

C11: before & after evaluation 11th national CHAPS conference



**Nottingham 4th & 5th March 2008
Sigma Research, May 2008**

SUMMARY

- 73% of delegates completed the evaluation and are included here.
- The majority of delegates at C11 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.
- 90% of delegates agreed that the organisation of the conference was good.
- 78% 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' – thus maintaining the high rating set at C10.
- 80% agreed they had learnt something new.
- 62% agreed they had increased their ability to think critically about their own work.
- 51% agreed they had been inspired to try new working practices, a smaller proportion than at the previous two conferences.
- 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 registration desk. All delegates were asked to leave their completed questionnaire in a ballot box after the conference or send it to Sigma Research, freepost, after the event.

All evaluation forms contained a delegate number. One week after the conference 113 paper questionnaires had been received by Sigma Research. Those 211 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 211 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 102 delegates completed the questionnaire online 1-3 weeks after the conference.

RETURNS	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11
Registered delegates	340	368	372	397	344
Registered and attended	316	313	349	380	324
Attendance rate	93%	85%	94%	96%	94%
Not registered but attended	--	19	6	17	9
Total delegates	316	332	355	397	333
Survey returns	166	138	173	266	244
Response rate	53%	42%	49%	67%	73%

- **The number of delegate registrations (344) was lower than C8, C9 or C10.**
- **The number of delegates attending (324) was lower than C9 or C10.**
- **The number of attendees completing the evaluation (244) was lower than C10 but the proportion of delegates doing so (73%) was higher than C10 or any previous year.**

Q1. Indicate your strongest reasons for attending C11

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

Reasons for attending C10 (n=205, missing 39)	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Mean score	Rank
To learn new things	1	1	1	2	1.10	1
To meet people working in a similar field	3	4	2	3	1.03	2
I've benefited from previous conferences	2	2	3	1	0.95	3
It's Britain's only gay & bisexual men's HIV conference	5	5	5	4	0.71	4
Provides a platform for my work	4	3	4	5	0.62	5
It's free	9	7	7	7	0.21	6
My manager insisted	7	8	8	10	0.19	7
To feel less isolated in my work	6	6	6	8	0.17	8
To meet up with people I've not seen for a while	10	10	10	9	0.09	9
It's in Nottingham [this town]	8	9	9	6	0.09	10
Other	--	--	--	--	0.12	--

- **The most common reason for attending C11 was to learn new things.**
- **The overall ranking of reasons for attendance has been broadly similar across the last five CHAPS conferences.**

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

60 (25%) 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 C11 attendance (n=184, missing 60)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Gain more knowledge (general learning)	54	47	41	43	66
Networking	50	36	27	46	47
New ideas / inspiration	51	42	44	60	44
Improve my work with gay men	8	6	5	30	24
(Learn about) specific topics	15	10	5	10	14
Raise profile of my organisation / present results of my work	--	7	5	4	14
Best (good) practice	11	10	2	16	13
Understanding other agencies / projects	5	4	8	2	13
Research findings	14	9	4	9	3
Policy issues and developments	5	3	2	1	1
Time for reflection / thinking time	--	--	4	13	0
Other answers	--	--	15	6	5

The vast majority of delegates gave one or more of the top three main hopes, aspirations or reasons for attendance at C11:

- [1] to gain more (general) knowledge**
- [2] networking**
- [3] to get new ideas or inspiration**

Compared to previous conferences, those attending C11 seemed slightly more likely to be seeking *more knowledge (general learning)* than seeking *new ideas or inspiration*, however the latter was still seen widely cited as reason for attendance. Within the search for *more knowledge* was a clear emphasis on *updating* existing knowledge with delegates seeing the conference as an opportunity to get up to speed on recent events and research in the HIV sector. The opportunity to *network* with others in the sector was once again given key importance.

Within the remaining responses there was a marked increase in the number of people hoping to *raise the profile of their organisation/present results of my work*, and in people hoping to gain a better *understanding of other agencies/projects*. Contrary to C10, no individuals who completed the evaluation hoped to find time for reflection/thinking time at C11.

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

Q3a: I would have liked more information about the conference before arriving (n=243, missing 1)	% C9	% C10	% C11
Disagree	48	55	36
Neither agree nor disagree	32	29	28
Agree	21	16	36

Q3b: I would liked more opportunity to influence the content to the conference (n=241, missing 3)	% C9	% C10	% C11
Disagree	34	36	30
Neither agree nor disagree	56	44	56
Agree	11	21	14

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

25 out of 70 answered.

