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General facts & figures

- 596 delegates from 50 countries

**TOP 15**

AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
UNITED KINGDOM
NETHERLANDS
SWITZERLAND
GERMANY

FRANCE
ITALY
DENMARK
SLOVENIA
USA
RUSSIA
LITHUANIA
HUNGARY
TAIWAN
• 258 evaluation survey respondents → 43%

• Gender:
  - Male: 49.8%
  - Female: 50.2%

• Respondents’/delegates’ structure:
  - Participant: 58%
  - Speaker: 23%
  - Journalist: 10%
  - Invited guest: 7%
  - Accompanying person: 2%
  - Accompanying person: 2%

- European Health Forum Gastein -
Delegates – who are they?

By organisation type

- **Public institution**: 36.8%
- **Teaching and research**: 24.9%
- **Politics**: 14.2%
- **Private sector**: 12.3%
- **Association/Interest group**: 9.5%
- **NGO**: 8.7%
- **Press**: 4.3%
- **Other**: 2.0%

By working field

- **Insurance industry**: 0.9%
- **Pharma sector**: 14.3%
- **Medical engineering**: 9.2%
- **IT**: 6.9%
- **Medicine**: 27.2%
- **Biomedicine**: 2.8%
- **Healthcare**: 30.0%
- **Support group**: 4.1%
- **Health promotion**: 17.1%
- **Networking**: 3.9%
- **Social security**: 2.8%
- **Management**: 1.0%
Ratings of the 15th EHFG

Average rating

(grading scheme: 1= excellent to 5= very bad)

- Balance between Plenary Sessions, Parallel Forum Sessions, Workshops: 1.91
- Thematic linkages between different sessions: 2.16
- Choice of topics for sessions: timeliness and relevance: 1.93
Rating of the general congress organisation

- Event signage: 2,80% (5), 4,21% (4), 14,02% (3), 36,45% (2), 42,52% (1)
  Average: 1,88

- Clarity of the congress papers: 2,76% (5), 3,23% (4), 9,22% (3), 43,32% (2), 41,47% (1)
  Average: 1,82

- Quality of the congress papers: 2,28% (5), 2,74% (4), 9,59% (3), 40,64% (2), 44,75% (1)
  Average: 1,77

- Assistance given by congress staff: 3,17% (5), 2,26% (4), 4,52% (3), 16,74% (2), 73,30% (1)
  Average: 1,45

- Communication in the run-up to the EHFG: 1,80% (5), 4,05% (4), 8,56% (3), 29,73% (2), 55,80% (1)
  Average: 1,66
Ratings of the format of the congress

- **Number of breaks**
  - 5 = too short/too few
  - 4 = OK
  - 3 = too long/too much or too many
  - Average: 2.50

- **Length of breaks**
  - Average: 2.52

- **Time allocated to interactive discussion**
  - Average: 2.79

- **Numbers of presentations per session**
  - Average: 2.22

- **Duration of the presentations**
  - Average: 2.26

---

**European Health Forum Gastein**
Average ratings of the networking opportunities

(grading scheme: 1= excellent, 4= very bad)

Overall: 1.66
Opportunities to make new contacts: 1.99
Opportunities to engage with key decision makers: 2.37
Opportunities to progress international health work: 2.33
Social Media: usage & importance

Which of our social media platforms did you use at EHFG 2012?

- Facebook: 35.0%
- Twitter: 53.0%
- LinkedIn: 31.6%
- YouTube: 8.5%
- RSS/Blog: 9.4%

How do you rate the importance of social media to the EHFG conference?

- Unnecessary: 4.4%
- Unimportant: 18.1%
- Important: 42.2%
- Very important: 27.0%
- Indispensable: 8.3%

31.3% followed Twitter hash tag #ehfg2012
Judgement of the development of the EHFG over the past years

1 = excellent 30,2%
2 = OK 20,6%
3 = 42,1%
4 = very good 6,3%
5 = very bad 0,8%

Would you participate again?

