

Kentucky Cancer Patient Navigators' Network Fall Forum: Evaluation Report



Held October 30, 2014 at the Kentucky Historical Society, Frankfort, KY

General Information:

- **Registered:** 121
- **Attended forum:** 97 [signed in at Registration Table, excludes three Kentucky Cancer Consortium staff members]
- **Evaluation forms returned:** 84 [Excludes three Kentucky Cancer Consortium staff members]
- **Participation Rate:** 86.5%

Summary and Recommendations:

- **Participation rate:** The Forum had a very high participation rate (86.5%) with completing the evaluation forms. A tablet was donated to the Kentucky Cancer Consortium (KCC) to use as a door prize for completing the evaluation form. Door prize tickets were collected at the same time the evaluations were collected, with the drawing being held at the close of the forum. Forum attendees had to be present to win. Judging from the enthusiasm of forum attendees, the door prize incentivized participation and should be continued in the future if a donated prize is able to be obtained.
- **Continuing Education Credits/Units Requested:** KCC contracted with the University of Kentucky, School of Social Work to provide online registration as well as Continuing Education (CE) credits for numerous professions. Approximately 36% of forum attendees requested CE credit with Nursing followed by Social Work being the most requested certificates. Since a large portion of forum attendees requested CE credit, efforts should be made to continue to offer CE credits in the future.
- **Evaluating Objectives, Presenters, and Content of the forum:** In regards to expectations being met, over 80% of forum attendees indicated the forum “Greatly Exceed[ed]” and “Exceed[ed]” their expectations for all of the following statements:
 - **OBJECTIVES**
 - Program objectives were explained at the beginning of the workshop.
 - Program objectives were achieved by the end of the workshop.
 - The workshop was well organized.
 - **PRESENTERS**
 - Used effective time management.
 - Provided content in a clear and understandable manner.
 - Were knowledgeable in content areas.
 - Demonstrated willingness to assist participants.
 - **CONTENT**
 - Content was appropriate for intended audience.
 - Content was consistent with stated objectives.

- Information could be applied to practice.

Examining these questions in hindsight, it may be useful to evaluate some of the statements above by asking, for example, “Were the program objectives explained at the beginning of the workshop?” Yes/No/Unsure or “Was the information you learned today applicable to your practice/work?” Yes/No/Unsure. By having a Likert scale measuring if forum attendees’ expectations were met, the responses were somewhat difficult to interpret.

- **Usefulness of attending the KY Cancer Patient Navigators’ Network Fall Forum:** Sixty percent of forum attendees/survey respondents indicated that attending the forum “substantially” enhanced their professional expertise. Over 95% indicated “yes, they would recommend this program to others”. From these results, we can conclude that the majority of attendees found the forum a valuable learning experience with almost all attendees indicating they would recommend it to others.
- **What forum attendees liked MOST about the Fall Forum:** For this question, forum attendees were invited to write a comment. Two predominant response categories emerged from forum attendees’ comments about what they liked most about the forum:
 - Networking opportunities
 - Overall forum comments regarding liking the format, variety of topics, logistics and atmosphere of the forum
- **Putting information into practice:** Every survey respondent who answered this question indicated that “Yes” (76 individuals or 90.5%), they would use the information they gained from the forum in their work activities. When questioned specifically how they planned to use this information, the largest category of responses related to “overall use” regarding organizational planning, improved patient navigation processes, increased partnership building and networking.
- **Topics that forum attendees wanted to learn more about:** The top 5 most frequently indicated responses:
 - Affordable Care Act and Cancer
 - Measuring success of cancer patient navigation efforts (What data to collect?)
 - Meeting CoC standards for Survivorship Care Plans
 - Dealing with compassion fatigue
 - Meeting CoC standards for patient navigation processes
- **Topics that forum attendees believe are the highest priority to learn more about:** The top 5 most frequently indicated responses:
 - Meeting CoC standards for Survivorship Care Plans
 - Meeting CoC standards for patient navigation processes
 - Measuring success of cancer patient navigation efforts (What data to collect?)
 - Fundraising to address patients' financial barriers
 - Cancer Patient Navigator certification-the national landscape
- **Forum attendees’ preferences for future trainings:** Forum attendees’ preferences for future trainings include:
 - Full-day workshops
 - Monday-Friday workshops
 - At least 4-6 weeks’ notice in advance of workshops
- **Other information related to the Patient Navigators’ Fall Forum:**
 - **Promotion:** Many forum attendees heard about this forum through KCC email/Wednesday’s Word newsletter or were referred by a colleague.