Allow agencies/previous delegates to inform abstract or talk selection (15), for example:

- "Through THT website – ideas, suggestions or asked to list possible topics in order of preference"
- "Opportunity to submit ideas to a list of topics that could then be shortlisted and distributed with request for abstracts"
- "Perhaps send out an email beforehand asking people to comment about what types of sessions or topics they'd like to see covered"
- "Consortium of delegates/other (especially outside of London) seeking suggestions for issues/needs"
- "Could we vote on items?"
- "Being someone who has presented at a number of CHAPS conferences, it may be worth while speaking to past presenters and getting ideas from them"

A widening of the abstract selection panel (3), for example:

- *"Open panel application to sit on steering committee – group"*
- *"It might be good to have one or two slots chosen by a wider (attendee) audience than just the selection panel"*

Talks need to be broadened outside of THT (2):

- *"More chance to services outside of THT to deliver papers"*
- *"A lot of views were THT oriented, maybe more talks from healthcare professionals working within the field of sexual health"*

Other suggestions (5), for example:

- *"Would have liked to have chosen workshops in advance. This may have helped speakers target their intros".*
- *"Earlier pre-conference alert"*
- *"I think that we need more thematic structuring so once we have a loose framework then we resend asking for further submissions"*


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'

C11 session name	Number of delegates	Mean rating
TUESDAY AM: Pre-conference satellite sessions		
Trans gay health	14	3.93
Sexual violence in relationships	11	4.09
Social marketing in gay men's health promotion	21	3.00
Group-work – beginnings, middles and endings	12	4.42
Working with sex	21	3.86
Changing patterns of LGBT youth service provision	12	4.25
OPENING PLENARY, 14.00 -15.00	176	3.30
TUESDAY, 15.00-16.15 Session 1		
Doing it for the kids (starter session)	4	3.25
A spoonful of sugar	52	3.37
Public sex environments and the law (starter session)	55	4.07
Relative safety II (feedback session)	17	4.06
Testing, testing	59	3.42
Supporting sex workers	30	3.80
TUESDAY, 16.45-18.00 Session 2		
Lobbying and influencing the political agenda (workshop)	1	4.00
New media in health promotion - hype or help?	49	3.35
Coming of age	35	3.89
Faith, prayer and religion: gay men and faith	41	3.07
At Her Majesty's pleasure	40	3.93
Not to be sniffed at? Poppers and HIV risk	37	3.84

C10 session name	Number of delegates	Mean rating
WEDNESDAY, 10.00-11.30 Session 1		
Education, Education, Education	52	3.85
Depression and HIV risk (starter session)	36	3.36
The strategic future of black gay men's HIV prevention	22	3.41
Positive prevention and STIs	50	4.14
Building partnerships in health promotion (workshop)	13	3.62
Preventing sexual exploitation of young men (workshop)	26	4.15
WEDNESDAY, 12.00-13.15 Session 2		
Promoting pleasure (workshop)	32	3.16
Sticking to the code (starter session)	9	4.22
Branding AIDS	80	4.04
Assert yourself	36	3.92
Online outreach for subgroups of gay men	29	3.69
Fit for purpose: health trainers (starter session)	18	3.11
WEDNESDAY, 14.15 -15.30 Session 3		
Planning for participation (workshop)	12	2.58
Taking responsibility: reactions to criminal prosecutions	44	3.93
Effective drugs outreach	29	3.48
Accentuate the positive	31	3.39
Prevention Futures (starter session)	3	4.33
Commissioning gay men's HIV prevention services (panel)	51	3.29
WEDNESDAY, 15.45 -17.00 Session 4		
Smoking, HIV and mortality (workshop)	14	4.21
Pushing the boundaries?	46	3.50
No Magic Bullet (DVD)	45	4.09
Migrant gay men	18	3.44
Asking for trouble?	17	3.24
CLOSING PLENARY, 17.00 -17.30	76	3.17

The average (mean) rating was 3.68. The average (mean) rating for the sessions ranged from 2.58 (Planning for participation - workshop) to 4.42 (Group-work – beginnings, middles and endings).



