

C13: before & after evaluation 13th national CHAPS conference



Sheffield 2rd & 3rd March 2010

SUMMARY

- 55% of delegates completed the evaluation and are included here.
- The majority of delegates at C13 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 12 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.
- 81% of delegates agreed that the organisation of the conference was good, a figure slightly higher than previous years.
- 75% of delegates agreed that the range of themes at the conference was good, a figure somewhat higher than previous years.
- 59% of delegates said their personal aspirations for the conference had been met 'mostly' or 'completely' – a slight decrease on the previous three years.
- 73% agreed they had learnt something new.
- 66% agreed they had increased their ability to think critically about their own work.
- 55% agreed they had been inspired to try new working practices, a smaller proportion than the previous conference.
- 91% of the delegates would recommend the CHAPS conference to others.
- 74% of the delegates agreed that the CHAPS conference was a key event in their calendar.
- The vast majority of delegates felt the annual conference should continue to be held in March rather than any other time of year (84%).
- The vast majority of respondents felt the length of the conference was "about right" (82%). Of the remainder more felt it was "too long" than "too short".

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.

NO evaluation forms contained a delegate number. One week after the conference 120 paper questionnaires had been returned to Sigma Research, of these 89 delegates had written their delegate numbers on the questionnaire. Those 250 delegates that had not returned their evaluation form were identified (when possible) by Sigma Research from their delegate number, and these numbers were passed to THT. THT then emailed 271 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 85 delegates completed the questionnaire online 1-3 weeks after the conference.

RETURNS	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13
Registered delegates	372	397	344	350	370
Registered and attended	349	380	324	323	Not known
Attendance rate	94%	96%	94%	92%	Not known
Not registered but attended	6	17	9	15	Not known
Total delegates	355	397	333	338	Not known
Survey returns	173	266	244	246	205
Response rate*	47%	67%	71%	70%	55%

*** PLEASE NOTE:** Due to not having access to actual attendance figures for C13 we are unable to provide a comparison to previous years based on actual attendance rate. We have revised the response rates to reflect **registered** delegates rather than **total number of delegates attending**.

- **The number of delegate registrations (370) was higher than C11 & C12 but lower than C9 & C10.**

Q1. Indicate your strongest reasons for attending C13

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

Reasons for attending C12 (n=161, missing 44)	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Mean score	Rank
To learn new things	1	2	1	2	1.31	1
To meet people working in a similar field	2	3	2	1	1.14	2
I've benefited from previous conferences	3	1	3	4	1.10	3
Provides a platform for my work	4	5	5	3	.83	4
It's Britain's only gay & bisexual men's HIV conference	5	4	4	5	.76	5
To feel less isolated in my work	6	8	8	8	.16	6
It's in Sheffield [this town]	9	6	10	10	.14	7
It's free	7	7	6	6	.17	7
Other	--	--	--	11	.14	7
To meet up with people I've not seen for a while	10	9	9	9	.09	10
My manager insisted I attend	8	10	7	7	.08	11

- **The most common reason for attending C13 was "to learn new things". This reason for attendance has been consistently, (1st and 2nd) 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)?

51 (25%) of all respondents did not answer this question at all.

Hopes for C13 attendance (n=154, missing 51)	% C12	% C13
Gain more knowledge (general learning)	37	27
Networking	21	17
New ideas / inspiration	19	17
Improve my work with gay men	9	8
Research findings	2	4
Raise profile of my organisation / present results of my work	2	1
Best (good) practice	2	10
Understanding other agencies / projects	1	5
(Learn about) specific topics	1	5
Policy issues and developments	1	1
Other answers	5	5

The vast majority of delegates gave one of the top three main hopes, aspirations or reasons for attendance at C13:

- [1] to gain more 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=201, missing 4)	% C11	% C12	% C13
Disagree	36	40	47
Neither agree nor disagree	28	29	29
Agree	36	31	24

Q3b: I would liked more opportunity to influence the content to the conference (n=197, missing 8)	% C11	% C12	% C13
Disagree	30	35	34
Neither agree nor disagree	56	46	49
Agree	14	19	17

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

28 out of 33 answered (themes below with numbers in category and selected quotes).

