

C10: before & after evaluation 10th national CHAPS Conference



**London 6th & 7th March 2007
Sigma Research, May 2007**

SUMMARY

- 67% of delegates completed the evaluation and are included here.
- The majority of delegates at C10 were health promoters working in England. Two thirds had attended previous CHAPS conferences.
- The geographic spread and job roles of delegates was very similar to previous CHAPS conferences, as was how they heard about the conference and their motivations for attending.
- 94% of delegates agreed that the organisation of the conference was good.
- 82% of delegates agreed that the range of themes at the conference was good.
- 62% of delegates said their personal aspirations for the conference had been met 'mostly' or 'completely' - the highest proportion of the last four conferences.
- 81% agreed they had learnt something new.
- 62% agreed they had increased their ability to think critically about their own work.
- 59% agreed they had been inspired to try new working practices.
- 94% of the delegates would recommend the CHAPS conference to others.
- 72% of the delegates agreed that the CHAPS conference was a key event in their calendar.

CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE & PARTICIPATION IN EVALUATION

All conference delegates received an evaluation form in their delegate pack - it was two sides of A4 and contained 14 questions. Parts of the form were intended to be completed before, during and after the conference. A large print version was also available from the C10 registration desk. All delegates were asked to leave their completed questionnaire in a ballot box when leaving the conference or send it to Sigma Research, freepost, after the event.

All evaluation forms contained a delegate number. One week after the conference 175 paper questionnaires had been received by Sigma Research. Those 222 delegates that had not returned their evaluation form were identified by Sigma Research from their delegate number, and a list of these numbers were passed to THT. THT then emailed all 222 delegates and invited them to complete the questionnaire ONLINE in the 2 weeks following. They were reminded of the potential to do this one week after the initial email. A further 89 delegates complete the questionnaire online 1-3 weeks after the conference.

RETURNS	C7	C8	C9	C10
Registered delegates	340	368	372	397
Registered and attended	316	313	349	380
Attendance rate	93%	85%	94%	96%
Not registered but attended	--	19	6	17
Total delegates	316	332	355	397
Survey returns	166	138	173	266
Response rate	53%	42%	49%	67%

- **The number of delegate registrations (397), attendances (380) and the proportion of registered delegates attending (96%) were all higher for C10 than for C9, C8 or C7.**
- **The number of attenders completing the evaluation (266) and the proportion of delegates doing so (67%) were far higher for C10 than for C9, C8 or C7.**

Q1. Indicate your strongest reasons for attending C10.

First reason scored 3 points, second reason 2 points, third reason 1 point. Unticked reasons scored 0 points.

Reasons for attending C10 (n=232, missing 34)	C7		C8		C9		C10	
	Mean score	Rank	Mean score	Rank	Mean score	Rank	Mean score	Rank
I've benefited from previous conferences	1.07	2	1.04	2	0.91	3	1.36	1
To learn new things	1.45	1	1.52	1	1.5	1	1.25	2
To meet people working in a similar field	0.98	3	0.9	4	0.99	2	0.99	3
It's Britain's only Gay & Bi men's HIV conference	0.64	5	0.48	5	0.55	5	0.74	4
Provides a platform for my work	0.81	4	1.01	3	0.57	4	0.64	5
It's in [this town]	0.07	8	0.06	9	0.06	9	0.29	6
It's free	0.07	9	0.14	7	0.16	7	0.20	7
To feel less isolated in my work	0.28	6	0.18	6	0.20	6	0.13	8
To meet up with people I've not seen for a while	0.05	10	0.09	10	0.05	10	0.07	9
My manager insisted	0.1	7	0.06	8	0.07	8	0.05	10
Other	0.1	--	0.04	--	0.09	--	0.20	--

- **The overall ranking of reasons for attendance was broadly similar across the last four CHAPS conferences.**
- **The most common reason for attending C10 was having benefited from previous conferences.**

Q2. What are you hoping to personally get out of the conference (what would make it a success for you personally)?

44 (17%) respondents did not answer this question at all.

