EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ‘Patient Safety Research: shaping the European agenda’ conference took place in Porto, Portugal from 24-26 September 2007. The conference was supported by the European Commission Sixth Framework Programme for Research and the Portuguese Ministry of Health during Portugal’s Presidency of the European Union.

The UK’s Faculty of Public Health (FPH), World Health Organization (WHO) World Alliance for Patient Safety and University College London (UCL) collaborated to host the event which was the first ever pan-European conference dedicated to patient safety research.

This document reports the findings of an online delegate survey which was undertaken by conference delegates between 26th September and 16th November 2007.

The objectives of the survey were to:

- Seek delegate views on the conference content, organisation and suggestions for improvement
- Identify delegates who are happy to be contacted by the collaborating organisations regarding future events and activities in this field

20.5% of the conference delegates responded to the survey. This report provides a summary of comments received, lists the comprehensive comments received and lists the delegates who are happy to be contacted in the future.

In general respondents were very happy with both the conference content and organisation. 95.8% of delegates agreed that the content met their needs and expectations and 100% were satisfied with the conference organisation.
INTRODUCTION

The online survey aimed to capture delegate feedback particularly in relation to the scientific programme and conference organisation. It also aimed to capture details of delegates who are happy to be contacted following the conference. 351 delegates from 56 different countries attended the conference.

The online survey was made available on the conference website (www.patientsafetyresearch.org) from 26th September – 16th November 2007. Each delegate was informed about the online survey in the closing plenary session at the conference and via an email which was sent to each delegate following the close of the conference.

RESULTS

Delegate’s responses

72 responses were received, giving a 20.5% (72/351) response rate to the survey.

1. Did the content of the conference meet your needs and expectations?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95.8% of respondents agreed that the conference met their needs and expectations. Particular elements of the conference content that were appreciated were:
- Networking opportunities
- Variety in style and content of sessions
- Mix of delegates (country and background)

The mix-it session in particular proved to be very popular: ‘...a unique opportunity for researchers, policy makers and clinicians to talk about patient safety interventions from their particular viewpoint - a rare opportunity’.

Suggestions for improvement include:
- More examples of research in patient safety and further discussion of the results of the research

Further suggestions for improvement are listed under questions 3. A full list of comments received is included in Appendix 1.

2. Was the organisation of the conference to your satisfaction?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% of respondents agreed that the conference organisation was to their satisfaction. In comments posted in the survey delegates praised the organisation of the conference and the assistance provided at the event.
- ‘Excellent organisation’
- ‘Probably the best organised conference I have attended - well done!’
- ‘...all aspects, including accommodation, transportation and most important the realisation of the conference scheduled were perfect’
Suggestions for improvement include:

- ‘Discussion and evaluation of the 52 tables regarding the four questions was too long!’
- ‘Bus coaches for the dinner party were very early so we missed them’

A full list of comments received is included in Appendix 2.

3. **Do you have any further comments or suggestions?**

47.2% of respondents left further comments. A full list of these comments is provided in Appendix 3

Suggestions for improvement include:

**General**
- *I would like to focus on research next time, some presentation about current research would be interesting’*
- *The feedback sessions in the main hall were of less value and difficulty to engage in; thought the final morning could have been more productive than it was - while the speeches were interesting, they were preaching to the converted’*
- *‘I missed the patient’s voice’*
- *‘preparation of the networking session was insufficient because did not now about it, no time for preparation - it was a good idea, but more information is necessary’*

**Abstracts**
- *‘I missed the traditional poster discussion sessions and oral presentations. Mostly I missed the fact that there was no time scheduled when the authors were at their posters. Viewing a poster only works when you can speak to the author’*
- *Many of the abstracts were submitted by people not actively involved in patient safety research or indeed research. Many abstracts seemed to form undergraduate or post graduate qualification’*

**Post conference activities**
- *‘I would welcome such events in the future, perhaps every 2 years’*

4. **I wish to be contacted by the collaborating organisations regarding future work and events around patient safety research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>95.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69/72 respondents would like to be contacted by the collaborating organisations regarding future work and events around patient safety research.

**CONCLUSION**
The conference organisers are grateful to all those who responded to the survey. It will be presented and discussed at the final meeting of the Conference Advisory Committee on 30th November 2007 and will be submitted to the European Commission as part of the final conference report.
Appendix 1

