

2003 GP&PHC Research Conference

'Primary Health Care Research: Evolution or Revolution?'

18-20 June 2003

Pre-conference Workshops: Evaluation

Seven pre-conference workshops were included in the program for the 2003 GP&PHC Research Conference, and were conducted on Wednesday 18 June 2003. They were attended by 234 participants, including 16 facilitators. The workshops provided information, taught skills, and provided opportunities for conference delegates from diverse backgrounds to come together and explore issues of common interest.

The workshop titles:

- 1 Evaluation of Youth Health Programs within Australian Divisions of General Practice
- 2 Methodological, Ethical, Logistical and Systems Issues in Indigenous Health Research
- 3 Exploring 'evidence' in research about general practice - a dialogue about the 'validity' of interpretive and critical approaches to research
- 4 Randomised Trials in Primary Care – tips for success
- 5 Evaluation of skill mix change in general practice
- 6 Using quantitative data in general practice research and evaluation—pitfalls in collection, analysis and interpretation
- 7 Understanding the shared wisdom in doctor-patient communication.

Method

Paper-based, self-complete, feedback sheets were available to all participants at the end of each workshop, and 100 were completed and returned. Feedback was sought through both quantitative and qualitative questions (see *Appendix i* for a copy of the survey).

Results

Note: Some questions were very specific to the content and presentation of each workshop (ie. *What did you hope to gain by attending this workshop? What aspect of your work practice do you intend changing as a result of attending this workshop?*) and are, therefore, not summarised in this document. Individual workshop evaluation reports were sent to all workshop facilitators.

Overall, the feedback from participants was very positive and any areas criticised did not occur across all workshops. Time for discussion and the interactive nature of the workshops was most frequently cited as being the most useful aspect of the workshops, followed by workshop-specific content (ie. information on datasets). A lack of direction and focus within some workshop discussions and small group discussions was most often mentioned as being the least useful aspect of workshops. Table 1 summarises the overall ratings for some of the feedback questions.

Table 1: Overall ratings for the 7 workshops combined: *

Were your expectations of the workshop met? n=96	Yes 63%	Partly 33%	No 4%	
To what extent did the w/shop enable you to have a better understanding of the topic? n=92	Considerable 52%	Moderate 48%	Not at all -	
How much relevance did the w/shop have to your working needs? n=95	Considerable 50%	Moderate 47%	None 3%	
How do you rate the quality of content? n=94	Excellent 41%	Good 49%	Fair 10%	Poor -
How do you rate the clarity of the presentations? n=94	Excellent 41%	Good 50%	Fair 9%	Poor -
How do you rate the value of the handout material? (if provided) n=75	Excellent 37%	Good 49%	Fair 11%	Poor 3%

* not all participants answered all questions

How could we improve future workshops?

Responses to this question most commonly referred to keeping to scheduled times, providing relevant pre-workshop reading, and guiding the direction of discussions to keep them focused. Unfortunately, fog delayed the arrival of some flights into Canberra and subsequently the workshops began late. As time scheduling was often mentioned in feedback about the workshops, it may mean participants were not sufficiently aware of the reason for the delayed starts and the subsequent timing of breaks.

Improving how well workshops meet the expectations of participants, and ensuring the content has relevance to working needs, may mean abstracts need to be improved to better describe the content, target audience, and appropriate skill levels of participants. Suggestions included:

“Everyone introducing themselves at the outset...”

“List outcomes and recommendations at the end of the session”

“A bit more interactive.”

Other comments:

“Fantastic – need more of these kind of workshops. Presenters were great!!”

“I was impressed by the level of attendance. It was also fun!!”

“I think perhaps my needs weren’t fully met because the group was so heterogeneous in experience, knowledge & aims.”

“Very useful to interact with others (from C/Wealth and Divisions [of General Practice]) interested in same topic and to see collaborative links initiated which were developed at other times at conference.”

Recommendations

- Participants to be kept well informed of any reasons for delays and changes to scheduling.
- PHC RIS to develop a one-page summary of key issues for facilitators to consider when planning workshops.

Overall ratings for each workshop

Evaluation of Youth Health Programs within Australian Divisions of General Practice

Attendance: 16 (2 facilitators) Feedback submitted: 5

To what extent did the w/shop enable you to have a better understanding of the topic?	Considerable 3	Moderate 1	Not at all	
How much relevance did the w/shop have to your working needs?	Considerable 3	Moderate 1	None	
How do you rate the quality of content?	Excellent 3	Good 1	Fair	Poor
How do you rate the clarity of the presentations?	Excellent 1	Good 3	Fair	Poor
How do you rate the value of the handout material? (if provided)	Excellent 3	Good 1	Fair	Poor

Methodological, Ethical, Logistical and Systems Issues in Indigenous Health Research