The table below outlines the volume of responses that were categorised into broadly the same themes as preceding CHAPS conferences.

Hopes for C10 attendance (n=222, missing 44)	C7	C8	C9	C10
New ideas / inspiration	51	42	44	60
Networking	50	36	27	46
Gain more knowledge (general learning)	54	47	41	43
Improve my work with Gay men	8	6	5	30
Best (good) practice	11	10	2	16
Time for reflection / thinking time	--	--	4	13
(Learn about) specific topics	15	10	5	10
Research findings	14	9	4	9
Raise profile of my organisation / present results of my work	--	7	5	4
Understanding other agencies / projects	5	4	8	2
Policy issues and developments	5	3	2	1
Other answers	--	--	15	6

The vast majority of delegates gave one or more of the three main hopes, aspirations or reasons for attendance at C10.

[a] to get *new ideas or inspiration*, for example:

- ▶ *"Learn new things. New inspiration. Get the feeling to be part of something bigger."*
- ▶ *"New info, new strategies, NEW something please, oh and inspiration."*

[b] to gain more (general) knowledge

- ▶ *"I was hoping to get first hand opinion and statistical information about the topics I chose to find out more about."*
- ▶ *"To learn the variety of good practices the many differing service have that highlighted our diversity, would like to learn more about trans men."*

[c] networking

- ▶ *"Making contacts and exposure to other professionals in the sector."*
- ▶ *"Networking with service providers, whose facilities can be accessed by our local community."*

Compared to previous conferences, those attending C10 seemed slightly more likely to be seeking *new ideas or inspiration* or *networking* than *gaining more (general) knowledge*. However, these three inter-connected hopes and aspirations remain paramount in people's reasons for attendance at the CHAPS conference.

The remaining responses were broadly similar to previous years though more people cited *improve my work with Gay men* compared to previous years.

- *"To have new ideas on how to do my job better in terms of connecting with service users and improving their Q.o.L [quality of life]."*

More delegates hoped to get best (good) practice than previous years. Slightly fewer cited desires to raise the profile of their organisation. Time for reflection or thinking time was cited by 13 participants compared to 4 in C9.

Q3. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q3a: I would have liked more information about the conference before arriving	% C9	% C10 (n=260, missing 6)
Disagree	48	55
Neither	32	29
Agree	21	16

Q3b: I would liked more opportunity to influence the content to the conference	% C9	% C10 (n=259, missing 7)
Disagree	34	36
Neither	56	44
Agree	11	21

[if Agree: How could that have happened? - paper version only]

25 out of 54 answered.

Ask agencies early on for suggestions (13), for example:

- ▶ *"Invite participating groups from around the UK to submit ideas."*
- ▶ *"Emailing health advisors/providers/nurses in sexual health/HIV/GUM."*

Themes posted rather than just a request for abstracts (7), for example:

- ▶ *"THT should take suggestions, ask opinions on a small proportion of next years content (annually)."*

Widening selection panels to agencies outside THT (5), for example:

- ▶ *"I think it would be good not to have a majority of THT employees on the abstract panel."*

DURING THE CONFERENCE


Q4. Please rate the sessions you attended for overall benefit to you on a scale of 1-to-5 where 1='no benefit' and 5='great benefit'

C10 session name	Number of delegates	Mean rating
Tuesday AM: Pre-conference satellite sessions		
Trans men's health 101	21	4.52
Activism - is it fashionable anymore?	11	3.64
Confronting religious homophobia	22	3.41
Global solidarity for Gay men and MSM	12	3.25
Is it me or is it you? Do our lives impact on services ..	27	3.67
Men at play: Using games in group-work	24	4.29
Could do better?	13	3.77
Opening plenary	158†	3.19
Tuesday PM: Session 1		
Tell me more about rectal microbicides (starter session)	20	3.25
Married men: Love cheats or victims? (workshop)	30	2.93
Drug use and Gay men .. (panel discussion)	56	3.63
We're all getting older	39	3.62
BME MSM – examining sexual health and sexual identity	39	3.18
HIV prevention: A mentor's approach (starter session)	25	3.36
Gay for pay? (starter session)	30	2.47
Tuesday PM: Session 2		
Is it time to get ready? prevention technology (workshop)	42	3.50
Diversity matters (workshop)	19	3.89
The consequences of HIV infection (panel discussion)	69	3.80
Suicide interventions (workshop)	34	3.62
Commissioning HIV prevention work (panel discussion)	40	3.28
HIV and Hepatitis C co-infection (starter session)	21	3.90

