

APPENDIX D: FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF THE CONFEREES

QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE DEBRIEFING INTERVIEWS

1. *Was the Leadership Conference relevant to the mission and goals of your organization?*
2. *Were the goals of the Leadership Conference clear to you?*
3. *What do you think were the most significant outcomes of the Leadership Conference?*
4. *If there was one thing you or your organization could do to advance the effort re-kindled by the Leadership Conference, what would that be?*
5. *If there was one thing ONDCP or other conference participants could do to assist you or your organization in engaging in such an effort, what would that be?*
6. *If there is an individual or organization not yet involved in this effort that should be, who would that be? Would you be willing / able to help us make contact and help involve that individual / organization?*
7. *What would be a good way to measure the results of the conference and follow-up effort (that is, outcome measures)? How do you think we could best measure the impact of the conference over the next year?*
8. *What is the one “breakthrough” or sign of progress you would most like to see accomplished over the next year?*
9. *If there is a follow-up Leadership Conference in 2005, would you be interested in attending?*
10. *Do you have any other comments or suggestions concerning the Leadership Conference and the follow-up effort?*

CONFEREES’ RESPONSES TO THE DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS

The following brief summary reflects feedback from participants in the Leadership Conference on Medical Education in Substance Abuse.

1. Interviewers report that the follow-up interviews have been beneficial in helping participants reflect and focus on the conference and what is needed to move forward.
REPRESENTATIVE COMMENT: “This follow up debrief with individual participants is terrific; this is an excellent way to keep the ball rolling. Ask participants for something concrete that they will do and then follow up with them to see if it was done (several people already made promises or suggestions).”
2. Interviewers report that to sustain the momentum created by the conference, it is essential to issue some sort of interim report in the near future.
REPRESENTATIVE COMMENT: “A number of interviewees have requested a summarization of the conference so they can use it to underpin their discussions. For example, Dr. Samuel Jones requested a summarization because he has an opportunity to influence the Board of Family Medicine in a meeting he will attend the third week of February. He is one of the newest members of this network and his enthusiasm blew me away.”
3. Conferees viewed the Federal agency representatives as helping the small group discussions by making specific commitments to assist in the areas of education, licensing boards and exams.
REPRESENTATIVE COMMENT: “Actions were discussed on a higher level than I originally would have thought. Ideas of bringing business into this discussion were significant. There was a broad strategy to tackle difficult problems and they pledged money.”

4. Many interviewees view progress toward a second (e.g., Surgeon General) meeting as an indicator of success. Other conferees saw a task force or high-level planning committee as the way to go. The facilitators agreed that some mechanism for continued communication, at a frequency the conferees find appropriate, is important.

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENT: “Instead of a conference next year, create a Task Force whose mission it is to address the goals of the conference and assess the extent to which they are addressed throughout the year. The Task Force would then make strategic recommendations to major stakeholders, such as funding agencies, HRSA, AAMC, RRC, Deans of medical schools, etc.”

5. *GENERAL COMMENTS:*

“I went with low expectations, but ended with great enthusiasm and was extremely impressed.”

“The networking was wonderful. I have and will continue to utilize those I met to come together on some issues. The conference gave great opportunity to do that.”

“The opportunity to really talk through topics in a group of people that had the same interest was extremely helpful. It opened areas that I had not considered before.”

“It is clear that each of the participants has bits of information that others need to know. For example, Jon Ritvo has information directly beneficial to Rich Saitz and Patrick O’Connor and to all the others indirectly. Sheldon Miller has information about the high level conference that should be jointly discussed. Sam Jones has excitement about influencing Family Medicine that would be a boost to all the participants.”