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 five conferences. For C11, it appears that fewer delegates attended sessions in the afternoon of the second day than was the case in previous years.**

AFTER THE CONFERENCE

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

Q5a: The organisation of the conference was good (n=239, missing 5)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Agree	94	94	92	94	92
Neither agree nor disagree	5	5	7	4	5
Disagree	1	1	1	2	3

- **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?]

6 of the 8 respondents that disagreed said why:

- "Programme only received 2 days before conference"
- "Programme not available before registration"
- "I didn't get much info until very close to the event"
- "Late information – planning"
- "Conference agenda was released very late, made it difficult to plan in advance best use of time"
- "Fine on day – very helpful and efficient but I would have liked a programme more than a few days before the event"

Q5b: The range of themes in the conference was good (n=241, missing 3)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Agree	83	82	84	82	78
Neither agree nor disagree	14	14	11	13	18
Disagree	3	4	4	5	4

- **A similar 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 22 respondents that disagreed said why:

- "Would have liked more on sex work, community responses (i.e. non health promotion; other STI's; experiences outside of London)"
- "Encouraging a little self-criticism amongst gay men"
- "I realise this widens the remit but more work on social care needs of gay men"
- "Demands on politicians. How to work political"
- "More stuff on pos gay men and their needs"
- "Limited themes – need to be wider ranging – involve external agencies/companies"
- "Still very THT-London focused"
- "Is CHAPS just for gay men? I've been asking and getting different answers – so please, African women and HIV"
- "More hands on 'how to' workshops"
- "Good but not as exciting/interesting as I'd have liked"
- "Unfortunately the main youth oriented workshop I had hoped to attend did not take place. Youth services are currently finding it near impossible to obtain funding to continue services offered to young LGBT people. The youth agenda seriously needs to be more prominent. There was nothing new and I think the format is being stagnant – we need some new innovative conference activities and possibly some on-site training."

Q5c: The conference venue was accessible and comfortable (n=242, missing 2)	% C10	% C11
Agree	72	78
Neither agree nor disagree	16	12
Disagree	12	10

[if Disagree: Why do you say that?]

25 respondents provided comments about the venue (more than those who disagreed):

Venue was cold (2)

- "I was cold on day one"
- "Too cold"

Venue was too far from accommodation and transport (23), for example

- "Too far from accommodation and city centre"
- "Miles from anywhere and no signage until you're on the doorstep"
- "Location was extremely inconvenient in relation to rail services"
- "It was quite a journey from both the station and the hotel"
- "Venue was comfortable but it was a pain having it beyond walking distance from the accommodation"
- "Buildings and facilities great but too far from hotels and the real world"
- "A bit too far from the city"

Q5d: The stalls were useful (n=239, missing 5)	% C10	% C11
Agree	57	61
Neither agree nor disagree	38	31
Disagree	5	8

[If disagree: Why do you say that?]

14 of the 39 that disagreed said why:

Already seen/accessed the resources (3)

- "Seen it all before"
- "I have access to everything available on the stalls"
- "I already have access to the information/reports etc on them"

Wider range/diversity needed (5)

- "Not enough diversity"
- "Expected more stalls – wider range"
- "Could have had more stalls – encourage more organisations to have them"
- "Some drugs/condom reps would be good"
- "They were low level awareness platforms – they were not providing dedicated information etc. They were too generic. Need a mix of low and high brow"

Other comments (6)

- "They were pointless"
- "Nobody to speak to on the stalls"
- "Boring"
- "More investment and thought in stalls would be good. Very bland"
- "Didn't even glance at them"
- "Some interesting materials and ideas for service delivery"

Q5e: I'd recommend the CHAPS conference to other people concerned with health promotion with gay & bisexual men (n=240, missing 4)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Agree	91	93	93	94	94
Neither agree nor disagree	5	5	6	5	4
Disagree	4	2	1	2	2

- **The proportion of delegates that would recommend the CHAPS 11 conference to others was similar across the last five CHAPS conferences.**

Q5f: The CHAPS conference is now a key event in my calendar (n=239, missing 5)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Agree	67	78	67	72	72
Neither agree nor disagree	29	16	26	24	24
Disagree	5	6	5	4	4

- **The proportion of delegates that consider the CHAPS conference a key event in their calendar was similar across the last five 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 (n=239, missing 5)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Agree	69	71	79	81	80
Neither agree nor disagree	23	21	16	15	13
Disagree	8	8	5	4	7