† We think that the layout of the paper version of the evaluation questionnaire resulted in a large number of plenary attendees NOT rating the opening plenary even though they attended it.

C10 session name	Number of delegates	Mean rating
Wednesday AM: Session 1		
C2C work	38	4.05
Lobbying and influencing the political agenda (workshop)	9	4.00
Homophobic assault	49	3.57
Questioning CHAPS sexual morality (panel discussion)	55	3.35
HIV and stigma	40	3.45
Media representation of Gay men (panel discussion)	28	3.96
Wednesday AM: Session 2		
Better community development	34	4.06
Modernising health promotion services (workshop)	25	2.76
Western perspectives of sero-sorting	51	3.75
More HIV diagnoses... is it about transmission or testing?	40	3.70
Homophobic bullying in education (workshop)	33	3.30
Tackling syphilis in Manchester and Stockholm	15	3.67
A change of scene	34	3.59
Wednesday PM: Session 3		
The men from afar	15	3.33
Our story, their story: Gay men and intimacy (workshop)	29	3.55
Social marketing and diverse Gay men (panel discussion)	76	3.53
Tackling drug use in Vauxhall: A partnership approach	37	3.62
Buying and selling sex	36	3.39
Talking and listening: therapeutic approaches	36	3.06
Wednesday PM: Session 4		
LGBT therapy	20	3.35
Pushing domestic abuse up the health promotion agenda	17	2.88
Should we give a f**k? Language and imagery	62	3.82
Forensic evidence in criminal prosecutions (starter sess.)	31	4.48
Crystal meth in two cities – London and New York	33	3.88
Circumcision: HIV prevention or mutilation	35	3.94
Closing Plenary	107	2.89

The average (mean) rating for the sessions ranged from 2.47 (Gay for pay?) to 4.52 (Trans men's health starter session). The average (mean) rating was 3.56.



The graph shows the proportion of evaluation respondents who attended a session in each time slot (there were no satellite events in C7, and a large number of delegates overlooked the ranking for the opening plenary at C10).

- **Attrition appears similar over the four conferences. For C10, it appears that a larger number of delegates attended the opening satellite sessions and the closing plenary than in previous years.**

AFTER THE CONFERENCE

Q5. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q5a: The organisation of the conference was good	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=265, missing 1)
Agree	94	94	92	94
Neither agree nor disagree	5	5	7	4
Disagree	1	1	1	2

- **The same high proportion of delegates as in previous years felt the organisation of the conference was good.**

[if Disagree: Why do you say that?]

All 5 of the respondents that disagreed said why:

- ▶ *"Tuesday evening networking venue was no where near known venues for outsiders who did not know London, the directions were atrocious."*
- ▶ *"Schedule very late, venue poor."*
- ▶ *"Presentation info. was neither sufficiently in-depth or linked into themes/ direction/ issues."*
- ▶ *"On the part of the hotel."*
- ▶ *"Location of Hotel / conference."*

Q5b: The range of themes in the conference was good	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=264, missing 2)
Agree	83	82	84	82
Neither agree nor disagree	14	14	11	13
Disagree	3	4	4	5

- **The same high proportion of delegates as in previous years felt the range of themes at the conference was good.**

[if Disagree: What other themes should have been given a platform?]

