ASPHN held its Annual Meeting virtually for the third time from June 13th through June 15th, 2022.

At the end of each day, attendees were sent a survey via email. At the request of ASPHN, a weblink was also provided to accommodate attendees who could not receive an email invitation.

The survey assessed participants’ feedback about the Annual Meeting. The survey included questions about the value of the information provided, the virtual format, and overall satisfaction with the meeting.
Response Rate

The response rate for the daily and overall surveys was good. Monday’s session had the highest response rate, and Wednesday had the lowest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>62% response rate, n=188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>42% response rate, n=263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>37% response rate, n=288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>47% response rate, n=288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday’s Agenda*

Pre-conference poster panel discussions: Interventions for Schools and School-Aged Children with Rita Stephenson, Sydney Meyer, & Cecily Weber

Welcome Logistics Announcement of 2022 Award Winners with Jamie Stang, PhD, MPH, RDN

History of Dietary Guidance with Lisa Jahn, PhD, RDN

Federal Update: USDA Update with Sara Bleich, PhD, Donna Johnson-Bailey, MPH, RDN, Helen Chipman, PhD, RDN

Public Health Nutritionists: What does the future hold? with Karen Probert, MS, RDN

*The initial survey was distributed with the incorrect agenda. Although the survey was corrected, 26 respondents did not complete the revised survey, therefore, their responses have been removed from related questions (slides 8-12).
96% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the statement, “I enjoyed the Annual Meeting presentations I attended today.”

2% Strongly Disagree 56% Disagree 40% Neither Agree nor Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

*(n= 117).*

* 1% strongly disagreed, 1% disagreed.
84% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the statement, “My organization allowed me to take full advantage of the training sessions today.”

* 1% strongly disagreed.
Note about “Invalid” Responses:
In some cases, respondents provided contradictory answers to two questions (whether a session met participants’ expectations and whether the session provided information they will use). Some respondents stated they attended the session in the first instance but said they did not attend in the second instance. These responses were removed from the data set and labeled as ‘invalid.’
Most respondents who attended the Pre-conference Panel Discussion agreed or strongly agreed that the session met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Information I will use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Met expectations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0 strongly disagreed.

**0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.

(n=47, 42 did not attend, 2 invalid)
Most respondents attending the Welcome Logistics Announcement session agreed or strongly agreed it met their expectations, and the session offered information they would use in their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met expectations**</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information I will use*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0 strongly disagreed.
**0 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed.

(n=62, 28 did not attend, 1 invalid).
Most respondents who attended *History of Dietary Guidance* agreed or strongly agreed that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

Information I will use*

- Strongly Disagree: 3
- Disagree: 24
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 14

Met expectations**

- Strongly Disagree: 3
- Disagree: 18
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 20

(n=42, 47 did not attend, 2 invalid).

*1 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.
**1 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.
Most respondents who attended the Federal Update strongly agreed that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

*0 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed, 1 neither agreed nor disagreed.  
**0 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed.  
(n=80, 7 did not attend, 4 invalid).
Nearly all respondents who attended the *Public Health Nutritionists* session agreed or strongly agreed that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met expectations**</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information I will use*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed. **1 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed. (n=71, 18 did not attend, 2 invalid).
Respondents described a variety of things they learned during Monday’s session. These included:

- History of dietary guidance and the new dietary guidelines
- The importance of continuing to encourage state and federal agencies to increase and measure equity
- Learning about the White House Conference on Hunger, Nutrition and Health
- Initiation of federal programs aimed at addressing food insecurity
- USDA resources, programs, and updates
- Emerging issues and Ideas for the future
- Future of Public Health Nutrition

(n=96, 21 skipped).
When asked how the day’s sessions could be improved, most respondents said that nothing needed improvement, and instead, respondents took the opportunity to comment on what they enjoyed. Themes from the few who did offer suggestions are below.

**History of Dietary Guidance.**
*The presenter for this session was unexpectedly absent. Many individuals mentioned their disappointment with the recorded (versus live session), or their frustration with the fact the presentation wasn’t held as scheduled. (15 respondents)*

**Beginning the day’s sessions with a more engaging and dynamic presentation.**
(2 respondents)

*To compensate, ASPHN had the presenter provide a recorded presentation which was available for later viewing.*
Tuesday’s Agenda

Pre-conference poster panel discussions: Feeding Under 5: Infant and Young Child Nutrition with Melissa Vang, Rachel Feinberg, Hailey Lewis, & Tiara Giddings

Welcome Federal Update: CDC-DNPAO with Ruth Petersen, MD, MPH

State Sharing: Using Communication to Support Nutrition Programs with Christopher Thomas, Ignacio Romero, Asbury Jones, Travis Parker, & Ann Potempa

Ripple Effect Mapping: A Participatory Method for Documenting Program Impacts with Scott Chazdon, MA, PhD

The Power of Policy in Produce: How Federal Policy and Programs Have Driven Demand and Consumption with Mollie Van Lieu
98% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the statement, “I enjoyed the Annual Meeting presentations I attended today.”

