

C12: before & after evaluation 12th national CHAPS conference



Brighton 3rd & 4th March 2009

SUMMARY

- 73% of delegates completed the evaluation and are included here.
- The majority of delegates at C12 were health promoters working in England. A third of delegates had never attended a previous CHAPS conference, and a third had attended 4 or more of the previous 11 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.
- 77% of delegates agreed that the organisation of the conference was good, a figure somewhat lower than previous years.
- 65% of delegates agreed that the range of themes at the conference was good, a figure somewhat lower than previous years.
- 68% of delegates said their personal aspirations for the conference had been met 'mostly' or 'completely' – an increase on previous years.
- 80% agreed they had learnt something new.
- 63% agreed they had increased their ability to think critically about their own work.
- 62% agreed they had been inspired to try new working practices, a somewhat higher proportion than the previous three conferences.
- 92% of the delegates would recommend the CHAPS conference to others.
- 73% of the delegates agreed that the CHAPS conference was a key event in their calendar.
- The vast majority of delegates felt the annual frequency of the conference should "stay the same" (82%).
- The vast majority of respondents felt the length of the conference was "about right" (82%). Of the remainder more felt it was "too short" than "too long".

CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE & PARTICIPATION IN EVALUATION

All conference delegates received an evaluation form in their delegate pack - it was two sides of A4 and contained 16 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 134 paper questionnaires had been returned to Sigma Research. Those 204 delegates that had not returned their evaluation form were identified by Sigma Research from their delegate number, and these numbers were passed to THT. THT then emailed all 204 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 112 delegates completed the questionnaire online 1-3 weeks after the conference.

RETURNS	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12
Registered delegates	368	372	397	344	350
Registered and attended	313	349	380	324	323
Attendance rate	85%	94%	96%	94%	92%
Not registered but attended	19	6	17	9	15
Total delegates	332	355	397	333	338
Survey returns	138	173	266	244	246
Response rate	42%	49%	67%	73%	73%

- **The number of delegate registrations (350) was lower than C8, C9 & C10 but higher than C11**
- **The number of delegates attending (338) was lower than C9 & C10 but higher than C11.**
- **The number of attendees completing the evaluation (246) was marginally higher than C11 but the proportion of delegates doing so (73%) was the same.**

Q1. Indicate your strongest reasons for attending C12

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

Reasons for attending C12 (n=185, missing 61)	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Mean score	Rank
To meet people working in a similar field	4	2	3	2	1.48	1
To learn new things	1	1	2	1	1.21	2
Provides a platform for my work	3	4	5	5	.97	3
I've benefited from previous conferences	2	3	1	3	.81	4
It's Britain's only gay & bisexual men's HIV conference	5	5	4	4	.78	5
It's free	7	7	7	6	.48	6
My manager insisted	8	8	10	7	.40	7
To feel less isolated in my work	6	6	8	8	.39	8
To meet up with people I've not seen for a while	10	10	9	9	.34	9
It's in Brighton [this town]	9	9	6	10	.29	10
Other	--	--	--	--	.11	

- **For the first time ever, the most common reason for attending C12 was “to meet people working in a similar field”. This reason for attendance has become increasingly important in the last 5 years.**
- **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)?

66 (27%) of all respondents did not answer this question at all.

Hopes for C12 attendance (n=180, missing 66)	% C12
Gain more knowledge (general learning)	37
Networking	21
New ideas / inspiration	19
Improve my work with gay men	9
Research findings	2
Raise profile of my organisation / present results of my work	2
Best (good) practice	2
Understanding other agencies / projects	1
(Learn about) specific topics	1
Policy issues and developments	1
Other answers	5

The vast majority of delegates gave one of the top three main hopes, aspirations or reasons for attendance at C12:

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

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

Q3a: I would have liked more information about the conference before arriving (n=239, missing 7)	% C10	% C11	% C12
Disagree	55	36	40
Neither agree nor disagree	29	28	29
Agree	16	36	31

Q3b: I would liked more opportunity to influence the content to the conference (n=237, missing 9)	% C10	% C11	% C12
Disagree	36	30	35
Neither agree nor disagree	44	56	46
Agree	21	14	19

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

34 out of 44 answered (themes below with numbers in category and selected quotes).