11 of the 14 respondents that disagreed said why:

- ▶ *"More about the work / interventions with HIV positive people being undertaken now."*
- ▶ *"Would have liked to see more in-depth work on Hep C & HIV co-infection would like more info on the recent trends in HIV infection with relation to new infections."*
- ▶ *"The needs and perspective of pos gm are poorly addressed."*
- ▶ *"Smoking could have been given a place with drug use."*
- ▶ *"Internet porn, bareback porn and the promotion of Gay men in the media and on the London scene."*
- ▶ *"Too many repeats of last years themes. Steroid usage amongst gay men should be addressed."*

- ▶ "I thought that the range of topics was good but how the topics were dealt with in the sessions was not that great."
- ▶ "More around supporting, empowering pos gay men- including secondary prevention in HIV prevention work."
- ▶ "Successful interventions & policy work - including interventions with diagnosed men."
- ▶ "Try something that wasn't London-centred and it felt that others were being alienated somewhat through the approach this year AGAIN!!"
- ▶ "Trans women were excluded! Trans issues were only touched on eg. Transvestite escorts are a high risk group and they are effectively ignored. Transvestite behaviour needs looking at due risky denial behaviours."

Q5c: The conference venue was accessible and comfortable (n=262, missing 4)	% C10
Agree	72
Neither agree nor disagree	16
Disagree	12

[if Disagree: Why do you say that?]

30 of the 31 respondents that disagreed said why:

Venue was uncomfortable (16)

- ▶ "All conference rooms were far too hot!!!"
- ▶ "Ugly, hot and dusty."
- ▶ "Too much smoking."
- ▶ "Overheated, and almost all session rooms were terrible in terms of hearing and seeing the speakers."
- ▶ "The food was a disgrace! - possibly the most unhealthiest conference menu I've seen."
- ▶ "Compared to the two previous years- the venue was not as good as in Bristol or Leeds."

Venue was too far out of central London (10) and difficult to find (4)

- ▶ "Why so far out of Central London? A shame the social event was so far away."
- ▶ "Long long way from Plymouth and expensive."
- ▶ "Too far out from central London."
- ▶ "The Docklands is not accessible to people outside London."

Q5d: The stalls were useful (n=253, missing 11)	% C10
Agree	57
Neither agree nor disagree	38
Disagree	5

[if Agree: Why do you say that?]

111 of the 145 that agreed said why:

Variety of resources and meeting with those doing the work (46)

- ▶ "You could see a range of information and speak directly to the people providing it."
- ▶ "It was good to look over all the health promotion material that various organisations (CHAPS partners) were producing, and chat to the NAM team."
- ▶ "Good to see African and Irish literature."

Free and accessible resources (33)

- ▶ "Always good to get freebies! and catch up with other organisations."
- ▶ "I collected some SIGMA documents I wanted copies of."
- ▶ "Great, free information easily available and well explained."
- ▶ "Getting access to useful resources and in decent quantities... Thank you."

Update information and resources (30)

- ▶ "A chance to update on literature."
- ▶ "Particularly Sigma Research - reports to take back."
- ▶ "It's useful to see what other organisations have on offer so as not to duplicate and be able to use resources effectively."

Q5e: I'd recommend the CHAPS conference to other people concerned with health promotion with Gay & Bi men	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=264, missing 2)
Agree	91	93	93	94
Neither agree nor disagree	5	5	6	5
Disagree	4	2	1	2

- **The proportion of delegates that would recommend the CHAPS conference to others was similar across the last three CHAPS conferences.**

Q5f: The CHAPS conference is now a key event in my calendar	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=264, missing 2)
Agree	67	78	67	72
Neither agree nor disagree	29	16	26	24
Disagree	5	6	5	4

- **The proportion of delegates that consider the CHAPS conference a key event in their calendar was similar across the last four CHAPS conferences.**

Q6. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements as a consequence of the conference?

