

**Research and Evaluation Committee (REC) Meeting
Minutes
November 3, 2016**

Attendance

voting members (year term started)

	Present		Present
Voting Members		Joe Grasso	
Jodi Polaha (2014)	x	Julie Gass	
Tina Studts (2016)	x	Kaitlin Lilienthal	
Robyn Shepardson (2016)	x	Karen Kinman	
Jennifer Hodgson (2014)		Kathryn Woods	
Zephon Lister (2014)		Katie Kanzler	
Jennifer Wray (2015)	x	Lauren Tolle	
CR Macchi (2016)	x	Limor Gildenblatt	
Patti Robinson (2016)	x	Lori Zeman	
Stephanie Trudeau (2016)	x	Mark Vogel	
		Mary Peterson	
Committee Members		Mary Talen	
Alejandra Posada		Matthew Tolliver	
Amber Landers		Melissa Baker	
Amelia Muse		Nancy Pandhi	
Angela Giles	x	Nyann Biery	x
Angela Lamson		Tawnya Meadows	
Ann Aspnes		Patrick Palmieri	
Astrid Beigel	x	Polly Kurtz	x
Beth Nolan		Randi Dublin	
Bill McFeature		Rebecca Aycock	
Brian DeSantis		Rodger Kessler	
Casey Gallimore	x	Rola Amar	
Chris Hunter		Rusty Kallenberg	
Christine Borst		Stacy Ogbeide	
Christina Vair	x	Suzanne Daub	
CJ Peek		Tawnya Meadows	
Colleen Cordes		Thabiso Batsell	x
Dan Blocker	x	Tina Runyan	
Danielle King		Tom Bishop	
David Johnson		Toni Watt	
Elizabeth Banks	x	Vickie Lynn	
Emilee Delbridge		Waymon Hinson	
Emma Gilchrist		Will Lusenhop	
Gary Rosenberg		William Sieber	
Halie Dyer			
Irina Kolobova	x		
Jackie Poor Hahn			
Jean Cobb			
Jeff Goodie			
Jennifer Funderburk	x		
Jeri Turgesen	x	Total attendees	19

1. Approved October minutes
2. REC Leadership Positions
 - a. Leadership positions opening up for next year: co-chair, secretary, 2 voting members
 - i. See Sept. or Oct. minutes for details of what the positions entail.
 - ii. Nominations due by Friday, Nov. 4 to allow for election in mid-November.
 - iii. Self-nominations or nominations by others are accepted.
 1. Current nominations: CR Macchi for co-chair and Julie Gass for secretary.
 - iv. **Action item:** Send your nominations to Robyn.Shepardson@va.gov by Nov. 4
3. Impressions of conference events and recommendations for next year
 - a. General notes
 - i. We need to give Polly/Steffani/Jackie list of issues that we want addressed/ considered for next year's conference (session length, poster session space/times, consultation space/timeslot) while this is all fresh on our minds.
 - ii. Jen F is going to be on the conference planning committee so she will also help be our voice for next year's conference to improve our committee's activities. We have to arm Jen with talking points so she can advocate for REC needs.
 - iii. Jodi proposed that REC leadership have a strategy meeting to identify all of the conference-related needs and demands REC is involved with. We have so many initiatives that we end up dropping the ball on some things. For example, at the last minute we realized we did not have a plan for counting attendance at the R&E track sessions and had to scramble to address this.
 - iv. Tina notes there are many things we revisit annually (e.g., call for proposals), but some may not really need to be done annually. New things that went wrong this year (e.g., low rate of evaluations completed) suggest new areas to focus on.
 - v. Jodi proposed we make a list of all of the things that ever need to be done, divide into which ones are "good enough" and which ones need our attention for next year. REC leadership will meet to discuss all the options before the Dec. REC meeting and we will report back then.
 - vi. **Action item:** REC leadership to meet and sort out options before Dec. meeting.
 - b. Refinements/adjustments to Training in Research and Evaluation Track
 - i. Overall attendance and audience engagement was great this year!
 1. Per Tina, we had 58 people (>10% of all conference attendees) attend ≥ 2 sessions within our track, so they would qualify for certificates.
 2. 30-40 people attended Let's Talk, 61 attended program evaluation talk, 21 attended multivariate approaches talk, 54 attended model fidelity talk, 40 attended the tale of 9 cities talk, and attended the FSH Editors talk.
 - ii. Session length was problematic
 1. 45 minutes felt too short for presenters and many attendees based on their comments to presenters after the talks
 2. Two-part sessions were apparently confusing, as many new people came in for the second sessions in the two-part series. Need to label them more clearly in program materials to reduce confusion.
 - iii. Issue of how to secure presentations for the track (not discussed)
 - iv. Other feedback / suggestions about the track this year?
 1. CR gave kudos to REC members for all the work we put in to produce excellent R&E presentations to benefit CFHA conference attendees!
 2. Overall this year there was a very low rate (12%) of completing evaluations. These were embedded within the mobile app and were easy to overlook.

