

# WGEA Conference Evaluation Ratings and Comments

Registrants: 254

Evaluations Submitted: 47

## Plenary Sessions

### Pre-Conference Panel- Sunday, April 25, 3:00-4:15 pm

#### Panel – UC Programs in Medical Education (PRIMEs): An Update on Admissions, Curriculum and Outcomes

Don Hilty, MD, Tom Nesbitt, MD, Julie Rainwater, PhD - UC Davis School of Medicine

Lawrence "Hy" Doyle, EdD - David Geffen School of Medicine, UCLA

Elizabeth Wilson, MD, MPH, Karen Sokal-Gutierrez, MD, MPH, Alma Martinez, MD, MPH - University of California, San Francisco

Charles Vega, MD - UC Irvine School of Medicine

1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent
0	0	1	6	5
0%	0%	8%	50%	42%

N	Mean	SD
12	4.3	0.7

#### Comments:

1. As a student, I found this session quite informative. Learning what the administrators' intent is for the students give me a better idea of how to contribute to the program.
2. Novel programs, great focus on disadvantaged and minorities.
3. Heard more about curriculum than admissions.

### Plenary 1- Sunday, April 25, 4:30-6:00 pm

#### Interprofessional Education: Imperatives for the Next Generation

Heather Young, PhD, RN, GNP, FAAN. University of California, Davis

Pamela Mitchell, PhD, CNRN, FAAN, University of Washington

Tom Nesbitt, MD, University of California, Davis

1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent
0	0	7	17	11
0%	0%	20%	49%	31%

N	Mean	SD
35	4.1	0.7

#### Comments:

1. Nice historical overview- challenges, and solutions. Great to see 2 of 3 keynotes as women and nurses.
2. Overlapping themes and history of IPE made for a great keynote for the meeting.
3. Good mix of perspectives.
4. A little too didactic.
5. PPT text – heavy. Also, more of Hx of evolution towards interprofessional ed; Not great take-aways. For schools with limited IP programs, hard to come away with usable solutions.
6. There needs to be more of these kinds of discussions.
7. Dr. Young is an excellent presenter. All three speakers were very knowledgeable and the plenary was very informative.
8. Dr. Mitchell's presentation was quite educational. It would be nice to have her slides available.
9. Great presentation about UC Davis Nursing/Medical School collaboration.
10. Nice overview and good information and discussion.
11. Great facilitation by Dr. Young.

## GME Focus Session - Sunday, April 25, 7:00-8:00 pm

### Patient Safety, Quality Improvement and Education\*\*

Moderator: Sandrijn van Schaik, MD, PhD, University of California, San Francisco

Joseph York, MD, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California

John Q. Young, MD, MPP, University of California, San Francisco

Arpana R. Vidyarthi, MD, University of California, San Francisco

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	2	5	7
0%	0%	14%	36%	50%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
14	4.4	0.7

#### Comments:

1. Would have liked some time for questions.
2. Outstanding presentations. Amazed how far the field has come. Arpana was great!
3. Very relevant to the changing environment of duty hours and new (relatively) GME competencies.
4. Excellent format and content from the presenters.
5. I was surprised at the newness of this topic in GME. It should start early in education of health professionals.
6. Well organized – 3 speakers, 3 topics – good questions. Appreciated positive focus of this meeting.

\*\*Note: An additional evaluation form was used for the GME session. See results in separate report.

## Plenary 2 - Monday, April 26, 8:45-10:15 am

### From the Practice of the Past to the Practice of the Future

Thomas Bodenheimer, MD, MPH

University of California, San Francisco

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	1	11	30
0%	0%	2%	26%	71%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
42	4.7	0.5

#### Comments:

1. Excellent and timely topic, good pace.
2. Tremendous story, moving (very), and call to action.
3. Comprehensive case made for IPE in patient care.
4. Full of wonderful challenges and ideas.
5. Should have been opening plenary – uplifting.
6. Excellent presenter and very useful info.
7. Lecturer quick to respond to comments- both difficult & supportive – from audience. Clearly articulated format and plan for primary care. Exploded various models of care out there.
8. Liked the model but there need to be more.
9. Excellent talk, very well taken.
10. Wonderful, inspiring talk. Relevant to education.
11. Good speaker- great passion about medical home.
12. More missionary than practical. Something to think about.
13. Excellent speaker, inspiring. I wish slides were provided.
14. Fantastic.
15. Very straight-forward- well handled and presented!
16. Great ideas- innovative, inspiring, learned things I didn't know/hadn't thought about.
17. More space to navigate between posters.
18. Informative and engaging!