![Bar chart showing responses](chart.png)

- Strongly Disagree: 2%
- Disagree: 53%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 45%
- Agree: 53%
- Strongly Agree: 2%

*(n= 110).*

* 0% strongly disagreed, 0% disagreed.
76% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the statement, “My organization allowed me to take full advantage of the training sessions today.”

*(n= 110).*

* 0% strongly disagreed, 0% disagreed.*
Most respondents who attended the *Pre-conference Panel Discussion* strongly agreed that the session met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information I will use*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met expectations**</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed.
**0 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed.

(n=48, 59 did not attend, 3 invalid).
Most respondents who attended the *Welcome Federal Update* agreed or strongly agreed that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information I will use*</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations**</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed.

**0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed, 1 neither agreed/disagreed.

(n=92, 16 did not attend, 2 invalid).
Most respondents who attended the State Sharing session agreed or strongly agreed that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met expectations**</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information I will use*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed.
**0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed, 1 neither agreed/disagreed.

(n=83, 25 did not attend, 2 invalid).
Most respondents who attended the *Ripple Effect Mapping* session agreed that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

- **Strongly Disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Neither Agree nor Disagree**
- **Agree**
- **Strongly Agree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information I will use*</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 strongly disagreed.
**0 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed.

*(n=80, 28 did not attend, 2 invalid)*
Most respondents who attended *The Power of Policy in Produce* session agreed that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

- **Met expectations**: 4 strongly disagree, 40 neither agree nor disagree, 38 agree.
- **Information I will use**: 2 strongly disagree, 10 disagree, 43 neither agree nor disagree, 28 agree.

*(n=83, 26 did not attend, 1 invalid).*

*0 strongly disagreed.

**0 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed.*
Respondents described a variety of things they learned on Tuesday.

- CDC updates/priorities and programs, such as the Obesity program
- Importance of Evaluation
- Global Nutrition Plan
- Ripple Effect Mapping
- New communication strategies to support nutrition programs
- The value of integrating the community in communication efforts

\[ (n=101, \text{ 9 missing}) \]
Similar to Monday’s feedback, most respondents provided positive feedback, or said they would not change anything. A few themes from those who offered improvements are below.

**Technical Difficulties** (5 responses)

“...difficulties with the ripple effects mapping...”

“...Perhaps an improvement would be to provide more guidance or support to the moderators so that the Q and A goes more smoothly?”

“PPT's able to be downloaded during session”

**Time Complaints** (4 responses)

“All fine, day a bit too long.”

“Opportunities to discuss more in detain.”

(n=38, 728 missing).
Wednesday’s Agenda

Pre-conference poster panel discussions: Online/Virtual Interventions with Alice Jo Rainville, PhD, RD, CHE, SNS, FAND, Emily DeWitt, Rachel Gillespie & Kuanyu Chen

Welcome Federal Update: MCHB with Laura Kavanagh, MPP, Laurel Huffman, MPH, CPH, RDN, LDN, & Meredith Morrissette, MPH

Designing iByte4health: A mobile health (mHealth) intervention for childhood obesity prevention with Gina Tripicchio, MSEd, PhD

Child Index Opportunity with Chaya Merrill, DrPH

Long-Term Disaster Recovery: Re-Engagement and Finding Vitality with Kira Mauseth, PhD
94% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the statement, “I enjoyed the Annual Meeting presentations I attended today.”

- Strongly Disagree: 6%
- Disagree: 53%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 41%

(\(n=106\)).

* 0% strongly disagreed, 1% disagreed.
75% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the statement, “My organization allowed me to take full advantage of the training sessions today.”

![Bar chart showing responses]

- Strongly Disagree: 4%
- Disagree: 20%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 33%
- Agree: 42%

(n= 106).

* 1% strongly disagreed.
Most respondents who attended the Pre-conference Panel Discussion agreed or strongly agreed that the session met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

*0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.  **0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.