Q6a: I learnt things that were new to me	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=264, missing 2)
Agree	69	71	79	81
Neither agree nor disagree	23	21	16	15
Disagree	8	8	5	4

- **The same high proportion of delegates as in previous years, felt they had learnt something new.**

Q6b: I have increased my ability to think critically about my own work	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=263, missing 3)
Agree	66	64	65	62
Neither agree nor disagree	24	25	28	32
Disagree	10	12	7	6

- **The same high proportion of delegates as in previous years, felt that they had increased their ability to think critically about their own work.**

Q6c: I have been inspired to try new work practices	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=265, missing 1)
Agree	32	47	68	59
Neither agree nor disagree	53	43	24	32
Disagree	15	10	9	9

- **The proportion of delegates inspired to try new working practices has varied over the last four conferences - in C10 it was substantially higher than in C7 or C8 but lower than in C9.**

Q6d: I have a better understanding of the needs of my role in the Gay and Bisexual men's health sector	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=264, missing 2)
Agree	48	59	49	42
Neither agree nor disagree	40	35	44	47
Disagree	12	6	7	10

- **The proportion of delegates gaining insight into the needs of their role has been lower in C10 than in any of the three previous conferences.**

Q6e: C10 felt like a celebration of the developments and successes of the Gay men's HIV health promotion sector over the last ten years (n=265, missing 1)	% C10
Agree	36
Neither agree nor disagree	45
Disagree	19

ABOUT YOU

Q7: Job roles [not exclusive]	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=265, missing 1)
Health promoter	69	69	71	71
Researcher	17	13	11	19
GUM provider	8	11	12	8
Commissioners	9	5	5	4
Policy Officer / maker	-	-	-	10
News media	2	2	2	4
Other	19	29	23	25

- **Among C10 delegates, job roles were similar to those for C9, C8 and C7.**

65 specified other roles including:

- admin /marketing
- advocacy; service provision; policy
- All levels of outreach
- Assistant Director
- Case Manager with Sex workers
- CEO HIV Charity
- charity project co-ordinator and support worker
- Community development
- Counselling co-ordinator
- Counsellor
- Criminal Justice worker hate crime
- Dramatherapist
- Educator (3)
- Emotional Support
- Finance Manager
- group facilitator
- Health Advisor clinic coordinator for MSM
- HIV Counsellor
- HIV Social Worker
- HIV/AIDS + PSE Support
- Manager of service (4)
- Marketing
- Mental Health strategy for LGB
- Nurse, counsellor
- Parliamentary and campaigns officer
- Police Officer
- Pride Chairman (place name)
- Programme & Team Manager
- Project leader HIV
- Project trustee
- Psychotherapist
- Publications Officer
- Service Manager
- Sex worker
- Sexual Health service improvement
- Social Worker HIV (2)
- Specialist HIV Nurse
- student (5)
- Support Worker (2)
- Telephone helpline
- Trainer (3)
- Trustee of Gay Mens Charity
- Trustee/Chairman
- University Professor
- Vol/stat sector support
- Volunteer (3)
- Work at strategic level in the PCT with a sexual health team.
- Youth Worker (3)

Q8: Areas where delegates worked	C7		C8		C9		C10 (n=257, miss 9)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
UK-wide	--	--	--	--	3	2	11	4
England	135	87	116	88	159	86	204	79
<i>England-wide</i>	3	2	5	4	2	1	2	1
<i>London</i>	56	36	41	31	60	39	105	41
<i>South England</i>	18	12	29	22	19	12	23	9
<i>Midlands & Eastern Eng.</i>	24	16	20	15	30	19	34	14
<i>North England</i>	34	22	21	16	24	15	40	16
Wales	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	1
Scotland	3	2	3	2	5	3	6	2
Northern Ireland	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	<1
Outside UK	14	9	10	8	12	7	30	12
<i>Denmark</i>	--	--	2	--	3	--	3	
<i>Belgium</i>	2	--	1	--	2	--	--	--
<i>Norway</i>	2	--	1	--	2	--	3	--
<i>Finland</i>	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
<i>Sweden</i>	5	--	4	--	1	--	6	--
<i>Switzerland</i>	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
<i>France</i>	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
<i>Republic of Ireland</i>	3	--	2	--	--	--	6	--
<i>Netherlands</i>	1	--	--	--	--	--	2	--
<i>Canada</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	7	--
<i>Germany</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--
<i>Nigeria</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--

