2011 Health Education Practice Conference Evaluation

Bridgette Blebu, MPH Candidate
Robin Munsey, MA OTR/L
University of Southern California

Outline

- Introduction
- Conference Attendees
- Knowledge Gain Results
- Overall Impressions
- Speakers
- Feedback
- Conclusion

Introduction

Objectives of Conference

- Increase knowledge on hot topics that impact health education in various practice settings
  - health literacy
  - health care reform
  - social determinants of health
  - new media
- Give examples of effective health education practice
- Network among health education practitioners throughout California

Conference Attendees

Gender	(n=56)
Male	4
Female	52
Age	(n=53)
21-35	27
36-45	12
46-55	9
56 or older	5
Ethnicity	(n=56)
Asian/Pacific Islander	11
Black/African American	10
Hispanic/Latino	16
White	16
Other (mixed race, etc.)	3

Highest Level of Education	(n=56)
High school diploma/GED	2
2-year college degree/AA	4
4-year college degree/Bachelors	10
Masters or Graduate degree	35
Doctorate	2
Prefer not to answer	1
Other (dual degree, current student)	2

Profession/Occupation	(n=56)
County Health Educator	24
Non-county Health Educator	5
Researcher	2
Nurse	6
Health Dept. representative	6
Educator/school administrator Advocate/policy maker	1
Non-profit	1
Other (students, project manager, etc.)	3
	8

Reason for Attending :	(n=56)
Required	10
Continued Education Units (CEUs)	16
Learn about health education	43
Other	14
Presenters :	(n=56)
Oral	4
Poster	13
Not Presenting	39
Heard about conference through:	(n=56)
Supervisor/manager	9
[HEALTHED] Listserv	24
Email from an associate	13
Training and education	1
The Voice	1
Other (professor, HEA, etc.)	8

Knowledge Results

Perceived Knowledge Gain

General Knowledge	Mean Pre	Mean Post	Change	P
Definition of effective health education practice**	6.9	8.3	15%	<0.001
Health education's role in community empowerment**	7.4	8.3	9%	0.0054
L.A. Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Education Program**	3.8	7.5	37%	<0.001
Accessing health promotion resources in DHS facilities and community partner agencies**	7.2	5.2	20%	<0.001
Using the Fotonovela Readers' Theater to address early childhood disease prevention**	3.6	8.5	50%	<0.001
Health education's role in healthcare reform**	6.2	7.7	15%	<0.001

Health Education Practice	Mean Pre	Mean Post	Change	P
Health literacy	7.4	9.1	16%	<0.001
Health-care reform	6	7.6	16%	<0.001
Social determinants of health	7.5	8.7	12%	<0.001
New media	6.7	8.5	18%	<0.001
Role of Health Education				
Government	5.6	8.2	27%	<0.001
Academia	5.8	8.1	23%	<0.001
Managed care	6.1	8.3	22%	<0.001

Knowledge Sub-Group Analysis

- Demographic variables:
  - gender
  - education level
  - profession
  - ethnicity
  - age
- Regression analysis showed moderate associations ($p<0.10$):
  - Profession, ethnicity
  - Came to learn about Health Education
  - Where you heard of the conference
  - Not presenting
- Mean knowledge gain is 2.17 (1.98) units
  - On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being not knowledgeable at all and 10 being very knowledgeable)

Was knowledge gain different based on reasons for attending?

Continued Education Units (CEUs)

- If you came for CEUs your knowledge gain was significantly lower ($t=1.93$, $p=.0292$) than those who did not come for them.

Were you a presenter at the conference?