(n=53, 49 did not attend, 4 invalid).
Most respondents who attended the *Welcome Federal Update* agreed or strongly agreed that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

(n=83, 22 did not attend, 1 invalid).

*0 strongly disagreed, 2 disagreed.

**0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.
Most respondents who attended the *Designing iByte4health* session **agreed** that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met expectations**</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information I will use*</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(n=73, 30 did not attend, 3 invalid).

*0, strongly disagreed, 2 strongly disagreed.
**0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.
Most respondents who attended the *Child Index Opportunity* session agreed that it met their expectations and provided them with information they would use in their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information I will use*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met expectations**</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n=80, \text{ 24 did not attend, 2 invalid}\).

*0 strongly disagreed.

**0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.
Most respondents who attended the *Long-Term Disaster Recovery* strongly agreed that it met the stated objectives and their expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met stated objectives*</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=64, 39 did not attend, 3 invalid).

*0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.
** 0 strongly disagreed, 0 disagreed.
Respondents described various things they learned on Wednesday that they will be able to use in their work.

- Child Health Opportunity Index and how to incorporate it in the community
- MCHB Updates
- Importance of staying abreast of federal policy developments
- ibyteforhealth as a valuable resource
- The ability to support communities through empathy and connection
- Strategies for resiliency

(n=94, 12 skipped).
As in the previous days’ surveys, many respondents to Wednesday’s survey used the opportunity to provide **positive** feedback, or state they would **not change anything** about the meeting. For those with suggestions, the reoccurring themes were related to:

**Absence / inability to locate copies of presenters’ slides, notes, agenda** (3 responses)

“...copies of the slides ahead of time. Maybe they are there and I can't find them...”

“...had a hard time capturing notes...If they could attach their script that would be helpful...”

**Issues with the speakers’ pace and/or comfort level presenting** (7 responses)

“Slow down speakers...had excellent presentations...too fast for me.”

“More interaction between speakers and participants.”

“Slower pace...speaker...”.

(n=26, 80 skipped).
Overall Evaluation
66% of the respondents were ASPHN Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Non-Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=135).
The most common way that respondents heard about the Annual Meeting was through an ASPHN email.

*The remaining 7% of respondents heard about the meeting through a ASPHN consultant, committee member, Twitter, or LinkedIn. (n=135).
60% of respondents stated their state had **no restrictions** about the number of people permitted to **travel** to attend the Annual Meeting. **Over 50%** reported **state restrictions** in **2021**.

(n=135).
Of the respondents who stated their state had travel restrictions, *budgetary constraints* and *staffing limitations* were mentioned as reasons for the restrictions. Other respondents stated they were unaware or unsure of state (or government) regulations. 

(n=135).
31% of respondents stated this was their **first** ASPHN Annual Meeting.

(n=135).
The **majority** of respondents were attending their **first** ASPHN Annual Meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Annual Mtg</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Mtgs</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Annual Mtg</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Annual Mtg</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n= 135).
Many respondents stated they worked for ‘Other’ organizations such as WIC, Nonprofits, or Academia.*

- **Other**: 43%
- **State Health Department**: 38%
- **Other state agency**: 12%
- **I am a student**: 7%

*Other organizations included ASPHN, WIC, University systems, and Nonprofit organizations. (n=135).
54% of respondents **attended** one or more pre-conference poster panel discussions.

(n=134, 1 missing).
Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the pre-conference poster panel discussions format worked well for them.

*No respondents strongly disagreed.

(n=73, 62 missing).
Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the pre-conference poster panel discussions were a valuable use of their time.

*No respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed.

\[(n=73, 62 \text{ missing})\].
When respondents were asked for suggested improvements to the panel discussions, most respondents used the opportunity to provide positive feedback. Those who did suggest improvements mentioned:

- Giving breaks between each presenter (2 responses)
- Allowing more time for presenters to answer questions (2 responses)
- Providing information prior to the sessions which would include background on each research project, and clarity as to what one may expect during these sessions (3 responses)
- Offering the entire session live versus a recording of the presentation (2 responses)

(n=34, 101 missing)
Respondents voted on their **favorite** virtual abstract presentations. The following were the **top two favorites**.

**Research Track**

- **Lunch Skipping: Assessing the Frequency & Reasons Why**
  - 20 votes

- **Navigating the Intersection between Food Insecurity & Overweight/Obesity**
  - 16 votes

- (n=97, 38 missing)

**Program, policy, & practice Track**

- **Breastfeeding Welcomed Here: Marketing Campaign 2022**
  - 29 votes

- **Barriers and Facilitators of Online Grocery Services: Perceptions and Experiences**
  - 16 votes

- (n=98, 37 missing)
Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that vFairs platform worked well and the meeting offered opportunities to network.