[1] Allow agencies/previous delegates to inform abstract or talk selection (19), for example:

- More input into planning from other than CHAPS partners.
- Contacting previous delegates and asking if there are areas not covered by the conference they would like to see.
- An email request for themes, issues or specific problems encountered in trying to reduce HIV infections.

[2] Talks need to be broadened outside of THT/CHAPS (6):

- More input into planning from other than CHAPS partners.
- NHS staff were not encouraged to submit abstracts.

[3] Other suggestions (5), for example:

- There were some bad / misleading sessions. Some very good ones too though.
- Very early registration process or post C12 consultation this spring.

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'. Higher mean rating denotes sessions that were particularly valued.

C12 session name	Number of delegates	Mean rating
TUESDAY AM: Pre-conference satellite sessions		
HIV & young people	33	4.15
All in the head? Gay and bisexual men's mental health	26	3.76
Faith & Risk	15	4.33
Sex addiction and gay men	5	<u>3.00</u>
OPENING PLENARY, 14.00 -15.00	196	4.11
TUESDAY, 15.00 - 16.15 Session 1		
Fatigue and complacency	53	<u>2.67</u>
Treatment as prevention (starter session)	38	3.86
North of the border	26	3.69
Selling and buying sex: does gender matter?	40	3.40
National group-work (workshop)	15	<u>2.73</u>
Undiagnosed infection	47	3.65
TUESDAY, 16.45 - 18.00 Session 2		
Policing transmission (briefing session)	67	3.85
Are we being served?	34	3.41
FS: Helping it help you (workshop)	10	3.40
Make Yourself Count (workshop)	17	4.00
An introduction to harm reduction (starter session)	9	3.77
Health trainers and HIV prevention (workshop)	50	3.76

C12 session name	Number of delegates	Mean rating
WEDNESDAY, 10.00-11.30 Session 1		
Community testing	53	4.11
Delay tactics (workshop)	26	4.26
MESH	23	4.17
Drugs, alcohol and risk	39	4.20
What works? Positive or negative?	14	3.64
Relative Safety II	50	4.30
WEDNESDAY, 12.00-13.15 Session 2		
Responding to migrant gay men	25	3.52
Young gay men and resilience (workshop)	22	4.22
HIV prevention mentoring for BME communities	26	3.61
Stop, talk, listen (workshop)	25	3.6
Tea and sympathy	33	<u>2.93</u>
Leaders, followers, communicators or gatekeepers?	61	3.75
WEDNESDAY, 14.15 -15.30 Session 3		
Back of beyond (workshop)	20	3.70
A closer look: BME MSM	35	3.82
Accreditation (workshop)	8	4.25
HEP C and HIV	48	3.87
To boldly go (workshop)	22	4.27
Stage Management	37	3.97
WEDNESDAY, 15.45 -17.00 Session 4		
What's changing? Young people and SRE	18	4.16
Exercise and HIV	6	<u>3.00</u>
Sero-sum games (advanced session)	15	4.40
Treatment as prevention – panel discussion	69	3.89
Safe as houses?	6	3.83
Effective Campaigns (workshop)	21	3.43
CLOSING PLENARY, 17.00 -17.30	83	3.22

Across all sessions the average (mean) rating was 3.63. The average (mean) rating for the sessions ranged from 2.67 (Fatigue and complacency) to 4.40 (Sero-sum games, advanced session). Of the 42 distinct sessions 14 (33%) were rated at 4/5 or above (mean score in **bold**). Just five sessions were rated at 3/5 or below (mean score underlined).

AFTER THE CONFERENCE

Q6. The conference takes place every year. In future do you feel it should take place ... (n=236, missing 10)	% C12
More often	3
Less often	15
Stay the same	82

- **The vast majority of respondents felt the annual frequency of the conference should “stay the same” (82%). Of the remainder more felt it short occur “less often” rather than “more often”.**

Q5. Do you feel that the conference was...

Q5. The conference was... (n=236, missing 10)	% C12
Too long	3
Too short	15
About right	82

- **The vast majority of respondents felt the length of the conference was “about right” (82%). Of the remainder more felt it was “too short” than “too long”.**

Q7. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q7a: The organisation of the conference was good (n=235, missing 11)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Agree	94	92	94	92	77
Neither agree nor disagree	5	7	4	5	14
Disagree	1	1	2	3	9

- **The number of respondents who agreed that the organisation of the conference was good was lower than in any of the previous 4 years.**

[if Disagree: Why do you say that?]