Yes 94,7%
No 5,3%
Sessions’ ratings

Attended Parallel Forum Sessions (block 1)

- F1 - Communicating Health 33.2%
- F2 - Global Health Governance 19.5%
- F3 - Health Systems Sustainability 33.2%
- I did not attend any of these parallel forum sessions 14.1%

n=205

Attended Parallel Forum Sessions (block 2)

- F4 - Public Health 2050 34.0%
- F5 - Personalised Medicine 14.1%
- F6 Non-communicable diseases 31.6%
- I did not attend any of these parallel forum sessions 20.4%

n=206
Quality of the presentations and speakers

The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives
Quality of the presentations & speakers

The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives.
Average rating of the attended workshop(s)

(grading scheme 1 = excellent, 3 = OK, 5 = very bad)

n=186
POINTS of CRITICISM

- More networking possibilities!
- Not enough time for discussion!
- Too many presentations per session!
- More international speakers!
The annual EHFG survey was divided into eight parts, in which respondents were asked general questions (1), questions in regard to their impression of the congress (2), the organisation of the congress itself (3) and their general impression (7). They were also asked to express their opinion about the Parallel Forum Session(s) and different Workshop Session(s) they attended (4 and 5). Respondents were asked questions about their social media activities during the congress and in general (6). In the last part of the survey they were asked to name topics they find important and would like to see to be considered at the next EHFG (8).

In most of the survey’s questions the respondents were asked to choose one answer, they find most applicable. However, to some questions they were allowed to give multiple answers and express their personal suggestions or point of criticism.

**General rating scheme used in the survey:**

1 = excellent, 3 = OK, 5 = very bad
1 = fully agree, 3 = OK, 5 = don’t agree at all
1 = too much/too many, 3 = OK, 5 = too less/too few
The EHFG congress offered 6 Parallel Forum Sessions, 11 different Workshop Sessions, 4 Parallel Lunch Workshops and 2 Breakfast Workshops.

Parallel Forum Sessions were arranged in two blocks, one starting on Wednesday (Forum 1, Forum 2, Forum 3) and second starting on Thursday (Forum 4, Forum 5, Forum 6) - therefore we also received two sets of results. Detailed survey findings on Parallel Forum Sessions can be found in respective part of the evaluation report.

Forum 1 and Forum 3 were equally attended, by over 33% (each) respondents, while Forum 2 was attended by 20%. In the first block all forums received good average rating, with Forum 1 scoring the highest (2,0) followed by Forum 2 and 3 with 2,2 rating.

Forum 4 was attended by 34% of respondents, Forum 6 by 31% and Forum 5 by 14% participants, who completed the survey. In the second block, Forum 5 scored excellent/very good average note (1,8), followed by Forum 4 and 6 with both rating 2,2.

Lunch Workshop 2 received the best overall rating among other workshops’ (1,62), followed by Breakfast Workshop 2 (1,63) and Workshop 6 (1,87).

The respondents gave their lowest overall rating to Lunch Workshop 3 - good/OK (2,40).
Regarding the format of the congress, the EHFG received moderate good rating (2,2-2,5-2,8). The number of presentations per session and their duration were rated as good (2,2), number of brakes and their length as rather good (2,5). As OK (2,8) was seen time allocated to interactive discussion. However, analysing open questions, one can state that respondents clearly wish more time for discussions during the sessions.

Some respondents suggested fewer and shorter presentations, in order to ensure more time for interactive discussion. Some also stated that breaks could be longer, to give more time for networking and discussion.

In the last part of the survey respondents were asked to express their opinion and expectations regarding general topics, they would like to be considered for the next year’s conference. Most frequently named topics were: • mental health, • health communication and usage of social media, • healthcare financing, • health systems sustainability, • health prevention and promotion and • patients’ related topics – patients’ empowerment, patients’ views and rights, patients’ safety.

Out of 29 given topics, respondents were asked to choose two they find most important. Healthcare resources/financing and organisation was most often named, followed by non-communicable diseases, health literacy and education, mental health, eHealth and health services.
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