

## **C14: Before & after evaluation**

### **14<sup>th</sup> National CHAPS conference Manchester 9<sup>th</sup> & 10<sup>th</sup> March 2011**

---



#### **SUMMARY**

- 67% of C14 delegates completed the evaluation and are included here.
- The majority of C14 delegates were health promoters working in England. 31% had never attended a CHAPS conference before, while 39% had attended four or more of the previous conferences.
- The geographical spread of delegates changed compared with C13 with more delegates identifying their area of work as being UK-wide or all England. Also more delegates attended from the East Midlands region and South East Coast.
- 95% of delegates agreed that the organisation of the conference was good, the highest figure in the last five years.
- 81% agreed that the range of themes in the conference was good. This figure was slightly higher than C11, C12 & C13.
- 68% of delegates said their personal aspirations for the conference had been met "mostly" or "completely" an increase on C10, C11 and C13.
- 79% agreed that they had learnt something new.
- 65% agreed they had been inspired to try new working practices, the highest figure in the last five years.
- 65% agreed that they had increased their ability to think critically about their work. This figure was similar to previous years.
- 94% agreed they would recommend the CHAPS conference to other people.
- 74% agreed that they CHAPS conference is 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, after the event.

Evaluation forms contained a delegate number. After the conference 77 paper questionnaires had been returned to Sigma Research. Those 216 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 216 delegates and invited them to complete the questionnaire ONLINE in the 2 weeks following. They were reminded of the potential to do so four days after the conference with a subsequent reminder a week later. A further 120 delegates completed the questionnaire online 1-3 weeks after the conference.

<b>RETURNS</b>	<b>C10</b>	<b>C11</b>	<b>C12</b>	<b>C13</b>	<b>C14</b>
Registered delegates	397	344	350	370	308
Registered and attended	380	324	323	Not known	283
Attendance rate	96%	94%	92%	Not known	92%
Not registered but attended	17	9	15	Not known	10
<b>Total delegates</b>	397	333	338	Not known	293
<b>Survey returns</b>	266	244	246	205	<b>197</b>
<b>Response rate</b>	67%	71%	70%	55%	<b>67%</b>

- **The number of delegate registrations (318) was lower than C10, C11, C12 & C13.**

**Q1. Indicate your strongest reasons for attending C14**

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

Reasons for attending C14 (n=130, missing 67)	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Mean score	Rank
To learn new things	2	1	2	1	1.42	<b>1</b>
I've benefited from previous conferences	1	3	4	3	1.14	<b>2</b>
To meet people working in a similar field	3	2	1	2	.97	<b>3</b>
Provides a platform for my work	5	5	3	4	.82	<b>4</b>
It's Britain's only gay & bisexual men's HIV conference	4	4	5	5	.77	<b>5</b>
It's in Manchester [this town]	6	10	10	7	.22	<b>6</b>
To feel less isolated in my work	8	8	8	6	.18	<b>7</b>
Other	--	--	11	7	.14	<b>8</b>
It is free	7	6	6	7	.12	<b>9</b>
My manager insist I attend	10	7	7	11	.09	<b>10</b>
To meet up with people I've not seen for a while	9	9	9	10	.09	<b>10</b>

- **The most common reason for attending C14 was to learn new things. This reason for attendance has been consistently important across 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)?**

(30% of all respondents did not answer this question at all.)

<b>Hopes for C14 attendance</b> (n=138, missing 59)	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
<b>Gain more knowledge (general learning)</b>	27	<b>28</b>
<b>Networking</b>	17	<b>17</b>
<b>New ideas / inspiration</b>	17	<b>15</b>
<b>Improve my work with gay men</b>	8	<b>9</b>
<b>Research findings</b>	4	<b>6</b>
<b>Raise profile of my organisation / present results of my work</b>	1	<b>2</b>
<b>Best (good) practice</b>	10	<b>3</b>
<b>Understanding other agencies / projects</b>	5	<b>2</b>
<b>(Learn about) specific topics</b>	5	<b>7</b>
<b>Policy issues and developments</b>	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Other answers</b>	5	<b>9</b>

