Responses for the Form INEBRIA Conference Evaluation

1. Name (Optional)

Answers
Richard Saitz
Heather M McCann, MPH, CPH, MCHES
Erikson Furtado
Yovan Gonzalez
Erica
Sara Barbosa
Walter Cullen
Hoogmartens
Divane de Vargas
Maria Lucia Oliveira de Souza Formigoni
Tereza Barroso
María Vanesa Luna
Jason Satterfield
Jennifer McNeely

2. Country

Answers
USA
USA
USA
USA
Brazil
USA
Brazil
US
USA
USA

USA

Brazil

United States

usa

Brazil

USA

Ireland

Belgium

Brazil

USA

US

Brazil

USA

Portugal

Mexico

USA

USA

3. Gender

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Male	10	37.04%
Female	17	62.96%
Other	0	0.00%

Total answers: 27

4. Inebria Member

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Yes	12	42.86%
No	16	57.14%
Don't know	0	0.00%

Total answers: 28

5. Indicate the category that best describes your work position.

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Policy Maker/Policy Adviser	1	3.57%
Academic/Educator	14	50.00%
Public Health	6	21.43%
NGO/Community based program	0	0.00%
Health professional	7	25.00%
Other	0	0.00%

Total answers: 28

6. Please check the two most important factors that influenced your decision to attend.

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Location	17 out of 27	62.96%
Conference dates	3 out of 27	11.11%
Networking opportunities	20 out of 27	74.07%
Other	8 out of 27	29.63%

Total answers: 27

Comments

Answers	Comments
Other	hear latest science
Other	Schorlaship
Other	Invitation from PAHO
Other	Interest in material
Other	topics of interest
Other	Speaker
Other	content, updates
Other	the contents of the congress

7. Overall impression of the conference:

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Excellent	21	75.00%
Good	7	25.00%
Fair	0	0.00%

Poor	0	0.00%
Very Poor	0	0.00%

Total answers: 28

8. Please rate the following statements on a 5 point scale 1=not at all satisfied, 2=somewhat satisfied, 3=satisfied, 4=very satisfied, 5=strongly satisfied.

Answer	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Opportunity for interaction with attendees (colleagues)	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	1 / 28 = 3.57%	7 / 28 = 25.00%	20 / 28 = 71.43%	4.68
Opportunity for interaction with or by trainees	2 / 26 = 7.69%	0 / 26 = 0.00%	4 / 26 = 15.38%	12 / 26 = 46.15%	8 / 26 = 30.77%	3.92
Personal competence increased	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	2 / 28 = 7.14%	14 / 28 = 50.00%	12 / 28 = 42.86%	4.36
Valuable for my daily work activities	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	1 / 28 = 3.57%	12 / 28 = 42.86%	15 / 28 = 53.57%	4.50
Contributes to improve regional policy	0 / 26 = 0.00%	0 / 26 = 0.00%	4 / 26 = 15.38%	13 / 26 = 50.00%	9 / 26 = 34.62%	4.19

9. Did the conference...help you to develop a new collaboration?

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Yes	23	85.19%
No	4	14.81%

Total answers: 27

10. Did the conference.... help you to strengthen existing collaboration?

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Yes	25	89.29%
No	3	10.71%

Total answers: 28

11. Did the conference.....help you develop your SBI research ideas?

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Yes	24	85.71%
No	4	14.29%

Total answers: 28

12. Did the conference..... inspire plans to implement new SBI studies?

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Yes	20	71.43%
No	8	28.57%

Total answers: 28

13. Please rate the following statements on a 5 point scale: 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree

Answer	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
I received sufficient information on the conference in advance	0 / 28 = 0.00%	1 / 28 = 3.57%	1 / 28 = 3.57%	9 / 28 = 32.14%	17 / 28 = 60.71%	4.50
Information via Email was effective	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	2 / 28 = 7.14%	5 / 28 = 17.86%	21 / 28 = 75.00%	4.68
Information provided on the website was useful	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	1 / 28 = 3.57%	13 / 28 = 46.43%	14 / 28 = 50.00%	4.46