21 of the 21 respondents that disagreed said why:

[1] Changes to programme (7), for example:

Too many last minute changes & cancellations of good sessions.

There were too many room changes. The amendment sheet was not clear.

Doors in room locations in programme booklet caused confusion and really should have been avoided.

[2] Programme not circulated before conference (6), for example:

No pre-conference information on the websites until days before it happened.

Programme needs to be out earlier.

There was very late notice about the content of the programme & too many room changes. The team at the conference however were super helpful.

Q7b: The range of themes in the conference was good (n=235, missing 11)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Agree	82	84	82	78	65
Neither agree nor disagree	14	11	13	18	24
Disagree	4	4	5	4	11

- **The number of people who felt that the range of themes in this year's conference was good was lower than in any of the four previous years.**

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

22 of the 26 respondents that disagreed said why (all quotes below):

Condom use, internet methods, new technologies.

Empowerment challenging the commissioning process together.

I would like to have seen more on psychological impact of HIV also on the impact of sexually transmitted infections and it impact on HIV transmission.

Internet based prevention, international aspects, transgender issues.

LGV information.

More sexual health sessions.

More emphasis given to institutional stigma & discrimination.

More focus on methods of working, practical tips - successful evaluated work, more discussion on achievable outcomes (definitions of) rather than boring old processes all the time – yawn.

More focus on young people, BME, global overview etc. Speakers other than THT. Beginning to feel it is a platform for THT to showcase their work and more people from other groups clearly have become marginalised.

More info on needs of gay/bi/men who have disabilities / trans other diversity issues.

More open to how mental / emotional & spiritual men can help themselves.

Need to develop conference issues relating not just to delivery but also best practice and how to advertise, strategy at PCT govt level, drug issues IE treatments from drug companies.

Non white gay/bisexual men seemed to be discussed completely apart from gay / bisexual men of the ethnic majority in UK. Especially in my context of London this is no longer relevant and acceptable.

Not sure but we now seem to be doing the same with a different title.

Pornography and its social impact on the gay community - changing trends towards Fetishisation.

Positive prevention, partner reduction.

Repeat sessions the same every year.

Repetition of themes from tuesday to wednesday was a shame.

Seemed quite THT focused.

STI's for Gay Men with lots of sexual partners.

More current research-based workshops.

More opportunities to discuss new diagnostics in HIV and STI testing.

There wasn't enough clinical research analysis / debate in the programme.

Young people, structural barriers commissioning / procurement.

Q7c: The conference venue was accessible and comfortable (n=235, missing 11)	% C11	% C12
Agree	78	77
Neither agree nor disagree	12	9
Disagree	10	14

Q7e: I'd recommend the CHAPS conference to other people concerned with health promotion with gay & bisexual men (n=236, missing 10)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Agree	93	93	94	94	92
Neither agree nor disagree	5	6	5	4	6
Disagree	2	1	2	2	2

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

Q7f: The CHAPS conference is now a key event in my calendar (n=236, missing 11)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Agree	78	67	72	72	73
Neither agree nor disagree	16	26	24	24	21
Disagree	6	5	4	4	6

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

Q8. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements as a consequence of the conference?

Q8a: I learnt things that were new to me (n=235, missing 11)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Agree	71	79	81	80	80
Neither agree nor disagree	21	16	15	13	14
Disagree	8	5	4	7	6

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

Q8b: I have increased my ability to think critically about my own work (n=236, missing 10)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Agree	64	65	62	62	63
Neither agree nor disagree	25	28	32	30	29
Disagree	12	7	6	8	8

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

Q8c: I have been inspired to try new work practices (n=236, missing 10)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Agree	47	68	59	51	62
Neither agree nor disagree	43	24	32	40	28
Disagree	10	9	9	9	10

- **The proportion of delegates inspired to try new working practices has risen from C11 and C10, but slightly lower compared to C9.**

Q8d: I have a better understanding of the needs of my role in the gay and bisexual men's health sector (n=236, missing 10)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Agree	59	49	42	44	51
Neither agree nor disagree	35	44	47	46	36
Disagree	6	7	10	10	13

- **The proportion of delegates gaining insight into the needs of their role has risen slightly compared to C11 and C10, but is still lower than in C8.**

