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EVALUATION
1st Joint AEMH–FEMS Plenary Assembly 18-19 May 2012

Please indicate your affiliation  
AEMH 15  +  AEMH +FEMS 4

Do you consider the part “Internal Affairs” sufficiently covered ?  
YES 16  NO 3

Did the Joint Meeting enhance your knowledge on the sister organisation?  
YES 18  NO 1

Which part of the meeting was most valuable to you ?  

- EU affairs  
YES 11  NO  

- National Reports  
YES 11  NO  

- Working Groups  
YES 17  NO  

Which topics were not sufficiently discussed ?  CME, National Report too long(2), Working groups, Salaries (3), funding of healthcare (2), privatisation

How would you rate the meeting over all ?  
9 Very good, 7 Good, 2 average, 1 poor 1 very poor

How would you rate the working group you attended  
A.  Prof. Qualification/ Competence 2 Very good, 7 Good, 1 average, 1 poor 1 very poor

B.  Task Shifting 3 Very good, 6 Good, 5 average, 5 poor 5 very poor

C.  Working Conditions 2 Very good, 5 Good, 1 average, 5 poor 1 very poor

Strengths of the Meeting  
Interaction between participants  
YES 16  -1-  NO  
Knowledge transfer  
YES 15  NO 3
Any other  

Weaknesses of the Meeting  
Lack of time  
YES 10  NO 6
Unbalanced repartition of tasks between the two organisations  
YES 4  NO 10
Any other  too many items, too many documents, lack of time

Do you think that the focus of the 2 organisations are  
Identical  
YES 6  NO 7
Similar, but approached differently
Complementary

Do you think that the collaboration between the 2 organisations should be enhanced?

YES 14
NO 4

Explain ....(different aims)........

Are you in favour of future Joint Meetings?

YES 16
NO 2

If YES, what recommendations do you have for conducting future Joint Meetings?

In favour of a merger in a couple of years (2x), less items or more time for discussion (2x), underline differences, distinction of trade unions and AEMH role, common statements,
Frequency: not regularly, every 2 years (3x), every year (4x), never ever again.
English only.
### Evaluation of Joint AEMH–FEMS Plenary Assembly 18-19 May 2012

Please indicate your affiliation

- AEMH [ ]
- FEMS [ ]

**Do you consider the part “Internal Affairs” sufficiently covered?**

- YES [13]
- NO [3]

**Did the Joint Meeting enhance your knowledge on the sister organisation?**

- YES [21]
- NO [1]

**Which part of the meeting was most valuable to you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU affairs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Reports</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Groups</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Which topics were not sufficiently discussed?**

- More European Parliament, reasons of absence of harmonisation of EU medical practice, national reports (2x) EU affairs (2x) WG

**How would you rate the meeting over all?**

- Very good, [7]
- Good, [14]
- Average, [1]
- Poor, [1]
- Very poor, [1]

**How would you rate the working group you attended**

- Prof. Qualification/ Competence [2]
  - Very good, [2]
  - Good, [1]
  - Average, [1]
  - Poor, [1]
  - Very poor, [1]

- Task Shifting [3]
  - Very good, [3]
  - Good, [2]
  - Average, [1]
  - Poor, [1]
  - Very poor, [1]

- Working Conditions [10]
  - Very good, [10]
  - Good, [2]
  - Average, [1]
  - Poor, [2]
  - Very poor, [2]

**Strengths of the Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between participants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge transfer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weaknesses of the Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbalanced repartition of tasks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you think that the focus of the 2 organisations are**

- Identical [4]
- Similar, but approached differently    [13]
- Too similar [1]
Complementary

Do you think that the collaboration between the 2 organisations should be enhanced?

YES  20  NO  2  Explain ..........but attributes better defined..............................................

Are you in favour of future Joint Meetings?

YES  21  NO  2

If YES, what recommendations do you have for conducting future Joint Meetings?

Clear attributes, 1 item with joint statement for lobbying, more time WG and discussion
Frequency: 6 months (4x), 1 ½ years, 2 years (3x)