

Heartland Genetics & Newborn Screening Collaborative Seventh Annual Conference

September 22-24, 2010
Des Moines, Iowa

Conference Evaluation Summary

TOPIC	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I. Pre-Conference Communications					
1. Travel and lodging arrangements were made without difficulty.	26	1			
2. Pre-conference e-mail and list serve communications were clear.	20	7			
3. Website information about conference was helpful.	17	7	3		
4. Registration instructions were clear.	17	4	1		
II. Conference Agenda					
1. There was sufficient time for networking during the meeting.	15	10	1	1	
2. There was time to address specific regional issues of concern.	12	12	2	1	
3. Topics chosen for discussion were relevant for the future of Genetics and NBS in the Heartland states.	8	16	2	1	
4. Information regarding the national agenda (from Puryear) was clearly presented.	5	12	4	1	
5. Sufficient time was allowed for work group meetings.	13	10	2	1	
6. Including posters of colleague's work outside the collaborative was an added benefit to the conference.	4	12	6	1	
7. I learned something from a speaker or colleague that I intend to try in my state or practice.	10	11	3		
III. Conference Location, Accommodations and Booths					
1. The Embassy Suites accommodations met my needs.	20	7			
2. Vendor booths contributed to the overall resources at the conference and are worth having at a future meeting.	9	10	8		
3. Staff at the Heartland Registration table was friendly, efficient, and helpful.	16	5	1		

Comments: Please use this space to comment on questions above or to provide other comments.

Could expenditures be included in agenda booklet? Nice meeting—thanks to all involved; As always the staff at Heartland were wonderful; Would be better to have more vendors; More posters should have been available from each state in Heartland. Wonderful hotel, best yet; Excellent conference—lots of good info shared and presented; Shona did another excellent job; Great location for a meeting/conference; The acronyms were very over-whelming, it would be nice to have glossary or something. Also it would be nice to have electronic copies of the power points. Thanks; It would be nice to see other posters from what colleagues have done in the past year, I would like to have an

acronym glossary because all of the acronyms get confusion. If possible for some of the groups a short definition of what they do; Would like pitchers of water on the tables in conference rooms. Have speakers stay in their time frame; We might want to consider promoting more posters. Many projects could be shared—especially if people felt that sharing things like: (QA projects; approaches to development and review of emergency preparedness plans, long-term follow-up, parent and professional education and outreach) might spur more participation, if we didn't feel it had to be "research" oriented. I understand why we didn't push it this year, but should consider it in the future; How about people first language? Several presentations/presenters did not speak using people first language. I am disappointed!; Would like to see more vendor participation, could have used a little more time for work groups—ending felt a little rushed, a couple of talks were too long.