ABOUT DELEGATES

Q9: Job roles [not exclusive] (n=238, missing 8)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Health promoter	69	71	71	71	74
Counsellor / therapist	--	--	--	18	17
Researcher	13	11	19	13	16
GUM provider	11	12	8	11	12
Commissioners	5	5	4	3	3
Policy Officer / maker	-	-	10	11	11
News media	2	2	4	5	5
Other	29	23	25	23	15

- **Among C12 delegates, job roles of delegates were similar to those for previous conferences.**

36 specified other roles including:

Youth Worker (7)
 Administrator (3)
 Support (2)
 Trainer (2)
 Volunteer (2)
 Activist
 Co-ordinator
 Communication Officer
 Community Nurse Specialist
 Facilitator
 Company Rep
 Information officer
 Peer Supporter
 Public Health Consultant
 Service Manager
 Social Care & Social Support
 Student
 Supported Housing Officer
 Web Developer

Q10: Areas where delegates worked (n=221, missing 25)	No. C12	% C12
UK-wide	8	3.6
All England	4	1.8
East of England	6	2.7
East Midlands	9	4.0
London	91	41.2
North East	9	4.0
North West	15	6.8
South Central	10	4.5
South East Coast	14	6.3
South West	12	5.4
West Midlands	9	4.0
Yorkshire & Humber	7	3.2
All Wales	0	0
All Scotland	6	2.7
Outside UK	21	9.5

Delegates listed as 'outside UK' comprised: Sweden (9), Republic of Ireland (4), Denmark (2), France (2), Germany (1), Finland (1), The Netherlands (1) & Norway (1).

- **More than 40% of C12 delegates worked in London.**
- **No delegates from Wales or Northern Ireland completed the evaluation.**

Q11: How did you hear about C12? [not exclusive] (n=246, missing 0)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
previous attendee	65	60	61	62	53
direct mailing	29	23	32	26	22
through a colleague	27	31	28	30	28
other	3	6	5	6	6

- **Ways of hearing about the C12 conference were similar to previous years.**

Q12: How many previous CHAPS conferences have you been to? (n=238, missing 8)	% C10	% C11	% C12
None	32	32	33
One	16	12	12
2 or 3	22	22	20
4 or 5	16	17	17
6 or 7	13	9	9
8 -11	--	8	9

- **A third (33%) of C12 delegates had never been to a CHAPS conference before; similar to C10 and C11.**
- **Another third (35%) had been to 4 or more conferences previously.**

Q13: Do you think you will attend C13 in the future (n=238, missing 8)	% C11	% C12
Yes	67	79
Not sure	3	3
No	30	18

- **Over three quarters (79%) of C12 delegates intend to attend C13, a higher proportion than last year.**

Q14: Were your self-defined aims (question 2) for the conference met? (n=151, missing 95)	% C8	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12
Not at all	2	3	1	2	1
A little	13	12	14	13	8
Somewhat	30	30	23	23	23
Mostly	41	48	52	51	52
Completely	13	7	10	11	16

- **Two thirds of delegates achieved their self-defined aims for attendance “mostly” (52%) or “completely” (16%). This proportion was higher than in previous conferences.**

**Q15. Please complete the following sentence in fewer than twenty words:
*The main way in which I benefitted from this conference was...***

192 delegates (78%) provided further comments, which have been grouped into the following themes.

1. Learning: GENERAL (n=53, selected quotes)

- Broad range of subjects and workshops very useful
- Gaining more awareness and understanding
- I have definitely updated my knowledge and am ready to do more
- Increased level of knowledge in the advances towards heightened awareness of sexual health.
- Learnt new things and challenged thinking.

2. Meeting others: networking (n=45, selected quotes)

- Good networking with people for programme development
- I met lots of colleagues from around the country
- Making new contacts and meeting old ones
- Networking with my colleagues and other workers in a similar field

3. Sharing of ideas, expertise and points of view (n=27)

- In sharing knowledge with other workers and learning from the experiences of other organisations
- The chance to meet up with other service providers and learn from their experiences
- To hear what colleagues are doing and sharing info, as we are all doing same job but different parts of country
- I got the learn about health promotion practices and experiences of other people in the sector, which will enhance my work

4. Learning: SPECIFIC ISSUES (n=25, selected quotes)

- A greater understanding of HIV the police deal with HIV prosecutions & renewed energy for work in the sector.
- Discussion around treatment as prevention
- Learning about PREP.
- The issues around BME MSM and the great work being done