3. CR noted the session evaluation form is not very informative. It doesn't tell us what people appreciated, what they want to hear more of, what they found engaging, etc. It might be worth out time to revisit the session evaluation questions to improve their yield.
4. Patti suggested maybe the presenters could be responsible for getting their own headcounts and asking ~3 evaluation questions at the end. This would help model asking for feedback to conduct evaluations.
5. Polly noted that CFHA would like to engage the REC more in helping to better evaluate organizational activities. So perhaps REC can help to improve the session evaluations as well as the overall conference evaluation.
6. Jodi proposed we create a subcommittee to focus on the R&E track. They would meet independently of the larger REC meetings, which would take some of the pressure off our regular meetings. Robyn volunteered to chair that subcommittee. We will be recruiting volunteers for this track in the next month.
Action item: Email Robyn.Shepardson@va.gov if you want to help out with the R&E track subcommittee.

c. Refinements/adjustments to Poster Sessions

- i. Physical layout of the poster area
 1. Many attendees felt the area was too small and lead to bottlenecks/crowding
 2. But we also heard some liked the layout and felt it fostered conversation
- ii. Poster session timeslots
 1. Issue of one or two dedicated poster sessions (with different posters at each session) vs. current approach of multiple 30-minute blocks of time in between breakout sessions (with same posters up for 4 all brief sessions)
 2. By the afternoon poster sessions, many of the posters were already taken down or had no presenters standing with them.
 3. If there is sufficient interest in posters, we could have a featured poster session, perhaps on Friday evening around 5:00 because nothing was scheduled at this time. This would allow presenters to have to be at their posters only once to answer questions, which makes it easier for them. It would also allow posters presenters to use those breaks throughout the day as they wish rather than always having to go stand with their posters.
 4. Suggestion that a cash bar reception could help with attendance. Apparently in the distant past a cash bar reception did not help improve attendance.
- iii. Poster presentations
 1. We may need to educate poster presenters on how to engage the audience.
 2. We could consider creative formats for people to share their findings. CR (presentations on laptops) and Jodi (consultation kiosk) had some ideas.
 3. Idea that REC could organize a compilation of tips and suggestions for poster presenters. This could include how to design and present posters.
- iv. Poster awards (not discussed)
- v. Other feedback / suggestions about the posters this year?
 1. Patti noted all our work to improve the posters paid off, as the posters were awesome and a highlight of the conference for her!
 2. Jodi proposed that we continue having a poster subcommittee. Polly suggested we include Jackie on it so that CFHA staff can consult.
 3. **Action item:** Stephanie will try to organize a meeting of the poster subcommittee before Dec. REC meeting.
 4. **Action item:** Email Stephanie at hernx002@umn.edu if you want to help out with the poster subcommittee.

- d. Preconference workshop for R&E training
 - i. We perceive renewed interest in the possibility of a preconference workshop as a venue for R&E training at the annual conference.
 - 1. Tina shared that after every R&E track session, attendees would come up to the presenters and say “this should be a precon!” and more time would have helped allow for answering questions and thoroughly covering the content.
 - 2. Jen F noted that if done well, a precon on R&E could be a great draw for professionals who might not otherwise attend the conference. No other organizations are offering training in R&E like this and it would address a big need in the field and draw new attendees.
 - ii. We don't want to replace the R&E training track, but we could try to add a precon if there is enough interest.
 - 1. We could survey the CFHA membership on interest in an R&E precon.
 - 2. We have the email addresses of everyone who attended the R&E track talks, so we could survey them on if they would be interested.
 - iii. Things to consider
 - 1. Polly stated the break even for attendance is usually about 20 to make it work.
 - 2. We would need to develop a concept for this and arm Jen F with talking points to take to the CFHA planning committee.
 - 3. Polly wondered if we should just have a couple 2 or 3 hour sessions in the body of the regular conference. So maybe one day is R&E day and we have a 3-hour session in the morning and a 3-hour session in the afternoon. This way people don't have to come early and pay extra, which could feel limiting.
 - 4. What are our goals? In bringing R&E training to the conference, we have always intended to address R&E needs across the spectrum (beginners, intermediate, advanced). Jodi feels the R&E track addresses the first two levels, but a preconference workshop would allow us to teach advanced skills.
 - 5. We need to pull together our options (precon, track as is, couple long sessions, etc.), the pros and cons of each, and consider in the context of our objectives.
 - 6. **Action item:** REC leadership will summarize the options and discuss at meeting to sort out options for this and other conference-related tasks.

4. Idea for Shark Tank plenary at 2017 CFHA Conference

- a. The idea is that people would present their ideas for R&E projects to a group of judges (REC members) who would ask questions like in the show *Shark Tank* where people present their business ideas.
- b. This could be a fun, engaging way to illustrate R&E topics (e.g., how to make study more rigorous). The goal is to illustrate what people need to think about to do R&E.
- c. We want Randall Reitz to help produce this because of his talent and experience developing amazing plenaries. He has agreed to help.
- d. REC as a whole would sponsor the plenary, and we would have to pitch this to the planning committee. Attendees expressed support for this idea.
- e. **Action item:** Jodi to revise draft of plenary proposal.

5. New subcommittee for Evaluation of Regional Education Conferences

- a. As Jen F reported at Oct. meeting, CFHA is starting new regional education conferences next year. This will be technical assistance training on integrated healthcare with up to 40 participants. REC has been charged with helping to evaluate this (i.e., do people who receive this training actually implement the principles in their clinics?).

- b. In addition to conducting the evaluation itself, we could also work in a training goal. For example, we could invite CFHA members who want to learn about program evaluation to be involved so they can learn through this process.
- c. Subcommittee volunteers (from Oct. meeting): Jodi, Angela Giles, Stephanie Trudeau, Jen Funderburk, Thabiso Batsell, Wil Lusenhop
- d. **Action item:** Anyone else who is interested in helping with this evaluation project or in joining for the training experience, email Robyn.Shepardson@va.gov

6. Other possible directions for next year (see Oct. minutes/Nov. agenda) were not discussed

Next meeting: Thursday, December 1, 1:00pm EST