- **The geographic distribution of areas worked by delegates was very similar in C10 to C9, C8 and C7.**

Q9: How did you hear about C10? [not exclusive]	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=266, missing 0)
previous attender	62	65	60	61
direct mailing	34	29	23	32
through a colleague	31	27	31	28
other	5	3	6	5

- **How delegates heard about the C10 conference was very similar to previous conferences.**

Q10: How many previous CHAPS conferences have you been to?	% C9	% C10 (n=265, missing 1)
None	33	32
One	23	16
2 or 3	20	22
4 or 5	14	16
6 or more	10	13

- **A third of C10 delegates had never been to a CHAPS conference before; similar to C9.**

Q11: Do you think you will attend C11 in 2008? (n=266, missing 0)	% C10
Yes	71
Not sure	5
No	24

- **Over two thirds of C10 delegates intend to attend C11.**

Q12: Looking back at your answer to Question 2, you were looking for from the conference?	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10 (n=239, missing 27)
Not at all	1	2	3	1
A little	15	13	12	14
Somewhat	29	30	30	23
Mostly	47	41	48	52
Completely	8	13	7	10

- **The proportion of delegates achieving their self-defined aims for attendance was similar across the last four CHAPS conferences.**

**Q13 Please complete the following sentence in fewer than twenty words:
The main way in which I benefitted from this conference was...**

1. Meeting others: networking (n=71, selected quotes)

- ▶ *"To keep in touch with my colleagues in my new capacity."*
- ▶ *"To network and catch up on new research."*
- ▶ *"Catching up with old colleagues, networking, sharing thoughts and ideas."*
- ▶ *"Being able to talk to people from other organizations and share thoughts and feelings."*

2. Learning (n=44, selected quotes)

- ▶ *"Able to share, to learn and question in a non-threatening atmosphere because I feel safe to be with other gay and bisexual men."*
- ▶ *"Being able to have information about the experiences of being a gay trans man in today's gay community & society."*
- ▶ *"By learning what was going on in other projects."*
- ▶ *"To get a sense of how professionals from various sectors and service users see gay men's health and HIV in 2007."*
- ▶ *"Hearing people talk and answer questions about their work."*
- ▶ *"Exposure to the range of topics in Gay men's health."*

3. Understanding the wider context of my work (n=36, selected quotes)

- ▶ *"To really understand the context of Making it Count to the point where I could train others in how to understand it (which I did on 12/3/07)."*
- ▶ *"Exposure to new ideas and to information which will help my work."*

4. Self-reflection (n=15)

- ▶ *"To know what I am doing and to know that I'm doing it OK but understanding that I can add to my practice."*
- ▶ *"Gems of information and reflective opportunity."*
- ▶ *"The debating process made me re-evaluate some of my own thoughts on health promotion objectives."*
- ▶ *"To get my staff to recognize that they do not work in isolation and improve their knowledge and understanding."*

5. Inspiration (n=11)

- ▶ *"I got inspiration and new ideas to develop my work."*
- ▶ *"Felt my passion reignited for the work I'm doing."*
- ▶ *"More challenging information in looking at my work practice for LGBT."*
- ▶ *"More confidence in my ability to contribute to debates and to deliver presentations myself."*

6. Specific sessions (n=7)

- ▶ *"From the forensic workshop - catching up with external people in Gay men's field."*
- ▶ *"Gain more information on sero- sorting and other HIV intervention strategies."*
- ▶ *"Learn more about the 'Legalize' re: HIV and transmission and sex workers."*

7. Other reasons (8)

- ▶ *"Participation."*
- ▶ *"To benchmark our own commissioning plans against the discussion and consensus of what was best practice."*
- ▶ *"Being able to give feedback to appropriate people."*

Q14 What other comments do you have about C10 or this evaluation?

All delegates answered this question.

