



Feedback from delegates. EQALM Dublin 2017

As in previous years, we undertook a survey monkey poll to ask all attendees at the annual Symposium on their thoughts and views. We had responses from 46 individuals which is an acceptable proportion of the registered delegates. Therefore, we can once again be confident that these findings are indeed a representative view from those attending. We thank everyone who completed the on-line survey.

The questions included some logistical aspects as well as the scientific content. The only categories that scored in the “How well organised?” question were ‘very organised’ and ‘extremely organised’, with over 40% in the top category. Once again this is a very strong endorsement of the effort and delivery by the local team (in this case Hazel Graham, Patricia Howley and Ann Kane of IEQAS). Likewise, the new approach of input from the Scientific Committee (as well as the tried and tested input from the Executive Board and taking feedback and tips from previous organising teams) worked very well.

The vast majority considered that the format was ‘very useful’. Most people thought that the time allocation was broadly ‘about right’. Of the responses on which some delegates considered ‘too much time’ was allocated, the Adam Uldall lecture was the topic that attracted the most votes. No topic attracted a ‘don’t include in future’ negative mark. On balance, I think the feedback would indicate that we got it ‘about right’.

Once again we have a slightly more difficult task in teasing out the subtleties on the feedback on specific topics. Usually the ratings can be predicted by the topic title, but this year it was a welcome surprise that a presentation on a statistical approach attracted high marks for relevance. The Round Table discussion involving all the delegates also scored highly and so this will likely become a regular feature in future meetings. The top marks on Relevance went to Mauro Panteghini and so the choice of speaker and topic for the Adam Uldall lecture was vindicated.

Most delegates believed that their knowledge and skills improved ‘a lot’ with a similar number saying ‘a moderate amount’. Luckily, no one said ‘Not at all’!

The overall satisfaction rate was a very encouraging 59% being ‘extremely satisfied’ with ‘moderately satisfied’ at almost 39%. Last year I posed the question about whether the input from the Scientific Committee [SC] would be a success and I think the statistics would suggest that it has.

As before, we asked for feedback on what delegates would like as topics for future meetings. This is a really important part of the feedback. As the Executive Board is always keen to point out, it is the EQALM membership that determines the direction of what we do and the Executive Board’s role is just to facilitate that mandate. There were nineteen responses some of which covered several suggestions. There was no ‘stand out’ topic that appeared, but all of the suggestions will go forward to the Scientific Program Committee in Zagreb for their consideration for 2018.

As always, it would be remiss not to mention the generous sponsorship that made the Symposium possible. The Executive Board would like to thank all of the speakers, the working group members and Chairs, the Scientific Program Committee and all the delegates for contributing to make a very distinctly friendly, yet informative, Symposium.

Thanks to Xavier Albe for conducting the Survey Monkey poll, but any errors in this summary are mine alone.

Finlay MacKenzie, Secretary EQALM.