[1] To inform abstract or talk selection, including selection process (17), for example:

- Pre conference survey of topic areas
- Ask for key topics desired in advance of abstract submission
- It would have been good to be able to suggest themes.
- I submitted an abstract, not even a NO was the answer

[2] Talk content / format (3):

- I would have like to have suggested other formats for the sessions - for instance, there could have been a session where people were explicitly asked about their research, experience with interventions, etc
- Knowing /deciding/ helping with workshops. I will be in touch for C14
- Longer sessions but less of them

[3] Other suggestions (8), for example:

- There were some bad / misleading sessions. Some very good ones too though.
- As I run a project that targets certain vulnerable groups such as Trans people and sex workers I could have been invited on a steering group to ensure that these groups were better represented
- By email

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.

C13 session name	Number of delegates	Mean rating
TUESDAY AM: Pre-conference satellite sessions		
Point of Care HIV/STI community screening	16	4.13
Mental health and wellbeing of BME LGB people	14	3.71
Let's talk about sex	12	4.25
Improving access to primary care for LGB	18	3.94
Influencing locally: GMSS data and SHout Loud	9	3.33
Making it Count briefing session	12	4.17
OPENING PLENARY, 13.30 – 14.30	153	3.42
TUESDAY, 14.30 – 15.45 Session 1		
Sexual and broader health needs of HIV+ men	36	3.58
Innovative ways of providing counselling & support services for young gay men	20	3.10
Outside in – sexual health services in prison	18	4.06
Urban/rural isolation	32	3.31
HIV testing in the noughties- <i>panel debate</i>	40	3.40
Crystal Meth and GBL: new trends in drug use	37	3.73
TUESDAY, 16.15 – 17.30 Session 2		
Sauna based screening	32	3.56
Positive speakers – <i>workshop</i>	21	4.19
Does gender matter? – <i>panel debate</i>	35	4.06
Inclusive or exclusive?	31	3.61
What is Making it Count Four?	17	3.53
National and local - what are the big issues?	42	3.55
Tuesday, 17.30 - 18:30 CLOSING PLENARY	145	<u>2.86</u>

C12 session name	Number of delegates	Mean rating
WEDNESDAY, 10.00 -11.15 Session 3		
The business of prevention: on-and-offline	22	3.64
Stigma and responsibility – <i>workshop</i>	27	4.15
Gay switchboards & Online mentoring - <i>workshop</i>	14	3.50
'Doctor I have something to tell you'	26	4.27
LGV/Hep C and emerging STIs	41	4.00
Gay men, ageing and HIV	39	4.18
WEDNESDAY, 11.45 -13.00 Session 4		
Current campaigns and cyber democracy	30	3.77
Sero-awareness? Re-imagining risk	36	3.25
Positive prevention – <i>workshop</i>	17	3.94
Adapting the health trainer model	24	4.00
Time to test: Increasing access to HIV testing	39	3.97
Addressing homophobia to promote well-being	24	3.54
WEDNESDAY, 14.00 -15.15 Session 5		
Telephone coaching for the 'isolated' – <i>workshop</i>	7	4.43
HIV stigma – <i>panel debate</i>	58	3.81
HIV testing in the noughties– (<i>REPEAT session</i>)	13	3.92
Recently acquired HIV infections	30	3.67
Twink to Bear – body image and mental health	37	3.70
Future of CHAPS	28	3.57
WEDNESDAY, 15.30 -16.45 Session 6		
1980s revisited?– <i>panel debate</i>	51	3.67
Sexual health needs of HIV+ men (<i>REPEATED</i>)	20	4.00
Sexual exploitation of young gay men – <i>workshop</i>	19	3.37
Evaluating our health promotion efforts	26	3.50
National and local (<i>REPEAT session</i>)	19	3.26
CLOSING PLENARY, 16.45 -17.30	86	3.15

Across all sessions the average (mean) rating was 3.72. The average (mean) rating for the sessions ranged from 2.86 (Closing Plenary, Tuesday) to 4.43 (Telephone coaching for the "isolated" workshop). Of the 42 distinct sessions 13 (31%) 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 feel that the conference was...

Q5. The conference was... (n=199, missing 6)	% C13
Too long	11
Too short	7
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 long" than "too short".**

Q6. The conference takes place every year in March. In future, do you feel that the conference should take place at a different time of year?

Q6. The conference takes place every year in March. In future, do you feel that the conference should ... (n=193, missing 12)	% C13
It should stay when it is	84
Would prefer it to be held in	16

- **The vast majority of respondents felt the CHAPS conference should continue to be held in March. Of the remainder, those who felt it should be changed felt it should be held in: April (1), May (10), June (2), July (2), Aug (1), Sept (6), Oct (2).**

A further 7 identified the following months: Oct – Sept (3), Summer (2), Autumn (1) & April – June (1).