- **Travel:** Many forum attendees traveled between 26-50 miles followed by 100+ miles to attend the forum.
- For specific information regarding this evaluation report, please contact Jessica Jones, the Kentucky Cancer Consortium’s Evaluator, at jjones@kycancerc.org. In this report, the most frequent responses are often noted in **RED**.

Type of CE Credit Requested:

Ranking	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/%
1	Nursing	19	54
2	Social Work	11	31
3	CHES	2	6
4	Psychology	1	3
4	CADC	1	3
4	Respiratory Therapist	1	3
5	LPCC/LCPA	0	0
	Total	35	100

Thirty-five forum attendees requested a CE certificate (approximately 36% of forum attendees). **Nursing** and **Social Work** were most requested for CE credit.

Continuing Education Evaluation

For each section below, forum attendees rated how much the statement met their [expectations](#).

OBJECTIVES

Program Objectives were explained at the beginning of the workshop.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/%	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	32	38.1	39	39
	Exceeds	35	41.7	42.7	81.7
	Adequately Meets	15	17.9	18.3	100
	Barely Meets	0	0		
	Fails to Meet	0	0		
	Total	82	97.6	100	
Missing		2	2.4		
Total		84	100		

Approximately 40% of the survey respondents (n=32) indicated their expectations were “greatly exceed[ed]” regarding program objectives being explained at the beginning of the workshop. When

combined with the “Exceeds” category, over 80% of survey respondents indicated program objectives were explained at the beginning of the workshop.

Program objectives were achieved by the end of the workshop.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	34	40.5	42	42
	Exceeds	36	42.9	44.4	86.4
	Adequately Meets	11	13.1	13.6	100
	Barely Meets	0	0	0	
	Fails to Meet	0	0	0	
	Total	81	96.4	100	
Missing		3	3.6		
Total		84	100		

Over 40% of the survey respondents (n=34) indicated their expectations were “greatly exceed[ed]” by program objectives being achieved at the end of the workshop. When combined with the “Exceeds” category, eighty-six percent of survey respondents (n=70) indicated their expectations were met.

The workshop was well organized.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	48	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Exceeds	28	33.3	33.3	90.5
	Adequately Meets	8	9.5	9.5	100
	Barely Meets	0	0	0	
	Fails to Meet	0	0	0	
	Total	84	100	100	
Missing		0			
Total		84			

Fifty-seven percent of the survey respondents (n=48) indicated the forum was well organized which “greatly exceed[ed]” their expectations. When combined with the response category, “Exceeds”, over 90% of forum attendees (n=76) believed the forum was well organized.

PRESENTERS

Used effective time management.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	41	48.8	48.8	48.8
	Exceeds	35	41.7	41.7	90.5
	Adequately Meets	8	9.5	9.5	100
	Barely Meets	0	0	0	
	Fails to Meet	0	0	0	
	Total	84	100	100	
Missing		0			
Total		84			

Approximately half of the survey respondents (48.8% or n=41) indicated their expectations were “greatly exceed[ed]” by presenters use of effective time management.

Presented content in a clear and understandable manner.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	43	51.2	51.2	51.2
	Exceeds	36	42.9	42.9	94
	Adequately Meets	5	6	6	100
	Barely Meets	0	0	0	
	Fails to Meet	0	0	0	
	Total	84	100	100	
Missing		0			
Total		84			

Over half of the survey respondents (51.2% or n=43) indicated their expectations were “greatly exceed[ed]” regarding presenters providing information in a clear and understandable manner.

Knowledgeable in content areas.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	47	56	56	56
	Exceeds	34	40.5	40.5	96.4
	Adequately Meets	3	3.6	3.6	100
	Barely Meets	0	0	0	
	Fails to Meet	0	0	0	
	Total	84	100	100	
Missing		0			
Total		84			

Over half of the survey respondents (56% or n=47) indicated their expectations were “greatly exceed[ed]” regarding presenters being knowledgeable in their content areas.

