Quo Vadis, EGPRN?

Jean Karl Soler
Where are we going?

- Executive Board
  - Discussion on membership
  - Discussion on finances
  - Discussion on vision for future

- Issues
  - Number of meetings a year?
  - Individual researchers or institutes?
  - NRs, or Colleges and Wonca?
Data collection

- Queried EGPRN National Representatives:
  - Questionnaire 2012
  - Focus group discussion Ljubljana 2012
  - Presentation of results and discussion Antwerp 2012
Outcomes of questionnaire

- We are doing very well in our core role of providing a safe atmosphere for developing research in family medicine, with rich discussions involving senior researchers to develop research capacity.

- We are effective in networking, but respondents feel a need for strengthening collaboration and involvement in more research projects.

- Respondents do not feel a need for major change in our orientation, but rather feel a need to protect what we have and build on our strengths.
Focus groups in Ljubljana
May 2012

- National Council broke into three groups
- All discussed the same themes
- Discussions recorded (tape, interviewer and observer notes)
- Thematic analysis
- Presented to National Council as summary of themes in Antwerp
Proposals for improvement

- Structure
  - Full-time office with involvement in management of research projects
  - New roles for NRs (visibility, interaction with members, annual report)
  - Activities between meetings (researcher networking, Skype Executive meetings, mini-meetings for projects, annual extra meeting for NRs)
  - Communications & marketing (Communications plan)
  - Fee payment (allow Bank transfers)
  - Web-archive
  - Outreach to non-attenders
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Proposals for improvement

- Meetings
  - One, or two, a year? Maybe two, with different focus?
  - Abstract selection process (different standards?)
  - Safe environment to be kept at all costs
  - Increase scientific quality, attract experts
  - Contain meeting costs
  - Methodology workshop (Ljubljana experiment worked)
  - Creative ideas (art in medicine, case presentations, research ideas)
  - Less but better key-note speakers
Proposals for improvement

- International research collaboration – very important and moved down to own slide
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- Developing research capacity
  - Meetings which focus on developing research capacity
  - Mentoring (database of experts, or even reviewers for EU projects)
  - Pre-meeting workshops delivering formal curriculum of research methods
  - Diverse level, frequent research courses (one country?)
  - Detailed feedback for rejected abstracts
  - Scholarships for unfunded researchers
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- One or two meetings a year (costs of attending 2!)
  - Possibly one high level conference, showcasing best and state-of-the-art presentations. High quality work with strict selection of best quality
  - Possibly one workshop, only for developing research ideas and extended discussion of work-in-progress. Give preference to researchers from countries with less developed research capacity.
  - Possibly one clinical (for practising FDs) and one academic focus meeting
Proposals for improvement

- International research collaboration
  - Planned before meeting. People invited in advance. Abstracts accepted outside normal processes.
  - Formal collaboration as a signatory partner in a research project. Involvement of all EGPRN members
  - Expert groups within EGPRN. Already exist – incorporate with formal structures.
Late feedback

- Not major change, but incremental changes
- Keep EGPRN atmosphere
- Possibly more methodology work, involving experts
- EU projects mentioned again and again

Tensions:
- High expectations but need to contain costs
- Who shall do the work? NRs saying that NRs need to do more
- How can EGPRN support NRs in countries where FM has low priority and little local support?
Discussion in Kushadasi

Now, we need to develop a vision to implement these suggestions over the next few years!
International research collaboration

- How should EGPRN participate in and lead international research projects in primary care?
  - Aim for formal collaboration as a signatory partner in major research projects. Involvement of all EGPRN members.
  - Changes to EGPRN structures? New committee or existing? Expert groups within EGPRN already exist – incorporate with formal structures.
  - Which meetings or networks to approach to improve our visibility?
Organisation of EGPRN meetings

- One or two meetings a year?
  - Possibly one clinical (for practising FDs) and one academic focus meeting.
  - Possibly one high level conference, showcasing best and state-of-the-art presentations. High quality work with strict selection of best quality. Good keynotes.
  - Possibly one workshop, only for developing research ideas and extended discussion of work-in-progress. Give preference to researchers from countries with less developed research capacity.
  - Theme selection – to lead not follow research agenda
Conclusions

- Reports of two focus groups
  - International research projects
  - Re-organisation of EGPRN meetings