- **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 (n=239, missing 5)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Agree	66	64	65	62	62
Neither agree nor disagree	24	25	28	32	30
Disagree	10	12	7	6	8

- **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 (n=239, missing 5)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Agree	32	47	68	59	51
Neither agree nor disagree	53	43	24	32	40
Disagree	15	10	9	9	9

- **The proportion of delegates inspired to try new working practices has fallen slightly compared to C10 and C9, however still remains higher than in C7 or C8.**

Q6d: I have a better understanding of the needs of my role in the Gay and Bisexual men's health sector (n=238, missing 6)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Agree	48	59	49	42	44
Neither agree nor disagree	40	35	44	47	46
Disagree	12	6	7	10	10

- **The proportion of delegates gaining insight into the needs of their role has risen slightly compared to C10, although is still lower than in C9, C8 or C7.**

ABOUT YOU

Q7: Job roles [not exclusive] (n=242, missing 2)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Health promoter	69	69	71	71	71
Counsellor / therapist	--	--	--	--	18
Researcher	17	13	11	19	13
GUM provider	8	11	12	8	11
Commissioners	9	5	5	4	3
Policy Officer / maker	-	-	-	10	11
News media	2	2	2	4	5
Other	19	29	23	25	23

- **Among C11 delegates, job roles were similar to those for C10, C9, C8 & C7.**

52 specified other roles including:

Administrator (2)	Service Manager (5)
Advocacy Worker	Service User Representative
Charity Director (2)	Sexual Relationships Education
Community Development (2)	Student
Executive Committee member & Treasurer	Substance misuse worker
Fundraiser	Support Worker (4)
Health Advisor	Trade union official
HIV Service Coordinator	Trainer (6)
HIV Strategist for Gay Men	Transgender Development Worker
Marketing	Trustee/Chairman (2)
Network Coordinator Sexual Health	University Teacher
Pastoral Care	Volunteer (4)
Project Coordinator	Youth Worker (5)
Project Developer/Web Comms	

Q8: Areas where delegates worked (n=225, missing 19)	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	
	%	%	%	%	No.	%
UK-wide	--	--	2	4	13	5
England	87	88	86	79	184	75
<i>England-wide</i>	2	4	1	1	1	<1
<i>London</i>	36	31	39	41	81	33
<i>South England</i>	12	22	12	9	23	9
<i>Midlands & Eastern Eng.</i>	16	15	19	14	41	17
<i>North England</i>	22	16	15	16	38	16
Wales	1	2	1	1	1	<1
Scotland	2	2	3	2	8	3
Northern Ireland	1	1	1	<1	0	0
Outside UK	9	8	7	12	18	7

- Delegates listed as 'outside UK' comprised: Sweden (6), Republic of Ireland (5), Denmark (3), France (1), Germany (1), Switzerland (1) & Globally (1)
- The geographic distribution of areas worked by delegates was very similar in C11 to C10, C9, C8 and C7.

Q9: How did you hear about C11? [not exclusive] (n=243, missing 1)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
previous attendee	62	65	60	61	62
direct mailing	34	29	23	32	26
through a colleague	31	27	31	28	30
other	5	3	6	5	6

- How delegates heard about the C11 conference was very similar to previous conferences.

Q10: How many previous CHAPS conferences have you been to? (n=244, missing none)	% C9	% C10	% C11
None	33	32	32
One	23	16	12
2 or 3	20	22	22
4 or 5	14	16	17
6 or 7	10	13	9
8 -10	--	--	8

- **A third of C11 delegates had never been to a CHAPS conference before; similar to C10 and C9. Another third had been to 4 or more previously.**

Q11: Do you think you will attend C11 in 2008? (n=242, missing 2)	% C10	% C11
Yes	71	67
Not sure	5	3
No	24	30

- **Over two thirds of C11 delegates intend to attend C12, a similar proportion to last year.**

Q12: Looking back at your answer to Question 2, you were looking for from the conference? (n=206, missing 38)	% C7	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11
Not at all	1	2	3	1	2
A little	15	13	12	14	13
Somewhat	29	30	30	23	23
Mostly	47	41	48	52	51
Completely	8	13	7	10	11

- **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=60, selected quotes)