The vast majority of delegates gave one of the top three main hopes, aspirations or reasons for attendance at C14:

- [1] Gain more knowledge (general learning)**
- [2] Networking**
- [3] New Ideas / inspiration**

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

<b>Q3a: I would have liked more information about the conference before arriving</b> (n=193, missing 4 )	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	40	47	<b>53</b>
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	29	29	<b>35</b>
<b>Agree</b>	31	24	<b>12</b>

<b>Q3b: I would liked more opportunity to influence the content to the conference (n=194, missing 3 )</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	35	34	<b>37</b>
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	46	49	<b>47</b>
<b>Agree</b>	19	17	<b>16</b>

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

27 out of 27 answered (themes below with numbers in category and selected quotes).

**[1] To inform abstract or talk selection, including selection process (15), for example:**

- Elective sessions that we could vote on.
- Email before programme is finalised, listen to partnership agencies suggestions.
- I would like to be on the selection panel for abstracts (again).
- Perhaps by being sent a questionnaire beforehand with some topics to choose from, but overall there was a wide selection available and it was possible to choose one of interest at every session.

**[2] Talk content / format (2):**

- Elective sessions that we could vote on.
- Not necessarily content but order of sessions as I missed some things running at same time e-mail preferences of what to attend.

**[3] Other suggestions (10), for example:**

- Consultation to begin once evaluation available from last conference.
- Key aims & objectives.
- Online.
- Website Q&A.
- To be asked what sort of issues were coming up for my clients and to be able to compare ideas at the conference.

## 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.**

<b>C14 session name</b>	<b>Number of delegates</b>	<b>Mean rating</b>
<b>WEDNESDAY AM: Pre-conference SATELLITE sessions</b>		
NAHIP and CHAPS	<b>9</b>	3.33
The National LGB&T Partnership	<b>26</b>	<b>4.08</b>
The changing face of CHAPS campaigns 1997-2011	<b>22</b>	3.95
Introduction to CHAPS	<b>14</b>	3.43
<b>OPENING PLENARY, 13.30 -14.30</b>	<b>142</b>	3.08
<b>WEDNESDAY, 14.30-15.45                      Session 1</b>		
Work with prisons	<b>24</b>	3.96
Advice services for PLHIV	<b>19</b>	3.74
HIV prevention with the over 50s	<b>30</b>	<b>4.17</b>
Asian MSM	<b>17</b>	<b>4.00</b>
Sexual health services in the community	<b>57</b>	3.47
Online initiatives	<b>41</b>	<b>4.15</b>
<b>WEDNESDAY, 16.15-17.30                      Session 2</b>		
The role of fear in HIV prevention	<b>72</b>	3.86
Re-engaging the community	<b>34</b>	3.91
SLHP model of HIV prevention	<b>15</b>	<b>4.20</b>
European MSM Internet Sex Survey (EMIS)	<b>27</b>	3.67
Treatment as prevention	<b>43</b>	<b>4.37</b>
<i>Room free for networking</i>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.67</b>
<b>DAY ONE CLOSING PLENARY, 17.35 -18.00</b>	<b>116</b>	3.84