Attendance: 22 (3 facilitator) Feedback submitted: 13

To what extent did the w/shop enable you to have a better understanding of the topic?	Considerable 4	Moderate 9	Not at all	
How much relevance did the w/shop have to your working needs?	Considerable 6	Moderate 6	None	
How do you rate the quality of content?	Excellent 3	Good 7	Fair 3	Poor
How do you rate the clarity of the presentations?	Excellent 2	Good 8	Fair 3	Poor
How do you rate the value of the handout material? (if provided)	Excellent -	Good -	Fair -	Poor -

Exploring 'evidence' in research about general practice - a dialogue about the 'validity' of interpretive and critical approaches to research

Attendance: 55 (2 facilitator) Feedback submitted: 28

To what extent did the w/shop enable you to have a better understanding of the topic?	Considerable 10	Moderate 17	Not at all	
How much relevance did the w/shop have to your working needs?	Considerable 12	Moderate 15	None 1	
How do you rate the quality of content?	Excellent 12	Good 13	Fair 3	Poor
How do you rate the clarity of the presentations?	Excellent 12	Good 13	Fair 3	Poor
How do you rate the value of the handout material? (if provided)	Excellent 10	Good 14	Fair 4	Poor



Randomised Trials in Primary Care – tips for success

Attendance: 35 (3 facilitator) Feedback submitted: 22

To what extent did the w/shop enable you to have a better understanding of the topic?	Considerable 9	Moderate 13	Not at all	
How much relevance did the w/shop have to your working needs?	Considerable 13	Moderate 9	None	
How do you rate the quality of content?	Excellent 10	Good 10	Fair 1	Poor
How do you rate the clarity of the presentations?	Excellent 9	Good 10	Fair 2	Poor
How do you rate the value of the handout material? (if provided)	Excellent 7	Good 9	Fair 2	Poor

Evaluation of skill mix change in general practice

Attendance: 23 (1 facilitator) Feedback submitted: 13

To what extent did the w/shop enable you to have a better understanding of the topic?	Considerable 8	Moderate 4	Not at all	
How much relevance did the w/shop have to your working needs?	Considerable 7	Moderate 5	None	
How do you rate the quality of content?	Excellent 7	Good 4	Fair 1	Poor
How do you rate the clarity of the presentations?	Excellent 8	Good 4	Fair	Poor
How do you rate the value of the handout material? (if provided)	Excellent 6	Good 6	Fair	Poor

Using quantitative data in general practice research and evaluation—pitfalls in collection, analysis and interpretation

Attendance: 41 (2 facilitator) Feedback submitted: 9

To what extent did the w/shop enable you to have a better understanding of the topic?	Considerable 5	Moderate 2	Not at all	
How much relevance did the w/shop have to your working needs?	Considerable 3	Moderate 5	None 1	
How do you rate the quality of content?	Excellent 1	Good 7	Fair 1	Poor
How do you rate the clarity of the presentations?	Excellent 3	Good 6	Fair	Poor
How do you rate the value of the handout material? (if provided)	Excellent 1	Good 3	Fair 1	Poor



Understanding the shared wisdom in doctor-patient communication

Attendance: 23 (2 facilitator) Feedback submitted: 6

To what extent did the w/shop enable you to have a better understanding of the topic?	Considerable 4	Moderate 2	Not at all	
How much relevance did the w/shop have to your working needs?	Considerable 2	Moderate 4	None	
How do you rate the quality of content?	Excellent 2	Good 4	Fair	Poor
How do you rate the clarity of the presentations?	Excellent 3	Good 3	Fair	Poor
How do you rate the value of the handout material? (if provided)	Excellent	Good 4	Fair 1	Poor



Feedback Sheet

Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions.
Your feedback is important for the planning of future workshops.

Which workshop did you attend?

.....

1. Which best describes you? applicable boxes

applicable boxes

Policy maker

Academic

Research/Project officer

General practitioner

Health practitioner (non-GP)

Consumer representative

Other *please specify*

2. Which best describes your work setting?

Government

Division of General Practice

University

Private health practice

Other *please specify*

3. What did you hope to gain from attending this workshop?

4. Were these expectations met?

Yes

Partly

No

Please comment on the following aspects of the workshop by circling the relevant option.

5. To what extent did the w/shop enable you to have a *better understanding* of the topic? Considerable Moderate Not at all

6. How much *relevance* did the w/shop have to your working needs? Considerable Moderate None

7. How do you rate the *quality* of content? Excellent Good Fair Poor

8. How do you rate the *clarity* of the presentations? Excellent Good Fair Poor

9. How do you rate the *value* of the handout material? (if provided) Excellent Good Fair Poor



10. What aspect of the workshop was *most* useful, and why?

11. What aspect of the workshop was *least* useful, and why?

12. What aspect, if any, of your work practice do you intend changing as a result of attending this workshop?

13. How could we improve future workshops?

14. Any further comments?

Please return your completed feedback sheet:

Hand in

Place in box provided at
the workshop

Mail

PHC RIS
Dept General Practice
Flinders University
GPO Box 2100
Adelaide SA 5001

Fax

PHC RIS
(08) 8204 4690

Thankyou for taking the time to provide feedback