Presenters

- Presenters had lower knowledge gains (t=-2.38, p=0.01)

Poster vs. Oral Presentation

- Poster presenters had lower knowledge gains (t=2.39, p=0.01)
- No difference in knowledge gains for oral presenters (t=0.32, p=0.76)

Overall Impressions

Overall Satisfaction

	SD	D	N	A	SA
I was satisfied with the conference	--	--	5.4 (3)	53.6(30)	41.1(23)
This conference met my expectations.	--	1.8 (1)	16.1 (9)	48.2 (27)	33.9 (19)
The information provided in this conference was useful.	--	3.6 (2)	5.4 (3)	46.4(26)	44.6(25)
The content presented was easy to understand.	--	--	3.57 (2)	53.6 (30)	42.9 (24)
Overall, the quality of the speaker presentations was high.	--	1.8 (1)	7.14 (4)	48.2 (27)	42.9(24)
Overall, the quality of the panel discussion was high.	1.8 (1)	1.8(1)	3.6 (2)	47.3 (26)	45.4(25)
Overall, the quality of the poster presentations was high.	--	--	12.5 (7)	53.6 (30)	33.9 (19)

Conference Components

	SD	D	N	A	SA
The Wellness Activity (led by Erika Siever) is a strategy I would consider integrating into future meetings.	--	--	10.7 (6)	37.5 (21)	51.8 (29)
The presentations increased my knowledge of issues related to health education.	--	--	7.1 (4)	46.4 (26)	46.4 (26)
The topics selected for this conference were helpful.	--	1.8 (1)	8.9 (5)	53.6 (30)	35.7 (20)
This conference has facilitated new connection with others in my field.	--	1.8 (1)	19.6 (11)	41.1 (23)	37.5 (21)

Future Use

	SD	D	N	A	SA
I would recommend attending this conference to others.	--	--	7.1 (4)	46.4 (26)	46.4 (26)
I feel confident about applying the knowledge/skills that were presented.	--	1.8 (1)	14.3 (8)	53.6 (30)	30.4 (17)
I plan to use the content from this conference to my work within the next two weeks.	3.6 (2)	7.14 (4)	14.3 (8)	39.3 (22)	35.7 (20)
What I have learned will increase my competence in performing my work.	--	5.4 (3)	5.4 (3)	58.9 (33)	30.4 (17)

Satisfaction Scale

- Factor Analysis
- Highly reliable: alpha=0.945
- Mean Score of attitude scale is 4.26, SD=0.57
  - On a scale from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree
- Range: 2.92 to 5.0

Attitude Sub-Group Analysis

- Demographic variables
  - gender
  - education level
  - profession
  - ethnicity
  - age

- T-test and ANOVA analysis: no significant differences
- Regression analysis also showed no associations.

Speakers

Analysis of Speakers

- Knowledgeable on the subject?
  - Mean score for all speakers was **4.3*(86%)**
- Promoted discussion and or interest on the topic?
  - Mean score for all speakers was **4.2*(82%)**
- Would recommend speaker for future trainings?
  - Mean score for all speakers was **4.2*(81%)**

* On a scale of 1 to 5: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=Strongly agree

Feedback

Logistics

LOGISTICS	SD	D	N	A	SA
The time and date of the conferenced worked for me	3.6% (2)	3.6% (2)	5.4% (3)	57.1% (32)	30.4 % (17)
The length of the conference was appropriate	7.1% (4)	7.1% (4)	19.6% (11)	46.4 % (26)	19.6 % (11)
The location of the conference was convenient and suitable	1.8% (1)	21.4% (12)	19.6% (11)	32.1% (18)	25% (14)

Attendee Commentary

- General consensus: overall great conference, but there were too many speakers
  - "Excellent conference, but a bit long-maybe shorten the day, less speakers."
  - "There were too many speakers. It was very hard to focus after awhile."
  - "It was all good, it had a little of everything."

- Suggestions for improvement
  - "More on policy work and how to help advocate for policy change/health care reform."
  - "More about social determinants of health."
  - "Not enough networking time."
  - "More representatives from DHS and DPH on their innovative work."
  - "Provide break-out sessions"
  - "More interaction with the audience" (ex: skill building session)

Conclusions

- Was this conference effective?
  - We saw a significant increase in knowledge
  - Attendees enjoyed the conference
  - Attendees felt they increased their competency in the three objectives
- Evaluation of Conference Analysis
  - Objective knowledge question
  - Pre-test attendee expectations (we want to see if their expectations were met)

Acknowledgments

- Chris Kanis
- Katayoun Kashani
- Kim Miller
- Golnaz Namdar
- Grace Huang
- Dr. Valente