**Plenary 3 - Tuesday, April 27, 8:45-10:15 am****Interprofessional Education:**

Mark Servis, MD

University of California, Davis

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	5	8	11
0%	0%	21%	33%	46%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
24	4.3	0.8

**Comments:**

1. Excellent, particularly as a pinch-hitter.
2. Great pinch-hitter. Nice delivery.
3. Nice job as substitute.
4. Dry- more interactive would be helpful.
5. Please remember to add gender/race/ethnicity/LGBT cultural issues to your "culture" challenges.
6. Provocative.
7. Thoughtful talk.
8. Well organized and realistic view.
9. A little slow. Interactive, but not too energizing. Give me an idea of what you envision everyone's roles- how does it all fit together.
10. Great talk, especially since this was a last minute change. Interesting topic, great to hear discussion from audience as well.
11. This was an outstanding wrap-up that tied threads of the conference together. I very much appreciated this, particularly as it was not in the original plan.
12. Great discussion and overview of issues. Well done!
13. Thought provoking, nice style!

**Poster Sessions****Poster Session 1 – Sunday, April 25, 7:00-10:00 pm (Includes GME Focus Session Posters)**

Did you present a poster at this session?

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
3	30

**General Organization**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
1	0	2	15	17
3%	0%	6%	43%	49%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
35	4.4	0.6

**Quality of Posters**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	1	18	16
0%	0%	3%	51%	46%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
35	4.3	0.8

### Opportunities for Meaningful Interactions with Presenters

<b>1</b> <b>Very Poor</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Poor</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Fair</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Good</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Excellent</b>
0	1	3	14	17
0%	3%	9%	40%	49%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
35	4.3	0.8

### Number of Posters

<b>1</b> <b>Too Few</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Just Right</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Too Many</b>
0	1	27	5	1
0%	3%	79%	15%	3%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
34	3.2	0.5

### Overall Evaluation

<b>1</b> <b>Very Poor</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Poor</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Fair</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Good</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Excellent</b>
0	1	1	17	16
0%	3%	3%	49%	46%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
35	4.4	0.7

### Comments and Suggestions:

1. Poster aisles too narrow, otherwise no complaints.
2. A bit too close together logistically, in terms of arrangement. Difficult to walk down aisles.
3. The aisles were too close together so you couldn't really stop to talk without being jostled by others trying to read the poster or get behind you.
4. Tight spacing – aisles. Loved the lighting.
5. Need a bit more spacing in the aisles to move easily and comfortably get by and not bump into people.
6. The physical set up of rows of posters way to close. Couldn't navigate or have room to read and speak to presenters.
7. A lot of GME—Good. Many young folks, which is nice.
8. Very organized.
9. Collegial interactions – gathered useful information.
10. Great to have a GME section.
11. Great timing and level of interaction.
12. Wonderful session!
13. Many opportunities to speak with colleagues. Poster presenters were enthusiastic.
14. Need more space between poster boards. Many poster presenters absent.
15. Overall good. It appeared that several posters were missing. Also, several presenters not in attendance. It would be nice if they were.

**Poster Session 2 – Monday, April 26, 7:00-10:00 pm**

Did you present a poster at this session?

**Yes**

17

**No**

18

**General Organization**

<b>1</b> <b>Very Poor</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Poor</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Fair</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Good</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Excellent</b>
1	0	1	20	20
2%	0%	2%	48%	48%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
42	4.4	0.8

**Quality of Posters**

<b>1</b> <b>Very Poor</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Poor</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Fair</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Good</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Excellent</b>
0	0	0	16	24
0%	0%	0%	40%	60%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
40	4.6	0.5

**Opportunities for Meaningful Interactions with Presenters**

<b>1</b> <b>Very Poor</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Poor</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Fair</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Good</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Excellent</b>
0	1	3	13	25
0%	2%	7%	31%	60%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
42	4.5	0.7