1. General: POSITIVE (n=64)

- ▶ *"Carry on the excellent work."*
- ▶ *"Excellent well organised & informative perhaps the best yet in terms of discussion."*
- ▶ *"Great as many different workshops rather than panel discussions."*
- ▶ *"I really enjoyed the conference. This was my 3rd and favourite CHAPS conference. A great range of workshops - often found it hard to choose what workshops to attend in sessions to my interest in different things."*
- ▶ *"It was great being able to meet people from around the country and talk about the work."*
- ▶ *"I love the disco."*

2. General: NEGATIVE (n=30) for example

- ▶ *"C10 was very useful, but some sessions concentrated on reporting figures which wasn't as useful as others."*
- ▶ *"Can we have a real speaker for the plenary next time, instead of irrelevant labour party spin?"*
- ▶ *"As a woman and a lesbian I felt quite a minority. Obviously this is a gay and bisexual men's health conference so I wouldn't expect 'my issues' to be on the agenda. I do feel that many delegates were quite dismissive of women during in discussions. I feel that with my work, voluntary and personal experience, I have plenty to offer in terms of my knowledge on gay/bi men's issues but this was ignored. In future perhaps facilitators could play more of a part in ensuring everybody is listened to, not just white middle class gay men."*

3. ORGANISATION: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE (n=41) for example

- ▶ *"CHAPS really needs to 'look over the fence' and learn and share more about what work is being done with HIV positive people - this has to be important in order for a rounded view of the work we SHARE in trying to prevent the onward transmission of the virus."*
- ▶ *"CHAPS should not need formal funding from DH to DO THE RIGHT THING, and meet the needs of pos gay men better."*
- ▶ *"Could you please video tape some of the sessions so we can see the ones we missed."*
- ▶ *"I did have some concerns about the cost of the whole event. I think it could have been done more cheaply without any loss of professionalism. However I was extremely impressed by how well it was organised."*
- ▶ *"I think it would be useful if there was a youth voice at the conference."*
- ▶ *"I think some of the talks were too anecdotal and had insufficient evidence to back*

- them up.”
- ▶ “There was also sweeping statements made about the success of health promotion.”
 - ▶ “...There is a lot around HIV but you are more likely to contract a STI before HIV. C11 more on STI’s.”
 - ▶ “I think we in the future need more researchers from a broader perspective, not so much SIGMA which not use more representative data. Look to USA and Australia.”
 - ▶ “More stalls.”
 - ▶ “More stuff on BME.”

4. Specific COMMENTS ON VENUE (n=18)

- ▶ “... dark stage [in] main hall, needed lighting.”
- ▶ “The layout of the venue made it difficult to connect with people easily.”
- ▶ “The venue org on reserving rooms/ proforma invoice leaves a lot to be desired. More seating was needed at lunchtime. The food was poor quality.”
- ▶ “Food disappointing, coffee diabolical.”
- ▶ “Lunch was rubbish for veggie, I had to go out therefore missing networking.”
- ▶ “Good conference but the hotel was awful, coffee was vile, food terrible and staff most unfriendly.”

5. Specific COMMENTS on Evaluation (n=6)

- ▶ “Excellent evaluation facility.”
- ▶ “Great to be able to evaluate online.”
- ▶ “...In terms of the this evaluation, I think that it is fine though the questions slightly skew peoples answers to the positive response, particularly the question above. Perhaps phrase more objectively in future.”
- ▶ “The evaluation doesn't want feedback about the services or concerns about individual conference sessions. It also leaves no room for thorough feedback.”

6. Specific COMMENTS on conference timing (n=4)

- ▶ “Often felt sessions were rushed.”
- ▶ “the timing /organisation of sessions was flawless-spot on. But it did seem not the strongest selection of abstracts.”

7. Specific COMMENTS on the Programme (n=1)

- ▶ “The conference programme felt like a rehash of the last 2 or 3 yrs programmes. A definite sense that the conference is becoming a networking event rather than a showcase for work or for looking at different ways of working/discussing issues facing the sector in a structured way. For first time delegates, conference is useful for those who have been for 3 yrs or more the programme and topics were predictable.”

Ford Hickson
Ford.Hickson@sigmaresearch.org.uk
Sigma Research
May 2007

[ends]