14. Please rate the following statements on a 5 point scale: 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree.

Answer	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
The issues raised at the conference were important and useful to deal with	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	8 / 28 = 28.57%	20 / 28 = 71.43%	4.71
The duration of each session was appropriate	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	3 / 28 = 10.71%	4 / 28 = 14.29%	21 / 28 = 75.00%	4.64
The individual presenters had adequate time to present their material	1 / 28 = 3.57%	1 / 28 = 3.57%	2 / 28 = 7.14%	8 / 28 = 28.57%	16 / 28 = 57.14%	4.32
The subjects covered at this conference were relevant to my work	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	8 / 28 = 28.57%	20 / 28 = 71.43%	4.71
The conference provided adequate networking and collaborative opportunities	0 / 27 = 0.00%	0 / 27 = 0.00%	2 / 27 = 7.41%	7 / 27 = 25.93%	18 / 27 = 66.67%	4.59
The number and length of breaks were adequate	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	7 / 28 = 25.00%	21 / 28 = 75.00%	4.75
The social program was attractive	0 / 27 = 0.00%	1 / 27 = 3.70%	6 / 27 = 22.22%	6 / 27 = 22.22%	14 / 27 = 51.85%	4.22
The concurrent sessions helped increase my knowledge and skills	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	3 / 28 = 10.71%	7 / 28 = 25.00%	18 / 28 = 64.29%	4.54

15. Was the conference:

Answer	Response Count	Percent

Too many days	0	0.00%
Too few days	5	17.86%
Just the right number of days	23	82.14%

Total answers: 28

16. Were the days at the conference:

Answer	Response Count	Percent
Too long	3	10.71%
Too short	0	0.00%
Just right	25	89.29%

Total answers: 28

17. Please rate these on a 5 point scale: 1=inadequate, 5=excellent

Answer	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Plenary/large group sessions	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	1 / 28 = 3.57%	6 / 28 = 21.43%	21 / 28 = 75.00%	4.71
Concurrent oral abstract presentations	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	1 / 28 = 3.57%	10 / 28 = 35.71%	17 / 28 = 60.71%	4.57
Concurrent Symposia and Workshop Presentations	0 / 26 = 0.00%	0 / 26 = 0.00%	1 / 26 = 3.85%	7 / 26 = 26.92%	18 / 26 = 69.23%	4.65
Poster Session	0 / 26 = 0.00%	0 / 26 = 0.00%	3 / 26 = 11.54%	11 / 26 = 42.31%	12 / 26 = 46.15%	4.35
Lunch	0 / 28 = 0.00%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	3 / 28 = 10.71%	14 / 28 = 50.00%	11 / 28 = 39.29%	4.29
Venue (conference space)	1 / 28 = 3.57%	0 / 28 = 0.00%	1 / 28 = 3.57%	7 / 28 = 25.00%	19 / 28 = 67.86%	4.54

18. Any comments about the best sessions?

Answers
excellent plenaries.
I really enjoyed the Adolescents and Young Adults session on 9/14, breakout session 2
Very interesting talks by Sharon Levy and Tom Babor!
Dr. Babor was nothing short of inspiring. I only wish the fire alarm didn't interrupt his presentation.
Tom Babor's conference was very good.
The plenaries were very interesting and engaging. I loved the session in Spanish on Latin America--really broadened my perspective
the plenaries were terrific!

The contents were excellent

19. Any comments on the worst sessions?

Answers

There was no "worst" session...

All sessions were great, however there was not enough time for presenters to speak about their research. Sessions should be limited to 2-3 presentations instead of 5-6.

No

Not the fault of the speaker or conference but the false fire alarm put a damper on things.

None

20. Any comments on the format of the overall conference?

Answers

Timing seemed to be an issue for the smaller breakout room sessions

None.

Excellent organization and content selection. However, there were too many concurrent sessions/workshops/symposia. Perhaps fewer plenaries and more breakout session times would help?