<b>C14 session name</b>	<b>Number of delegates</b>	<b>Mean rating</b>
<b>THURSDAY, 10.00-11.15                      Session 3</b>		
Targeted working	<b>21</b>	3.67
Transmen	<b>21</b>	<b>4.48</b>
Sex workers	<b>44</b>	3.91
Blood donation	<b>19</b>	<b>4.05</b>
Partner numbers and patterns	<b>54</b>	3.98
<i>Room free for networking</i>	<b>8</b>	3.75
<b>THURSDAY, 11.45-13.00                      Session 4</b>		
Undiagnosed infection	<b>35</b>	<b>4.09</b>
National LGB drugs and alcohol database	<b>18</b>	3.44
The role of fear in HIV prevention ( <i>repeat</i> )	<b>21</b>	<b>4.14</b>
Sexual orientation monitoring	<b>13</b>	3.31
EMIS – Differences in STI testing	<b>11</b>	3.18
The changing sexual behaviours of MSM	<b>70</b>	3.04
<b>THURSDAY, 14.00 -15.15                      Session 5</b>		
Measuring outcomes	<b>32</b>	3.69
Treatment as prevention ( <i>repeat</i> )	<b>11</b>	<b>4.27</b>
Just gay men?	<b>15</b>	<u>3.00</u>
Condom & lube distribution	<b>17</b>	3.35
Pornography and gay men's attitudes towards sex, risk and pleasure	<b>52</b>	3.37
Telling partners about HIV status	<b>36</b>	3.72
<b>THURSDAY, 15.30 -16.45                      Session 6</b>		
Re-engaging the community ( <i>repeat</i> )	<b>17</b>	3.76
HIV and ageing	<b>26</b>	<b>4.15</b>
Young people and homophobia	<b>23</b>	3.96
Crystal Meth	<b>20</b>	<b>4.15</b>
Testing times	<b>37</b>	3.57
<i>Room free for networking</i>	<b>10</b>	3.40
<b>CLOSING PLENARY, 16.45 -17.30</b>	<b>79</b>	3.34

Across all sessions the average (mean) rating was 3.78. The average (mean) rating for the sessions ranged from (3.00) to (4.67). Of the 43 distinct sessions 14 (30%) were rated at 4/5 or above (mean score in **bold**). Just 1 session was rated at 3/5 or below (mean score underlined).

## AFTER THE CONFERENCE

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

<b>Q5a: The organisation of the conference was good</b> (n=195, missing 2)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Agree	94	92	77	81	<b>95</b>
Neither agree nor disagree	4	5	14	12	<b>3</b>
Disagree	2	3	9	7	<b>2</b>

- **The number of respondents who agreed that the organisation of the conference was good was the highest during the last 5 years .**

**[if Disagree: Why do you say that?]**

of the respondents that disagreed said why:

**[1] Quality of venue (1), for example:**

- Food vegetarian!! Space to eat

**[2] General conference organisation (3), for example:**

- Started late and closing plenary on first day was running late.
- More interactive sessions rather than all presentations.
- Information was too slow coming out prior to conference, only received days before hand which does not help in selling this for management approval. The actual conference was well managed during the two days.

<b>Q5b: The range of themes in the conference was good</b> (n=194, missing 3)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Agree	82	78	65	75	<b>81</b>
Neither agree nor disagree	13	18	24	15	<b>13</b>
Disagree	5	4	11	10	<b>6</b>

- **The number of people who felt that the range of themes in this year's conference was good was higher than C11, C12 & C13.**

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

11 of the 11 respondents that disagreed said why (all quotes below):

- I felt that commissioning would have been useful in this context. Interesting that opening speaker had to ask the audience not to demonise commissioners with new



emerging health reforms!! I have never experienced a conference like this...the majority of delegates /speakers etc were friendly and welcoming, However, there was an element within this where I left to feel not welcomed and not comfortable in sharing a view or openly networking (especially in the breaks). It's a shame... as I benefited by attending, but was disappointed that the very prejudices and alienation that gay/bisexual/ trans sexual people often shout about was at this event. It should never be about gender or sexual orientation, but as female heterosexual, I felt there were those who felt I shouldn't be there?