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

Q7a: The organisation of the conference was good (n=200, missing 5)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Agree	92	94	92	77	81
Neither agree nor disagree	7	4	5	14	12
Disagree	1	2	3	9	7

- **The number of respondents who agreed that the organisation of the conference was good was higher than C12 but lower than C9, C10 & C11.**

[if Disagree: Why do you say that?]

11 of the 13 respondents that disagreed said why:

[1] Quality of venue (5), for example:

Venue not up to standard - noisy rooms.

Bad venue.

Poor venue, no space between workshop times.

Disability, vegetarian I'm both and was not catered for.

[2] General conference organisation (6), for example:

There was no information about the need to sign up to workshops prior to attending them.

Worst one I have attended.

Too much emailing of overlapping similar conference info.

Sessions oversubscribed / workshop sign up.

Q7b: The range of themes in the conference was good (n=199, missing 6)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Agree	84	82	78	65	75
Neither agree nor disagree	11	13	18	24	15
Disagree	4	5	4	11	10

- **The number of people who felt that the range of themes in this year's conference was good was lower than C9, C10 & C11 but higher than C12.**

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

19 of the 21 respondents that disagreed said why (all quotes below):

Focus on commissioning how it works, best practice

BME (including immigrant communities) was severely lacking. Also information on non mainstream MSM LGBT would have been good

Many repeat sessions

Commissioning indicators and tool kit guidance

Innovative projects

More training type workshops, more debate and challenge, less basking in past glories

More general awareness of HIV

Lack of trans (specifically trans men) issues- could have been given a greater platform.

More on substance misuse as I feel that it was somewhat overlooked.

Criminalisation / diversity

Barebacking

Little of interest.

More useful info on how to do prevention work... best practice, and some new information

The content of the closing plenary session of the first day was disgraceful. I don't come to a conference like CHAPS to be subjected to a party political broadcast by any political party. Whoever organised this session should be sacked. A complete lack of political balance.

Very little mention of sex workers

With money tight and the fact that men who have sex with men are switched on and generally online there was very little to do in the conference relating to online strategies.

Where was trans? Disabled issues? Scotland?

Same content every year, always directed towards policy implementation or commissioning. People attending the conf want to pick up skills for best practice. Will more than likely be unable to justify attendance next year to line manager.

More about HIV trends and less about THT and its political agenda

Q7c: The conference venue was accessible and comfortable (n=202, missing 3)	% C12	% C13
Agree	77	43
Neither agree nor disagree	9	23
Disagree	14	34

Q7e: I'd recommend the CHAPS conference to other people concerned with health promotion with gay & bisexual men (n=200, missing 5)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Agree	93	94	94	92	91
Neither agree nor disagree	6	5	4	6	7
Disagree	1	2	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=201, missing 4)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Agree	67	72	72	73	74
Neither agree nor disagree	26	24	24	21	20
Disagree	5	4	4	6	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=201, missing 4)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Agree	79	81	80	80	73
Neither agree nor disagree	16	15	13	14	18
Disagree	5	4	7	6	9

- A slightly smaller proportion of delegates compared to previous years, felt they had learnt something new.

Q8b: I have increased my ability to think critically about my own work (n=201, missing 4)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Agree	65	62	62	63	66
Neither agree nor disagree	28	32	30	29	26
Disagree	7	6	8	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=201, missing 4)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Agree	68	59	51	62	55
Neither agree nor disagree	24	32	40	28	33
Disagree	9	9	9	10	12

- The proportion of delegates inspired to try new working practices has risen from C11, but is slightly lower compared to C9, C10 & C12.

Q8d: I have a better understanding of the needs of my role in the gay and bisexual men's health sector (n=201, missing 4)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Agree	49	42	44	51	48
Neither agree nor disagree	44	47	46	36	38
Disagree	7	10	10	13	14

- 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

Q9: Job roles [not exclusive] (n=203, missing 2)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Health promoter	71	71	71	74	70
Counsellor / therapist	--	--	18	17	9
Researcher	11	19	13	16	16
GUM provider	12	8	11	12	6
Commissioners	5	4	3	3	6
Policy Officer / maker	-	10	11	11	10
News media	2	4	5	5	8
Other	23	25	23	15	23

- **Among C13 delegates, job roles of delegates were broadly similar to those for previous conferences. Although there were less Counsellor /Therapists at C13 compared to C11 & C12.**

36 specified other roles including: Administration; Team leader / Manager; Group worker; Psychiatric nurse; Social work; Advocacy and Support; Youth Work.