Demonstrated willingness to assist participants.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	48	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Exceeds	33	39.3	39.3	96.4
	Adequately Meets	3	3.6	3.6	100
	Barely Meets	0	0	0	
	Fails to Meet	0	0	0	
	Total	84	100	100	
Missing		0			
Total		84			

Fifty-seven percent (n=48) of the survey respondents indicated their expectations were “greatly exceed[ed]” regarding presenters’ willingness to assist participants.

CONTENT

Content was appropriate for intended audience.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	42	50	50	50
	Exceeds	31	36.9	36.9	86.9
	Adequately Meets	11	13.1	13.1	100
	Barely Meets	0	0	0	
	Fails to Meet	0	0	0	
	Total	84	100	100	
Missing		0			
Total		84			

Half of the survey respondents (n=42) indicated their expectations were “greatly exceed[ed]” regarding presenters’ content being appropriate for the intended audience.

Content was consistent with stated objectives.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	41	48.8	49.4	49.4
	Exceeds	33	39.3	39.8	89.2
	Adequately Meets	9	10.7	10.8	100
	Barely Meets	0	0	0	
	Fails to Meet	0	0	0	
	Total	83	98.8	100	
Missing		1	1.2		
Total		84	100		

Approximately half of survey respondents (n=41) indicated their expectations were “greatly exceed[ed]” regarding forum content being consistent with stated objectives.

Information could be applied to practice.

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Greatly Exceeds	39	46.4	47	47
	Exceeds	31	36.9	37.3	84.3
	Adequately Meets	12	14.3	14.5	98.8
	Barely Meets	1	1.2	1.2	100
	Fails to Meet	0	0	0	
	Total	83	98.8	100	
Missing		1	1.2		
Total		84	100		

Almost half of survey respondents (n=39) indicated their expectations were “greatly exceed[ed]” regarding being able to apply information from the forum into practice.

This program enhanced my professional expertise:

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Substantially	53	63.1	63.9	63.9
	Somewhat	30	35.7	36.1	100
	Not at all	0	0	0	
	Total	83	98.8	100	
Missing		1	1.2		
Total		84	100		

Fifty-three survey respondents (63.1%) indicated that the KY Cancer Patient Navigators’ Network Fall Forum “substantially” enhanced their professional expertise.

I would recommend this program to others:

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	79	94	95.2	95.2
	No	4	4.8	4.8	100
	Not Sure	0	0	0	
	Total	83	98.8	100	
Missing		1	1.2		
Total		84	100		

The vast majority of survey respondents (n=79 or approximately 95%) indicated “Yes”, they would recommend this program to others.

**Kentucky Cancer Consortium (KCC)- Kentucky Cancer Patient Navigators' Network
Forum Evaluation and Planning for future Webinars or Trainings**

What did you **like MOST** about the Kentucky Cancer Patient Navigators' Network Fall Forum?

Response Category	Frequency/ Number	Comments by Survey Respondents
Networking	22	• Networking/Networking Opportunities
		• Understanding more about the state...I often feel very isolated [in my part of the state]
		• Being able to hear and network with other cancer workers
		• Meeting new people; learning new information
		• Time for networking
Overall: Format, Logistics and Atmosphere	22	• Mix of formats/Variety of topics
		• Wealth of information
		• Many interesting topics presented
		• Great information
		• Excellent content, very professionally done by KCC
		• Casual atmosphere/very informative
		• Content was so useful-pertinent
		• Well structured
		• All the topics discussed and presented were helpful to me as a new nurse navigator.
		• Ease of registration
		• Everyone was helpful and friendly
		• I liked the varied aspects covered and different approaches and disciplines. Looking forward to next year already.
		• Very informative!
		• Very informative and well presented/planned
		• Location! Beautiful venue. Comfortable and easy to find.
• Excellent-organized. Everything was relevant; evidence-based and so well organized. Sincerely appreciate your work and quality forum.		
• There was not one thing I most liked-it was all valuable information.		
• Increased my personal understanding of the scope of navigation.		
Panel Discussions	14	• Panel format was great
		• Really enjoyed the panel discussion on tobacco treatment
		• The tobacco treatment conversation
	10	• Guest speakers