- Dissent
- Mental health content
- Mental health issues in PLHIV / MSM
- Should have liked more research presented rather than so much issue related discussions
- I would like to have seen more on community based working, PSE sites and saunas
- Young people.
- Some of the presentations were only done once so missed ones I wanted to do.
- Co infection. More linkages between drug use and HIV
- Whoever lumped Treatment as Prevention and PrEP & Microbicides onto the one session made a poor judgement call. Surely with the results of Caprisa and iPrEx in the last year they could have had their own session. Clumping everything under ARV based prevention is not helpful.
- More BME presentations

<b>Q5c: The conference venue was accessible and comfortable</b> (n=195, missing 2)	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Agree	77	43	<b>85</b>
Neither agree nor disagree	9	23	<b>7</b>
Disagree	14	34	<b>8</b>

- **The proportion of delegates that agreed the conference venue was accessible and comfortable was higher than ever before.**

<b>Q5d: I'd recommend the CHAPS conference to other people concerned with health promotion with gay &amp; bisexual men</b> (n=195, missing 2)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Agree	94	94	92	91	<b>94</b>
Neither agree nor disagree	5	4	6	7	<b>5</b>
Disagree	2	2	2	2	<b>1</b>

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

<b>Q5e: The CHAPS conference is now a key event in my calendar</b> (n=193, missing 4)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Agree	72	72	73	74	<b>74</b>
Neither agree nor disagree	24	24	21	20	<b>21</b>
Disagree	4	4	6	6	<b>5</b>

- **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?**

<b>Q6a: I learnt things that were new to me</b> (n=194, missing 3)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Agree	81	80	80	73	<b>79</b>
Neither agree nor disagree	15	13	14	18	<b>17</b>
Disagree	4	7	6	9	<b>4</b>

<b>Q6b: I have increased my ability to think critically about my own work</b> (n=194, missing 3)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Agree	62	62	63	66	<b>65</b>
Neither agree nor disagree	32	30	29	26	<b>27</b>
Disagree	6	8	8	8	<b>8</b>

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

<b>Q8c: I have been inspired to try new work practices</b> (n=193, missing 4)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Agree	59	51	62	55	<b>65</b>
Neither agree nor disagree	32	40	28	33	<b>31</b>
Disagree	9	9	10	12	<b>4</b>

- **The proportion of delegates inspired to try new working practices has risen compared to C10, C11, C12 & C13.**

<b>Q8d: I have a better understanding of the needs of my role in the gay and bisexual men's health sector</b> (n=193, missing 4)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Agree	42	44	51	48	<b>49</b>
Neither agree nor disagree	47	46	36	38	<b>38</b>
Disagree	10	10	13	14	<b>12</b>

- **The proportion of delegates gaining insight into the needs of their role has decreased slightly compared to C12, but is higher than in C10 & C11.**

## **ABOUT DELEGATES**

<b>Q9: Job roles [not exclusive]</b> (n=169, missing 28)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Health promoter	71	71	74	70	<b>66</b>
Counsellor / therapist	--	18	17	9	<b>13</b>
Researcher	19	13	16	16	<b>18</b>
GUM provider	8	11	12	6	<b>9</b>
Commissioners	4	3	3	6	<b>3</b>
Policy Officer / maker	10	11	11	10	<b>11</b>
News media	4	5	5	8	<b>4</b>
Other	25	23	15	23	<b>21</b>

- **Among C14 delegates, job roles of delegates were broadly similar to those for previous conferences. Although there were slightly less Health Promoters compared with previous years.**

38 specified other roles including:

Activist  
Administration  
Trainer  
Team leader / Manager  
Group worker  
Psychiatric nurse

Social work  
Advocacy and Support  
Youth Work  
Volunteer  
Epidemiologist  
Service provider

<b>Q10: Areas where delegates worked</b> (n=178, missing 19)	<b>No. C14</b>	<b>% C14</b>
UK-wide	8	4.5
All England	7	4.0
East of England	4	2.3
East Midlands	11	6.2
London	55	31.1
North East	1	.6
North West	17	9.6
South Central	4	2.3
South East Coast	10	5.6
South West	7	4.0
West Midlands	11	6.2
Yorkshire & Humber	9	5.1
Wales	1	.6
All Scotland	8	4.5
Outside UK	24	13.6

**Delegates listed as 'outside UK' comprised: Sweden (6), Republic of Ireland (1), Ireland (2), Denmark (3), Germany (3), Norway (5), Switzerland (1) Belgium (2) & "International" (1).**

