

### Attendance and Evaluation Summary

The First Annual HARC was very well attended. An online registration site was created, and 206 people registered for the conference, and 198 attended. Participants included the strong majority of all active health literacy researchers in the United States.

The breakdown of registration types is in the table below.

<b>Registration Type</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Faculty	96	47%
Trainee	18	9%
Other	92	45%

### Evaluations

There were 95 evaluation forms completed and returned after the conference. Overall, the sessions were rated very well, with the majority of attendees planning to attend the following year.

### **Session Ratings**

<i><b>Below Expectations</b></i>	<i><b>Average</b></i>	<i><b>Above Average</b></i>	<i><b>Outstanding</b></i>	<i><b>Top 5%</b></i>
1	2	3	4	5

<b>Day 1: Monday Oct 19</b>	<b>Average Score</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Implement Lesson Learned*</b>
NIH GAPS Session	3	73	71%
Keynote Address: David Baker	3.9	82	74%
Abstracts: Oral I Presentations	3.2	81	78%
Invited Panel A Discussions	3.4	84	92%
Invited Panel B Discussions	3.4	74	83%
Poster Session	2.9	76	84%
<b>Day 2: Tuesday Oct 20</b>			
Keynote Address: Ann Beal	3.6	83	74%
Abstracts: Oral II Presentations	3.3	75	75%
Invited Panel C Discussions	3.7	59	97%
Invited Panel D Discussions	3.7	47	91%
Project Officer 1-on-1 Meetings	3.4	28	93%
Mentor/Mentee 1-on-1 Meetings	3.8	26	87%
Abstracts: Oral III Presentations	3.3	57	67%

\*Of those who responded yes or no.

## Meeting Goals

<i>How important were these meeting goals for you?</i>			
<i>Not At All Important</i>	<i>Somewhat Important</i>	<i>Moderately Important</i>	<i>Very Important</i>
1	2	3	4

	Average Importance	N	Felt goal was met*
Disseminate my work	2.8	87	88%
Hear about new research	3.9	95	98%
Learn research skills or methods	3.1	92	80%
Meet with collaborators	3.3	92	94%
Network	3.6	94	99%
Meet with mentors or mentees	2.5	81	82%
Meet with project officer(s)	2.5	80	70%

\*Of those who responded yes or no.

## After attending the meeting I will:

	% Yes*
Start a new research project	66%
Modify a current research technique	65%
Start or modify a QI project	32%
Start a new collaboration	76%
Change the way I teach	32%
Change the way I teach others to teach	22%
Have started a relationship with a new mentor or mentee	44%

\*Of those who responded yes or no.

## Plans to attend conference in 2010:

Will definitely attend	Will probably attend	Might attend	Probably will not attend	Will not attend
46%	29%	21%	3%	0

## Written Comments on Evaluations – Attendees wanted:

- More interactive sessions, time for discussion
- More time for mentor and program officer meetings
- More opportunities for networking
- Session on research methods for new investigators

### Overall Conclusions/Recommendations

- Improving NIH Health Literacy special emphasis panel of reviewers.
- We recommend that there be 2 review panels in order to avoid conflicts of interest.
- Professional development among reviewers (what types of projects should be funded
- Definitions – should there be one?