

Seventh Pan-Pacific Nursing Conference
“From evidence to impact: Co-designing care for future”

Evaluation Report

The Nethersole School of Nursing
Faculty of Medicine
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

December 2021

This material/event is funded by the Professional Services Advancement Support Scheme of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material/any event organised under this project do not reflect the views of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region or the Vetting Committee of the Professional Services Advancement Support Scheme.

1. About Our School

The Nethersole School of Nursing, formerly Department of Nursing, was established under Faculty of Medicine, The Chinese University of Hong Kong in 1991. It is the first university department of nursing in Hong Kong. The School focuses on high quality, innovative nursing and health education and research to prepare and support nurses to commit themselves to improving health outcomes for individuals and communities locally, regionally and globally, as well as facilitating nursing development in Hong Kong. With the generous support of the Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Charity Foundation, the School has further invigorated its commitment to pursuing excellence in nursing education, research and practice under the name of “The Nethersole School of Nursing” since 1 January 2002. According to the QS World University Rankings 2021 – Nursing, the School has been ranked the top one in Hong Kong and Asia, and the 22nd in the world.

2. Project Background

The healthcare needs have become increasingly complex due to the high prevalence of non-communicable diseases and also the unexpected health challenges arising from epidemics. Research on various interventions and treatment modalities is proliferating worldwide. However, the time needed for evidence to be translated to healthcare practices and policy is undesirable. The impact of research beyond the academia, on health, quality of life, environment, economy, socio-cultural domain, public policy and healthcare services, has not much been explored.

3. Project Objectives

The theme of this project was “From Evidence to Impact: Co-designing Care for Future”. It aimed to bring together multi-disciplinary healthcare providers, policy-makers, educators, and researchers worldwide to expand the impact of research evidence to improve health and social care and their outcomes across local and global contexts.

- a) Provide an international multidisciplinary platform for engaging renowned scholars, academics, doctors, nurses and paramedical personnel to co-design quality care based on research evidence;
- b) Enhance healthcare professionals’ competence in translating research evidence to

effective and safe practices for meeting current healthcare needs;

- c) Increase the publicity of Hong Kong in developing evidence-informed healthcare practices, care models and public health policy.

4. Key Project Deliverables

A two-day pre-conference research workshop and a two-day international conference were conducted through a virtual platform between 26 and 29 May 2021.

4.1. International conference

A series of scientific activities were delivered, including two keynote and three plenary speeches, five symposiums, and one roundtable discussion session. In addition, a total of 233 scientific abstracts relating to the conference theme and sub-themes were accepted for oral or e-poster presentations during the conference. The conference facilitated exchange of ideas among local and overseas researchers in health and social care field and increased the competitiveness of Hong Kong in taking a leading role to co-design health and social care services for the future.

4.2. Research workshop

The workshop was delivered by renowned experts from Cochrane Singapore and Cochrane Hong Kong. The workshop equipped medical, nursing and paramedical personnel with skills for identifying and translating the best evidence into healthcare practices and service development.

5. Results of Enrolment

There were over 600 registrations from local, mainland China, and overseas countries such as Australia, Colombia, Indonesia, Singapore, South Korea and Vietnam. Of them, 617 registrations were for the conference and 316 were for the workshop.

6. Evaluation

6.1. Evaluation of conference

A total of 420 participants completed the evaluation survey of the conference, achieving

a completion rate of 68.1%. As shown in Tables 1 – 3, the respondents generally agreed that the conference had achieved the project objectives and they were satisfied with the conference arrangement. Their qualitative comments also reflected that the respondents appreciated the well coordination of the conference and the virtual platform for increasing conference accessibility. Also, many complimented that the programme was well structured with excellent speakers.

Table 1. Evaluation result regarding project objectives

Participants rated their level of agreement with the following items:	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
1. To provide an international multidisciplinary platform for renowned scholars, academics, doctors, nurses and paramedical personnel to co-design quality care based on research evidence.	243 (57.9)	172 (41.0)	5 (1.2)	0	0
2. To enhance health care professionals' competence in translating research evidence into safe and effective practices for meeting current and future health care needs.	242 (57.6)	169 (40.2)	9 (2.1)	0	0
3. To increase Hong Kong's visibility and reputation, regionally and internationally, in developing evidence-informed health care practices, care models and public health policies.	258 (61.4)	147 (35.0)	13 (3.1)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)
4. I gained a good understanding on the impact of research evidence to improve health and social care management and outcomes in the local, regional and global contexts.	224 (53.3)	177 (42.1)	19 (4.5)	0	0
5. The keynote, plenary and roundtable speakers are experienced in the topic areas.	268 (63.8)	145 (34.5)	7 (1.7)	0	0
6. The delivery method of this conference was appropriate.	245 (58.3)	156 (37.1)	16 (3.8)	3 (0.7)	0