Speakers (Diversity & Knowledge)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent speakers • Presenters were knowledgeable • Really enjoyed the information from different approaches and disciplines • Content was relatable and well presented. • Interactive presenters- knowledgeable and very confident in their respective fields
CoC Information & Nina Miller	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission on Cancer (CoC) information • Nina Miller did an excellent job in engaging the audience-great topic-relevant to our work • CoC Review S 3.3 • Best-meeting CoC guidelines speaker • Presentation on patient navigation program standards
Resources	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gathering resources • Resource tables • Pathfinder information • The introduction to many resources for patients • So many helpful resources • Providing resources for navigators • Love Wednesday's Word
Community Health Worker Information	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information regarding Community Health Workers • Most helpful topic was Community Health Workers • CHW presentation
Survivorship Care Planning and KY Cancer Registry	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survivorship building plan from KY Cancer Registry database • KY Cancer Registry information
Suggestions for the Next Forum	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needed information on psychosocial distress screening & Survivorship Care Plans • Did not need so much time spent on Registry, only navigation • Larger cups for coffee

The majority of survey respondents who answered this question indicated they **liked MOST** the Networking and the Overall Format (includes logistics and atmosphere) of the forum.

Do you plan on using information you gained during the Forum in your work activities:

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/ %	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	76	90.5	100	100
	No	0	0		
	Total	76			
Missing		8	9.5		
Total		84	100		

Every survey respondent who answered this question indicated that “Yes” (n=76 or 100%), they would use the information they gained from the forum in their work activities.

Note: there were 8 missing responses.

If yes, please provide an example of how you plan to use the information.

Response Category	Frequency/ Number	Comments by Survey Respondents
Overall: Organizational Planning, Management, Networking	15	• Organizational planning
		• Be proactive with motivated interaction
		• Better ways to navigate patients that better benefits the patients
		• To assist in cancer patient navigation
		• I will use information from today to help with navigating patients to their cancer screenings and those new to ACA.
		• I took some posters for HPV prevention and plan to place them in the STD clinic.
		• Connections made will help me do my job-those connections have more value than any information.
		• Partnership building
Tobacco Cessation/ Motivational Interviewing	11	• Tobacco cessation and motivational interviewing
		• Tobacco cessation information
		• Smoking cessation information and resources to provide to cancer patients
		• Tobacco treatment plan will be very useful in Eastern KY
		• Further research on smoking cessation tools/education
		• Taking a positive approach of meeting patients where they are at in regards to smoking cessation
		• I really enjoyed the discussion on “motivation counseling” during the Tobacco Cessation panel.
Connecting others/patients to resources	11	• Refer patients to resources
		• Resources to help clients in need
		• Resources that I was unaware of
		• Kentucky Cancer Program- Pathfinder- provide to patients (x2)
		• Provide more in-depth information and resource links to my patients
		• Connecting patients to community and cancer resources
Community Health Workers/CHWs	9	• Community Health Care Workers are an awesome thing to utilize
		• Plan to use the data presented to push for CHW legislation
		• Connecting members with CHW and helping to connect with resources
		• Specifically KY Homeplace-interested in locating CHW in rural communities where patients I serve reside.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Health Workers as local coordinator for our patients Working with CHWs at LHDs for meeting needs of patients Community Health Worker, community assessment to help identify barriers Exploring information more specific to CHW & reimbursement
Sharing Information	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide information to patients Inform staff of information learned-share handouts The colon cancer data/graph & cancer snapshot data in educational presentations in the community Provide information to underserved, minority audiences Patient education Review information with team of Social Workers I currently work with Share web links Share information with providers Share important information
Kentucky Cancer Registry/ Survivorship Care Plans	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survivorship Care Plans Registry/Survivorship Survivorship Care Plan Implementation Use of registry data for SCP
Commission on Cancer Information	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CoC 3.1, Navigation, Survivorship Standards Information provided by Nina CoC Standards, Navigation Resources

What topics would you like to learn more about in cancer patient navigation webinars and/or upcoming meetings?

Ranking	Topic Area	Frequency/ Number
1	Affordable Care Act and Cancer	42
2	Measuring success of cancer patient navigation efforts (what data to collect?)	41
3	Meeting CoC standards for Survivorship Care Plans	38
4	Dealing with compassion fatigue	37
5	Meeting CoC standards for patient navigation processes	35
6	Lung cancer screening-latest research	30
7	Cancer Patient Navigator certification-the national landscape	29
8	E-cigarettes-latest research	28
9	Colon cancer screening-FIT & Colonoscopy	28
10	Fundraising to address patients' financial barriers	27
11	Helping cancer patients with employment issues	21
12	Developing a patient flow chart/algorithm	20