Q10: Areas where delegates worked (n=187, missing 18)	No. C13	% C13
UK-wide	1	.5
All England	8	3.9
East of England	2	1
East Midlands	4	2
London	60	29.3
North East	2	1
North West	15	7.3
South Central	11	5.4
South East Coast	4	2
South West	6	2.9
West Midlands	15	7.3
Yorkshire & Humber	25	12.2
Northern Ireland	1	.5
All Scotland	13	6.3
Outside UK	20	10.2

Delegates listed as 'outside UK' comprised: Sweden (4), Republic of Ireland (2), Denmark (4), Germany (2), The Netherlands (3) & Norway (5).

- **30% of C13 delegates worked in London.**
- **No delegates from Wales completed the evaluation.**

Q11: How did you hear about C13? [not exclusive] (n=160, missing 45)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
previous attendee	60	61	62	53	74
direct mailing	23	32	26	22	36
through a colleague	31	28	30	28	42
other	6	5	6	6	8

- **Ways of hearing about the C13 conference were similar to previous years.**
- **More delegates heard about the conference through a colleague than in the previous four years.**

Q12: How many previous CHAPS conferences have you been to? (n=238, missing 8)	% C11	% C12	% C13
None	32	33	31
One	12	12	14
2 or 3	22	20	16
4 or 5	17	17	17
6 or 7	9	9	8
8 -11	8	9	13

- **A third (31%) of C13 delegates had never been to a CHAPS conference before; similar to C10 and C11.**

Q13: Do you think you will attend C14 in the future (n=202, missing 3)	% C12	% C13
Yes	79	74
Not sure	3	24
No	18	2

- **Three quarters (74%) of C13 delegates intend to attend C14, a similar proportion to last year.**

Q14: Were your self-defined aims (question 2) for the conference met? (n=171, missing 34)	% C9	% C10	% C11	% C12	% C13
Not at all	3	1	2	1	3
A little	12	14	13	8	15
Somewhat	30	23	23	23	23
Mostly	48	52	51	52	43
Completely	7	10	11	16	16

- **Just under two thirds of delegates achieved their self-defined aims for attendance “mostly” (43%) or “completely” (16%). This proportion was higher than C9 but lower than C10, C11 & C12.**

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

150 delegates (73%) provided further comments, which have been grouped into the following themes.

1. Learning: GENERAL (n=31, selected quotes)

- From learning new information on a variety of related issues.
- Obtaining great knowledge & initiatives in various parts of the country.
- Through greater understanding about HIV issues.
- Variety of workshops & networking.
- Identifying emerging issues in MSM HIV health promotion.

2. Meeting others: networking (n=44, selected quotes)

- By meeting and talking to colleagues.
- Feeling part of a lively radical & supportive sector. I feel less isolated & ready to agitate.
- It is always a good event to network and share info.
- Making contact with people whose resources will be a great help to my work
- Meeting and sharing real concerns with others in the field.

3. Sharing of ideas, expertise and points of view (n=20)

- By promoting the needs of HIV+ MSM as central to all our work.
- Discussing ideas in workshops with so many other like minded workers.
- I got a chance to talk to other people in the field and hear about current trends and developments.
- Seeing that other organisations face similar problems and that I'm ahead of the curve, not lagging behind.
- To learn of developing strategies in other areas than mine.

4. Learning: SPECIFIC ISSUES (n=27, selected quotes)

- I got a better understanding of the complexity in living with HIV. Stigma etc.
- I was able to see the gaps in provision for boys and young men (under 18's).
- My broader perspective on health promotion in a political environment in this case an English political environment.
- The way forward during economic restrictions & how to influence commissioners.
- In the ability to explore ideas of web interventions, strategic alignments and justification of current plans.

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

- By thinking critically about how I might commission services in future.
- More of an understanding of my role and others around me.

6. Affirmation of current practices/approaches (n=15)

- Hearing examples of good practice from other agencies.
- In hearing evidence of good practice with suggestions & recommendations for how these initiatives may be incorporated or adapted.