Footnote: *n*, Frequency; %, Percentage. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 2. Level of satisfaction with the conference

Participants rated their level of satisfaction with the following items:	Excellent <i>n</i> (%)	Good <i>n</i> (%)	Satisfactory <i>n</i> (%)	Fair <i>n</i> (%)	Poor <i>n</i> (%)	Missing <i>n</i> (%)
<i>Conference arrangement</i>						
1. Delivery mode of the conference	156 (37.1)	219 (52.1)	41 (9.8)	4 (1.0)	0	0
2. Registration process	179 (42.6)	203 (48.3)	29 (6.9)	5 (1.2)	0	4 (1.0)
3. Conference facilities and technical support	151 (36.0)	198 (47.1)	56 (13.3)	4 (1.0)	0	11 (2.6)
4. Conference information	147 (35.0)	228 (54.3)	39 (9.3)	6 (1.4)	0	0
5. Organisation of conference programme	179 (42.6)	206 (49.1)	32 (7.6)	3 (0.7)	0	0
6. Overall evaluation of the conference	163 (38.8)	228 (54.3)	28 (6.7)	1 (0.2)	0	0
<i>Content</i>						
1. Keynote addresses	142 (33.8)	237 (56.4)	35 (8.3)	2 (0.5)	0	4 (1.0)
2. Plenary sessions	131 (31.2)	243 (57.9)	39 (9.3)	2 (0.5)	0	5 (1.2)
3. Poster and oral presentations	115 (27.4)	227 (54.1)	66 (15.7)	6 (1.4)	0	6 (1.4)
4. Symposiums	141 (33.6)	229 (54.5)	41 (9.8)	3 (0.7)	0	6 (1.4)
5. Roundtable discussion	112 (26.7)	221 (52.6)	57 (13.6)	7 (1.7)	0	23 (5.5)

Footnote: *n*, Frequency; %, Percentage. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 3. Evaluation regarding adequacy of the sessions

Sessions	Too many	About right	Too few	NA
	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
1. Keynote addresses	16 (3.8)	392 (93.3)	6 (1.4)	6 (1.4)
2. Plenary sessions	14 (3.3)	392 (93.3)	7 (1.7)	7 (1.7)
3. Poster and oral presentations	48 (11.4)	349 (83.1)	15 (3.6)	8 (1.9)
4. Symposiums	16 (3.8)	390 (92.9)	10 (2.4)	4 (1.0)
5. Roundtable discussion	14 (3.3)	349 (83.1)	38 (9.1)	19 (4.5)

Footnote: *n*, Frequency; %, Percentage. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

6.2. Evaluation of Workshop

There were 167 and 84 respondents completing the evaluation survey for Day 1 and Day 2, respectively. Table 4 shows that the respondents generally agreed that the workshop had achieved its objectives. The majority of them were satisfied with the workshop, as

shown in Table 5.

Table 4. Evaluation of the workshop objectives

Participants rated their level of agreement with the following items:	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
DAY 1 (N = 167)					
1. To enable participants to understand and interpret systematic reviews and using Cochrane Reviews.	87 (52.1)	76 (45.5)	4 (2.4)	0	0
2. To equip participants with knowledge and skills in interpreting systematic reviews and using Cochrane Reviews.	83 (49.7)	76 (45.5)	7 (4.2)	1 (0.6)	0
3. I gained a good understanding on interpreting systematic reviews and using Cochrane Reviews.	70 (42.0)	76 (45.5)	19 (11.4)	2 (1.2)	0
4. The workshop speakers are experienced in the topic areas.	100 (60.0)	65 (39.0)	1 (0.6)	1 (0.6)	0
5. The delivery method of this workshop was appropriate.	79 (47.3)	77 (46.1)	9 (5.4)	2 (1.2)	0
DAY 2 (N = 84)					
1. To enable participants to understand and interpret Systematic Reviews and Evidence Synthesis.	60 (71.4)	24 (28.6)	0	0	0
2. To equip participants with knowledge and skills in planning and conducting Systematic Reviews and Evidence Synthesis.	56 (66.7)	26 (31.0)	1 (1.2)	1 (1.2)	0
3. I gained a good understanding on Systematic Reviews and Evidence Synthesis.	52 (61.9)	30 (35.7)	1 (1.2)	1 (1.2)	0
4. The workshop speakers are experienced in the topic areas.	65 (77.4)	18 (21.4)	1 (1.2)	0	0
5. The delivery method of this workshop was appropriate.	48 (57.1)	28 (33.3)	5 (6.0)	3 (3.6)	0