**Number of Posters**

<b>1</b> <b>Too Few</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Just Right</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Too Many</b>
0	0	31	8	3
0%	0%	74%	19%	7%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
42	3.3	0.6

**Overall Evaluation**

<b>1</b> <b>Very Poor</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Poor</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Fair</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Good</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Excellent</b>
0	1	0	23	16
0%	3%	0%	58%	40%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
40	4.4	0.6

**Comments and Suggestions:**

1. I had great conversations about programs being implemented at different campuses. I was able to find possible collaborative opportunities.
2. Aisles issues.
3. Lovely desserts, wine and music – brilliant! Lent a very festive atmosphere.
4. Same as above (aisles).
5. + music, +desserts. Well attended.
6. Space was too cramped! Nice to have wine tasting and dessert concurrently.

7. Especially liked the music and winetasting.
8. Set-up generated lots of interaction.
9. Excellent variety and great food and wine.
10. A bit cramped b/t aisles. Tough to maneuver among posters.
11. Next year, it might be nice to encourage all poster presenters to have copies of their posters available.
12. Wonderful session!
13. I just didn't get to all the posters. I did enjoy the discussions I had.
14. It was hard to walk between posters! Please spread the posters a little more!
15. More spacing between the rows.

### SMALL GROUP SESSION EVALUATIONS (COMBINED RATINGS)

#### Session 1: Monday, April 26, 10:30-Noon (9 Concurrent Sessions)

1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent
0	2	5	10	21
0%	5%	13%	26%	55%

N	Mean	SD
38	4.3	0.7

#### Session 2: Monday, April 26, 1:00-2:30 (8 Concurrent Sessions)

1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent
2	2	4	11	17
7%	7%	13%	37%	57%

N	Mean	SD
27	4.9	0.6

#### Session 3: Monday, April 26, 2:45-4:15 (9 Concurrent Sessions)

1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent
0	0	2	9	18
0%	0%	7%	31%	62%

N	Mean	SD
29	4.6	0.4

#### Session 4: Tuesday, April 27, 10:30-Noon (7 Concurrent Sessions)

1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent
0	0	1	5	15
0%	0%	5%	24%	71%

N	Mean	SD
21	4.7	0.3

**Session 5: Tuesday, April 27, 2:00-3:30 (5 Concurrent Sessions)**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	0	3	7
0%	0%	0%	30%	70%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
10	4.7	0.6

**OVERALL CONFERENCE EVALUATION****Abstract Submission Process**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	0	20	17
0%	0%	0%	54%	46%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
37	4.4	0.5

**Comments:**

1. Not too bad.
2. Good job UC Davis.
3. Thanks to John Drummer!
4. More feedback would be great.

**Conference Registration**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	3	18	20
0%	0%	7%	44%	49%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
41	4.4	0.6

**Comments:**

1. Very easy.
2. Good I forgot to register after getting a room and I could be registered on the spot.
3. UC Davis organizers were helpful and friendly.
4. Very smooth and easy for presenters.
5. Didn't like having to create a username/password on the Davis CME site.

**Asilomar Lodging**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	4	13	19
0%	0%	11%	36%	53%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
36	4.4	0.7

**Comments:**

1. Tell attendees that they won't have phones or computer connection, so they can plan in advance.
2. A little cumbersome.
3. Clean and comfortable.
4. A great place for a conference.
5. Would like internet in room.

6. WiFi would be great.
7. Would prefer a single room option without penalty.
8. Very expensive.
9. They made me wait until 4:15 pm to check in, not very welcoming front desk.

### Meeting Rooms

1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent
0	0	2	25	14
0%	0%	5%	61%	34%

N	Mean	SD
41	4.3	0.6

#### Comments:

1. It was confusing how to properly fill out Asilomar form. My husband came with me and should have been "meals only" but we were charged as if he was participating with the conference. They fixed this, but it was difficult to deal with this.
2. Rustic. AV okay. Views great.
3. They had character.
4. Couldn't find some rooms- hard to find. Missed session and late to another. Need signage.
5. Quite a bit of outside noise, but rustic.