- **31% of C14 delegates worked in London.**

<b>Q11: How did you hear about C14?</b> [not exclusive] (n=197, missing 0)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
previous attendee	61	62	53	74	<b>64</b>
direct mailing	32	26	22	36	<b>25</b>
through a colleague	28	30	28	42	<b>32</b>
other	5	6	6	8	<b>8</b>

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

<b>Q12: How many previous CHAPS conferences have you been to?</b> (n=194, missing 3)	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
None	33	31	<b>31</b>
One	12	14	<b>12</b>
2 or 3	20	16	<b>17</b>
4 or 5	17	17	<b>15</b>
6 or 7	9	8	<b>10</b>
8 or more	9	13	<b>14</b>

- **A third (31%) of C14 delegates had never been to a CHAPS conference before; similar to C12 and C13.**

<b>Q13: Do you think you will attend C15 in the future</b> (n=194, missing 3)	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Yes	74	<b>76</b>
Not sure	24	<b>22</b>
No	2	<b>2</b>

- **Three quarters (76%) of C14 delegates intend to attend C15, a similar proportion to last year.**

<b>Q14: Were your self-defined aims (question 2) for the conference met?</b> (n=147, missing 50)	<b>% C10</b>	<b>% C11</b>	<b>% C12</b>	<b>% C13</b>	<b>% C14</b>
Not at all	1	2	1	3	<b>0</b>
A little	14	13	8	15	<b>12</b>
Somewhat	23	23	23	23	<b>20</b>
Mostly	52	51	52	43	<b>50</b>
Completely	10	11	16	16	<b>18</b>

- **Over two thirds of delegates achieved their self-defined aims for attendance “mostly” (50%) or “completely” (18%). This proportion was higher than C10, C11 & C13.**

**Q15. Please complete the following sentence in fewer than twenty words:**

***The main way in which I benefitted from this conference was...***

151 delegates (77%) provided further comments, which have been grouped into the following themes.

**1. Learning: GENERAL (n=39, selected quotes)**

- By raising my awareness of HIV prevention in a range of different areas / settings.
- Give me a snapshot of what is going on in the field.
- Increased knowledge on a variety of topics, and some clear messages about moving on in practice.
- That I got knowledge about areas I had none in.
- Updating HIV information and statistics.

**2. Meeting others: networking (n=32, selected quotes)**

- Building relationships with others that I can use to further my work in the future.
- Maintenance of existing contacts.
- Networking and gathering various opinions on key issues.
- Networking with other organisations and sharing ideas.
- To meet new and old friends and talk about what is happening.

**3. Sharing of ideas, expertise and points of view (n=32)**

- Chance to hear and learn from what is going on in HIV prevention in other European countries.
- Initial and ongoing conversations to foster greater synergy and complimentary work in delivering sexual health and HIV prevention work.
- Listening to what others has found works in their fields, and sharing good practice.
- Raising awareness by facilitating a workshop, networking and learning from others.
- The conversation with the other delegates, to see how you are working with MSM in UK...

**4. Learning: SPECIFIC ISSUES (n=13, selected quotes)**

- Gaining a better understanding of developments in treatment and prevention.
- The discussions about aging and HIV.
- Understanding Making It Count better- and promoting the information of Best Sex Least Harm in my work.
- Encouragement to think about partner numbers & the challenging debate this will bring.
- By finding out why men don't get tested and what I can do to try and change this.

**5. Understanding the wider context of my work (n=2)**

- Seeing different ways of working & contrasting provision in my own area.
- Reflection of my own work, meet colleagues, beautiful men, affirmation of what I am doing as a health promotion officer.

**6. Affirmation of current practices/approaches (n=11)**

- By learning about new research and other information which provide evidence to support practice.

- Learning about good practices and innovative projects
- Shared experience of good practice.
- Sharing best practice and networking.
- reaffirmed my decision to leave my last job and do something different.