Footnote: *n*, Frequency; %, Percentage. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 5. Level of satisfaction with the workshop

Participants rated their level of satisfaction with the following items:	Excellent <i>n</i> (%)	Good <i>n</i> (%)	Satisfactory <i>n</i> (%)	Fair <i>n</i> (%)	Poor <i>n</i> (%)	Missing <i>n</i> (%)
DAY 1 (N=167)						
1. Adequacy of the content covered	37 (22.2)	105 (62.9)	24 (14.4)	1 (0.6)	0	0
2. Organisation of content	39 (23.4)	105 (62.9)	21 (12.6)	2 (1.2)	0	0
3. Presentation	42 (25.2)	98 (58.7)	20 (12.0)	7 (4.2)	0	0
4. Your level of understanding	23 (13.8)	75 (45.0)	55 (32.9)	12 (7.2)	2 (1.2)	0
5. Usefulness of the workshop to your work	29 (17.4)	96 (57.5)	34 (20.4)	8 (4.8)	0	0
6. Overall evaluation of the workshop	34 (20.4)	107 (64.1)	22 (13.2)	4 (2.4)	0	0
DAY 2 (N = 84)						
1. Adequacy of the content covered	40 (47.6)	36 (42.9)	7 (8.3)	0	0	1 (1.2)
2. Organisation of content	42 (50.0)	36 (42.9)	4 (4.8)	1 (1.2)	0	1 (1.2)
3. Presentation	45 (53.6)	33 (39.3)	3 (3.6)	2 (2.4)	0	1 (1.2)
4. Your level of understanding	28 (33.3)	31 (36.9)	17 (20.2)	7 (8.3)	0	1 (1.2)
5. Usefulness of the workshop to your work	35 (41.7)	34 (40.5)	10 (11.9)	4 (4.8)	0	1 (1.2)
6. Overall evaluation of the workshop	37 (44.1)	37 (44.1)	6 (7.1)	3 (3.6)	0	1 (1.2)

Collaborating Organisations:

- Cochrane Hong Kong
- Y.K. Pao Foundation Centre for Nursing Excellence in Chronic Illness Care

Supporting Organisations (*in alphabetical order*):

- Asian and Pacific Alliance for Nursing Education (APANE)
- Louise Herrington School of Nursing, Baylor University
- School of Nursing, Fudan University
- Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education, Kingston University and St. George's University of London
- School of Nursing and Midwifery, La Trobe University
- Department of Nursing, Manchester Metropolitan University
- Department of Nursing, College of Medicine, NCKU
- School of Nursing, NTU
- School of Nursing, Shandong University
- West China School of Nursing, Sichuan University
- College of Nursing, Taipei Medical University
- College of Nursing, The Pennsylvania State University
- School of Nursing, The University of California, Los Angeles
- School of Nursing and Midwifery, The University of Newcastle
- Faculty of Nursing, Health Science Centre, Xi'an Jiaotong University
- College of Nursing, Yonsei University

Sponsors:

- Wofoo Foundation
- Chung Chi College, CUHK

Conference Organising Committee:

- **School Director:** Professor Wai Tong CHIEN
- **Conference Consultant:** Professor Janita Pak Chun CHAU
- **Conference Chairperson:** Dr Helen Yue Lai CHAN
- **Secretariat:** Dr Suzanne Hoi Shan LO
- **Treasurer:** Dr Jojo Cho Lee WONG
- **Subcommittee Chairpersons**
 - **Scientific Subcommittee:** Dr Ka Ming CHOW
 - **Publication Subcommittee:** Dr Ho Yu CHENG
 - **Management Subcommittee:** Dr Aileen Wai Kiu CHAN
 - **Publicity and Public Relations Subcommittee:** Dr Sally Wai Sze LO and Dr Amy Yuli ZANG
 - **Sponsorship Subcommittee:** Dr Kai Chow CHOI
 - **Social Subcommittee:** Dr Dorothy Ngo Sheung CHAN
- **IT Support:** Ms Annie Suk Man LAW, Mr Tony Chak Pan SO
- **Administrative Support:** Ms Sammi So Ying NG