Comments on the conference content

- Great multidisciplinary content. Excellent facilitation of the workshop.
- Good to have a high level focus. Excellent for networking.
- Overall content was very good for an initial European event such as this. Good selection of speakers. The posters were very effective for providing an overview of work across different countries; it was good to have them so accessible for the duration of the conference. Variety in the style of sessions was refreshing compared to other conferences with endless parallel sessions and PowerPoint presentations.
- think the content was balanced addressing all important areas and giving time to discuss important issues It has been a good chance for me to learn about patient safety in general and in Europe and give me insight on how to create linkages with others
- Enjoyed the broad range of people invited and different streams on offer.
- 3 days was too long I would have preferred more keynote presentations with a better mix of researchers and policy makers.
- There were a wide range of very benefited topics.
- The mix it session was very good. I think everybody learned a lot from exchanging information from the different countries. Not only about the specific research but also the levels of patient safety in different countries, and how to deal with it.
- need more focus on research collaboration
- The content of the conference set the scene for a call to action. I came away from the conference challenged to act on what I had learnt and what had been discussed. And to follow up on contacts made (please see my answers to question 2 below).
- Although it might have been better if the workshops also discussed (results of) research.
- I would like more descriptions of actual experiences that have showed effectively in improve the patient safety
- I would like to implement all knowledge I received in the conference to the work of Republican Ungovernment Organization for Donation Safety.
- Its very interesting, I wish next workshop to learn about interventions measured to show improvement done in some countries who did the researches in the late ninty.and how to build a system in organization to improve the safety of patient.
- I look for more ways to underline the importance & needs for Patients' Safety.
- more emphasis on empirical research would be nice.
- It was very interesting to hear about the practices that are being taken in other countries.
- Very good, I liked the format. The round-table discussions were excellent.
- The mix of researchers and policy makers was very interesting and helpful. The conference gave an excellent insight in the field of patient safety research an policy in different countries and provided a good opportunity for networking.
- Too much talking about doing research and not enough getting “dirty”.
- Plenary meetings are important, but because of the large group difficult to practice. More small group meetings (like mix up and network session) are welcome.
- Very good, I could find most of the topics of interest for me well represented.
- 'Mix it' sessions particularly was a unique opportunity for researchers, policy makers & clinicians to talk about patient safety interventions from their particular viewpoint - a rare opportunity
- It was a great chance to get to know how is the problem of patient safety valued nowadays in the developed countries of Europe and what are the intentions to do furthermore
- Foster priorities for patient safety research. - Benefit from the EU experiences in patient safety research, and the global directions regarding patient safety
research. - Agreement on the importance of networking. - Involvement of the developing countries within the EU activities regarding patient safety agenda.

- I had liked to have a forum where local strategies in operative level share.
- A few minor comments: - I would prefer more examples of research that is done in the patient safety area. - with regard to the network sessions it might be useful to only have meetings with existing networks. For the proposed network it might be useful not to call it network session, but research interests. So research interests meeting session could be arranged apart from the existing network sessions. Every person with the same interest, for example interventions, methods, theories, could meet each other and exchange experiences and ideas.
- It was very good.
- It was a "research conference". To support the issue one should consider a congress together with the stakeholders.
- participants were open minded and interested in exchange of knowledge and experiences, easy way of networking, stimulating climate
- It was a very good congress! Excellent. Especially the workshops (including the review papers) en the network sessions. Also the mix it session was a good way of working together. One minor point: there were too many remarks form too many people on the final day.

Appendix 2
Comments on the conference organisation

- Brilliant planning
- Excellent
- Excellent organisation
- Very well organised and assistance provided was excellent
- Lovely venues
- Yes, I was very proud to be part of the conference and I am very happy that I could contribute my experience over my research's field.
- Very well organised
- It was perfect. The organizers did their best.
- Very good organized!
- Perfect
- The format of the "plenary sessions", with seating arranged in tables, set the scene for getting to know others and discuss issues with colleagues, ultimately working towards the same aim, but in different particular aspects. This was then followed through with the workshops and networking sessions. For me this all worked to help to develop new contacts. Behind all this was a quietly efficient organisational machine.
- The table-session was good The discussion and evaluation of 52 tables regarding the four? questions was too long! Does not need to go through all that!
- bus coaches for dinner party were very early so we missed them
- The organization was most efficient.
- Thanks to all the administration staff for their efforts before ,during and after the conference, excellent job
- Well done!
- Probably the best organised conference I have attended - well done.
- The conference gave a lot of possibilities for networking. The organisation was very good. However, in the future it could beneficial to receive a list of participants beforehand for a better preparation.
- Buses left hotels to get to the venue too early!
- The organisation of the conference was EXCELLENT!!! Thank you!
- Excellent
- They were excellent in managing the time. The organization in round tables for discussion was very well managed as it's difficult to make it work.
- You did a very good job!
• Shortly before the start there was a little buzz, which made me prepare just a little bit better. Very good!
• very well organised and structured. I came away feeling we had achieved something - a good outcome.
• I give my best complements on the organisation; all the aspects, including accommodation, transportation and most important the realisation of the conference schedule were perfect.
• Absolutely, the organizers deserve our appreciation, and Special thanks should be mentioned to those who have worked behind the scene till this great work has happened.
• the rooms in some cases were not adapted to number of participants (we had difficult to hear)
• He is interesting to have translation system synchronizes. It helped to spread the strategies of security to the citizens. I propose Spanish, French and of the organizing country.
• For me it would have been more satisfying if during the poster session every researcher stand beside their poster. For me, the poster session was not a success for I could not ask researcher questions about the posters of my interest.
• Excellent
• Great. Felt perfectly at home even with some necessary improvisations.
• Conference venue, accommodation, dinner and overall organisation were great.
• Perfect organisation. No comments at all!