The venue was perfect except for the two evacuations, which were entirely unacceptable.

No

The number of concurrent sessions was too big, considering the number of participants. It would be more profitable a smaller number of one more day of conference.

great format

nice to have the hotel and conference at the same place for easier logistics.

Increase the duration of the workshops.

Terrific science, presenters, networking

21. Any recommendations or future conference format and content?

Answers

more time for argument and discussion. emphasize time limits - strict- for presenters. in abstract sessions more free or designated networking time, maybe even a mentor mentee matching

I am a health scientist fellow on the FAS team at CDC. SBI is a newer topic for me and this conference allowed me to expand my topic knowledge and network with experts in the field.

Inclusion of short courses for students or healt professionals yet not familiar with SBIRT or other related topics, including research methodology.

Less speakers per session so material can be adequately covered.

see above

No

No

The same above

the publication of all abstracts (poster and oral comunication)

The inclusion of practical workshops

22. Which principles of SBI-related implementation science will you incorporate into your research/practice setting?

Answers

I am a health scientist fellow on the FAS team at CDC. SBI is a newer topic for me and this conference allowed me to expand my topic knowledge and network with experts in the field.

new dissemination ideas

Evaluation principles

I will add research topics discussed as talking points for my SBIRT trainings for practitioners and will use this information for gaining buy in from administrators.

better consider or evaluate the conceptual framework of behavior change

I have been using SBI in trainings for health care providers in Brazil and also to help smokers quit smoking in a clinical trial. I will keep using FRAMES method but also address other issues discussed in the conference, such as post treatment support and antecipation of talk, more then SBI lenght or contents.

Alcohol SBI in primary care patients

Contact with the patient

I will not research. I teach

The incorporation of new technologies in the application of SBI.

23. What changes will you make to your research/practice related to addressing polysubstance use or mental health interventions?

Answers

I am a health scientist fellow on the FAS team at CDC. SBI is a newer topic for me and this conference allowed me to expand my topic knowledge and network with experts in the field.

The conference helped me to 'think outside the box' with regard to new implementation strategies.

inclusion of effectiveness measures

I will include much of this information in my future SBIRT trainings.

better examine the outcome of interventions

I will look for improvements in the post treatment support.

Try to generate more real world data on efficacy

Taking more time

try to use brief screens. Teach brief interventions to trainees

The length of the intervention and the use of new technologies like the social media.

24. How do you plan to incorporate the use and application of technology to deliver SBI in your research/practice setting?

Answers

I am a health scientist fellow on the FAS team at CDC. SBI is a newer topic for me and this conference allowed me to expand my topic knowledge and network with experts in the field.

I am not sure yet.

Already in use

I continually emphasize the importance of SBIRT adoption into the EMR at all of my SBIRT trainings and speak with Administrators/IT Staff about adapting various platforms to include SBIRT screening tools and documentation resources.

continue to include technology-based interventions

I'm planing to advance in my research using TXT to help people quit smoking.

Not sure!

After a discussion with my colleagues I will introduce a new method to treat my patients

I intend to develop new apps and evaluate e-interventions in partnership with colleagues from other countries

Hoping we will get tablet based screeners

Using social networks to promote the intervention. Implementing marketing strategies, in combination with the motivational interview in the treatment sessions.

25. In addition to the changes to practice described above, please list any other changes to research/practice you intend to make resulting from your participation in this activity.

Answers

I am currently working on a practice highlight article: Adolescent Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) for Substance Use: An Application for School Social Workers. The sessions at the conference provided me with resources and a network of individuals that will help me.

I plan to think about other ways to study the effects of SBI as opposed to an RCT.

Overall, betterment of research communication skills.

After this conference, I see a new importance in marketing and campaigning for SBIRT. I have recently developed SBIRT marketing materials but see a much greater importance of getting the communities involved with these efforts as well.

NA

Taking more time

do more screening

Make changes in the material of the manuals, so that they adjust to the needs of the population to which they are directed. Use group management strategies for the application of the brief intervention.