The vFairs platform worked well.*

- Strongly Disagree: 7%
- Disagree: 41%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 51%

The online meeting offered opportunities to network.**

- Strongly Disagree: 5%
- Disagree: 35%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 38%
- Agree: 21%

*0% strongly disagreed, 1% disagreed.

**1% strongly disagreed.
Most respondents **agreed or strongly agreed** that participants were able to get their questions answered and the 30-minute breaks worked well.

The 30 minute breaks in between sessions worked well for me. *

Virtual participants were able to get their questions answered. **

*1% strongly disagreed, 2% disagreed.
**0% strongly disagreed, 1% disagreed.
Most respondents agreed they learned things that will increase their leadership capacity and competency as public health practitioners.

*0% strongly disagreed, 1% disagreed.
**1% strongly disagreed, 0% disagreed.
Most respondents were open to either an in-person or virtual meeting in 2023. (n=131, 4 missing).

*8% were unsure.
In comparison to other virtual meetings, 64% of respondents rated the Annual Meeting as excellent; 21% rated it as superior.

*0% rated ‘terrible’ and 0% rated ‘Poor’.

$(n=134, \ 1 \ missing)$. 
Respondents were asked to explain their rating of the virtual meeting. Sample comments included:

“Despite some video conference fatigue, sessions went quickly and I felt more engaged than at other conferences”

“I enjoyed the pacing of this meeting. It was helpful that it was not an entire 8 hours and that there were many breaks between sessions.”

“I didn't experience any technical difficulties. The speakers were prepared and high quality. ASPHN facilitators made the sessions move smoothly, especially the intro and question sections.”

“...I love how relevant everything was to my work. Some other virtual conferences are interesting but less useful to me. I though the agenda was thoughtfully constructed, too..”

(n=89, 46 missing).
When asked what they **enjoyed the most** about the meeting, respondents mentioned:

- **Freedom and opportunity that a virtual meeting allowed**
- **Quality and variety of the presentations and speakers**
- **Hearing other states’ projects and the Federal updates**
- **Learning about evaluations and being presented with topics relevant to their work**

(n= 113, 22 missing).
Comments about **platform shortcomings** (12 responses) and **meeting improvements** (48 responses) included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform Shortcoming and Meeting Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide longer breaks between sessions (8 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to link meeting registration to personal calendars (2 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downloadable resources &amp; ability to view all sessions at a later date / time (slide deck, notes, recorded presentations) for future utilization and reference (10 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities to network and interact with individuals who share specific areas of interest (10 responses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other comments were about unique challenges of respondents (such as personal issues with Zoom, wanting the meeting to end earlier, and finding others’ cameras distracting to the presentation).*
Since the implementation of a virtual format in 2020, participation continues to remain high.
ASPHN held the Annual Meeting virtually for a third time in 2022.

- In 2022, more survey respondents were ASPHN members (66%, n=135) than in 2021 (56%, n=111). About a third were first time attendees.

- The virtual platform allows participants to attend regardless of location, travel restrictions, or budgetary constraints.

- However, individuals missed the networking and interaction which occurs during in-person meetings and requested more opportunities to engage with others while participating in the virtual platform.

- Participants continue to support the virtual format and were highly satisfied with the meeting.
Most respondents were highly satisfied with the speakers and the variety of content. Many respondents commended the value of the information, stating it was interesting and pertinent to their day-to-day work.

The format of the poster presentations impacted respondents’ satisfaction with the sessions. Almost all (90%) of the respondents agreed/strongly agreed the sessions were a valuable use of their time.

Respondents also requested the ability to access copies of the slides (notes) from the presentations.

Respondents would appreciate access to notes and resources prior to sessions, if possible.

Overall, respondents felt the meeting contributed to their leadership capacity and competency as public health nutritionists.
Although Monday’s response rate was over 60%, the response rate of the other surveys were under 50%.

➢ ASPHN should continue to emphasize the value of participant feedback during the meeting and encourage participants to respond to the survey.

➢ ASPHN might consider reducing the number of surveys, opting for one overall survey, which may increase the response rate.
Moving forward, ASPHN should maintain the depth of session topics, relevance to participants’ work, and the quality of its speakers.

ASPHN should continue to allocate time for interaction, reflective networking, and breakout sessions.