Appendix 3
Further comments or suggestions
• Would be great to receive feedback on the action points, evolution of the agenda and the future conference.
• I would welcome other such events in future, perhaps every two years. Thank you for the opportunity to attend and to those with the foresight to initiate this event.
• The feedback sessions in the main hall were of less value and difficult to engage in; thought the final morning could have been more productive than it was - while the speeches were interesting, they were preaching to the converted.
• Many of the abstracts were submitted by people not actively involved in patient safety research or indeed research, many abstracts seemed to form of undergraduate or post graduate qualification
• We need collaborate concerning our future work
• It was done perfectly well to encourage the EU neighbours to take part in this event.
• It would be most helpful to have the actual slides of the presenters and the abstracts available for download
• Thank you for a great conference!
• Typically a conference is a time "out" from the busy day-day demands. The success of the conference ultimately depends on us delegates taking up the challenge to ensure that Porto 2007 will be seen as the "happening" that David Bates in his opening keynote address hoped for. Seldom have I come away from a meeting with so many issues and contacts that I want to follow up; two weeks on I have started the process - I hope that in a further two weeks more will have been done. Each of us attending the meeting have busy day demands - one method of accepting the challenge that we face is integrating the lessons that we have learnt into these day-to-day demands. Question and call for help: I and others want to set up a "Medical Device Safe Use" research/action network. (This came out of the combined "Medical Devices" network - which I led - and the "Ergonomics - medical devices" network session led by Uvo Hoelscher. A group of 4 of us who met at Porto have during the past fortnight shared draft ideas on what we would like to accomplish. We would appreciate help/guidelines with how to go about getting funding to take this forward. (I am aware that some work
can be done, as was mentioned at the Wednesday morning session, without funding, but ultimately funding will be required, both to employ staff dedicated to work on particular aspects, and also to disseminate and discuss the work done at meetings. Could those who are working on networks, be encouraged to post information and details on the Porto conference website - with facilities made available for this. (This is one way that the website can have information on post meeting activities and help to realise the aims of Porto 2007.)

- repeat this conference every year in the future
- It was difficult to choose between the different workshops organised at the same time, since many topics were very interesting
- To include questions on Donation Safety to work of patient safety researches.
- I wish you to establish permanent session to the transitional and developing countries and also budget to be used through you to help them in improving the safety of the health system, researches and as I wish to establish a centre for patient safety in my country / JORDAN
- Congratulations and thank you for such an interesting conference
- The continuation of such important meeting!
- I would like a little more focus on research the next time, some presentations about current research would be interesting.
- More presentations of on-going work helpful. Presenting your poster without having it to hand was very difficult and it would have been useful to have been warned of this!
- I would have liked to see more presentations of research (maybe instead of the workshops)
- Especially the abstracts on the first day and the workshop papers have been extremely interesting. It would be great if the missing workshop papers still could be made available in an electronic form since you could attend only a few workshops. This would be great also for the abstracts.
- The social events were very well organized and very interesting. Congratulations
- Is it possible to upload the final congress video on the website?
- Next time maybe more plenary brainstorming and even voting.
- There were only two patient representatives there (to my knowledge) - it may be that others were invited but did not come or were not aware. A larger patient presence may have been more balanced
- "Sharing science is best diplomacy", was said in one occasion and I do support it strongly.
- do believe that such important events should be every year to make more opportunities in making evidences ( indicators) from research for policy makers to integrate the safety culture in developed strategies for the health care system improvement, in building proposals for future researches, and in enhancing an international collaboration on networking.
- We need to involve more clinicians and surgeons in this research, it is an applied research and the main actors of the risk management must have a fundamental role.
- Thanks and congratulations to make available of the professional initiatives of this level without I animate of profit
- I missed the patients voice
- I think another issue to think about is patient's identification.
- The facilitated approach was a milestone in congress history (even if the participants were a little bit tired on the last day)
- preparation of the networking session was insufficient because people did not know about it, no time for preparation - it was a good idea, but more information about is necessary
- Next time I would like to spend more time on the posters. I missed to traditional poster discussion sessions and oral presentations. Mostly I missed the fact that there was no time scheduled when the authors were at there posters. Viewing a poster only works when you can speak to the author.
In Finland we do not have a strong tradition in patient safety research, or clear and visible patient safety organisations. To set up those the policy makers contribution is crucial - now there is no budget for any kind of patient safety research. (The costs from this conference were covered from my family’s budget, no financial support was available.) But as John Övretveit said, - just do it. I will try to find and connect with people with same interests, but support from WHO or connecting with more advanced countries would be very helpful. As a support I mean mostly advice and guiding, not solely financial support. Now I have met the Swedish researchers and policymakers, and I’m looking forward to their experiences and expertise as from Finnish policymakers attending the conference the response was quite weak. I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for this conference, I have received so much more than I ever expected. And I hope this was the opportunity to open up the Finnish policymakers eyes for this important cause. Thank you!