#### **7. Inspiration (n=4)**

- I was inspired to try some creative new ways to engage gay and bisexual men.
- That it gave me new inspirations and ideas & confirmed my own ideas in other areas. Really useful.
- attending the conference helps me think outside the box and broaden my delivery.
- Refuelling interest and commitment in gay men's HIV prevention work.

#### **8. Personal development (n=5)**

- Helped me think about issues
- Not to be blinkered, treat everyone the same.
- That I learned how to communicate with LGBT and to understand there feelings and needs.

#### **9. Other reasons (n=13)**

- Helped me think about issues.
- Sharing information and update person knowledge.

### **Q16. What other comments do you have about C13 or this evaluation?**

98 delegates (50%) provided further comments, which are grouped into the following themes:

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

- Great experience, and engaging more with BME communities as it appeared there weren't many present.
- I generally enjoyed the conference and it's a great place to meet new people.
- I thought it was the best one yet!
- One of the best CHAPS conferences I've been too. A significant improvement on last year.
- The conference was amazing, beautiful people all working together to look after the LGBT community and those living and affected by HIV. Keep up the great work.

#### **2. GENERAL: NEGATIVE (n=6) for example**

- As a new person I found it very difficult as everyone knew each other.
- Felt like the same old people talking the same old talk whilst ignoring the advances that have been made in biomedical interventions. Hardly surprising though!
- I have now been to three conferences and always feel that although very positive and offer good content seem to miss some of the issues facing a rural lgb population and those who are not part of the gay scene
- I think it lacked opportunities for people to interact with each other both within the sessions and on a social basis.

### **3. ORGANISATION: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE (n=?\*?) for example**

- I thought when we were given the flash stick that it contained all the Power Points from the conference, and at the time I remember thinking what a fantastic idea! on a few occasions there were more than one workshop I wanted to do, so I thought having all the PP would at least give me the chance to see the information that was being delivered. Is it possible that we could get all PPs? Also the planning of sessions, because again on at least three occasions I was torn over which workshop would benefit me the most.
- Now that some MSM work is being done through community based sexual health services, are these staff routinely invited to CHAPS?

### **4. PROGRAMME: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE (n=4)**

- Too many people leave on day 2. Perhaps have a full days programme on day one instead.
- An earlier finish on day two. Arrange for speakers not to stand in front of the screen.
- As said mental health or self esteem keys to the doors of what we are trying to achieve. Needs more focus!
- Would have liked to have seen more break away sessions

### **5. SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON VENUE (n=12)**

- Catering provided in the Da Vinci lounge resulted in lots of noise that distracted me from the presentations as people were very noisy!
- Excellent hotel - catering / staff / accommodation - best yet.
- Food was excellent!
- It was a good venue and I liked the food and service.
- The venue was great, and I have now put on about a stone as you fed us so well.....cheers!

### **6. SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON SESSIONS (n=19)**

- Be more inclusive of trans men repeat sessions, keynote speaker
- Good conf, but less LGBT youth workshops than last year which was a shame
- I would like to see more interaction.
- The opening plenary was very poor and did not think it was fitting to open CHAPS.
- It would be better if it was less - London based for seminars- i found some of the information very London -centric which was not really of benefit to me.
- It would've been great for C14 to have a wider range of presentations, instead of having repeats. C14 didn't feel representative of the gay community, at least in regards to ethnicity.
- Most sessions I attended alluded to the importance of mental health and its effects on PLHIV and MSM, however it was unfortunate that despite this general acknowledgement and the astute observations made in the Day One closing plenary, there were no satellite sessions specifically addressing this issue.

### **7. OTHER COMMENTS (n=9)**

- A coordinated, organised evening event would've been beneficial.
- Do we need this partnership in the UK?
- Scotland?



- It was upsetting to hear of all the cuts and how it will affect all of us
- At the drinks reception no soft drinks were provided only alcohol.

[ENDS]

[gary.hammond@sigmaresearch.org.uk](mailto:gary.hammond@sigmaresearch.org.uk)

17<sup>th</sup> May 2011