- Meeting with colleagues to share good practice & discuss relevant issues.
- Sharing good practice.
- Identifying future needs and insights for present working practice.

7. Inspiration (n=8)

- Inspiration especially concerning the philosophy of making it count.
- Pretty inspired for implementing a project in Holland, presenting evidence, networking.

8. Personal development (n=5)

- As always useful for my self development.
- 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=8)

- Seeing the reality of the essential and practical disregard of gay men in Britain who are not white and British.
- What the future holds for clients and us as working depending on who gets into No 10.

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

111 delegates (46%) provided further comments, which are grouped into the following themes:

1. GENERAL: POSITIVE (n=25) for example

- Keep up the excellent work and I look forward to C14.
- Good experience - enjoyed the venue. Crowded but friendly. Super bunch of orange conference helpers.
- C13 was worth while attending because of the wealth of knowledge that not only the speakers passed on but from peers and other service providers shared.
- First time, really enjoyed it, would of liked Tuesday to have had more sessions, but will be back for the next one!
- As a female I wondered how out of place I might feel, but it was not an issue and I felt comfortable and welcome.

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

- Sheffield is a total nightmare of a city. Venue was horrendous. NEVER AGAIN!
- Not a lot of diversity within the conf attendance.
- The layout of lunch hall with no seating was difficult, especially as I have a bad back. I was told twice when I registered on Wednesday there was no need to sign up for workshops, consequently I missed a session I really wanted to take part in.
- Get disabled advice.

3. ORGANISATION: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE (n=6) for example

- Earlier dates, times, venue, sessions please for C14. Please more handouts summarising sessions - they take so long to come on line my manager wants instant feedback

- The structure of conference may need to change a bit to encourage more commissioner participation
 - 5 minutes interval between 2 sessions if no break in between
- 4. PROGRAMME: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE (n=3)**
- Would have been good to have more research and more structured networking
 - Fabulous conference more about mental health (which is my field)
 - Can we offer a place for providers to contribute posters and or abstracts, these could be displayed in the main hall where each organisation displays their leaflets
 - If a session is billed as a workshop then it should not be just a presentation.
 - Some of the programme was slightly misleading and my interpretation of one or two of the events I went to was not what I thought it would be.
- 5. SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON VENUE (n=17)**
- The venue - some rooms were unsuitable as children were playing noisily outside
 - Venue was poor, shared use of building (screaming kids) rooms too hot too many stairs / Session over ran & by being 5 minutes late there was no tea coffee juices etc. Water stations in corridors would have been good nowhere to sit and eat lunch
 - The venue was awful. There was never any water around, so found it very hard to get a drink. it was a bit too far out of the city and had way too many technical issues.
 - The venue did not cater for disability enough (lift).
 - Do not play Wagner at high volume during lunch breaks
- 6. SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON SESSIONS (n=23)**
- Felt the plenary session on Tuesday showed too much political bias with a big P. I did not attend a conservative party conference but CHAPS. I found this direction in the conference disturbing.
 - I was very confused by the closing plenary on day 1 of the conference, and felt that it was in fact a platform for the conservative party to try to sell themselves to a community that their party has historically repressed, rather than a useful and informative session for attendees. I felt there was some other hidden agenda behind this particular decision.
 - The closing plenary on day 1 was like a conservative party conference. The choice of speakers was offensive
 - The opening plenary was very poor and did not think it was fitting to open CHAPS
 - I found many of the sessions chewed over the same old topics @ the same level as always - so little sense of progress.
 - Both plenaries on day 1 were appalling. Ruth Hunt is a fantastic speaker but her talk was irrelevant for the CHAPS conference. We have a day and half a year to talk about gay men's HIV prevention. This year's conference seemed to go off in all sorts of directions - politics, LGBT health and well-being. C14 needs to stay more focussed.
 - A great varied informative event which, while the closing plenary of day one proved difficult and was over shadowing, was still very useful and beneficial

7. OTHER COMMENTS (n=17)

- As a new delegate to CHAPS I have found that a lot of acronyms used are not explained.
- Needs to be more in-depth.
- Ruth mentioned Stonewall - maybe its time to open it up to all services who deal with gay and bi men at a small cost
- It is an inside group, sharing with others must be more feasible in methods and structures
- Thank you

[END]

gary.hammond@sigmaresearch.org.uk

10th May 2010