13	Addressing cultural competency in your patient navigation program	18
14	Other	8
Total		402

“Other” topic areas noted included:

- Resources (local/national) available
- Learn about federal funded programs available to cancer patients
- Information that impacts the nurse navigation in the hospital, inpatient and outpatient services: meeting new standards, barriers, operational processes, evaluation more consistent process for patient management across the state to allow meaningful data to improve and drive our services
- Psychosocial Distress Screening and Survivorship Care Plans
- Grant writing
- Motivational Interviewing (x2)
- Oncology National Certification for Nurse Navigators

A total of 402 responses were indicated by survey respondents on topics they wanted to learn more about. The **top five most frequently indicated responses** included:

- 1) Affordable Care Act and Cancer
- 2) Measuring success of cancer patient navigation efforts (what data to collect?)
- 3) Meeting CoC standards for Survivorship Care Plans
- 4) Dealing with compassion fatigue
- 5) Meeting CoC standards for patient navigation processes

Of these topics listed above, **please choose the highest priority topic for you to learn more about** through patient navigation webinars/upcoming meetings? **Please indicate only ONE topic.**

Ranking	Topic Area	Frequency/Number
1	Meeting CoC standards for Survivorship Care Plans	15
2	Meeting CoC standards for patient navigation processes	13
3	Measuring success of cancer patient navigation efforts (what data to collect?)	10
4	Fundraising to address patients' financial barriers	8
5	Cancer Patient Navigator certification-the national landscape	8
6	Affordable Care Act and Cancer	7
7	E-cigarettes-latest research	5
8	Colon cancer screening-FIT & Colonoscopy	5
9	Lung cancer screening-latest research	4
10	Helping cancer patients with employment issues	3

11	Developing a patient flow chart/algorithm	3
12	Dealing with compassion fatigue	3
13	Addressing cultural competency in your patient navigation program	1
14	Other	0
Total		85

A total of 85 responses were indicated by survey respondents on high priority topics (note: one respondent indicated two choices). The **top five most important/highest priority topics indicated** included:

- 1) Meeting CoC standards for Survivorship Care Plans
- 2) Meeting CoC standards for patient navigation processes
- 3) Measuring success of cancer patient navigation efforts (what data to collect?)
- 4) Fundraising to address patients' financial barriers
- 5) Cancer Patient Navigator certification-the national landscape

Participant Preferences (please check):

Do you prefer:

Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/%
Half-Day Workshops	25	26
Full-Day Workshops	68	69
Multi-Day Workshops	5	5
Total	98	100

Survey respondents indicated they prefer full-day workshops (69% or n=25). Note: respondents could indicate more than one response.

Do you prefer:

Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/%
M-F Day-Time Workshops	80	98.8
M-F Evening Workshops	0	0
Weekend Workshops	1	1.2
Total	81	100

Survey respondents indicated they prefer Monday-Friday workshops (98.8% or n=80).

How much time do you need to respond to a workshop announcement?

Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/%
Less than a Month	19	23.5
4-6 Weeks	45	55.6
6+ Weeks	17	21
Total	81	100

The majority of survey respondents indicated they need 4-6 weeks to respond to a workshop announcement (55.6% or n=45).

How did you learn of this workshop?

Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/%
KCC Email/Wed. Word	46	54
CE Listserv for UK-SW	4	5
Referred by Colleague	23	27
Referred by My Licensing Board	0	0
UK CE Website	4	5
Flyer, poster or brochure	1	1
Other	7	8
Total	85	100

Over half of the survey respondents indicated they learned of this workshop through KCC email/Wednesday's Word newsletter (54% or n=46), followed by being referred by a colleague (27% or n=23). Note: respondents could indicate more than one response.

How far did you have to travel to attend this workshop?

	Response	Frequency/ Number	Percent/%	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0-25 miles	12	15.5	15.7	15.7
	26-50 miles	27	32.1	32.5	48.2
	51-100 miles	17	20.2	20.5	68.7
	100+ miles	26	31	31.3	100
	Total	83	98.8	100	
Missing		1	1.2		
Total		84	100		

Some survey respondents traveled a great distance in order to be able to attend this forum. Survey respondents traveled between:

- **26-50 miles** (32.5% or n=27)
- **100+ miles** (31.3% or n=26)

New additions to Wednesday's Word email list: 23 individuals

New additions to the UK College of Social Work email list: 11 individuals