. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Networking with investment schools. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Openness. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater knowledge across projects. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of utilizing the umbrella of the Institute, AAN, AACN, for communications and structures. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including all Stakeholders at the table. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion stimulated me to think about how to achieve and expand our goals. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Willing to collaborate/ cooperate and use of national organizations. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent list of future activities. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hearing about NYU's new initiatives was valuable. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans for branding. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the goals of my project are narrow in scope, a lot of what was discussed at the meeting did not directly impact the achievement of my goals. The development of a workgroup of AACN, AAN, and the Institute, as mentioned above, is very exciting. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The coordination that may begin with the different JAHF programs. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding the role of the three national level organizations - AAN, AACN and Institute. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding the role of the three national organizations. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excitement about the "movement" and the power of the whole to meet overall goals. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General info sharing about all projects. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment ideas. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of common ground, i.e. seven areas and two approaches (leveraging, regionalizing) <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of specific resources to assist us. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration ideas. <i>(NSGIP)</i>

Evaluation of the John A. Hartford Foundation Stakeholders Meeting, October 2002

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning about projects or creative solutions to issues that are happening at other schools that our school may want to adopt. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing of common goals - lists of where we could go together. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The summary of lessons learned, etc., stimulated my thinking about other possibilities. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulation of the roles of the coordinating entities. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synergy created by the opportunity to brain storm re: the future. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hearing the caveats and concerns raised by others and experiencing the enthusiasm and commitment. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candid honest discussions from the outset. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeing people, face-to-face. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing info about actual project activities. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of common message. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership - self authorization of next generation. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legitimizing a role for the 3 coordinating centers (AAN, AACN, Institute) to work together. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing next steps. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator's style recognized contributions from each individual encouraging others to participate - fuller discussion resulted. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying areas of synergy, i.e. web based learning. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment of students. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web-based courses (tab force for collaboration). <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making link between actual projects and the individuals directing them - e.g. HCGNE/NSGIP. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizing issues and setting priorities. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty development. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal collaboration among 3 national centers. <i>(Other)</i>
<p>Please provide up to three concrete or specific examples of how you think you will use the strategies, contacts, or information developed in this Stakeholders Meeting.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold a regional dinner and invite investment schools to identify how to increase geriatric research regionally. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through directors meetings and seeking links with investment schools. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of umbrella organizations will define use. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing of recruitment strategies. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss a plan with investment schools to assure universities in our region incorporate geriatric content - preferably a stand alone course. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans for future annual meetings or other collective gatherings. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication and branding strategy. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During any presentations where recognizing the broader movement is key. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing and enhancing our recruitment strategies. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect with Elaine Gould as she coordinates the web-based learning. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I know someone else is interested in exploring how we can collaborate, so will follow-through. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I plan to consult with University of Michigan regarding how they are moving their community work forward. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I will use my participation in the leveraging/funding group and the "regional" group to plan for the future of my program. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of AHRQ contact that could help provide information for our project (from networking). <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with institutions in my area to develop courses and modules. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborating with others offering similar courses and similar formats. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will work on strategic plan to increase our PhD enrollment in geriatric nursing. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'm interested in the idea of creating a common message. I asked for discussion of "public relations" at the leadership meeting. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I plan to collaborate with several other projects that have similar problems re: masters curriculum issues. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I will use the products of the seven work groups to enhance effectiveness of our program. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify potential cross site research projects. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate with the fundraising task force to promote sustainability. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I plan to serve as a resource to another program with similar research interests as ours. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider strategies used for specialty outreach by AACN for faculty development at our organization. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I will contribute where ever I have useful information. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved communication to individual projects as well as better integration of the overall objectives of this initiative in communication strategies. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we can get the listserves to be productive, they can be a good vehicle for collaborations. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target self authorization strategies at GSA - newsletter to MSN scholarship recipients and pre/post docs. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legitimizing a role for the 3 coordinating centers (AAN, AACN, Institute) to work together. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will collaborate with Institute on dissemination efforts. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will share specifics/summary of meeting with awardees. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confidence in identifying the appropriate contact and resources within projects. <i>(Other)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying areas of synergy, i.e. web based learning. <i>(Other)</i>

• Will nominate awardees to participate in the 7 collaborative circles. <i>(Other)</i>
• Identify activities to enhance Leadership Conference which could improve synergetic work between programs - and between programs and scholars. <i>(Other)</i>
• Share efforts re: Gero content at national boards. <i>(Other)</i>
• Will initiate conversations re: LTC settings and need for better prepared workforce. <i>(Other)</i>
• Will put forward names of schools to participate in regional collaborative efforts. <i>(Other)</i>
Additional Comments, not solicited (refers to corresponding question number)
• (9) Unsure - depends upon the outcome of this meeting. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• (2c) Did not discuss at meeting. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• (2c) n/a <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• (9) Maybe - there should be another Stakeholders meeting held in the future. <i>(HCGNE)</i>
• (1d) I missed this portion. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• (1a) We better identified areas of collective interest. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• (1c) Only touched on this. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• (9) More time to share what we are all doing would also be very helpful for the next meeting. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• (3) Did not attend. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• (1d) Plans to carry out still sketchy. <i>(NSGIP)</i>
• (2) Not sure this applies to our program. <i>(Other)</i>
• (9) Maybe <i>(Other)</i>
• (9) Maybe smaller group center directors plus national group teachers. <i>(Other)</i>
• (9) Possibly - but would highly recommend Stakeholders' meeting for any future initiative that involves multiple projects. <i>(Other)</i>
• (9) I am not sure about this; the purpose would have to be very clear with clear expected outcomes. Given many people's schedules and competing commitments, we might look at how to achieve goals without face to face meetings or at meetings where we are in attendance for another purpose. <i>(Other)</i>
• (9) If the goals aren't global and are specific so people don't think they are just getting more work to do that is not in their grant. <i>(Other)</i>
• The facilitator was too slow. <i>(Other)</i>

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the data presented above.

- Participants rated the meeting favorably, although not always in the highest category on all dimensions. While it is not possible to isolate direct support for the following assertion within the data because of the questions asked, it seems probable that the fact that this was a “complicated” meeting seeking to integrate 16 different projects was partially responsible for the respondents not giving the meeting the highest possible ratings on all dimensions as sometimes happens in meetings which have “simpler” agendas.
- The qualitative comments and ratings along with the content of the sessions suggest that this was a meeting that the participants could not approach in a “simple” way with clear prior expectations about what to expect in terms of very specific discussions or activities. Rather, because the meeting was seeking creative solutions to fairly broadly-defined issues like collaboration, synergy, leveraging, and new models for sharing, the benchmarks for “the best possible session” are probably not ones for which the participants have a narrowly-defined consensus definition of what constitutes the best possible exemplar. That is, this was a new kind of meeting for many participants, and they did not necessarily have a strong consensus on what would constitute an “excellent” as opposed to a “good” meeting.
- A number of participants are in favor of moving forward with additional meetings or alternate forms of collaboration and communication, although a number also appear to be looking for more concrete plans for future collective activities.
- A high percentage of HCGNE and NSGIP attendees obtained information that they believe will help improve their individual projects.
- Now that preliminary information sharing and collaboration steps have been started, there appears to be a shared preference for more specific agenda items related to specific activities at future meetings.