

# WP7 WORKSHOP

May 7<sup>th</sup> - 2014, FIRENZE

## INTRODUCTION

GOAL OF THE ACTIVITY: WP7 has the task to create a network of European experts on planning & forecasting on Health Workforce, in order to help EU & Member States to progress in this matter. Definition of what the network will do and how this could happen

KEY OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP: Collect as many good ideas as possible!

SET-UP: Variance of World Café

- Set of Topics
- Discussions on 8 statements, turning through the groups of 3 to 4 / 15 to 20 min per statement, with a coffee or a tee
- Feedback by all on a sheet of questions in the end by each participants individually – only one comment per participant requested.

**Attendees** divided in 4 groups /

- GROUP 1: Michel Van Hoegaerden, Prof. Todorka Kostadinova, Dr. Pascal Meeus
- GROUP 2: Gerlinde Holweg, John Williams, Prof. Heinz Rothgang
- GROUP 3: Zuzana Matlonova, Miloslava Kovacova, Alisa Puustinen, Johanna Lammintakanen, Mariano Votta
- GROUP 4: Assoc. Prof. Zheni Staykova, Assoc. Prof. Natashka Danova, Assoc. Prof. Emanuela Moutafova, Slava Penova

QUESTIONS PER STATEMENT:

1. Do you agree with this statement?
2. Which added value do you regard compared to current situation?
3. What would be your requirements as experts about it?
4. How feasible is this?
5. Do you know similar best practices?

## WORKSHOP REPORT

### SUMMARY

Topics	Most striking idea
Meet & train	<b>Globally favourable, but not necessary physically and concerns about the cost / twice per year</b>
Local branches	<b>Majority favourable / free to join and not necessary everywhere</b>
Share info.	<b>Definitely Yes / defining the goals of the network is vital</b>
Publication	<b>Major way to disseminate in current context, but it is not the main task / Many positive against some resistance</b>
Consulted on policies	<b>We should propose, inform and follow up / how to motivate it – what about the feasibility</b>
Portal	<b>Very important as next step of the project / close forum, open forum – various options</b>
Virtual observatory	<b>No / hard to define, important for comparison analysis but variety of systems</b>
JA netw. Vs EU existing networks	<b>Not merging, but affiliate / learning from each other, funding?</b>

Within those statements, a survey identified the following statements as most appealing:

- Portal
- Share info

And as less appealing

- Consulted on policies
- Meet & Train

## LISTING OF THE RESPONSES FROM ALL GROUPS

(note / input is reproduced as much as possible based on hand written feedback)

### **STATEMENT 1: A network must meet physically and a secretary must organize seminars and help to train new expert**

- Physical meetings should be arranged at least every 6 months – twice per year
- Should find cost effective ways of meeting as arranging a conference is costly
- There should be working of getting involved everyone in the meetings, so as to exchange experience and be productive
- A specific topic should be raised on each meeting of the experts
- Online trainings - it is too expensive to train new experts on national and local level
- The role of the network could be training of new expert – a way of enlarging the network itself
- External experts could be asked to join the network meetings
- Virtual meetings, online conferences, skype sessions, webex meetings, etc.
- Very important (not necessarily physically though) to set the goal of the network, set up rules, coordinate (secretary)
- Not necessarily. Depends on the predefined goals, target issues etc.
- Not secretary but other colleagues already involved in the network
- No. But how to make the expert list attractive and better than a commercial consultancy agency
- Yes, but concrete output and well prepared secretary topics
- A network should meet physically at least twice a year but a secretary may be superfluous
- No secretary, yes a coordinator. WP4 + WP6 should communicate
- No, it's nice, but not a must. Experts should meet expert without train

### **STATEMENT 2: A network must have local branches, help translation and support local policies**

- Network building program (for example 3 years)
- A lot of thematic of specific professions
- The difficulties of having a network with different languages could be overcome by creating sub networks at national levels
- Local branches: to organize a council of experts, universities, scientific organizations, representatives from young generations

- A question could be raised of how the countries with different regions would be treated – as different countries or as a whole country (for example Italy)
- Local medias, local policy
- Pilot projects policy, which aims to use good practises
- Don't like the wording "local branches", not necessarily needed as every country involved might not have an expert
- Depends on the role, mission and goal of the network
- Are there enough experts in every country and every specific area to do this
- Everything is connected. You cannot isolate
- Yes – clusters, but free/open to join
- Local policies should be influenced, but local branches are not essential.
- Interesting thing is international comparison, but local application with HMP local planning is not sufficient because of mobility
- It depends on the main goal of the network