- *"Met some really interesting people who have helped me in my work"*
- *"Making better contacts and relationships with others in the field"*
- *"Getting members of staff and volunteers to network with others and find out what work is being undertaken across the partnership"*
- *"Gained new idea, met new people, increased networks"*
- *"More links with other organisations and new ways of working"*
- *"An opportunity to see relevance of the conference to my work and to network with agencies outside of (area)"*

2. Learning: GENERAL (n=45, selected quotes)

- *"Expanding my knowledge base. Learning new skills in areas I have previously no experience"*
- *"I have learnt a huge amount about a variety of topics that are of interest to me"*
- *"Increasing knowledge so I will give a presentation to my GU clinic on return"*
- *"Learning about new initiatives started in the last 12 months and how I can use these"*
- *"Raising my awareness of issues facing health promotion"*
- *"To get new ideas about HIV prevention"*

3. Learning: SPECIFIC ISSUES (n=19, selected quotes)

- *"The branding session got me to think outside the box and to challenge the ways in which we access gay men"*
- *"Greater knowledge of HIV testing & issues for MSM around HIV"*
- *"I learned more about prosecution issues"*
- *"In gaining a greater knowledge of some of the more complex issues around the negotiating of fun and pleasurable sexual relationships for gay and MSM"*
- *"Law in public sex environments"*
- *"New information on poppers"*

4. Sharing of ideas, expertise and points of view (n=28)

- *"Being in an environment of open and honest discussion and challenging beliefs"*
- *"By hearing new ideas – challenging old/new ideas"*
- *"get support and new ideas from the workshops and other people"*
- *"Having the opportunity to discuss issues and share learning with my peers"*
- *"Hearing other peoples experiences of what works and what doesn't. Learning from other's experience"*
- *"To hear other points of view, understand how other systems of support work, become familiar with other workers' problems"*

5. Understanding the wider context of my work (n=9)

- *"To feel that the work I do does make a difference and feel supported"*
- *"To reconnect with the national scene"*
- *"To open my eyes to services in the rest of the country"*
- *"I have a better idea of the range and scale of gay men's issues in the UK"*
- *"Learning about activities nationwide"*
- *"Seeing and understanding the problems faced by CHAPS partners with cuts in funding and changes in contracts"*
- *"The differences between the UK and Sweden and how similar it is"*
- *"To compare HIV promotion in Sweden and UK"*
- *"My feeling we're a part of something great. We make a difference"*

6. Affirmation of current practices/approaches (n=5)

- *"To confirm that my practice and work is in line with current thinking and at times ahead"*
- *"That we are moving the right way"*
- *"Realising that the organisation that I work for is on track and doing a good job overall"*
- *"Knowing that I'm heading in the right direction"*
- *"Feel affirmation in the quality of the work GMFA do"*

7. Inspiration (n=5)

- *"It gave me sense of direction in the work I do with gay/MSM. I have walked away feeling motivated and energised"*
- *"Felt inspired/did great networking/learnt about new practice ideas"*
- *"New energy and a critical look at what we are not doing in my area"*
- *"By attending workshops which were inspirational , filled me with enthusiasm, and made me look at what I was doing and see there were ways to improve practice, both as an individual and as an organisation, as I intend to feedback my experiences"*
- *"Being inspired, uncovering new fields of work, learning about practices"*

8. Personal development (n=4)

- *"I presented an abstract which was a new challenge for me"*
- *"Having the opportunity to team work away from the distraction of the usual busy office environment"*
- *"Going away feeling more in control"*
- *"Being introduced to areas of work that are part of the direction I want to move in professionally and in improving certain aspects of my work, especially in terms of being aware of different individual and community needs"*

9. Other reasons (n=3)

- *"Promoting a project (successfully)"*
- *"The CHAPS conference initially seemed to have interesting session, however they failed to provide any insightful views or ground breaking results"*
- *"Only there for my session"*

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

152 delegates (52%) provided further comments, which have been grouped into the following clusters:

1. General: POSITIVE (n=58) for example

- *"This conference becomes more and more professional every year"*
- *"Really enjoyed it, best one yet!"*
- *"I really found the past few days very interesting and fulfilling. I look forward to C12"*
- *"Great opportunity to meet other health promotion workers and also learning how to develop services in our area, and a great evening out with people who do similar work"*
- *"An invaluable two days and had it not been free I would not have been able to attend. THANK YOU!"*
- *"Conference great, survey easy-peasy. Many thanks, not enough words to describe benefits"*
- *"Love the design, graphics and all the little touches (e.g. music) which add up to a professional presentation"*
- *"I couldn't sleep on Wednesday night because of all the ideas charging through my thoughts"*
- *"Well done to all the health promotion team. You've provided another excellent CHAPS conference, especially with new people in key roles (David, Andi & Paul especially)"*
- *"Another excellent conference. Great venue, well organised, friendly, good social event. Good idea to have buses provided. Organic cotton bags – lovely!"*

2. General: NEGATIVE (n=19) for example

- *"Feel that in some sessions the political agenda between agencies got in the way of the aims of the session"*
- *"Please move away from this presumption that sexual health stops in London or the south of England"*
- *"Needed much more info on the conference as a first time delegate. What's a satellite session?"*
- *"I thought a number of the sessions were very weak"*
- *"I found it unusually boring – nothing new/contentious. Give me something to think about"*
- *"C11 – very London/gay centred. Almost a third of MSM we contact are married Bi men – difficult to reach groups – HIV impact?"*

- *"The session descriptions did not always match the delivered session. There was no emphasis on sharing ideas/good practice or equipping smaller organisations with tools to progress and aid their work – more a case of self-promotion by THT and GMFA. There was precious little focus on partnership working, despite the fact that CHAPS in itself is meant to be built on just that. There was a complete lack of focus on issues specific to bisexual men"*

3. ORGANISATION: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE (n=16) for example

- *"PLEASE put PowerPoint presentations on the net"*
- *"Should move towards trades fair type of event – involve wider views with external agencies (DH), consider drugs companies. More themes with practical outputs. E.g. developing comms"*
- *"Thank you so much. Don't let this become too exclusive to THT & GMFA. More support for smaller orgs. Still very urban focussed, missing a large area of our work. More lo/no alcohol activities for delegates would be great"*
- *"I feel that more young people must be encouraged to be involved and invited to C12"*
- *"In order to prepare our participation more thoroughly it would be nice to see the programme a bit earlier"*
- *"Why are satellite sessions kept separate from the programme? Make themed conference session a bit shorter"*
- *"An extra day would be invaluable"*
- *"It would be helpful to know in advance the attendance limits of some of the sessions. I am aware of several people disappointed (including me) who missed a session that they were keen on. I'm not complaining as the session I attended were all useful but having to make a last minute decision because the intended session was full was frustrating"*

4. PROGRAMME: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE (n=13) for example

- *"I would like to see advanced session for people that have worked in the sector for some time, to help continue growth"*
- *"Although there are starter sessions there aren't for those of us who've been in the business a long time and might give CHAPS more credibility and attract more clinicians and commissioners who could then see our work"*
- *"Would be great to see more discussion of what worked for different services and what didn't. More research and evidence based practices and developments, and less selling of services and self-promotion of people and services from around the country"*
- *"Very metropolitan based – needs more about rural projects/issues. i.e. rural Cumbria"*
- *"More trans stuff. Had a great female presence though still nothing on lesbian sexual health"*
- *"More rural communities, married men who have sex with men"*
- *"More work on Asian & BME men working with religion, culture and spirituality"*

5. Specific COMMENTS ON VENUE (n=14)

- *"Don't go to this venue again, very difficult to access"*
- *"Venues need to be nearer hotels. Nottingham not a very good place"*
- *"Venue good, transport to and from less good"*
- *"The venue was a bit out of the way"*
- *"The conference venue was great for people with access for wheel chairs to get around; however the venue was too far from the hotels. People were a great help if you needed help in whatever concerns or wants you had"*
- *"This venue is excellent and the best I have been to in the last 4 years. Last year's had much to be desired"*

6. Specific COMMENTS on OPENING PLENNARY (n=4)

- *"Opening plenary was very poor, no new ideas just old hat"*
- *"As stated the format is old, the plenary needs to make a statement and be news worthy"*
- *"Great venue. Opening plenary would have been better as a session. Didn't seem relevant for the start of the conference"*
- *"The opening plenary was like a themed session and the imminent commissioning changes were ignored but it was a worthwhile conference, thank you"*

Adam Bourne
adam.bourne@sigmaresearch.org.uk
Sigma Research
May 2008

[Ends]