### Food and Beverages

1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent
0	0	2	15	21
0%	0%	5%	39%	55%

N	Mean	SD
38	4.5	0.6

#### Comments:

1. Didn't eat. You should have had water refill areas.
2. Need vegan options. Soy milk easily available, in AM. Non-meat choices.
3. A lot of food! Good variety.
4. The BBQ was outstanding!!
5. More vege options please.
6. Great food, but more vegetarian / pescatarian would be nice.

### UC Davis Staff Support

1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent
0	0	0	10	30
0%	0%	0%	25%	75%

N	Mean	SD
40	4.8	0.4

#### Comments:

1. Deb is awesome!
2. Deb fabulous.
3. The welcome bags were awesome. Would have been welcome to have print-outs (including this eval) in double sided paper.
4. Outstanding "seamless" conference.
5. Thanks for all your hard work!
6. Staff were super.
7. Cheerful! However, one staff member gave keys and told us to lock up the room ourselves before lunch.
8. Outstanding!!
9. Great help in spite of my lack of pre-registration.



**Audiovisual-Computer Support**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	1	21	16
0%	0%	3%	55%	42%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
38	4.4	0.5

**Comments:**

1. N/A- think it was good, bud didn't have cause to interact with anyone on this.
2. Rare problems, which is good.
3. Probably should have dedicated 1-2 more people to check set up prior to session start.
4. Good.

**Conference Website**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	1	5	20	14
0%	3%	13%	50%	35%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
40	4.2	0.7

**Comments:**

1. Very helpful.
2. Good.

**Conference Program Booklet**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	2	15	25
0%	0%	5%	36%	60%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
42	4.5	0.6

**Comments:**

1. Fantastic! Thank you for creating this great learning resource!
2. Superb.
3. Could be thinner—we be useful to have an on-line resource instead.
4. One of the best I've seen in a while.
5. I would like slides of presentations. Also space for notes in the booklet.

**OVERALL RATING OF THE 2010 WGEA CONFERENCE**

<b>1 Very Poor</b>	<b>2 Poor</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
0	0	0	16	23
0%	0%	0%	41%	59%

<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
39	4.6	0.5

**Comments:**

1. Great job!
2. I love this meeting!
3. I like the shorter version.
4. Great work and effort by UC Davis!
5. Very inspiring. Help me remember why I choose to educate.
6. Great job- this was well organized and great energy! Lots of fun.

## Comments and Suggestions for Next Year's Conference

1. I appreciate the interprofessional theme this year and the acknowledgement that our medical schools train many different health professionals. Next year's theme is again uni-dimensional – physicians only. It is a combined GEA-GSA meeting, I know admissions folks are interested in admissions for other students as well, as are advisors. I recommend the committee consider being more inclusive by expanding theme to health professionals and not just limit it to physicians.
2. Quicken—perhaps a more content driven pace. More relevant examples and more thorough presentation of methods than I experienced in the sessions I attended.
3. Make sure AV support at meeting rooms available before (15 minutes) sessions.
4. Please double-side any printed material. Please get info on the web ASAP. Helps with travel planning and budgeting.
5. Why no CME? This was really an audience of physician educators and we need CME.
6. I preferred to begin conference on Mon-Wed vs. Sun-Tues. Interfered with family commitments on weekends. Travel harder to manage.
7. Special thanks to John Drummer for helping coordinate my posters and accommodate personal needs.
8. You're great! Superb conference, sure to get people coming back.
9. If the focus is on IPE there should be better representation from other professions. It is one thing to talk about the need for IPE and another to facilitate meaningful discussions among IPE faculty. There were some IPE posters that limited participation of faculty who teaching in these programs.
10. Continue evening poster session w/ wine and dessert. Chance for informal discussions between "learners" and "experts." Continue the wonderful organizational skills next year!
11. To the brochure, please add, if at Asilomar, to dress casually and warmly.
12. As far as goody bag, rather than giving us plastic bottle (environment), give us a coffee mug to use during our break so we do not have to use disposable cups for coffee and tea and save environment. Also, award "prizes" or incentives for car pooling! Go more green! Offer whale watching as a social event?
13. Would be nice to include in the meeting book names and emails for all presenters so that contacting them in the future would be easier.
14. Less expensive locale.
15. Plenary sessions were held in rooms w/o enough seats! People were left standing at the back of the room!! More seats please.
16. Keep the food and wine with the poster session. Consider one day longer so fewer competing concurrent sessions.