### **STATEMENT 3: A network must share information**

- To share information in the web
- To have a report of all FAQs
- A need of experts of various fields of expertise
- To share information through educational and training meetings
- To create a common e-mail of experts network
- To share good practices
- The communication language will be English, but there could be national translators of the information
- Totally agree, but you don't need an expert for this. National contact point would do
- Important, but totally dependent on the goal of the network
- How to include "practical" information in the network? Different data sources
- Yes, but how to attract attention in the overloaded world of information.
- Forum + moderator
- Definitely, but how?
- Yes – best practices + products is first process
- Yes. Which kind of information? The network can only survive if it's producing relevant information

### **STATEMENT 4: A network must publish (scientific work & experience)**

- Publishing is the only way of sustaining the information in the current situation
- To be published in national and international scientific journals

- Publishing the way to sustain the information flow
- The network should have a common tool for sharing the information
- Periodical publications of the various organizations
- To be uploaded on the web sites of the institutions
- To be shared in the scientific conferences (reports, posters, etc.)
- To organize workshops and to issue policy briefs
- The publications could educate the next generation of experts
- The network should always published reports of its activity
- The should also publish all the available literature
- The network will be promoting the work by publishing
- This is not the main tasks. Scientific publishing not mandatory. Probably more like statements, guidelines
- Various forms of publications e.g. summaries can be produced
- Yes! But depends on your goal: who to influence?
- Yes, own publication of the network (with scientific writer)
- Not necessary, except for policy and progress documents
- Publication is interesting for participants in the network and also participants if and only if it is of high quality and influences policies.
- Not mandatory, if so, with pragmatic and integrated approach.

### **STATEMENT 5: A network must be consulted by policy makers**

- The political will guarantees the sustainability of Joint Action
- The network should encourage politicians and experts to be proactive
- The experts and the politicians should consistently synchronise their ideas so as to avoid working in different directions
- The good collaboration between policy makers and experts will guarantee the sustainability of project and will be effective evidence based on political decision
- An external opinion of the country will be more valuable
- Both policy makers and network experts need to be incentivized
- important, but difficult in practice
- If this is one of the tasks then permanent relationships must be proactive
- Credibility + neutral --> then the policy makers will contact voluntary --> how to make it attractive
- Yes, but not the first objective and not at the beginning (first – be credible)
- We should propose, inform and follow up.
- Yes. My motive/their motive. Specific process/professions/countries

- How can experts be motivated to participate? Whom to address if the network is very big?

### **STATEMENT 6: A network is usefully supported by a portal**

- To create a portal of network experts, where could be organized virtual trainings, and online meetings, where they should be share the good practice and information
- The portal is the next step of the development of the project
- The portal could be a closed forum or a small web site
- The portal will enable the experts to communicate in a better way
- It will ensure an effective communications among the experts
- The structure of the portal should be close area for the different types of experts
- An efficient way should be found to make the people active in the portal
- The portal will comprise the following: statistical data, qualitative data, quantitative data, analyses, share of policy making, good practice
- Portal is important supportive tool to nourish the network
- Define who will be the users of the portal, how it will provide cutting edge and attractive information
- Essential part/ platform for the network to function
- Some kind of portal is useful
- Yes, but how to attract people?
- Yes, obviously (+secretary)
- As in a closed forum.
- Definitely yes, in order to be a virtual but not invisible network.

### **STATEMENT 7: A network can be a virtual observatory**

- The practice need one and the same methodology including system of indicators to scan the situation of human resources
- To compare the different countries and be based on the extrapolation of Health Workforce mobility in modern statistical ways
- To enrich the analysis of the healthcare system
- Very useful for the decision makers
- Human nature needs regular face to face meetings. Virtual observatory gives low level or no incentives
- The concept itself is hard to define
- No, a lot of observatories already. With what goal to observe?
- Won't work. Not alone!

- Observatories already exist. No need.
- Countries have different demands. This must be accounted.

### **STATEMENT 8: A network should merge with any existing EU network**

- The network could be a subsection of the observatory
- It is important to have focus, but some networks should be incorporated
- Exchange of information and results between the different network experts through methods discussed in theme four
- Share different experiences
- Different methodologies guarantee different opinions and produce different results
- It is important for the sustainability of the network to merge with the existing networks with the same/ similar scope and goal
- Networks should be identified. Not merging but affiliation
- Advisable to analyze if similar networks exist
- Usually collaborate at least, network should have a focus on humans
- Learning from each other. What is the profit?
- Yes, principal but merge with lobby? Who is funding?
- In association with existing networks, more than merging.
- No other networks. Funding?
- Depends on what other networks are doing. The theme HWPF should be represented. Merging makes sense if there is a theme in other networks with a theme close to ours but not identical.

Author & Deliverable owner :

Ms Elitsa Ilieva – Medical University of Varna on behalf of Prf. T. Kostadinova

Workshop organiser & co-author :

Michel Van Hoegaerden – Katholieke Universiteit Leuven on behalf of Prf. W. Sermeus