- Increasing my knowledge surrounding children and adolescents with HIV
- 5. Understanding the wider context of my work (n=15)**
- It broadens my horizon in terms of health promotion interventions
 - New perspectives
 - The sessions that I attended were very relevant to BME health promotion and I am working at the moment and I learnt a great deal.
 - Understanding the wider context of my work and appreciating the challenges of working with MSM outside of the Metropolis.
 - Via engagement with others over my own work in gay men's health promotion, namely how what I do can be adapted to work within other projects
- 6. Affirmation of current practices/approaches (n=8)**
- Reinforced the value of my work
 - Update our best practise
 - Gained reassurance on my own working practice
- 7. Inspiration (n=8)**
- Being inspired by so many people and learning new things
 - I feel inspired in my work & my understanding has broadened and deepened - inspiration, confirmation, information. Hearing the voices of both young people and people not afraid to critically evaluate.
- 8. Personal development (n=2)**
- Keeping my thoughts on the work fresh and myself inspired to try new things and build on past experience, being open to innovation and new ways of working.
 - My skills gaps and new ideas and challenging myself
- 9. Other reasons (n=9)**
- Not a lot. Very disappointing
 - I brought the queer concept forward

Q16. What other comments do you have about C12 or this evaluation?

134 delegates (55%) provided further comments, which are grouped into the following themes:

1. GENERAL: POSITIVE (n=47) for example

- Brighton was a great venue to host event
- It was an excellent way of picking up new information as well as networking!
- More thought provoking this year people seemed more open to debate and less to derision
- This year was by far the best yet as far as diverse content. Lots of new ways to get the message across. Superb, I came back from the conference charged, and enthused looking forward to developing new strategies. Thanks so much for a great conference.
- The content of the programme was well balanced. venue was great and well done for putting it all together.

2. GENERAL: NEGATIVE (n=18) for example

- Disappointing that "community testing" was full. Satellite session was cancelled and the one I attended was poor.
- It was a THT show case - too many THT dominated - would be ok if they had more to say. They may be the biggest agency but surely there is some interesting research and examples of good practice from other agencies here and abroad.
- Mostly same old things. Learnt not much changes.
- Disappointed not to have more display stands. It has been a great benefit in the past to see initiatives from other areas displayed in lobby areas.
- Highlighted issues but little chance during sessions to build on and discuss them.

3. ORGANISATION: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE (n=27) for example

- As I experiences attending other conferences I think it is always better to have the biggest day first due to lower concentration and interest level at the second day.
- It would have been nice to have more of a collaboration with treatment providers as well, alongside workshops more focussed along the lines of outreach advertising health training etc.
- Make sure there are enough seats in each venue.
- Pre conference website went up far too late. Organisation & venue was excellent.
- It would have helped if some presentations could have been offered twice.

4. PROGRAMME: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE (n=3)

- Allow more diversity & selection of organisations presenting (not just CHAPS)
- An attempt to bring in learning or examples of successful intervention could be explored that target BME (examples beyond Europe)
- Please have sessions on racism on the scene and impact on health and body facism and those who do not conform, the mental implications.

5. SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON VENUE (n=14)

- The venue was too small especially the workshop rooms. Not at all suitable for group work on which time was an over-reliance.
- Venue - not as well planned as previous years. Evening entertainment very poor student night at a straight venue? Please!
- Workshop rooms too small and hot. The same people to talk to every year.
- Accommodation on ground floor cramped, limited networking opportunity - enjoyed food though.

6. SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON SESSIONS (n=16)

- I'd like some greater thematic direction.
- I was very disappointed with session 3 Wednesday - this was billed as a workshop specifically in my area of work however it was played out as a themed session on the young leaders project - something already covered in another session.
- Marvellous opening plenary speech by Ford, uplifting and sent a clear message on the future of prevention work.
- Some seminars came across as a rehearsal of journal papers or extracts from PhDs - one was about discussing the research that someone WOULD be doing in the future rather than based on research that was already done.

7. OTHER COMMENTS (n=9)

- I was angry and embarrassed about an unprovoked outburst by Nick Partridge (THT) in the 1st session I attended (fatigue and complacency). He came across an arrogant and totally out of context and then left before anyone could discuss with him. Luckily the panel in that session reacted professionally. I feel Mr Partridge must be told that his comments were uncalled for in the context of that session. Bad manners. Thank you.
- The evaluation form is too long.
- The evaluation questionnaire does not reflect the many changes made to the programme.