



Science Meeting – Scientific Report

Scientific report (one single document in WORD or PDF file) should be submitted online within two months of the event. It should not exceed seven A4 pages.

Proposal Title: EANS/REFLECTION SUMMER SCHOOL 2013

Application Reference N°: 4814

1) Summary

For the 2013 edition of the European Academy of Nursing Science (EANS) summer school, doctoral participants from across Europe travelled to The Netherlands, where the event was hosted by the Scientific Institute for Quality of Healthcare of the Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Centre. The event was sponsored through the ESF funded REFLECTION network.

Participants

Participants attending the 2013 Summer School represented 19 different European states. A total of 102 participants participated in the summer school, with 35, 33 and 34 participants in the first, second, and third year respectively. First year participants attended the summer school for ten days (June 24th-July 5th), while second and third year participants attended for five days (July 1st-5th).

Programme

The summer school programme is based on the MRC framework for Developing and Evaluating Complex Interventions, as developed by the UK's Medical Research Council. The model has been further developed by the faculty responsible for the program.

First year participants are made familiar with the development and feasibility/pilot stage of the MRC model. First, they must be able to demonstrate a critical understanding of the key concepts in the complex interventions research process in nursing, including the role of the existing evidence base, theory and modelling. Second, they must demonstrate a critical awareness of the role of a pilot study in addressing the uncertainties that come with developing complex interventions.

Second year participants take teaching sessions on the evaluation stage of the MRC model. They must demonstrate a critical awareness of the important outcome, process

and economic considerations when designing and conducting full-scale evaluation. *Participants in the third year* are trained to develop critical awareness of change strategies for getting evidence into practice and of the importance of surveillance and long-term monitoring to identify unexpected or rare effects, and the persistence of original study outcomes. This corresponds with the implementation stage of the MRC model.

Education on all four stages requires participants to strongly develop and demonstrate their collaborative and presentations skills. As such, the EANS summer school for doctoral participants is perceived as an intense learning experience.

Teachers

Teachers in the programme were 23 interdisciplinary senior scientists from 9 European states, with backgrounds in relevant fields such as in health sciences, nursing science, epidemiology, health economics, health ethics, consumer participation and medical sociology.

Use of ESF funding

The ESF funding was used to (partly) reimburse accommodation costs for all participants (50% of the costs) and teachers (100%) in the programme. The funding was additionally used to provide lunches and coffee breaks free of charge for all participants and teachers throughout the summer school. All participants and teachers had to pay their own travelling expenses. Social activities were free of charge, except for the gala dinner (€55 for each attendant). The programme was co-sponsored by the city of Nijmegen (welcome reception) and the Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Centre.

Evaluation

As with previous editions of the EANS summer schools, participants evaluated the event very positively on aspects of organization and teaching. Following positive experiences with the 2012 edition of the summer school in Leuven, part of the programme was integrated with a summer conference (July 4th-5th), which additionally attracted many EANS scholars and fellows. This provided participants in the programme to integrate and network with advanced nursing scientists. This integrated programme received similar positive evaluations for the participants.

Like previous editions, the 2013 edition of the EANS summer school was a success, and continuation is obvious. The next summer school will be take place at The EHESP School of Public Health in Rennes, France.

2) Description of the scientific content of and discussions at the event

The summer school has been in place since 1998 and was continuously developed to meet the needs of evidence based nursing care methods in health care. The organizer throughout the years has been the European Academy of Nursing Science (EANS) and the activities have taken place at different universities throughout Europe. EANS is an independently organized body composed of individual members who have made significant contributions to the advancement of nursing science in Europe through scholarship and research. It has been in existence since 1997. Each year about 100 doctoral participants from across Europe gather at any European University and teachers are recruited among EANS members as well as from the host university. In addition,

there is a scholars meeting open for EANS scholars or those having completed the three year's summer school. The summer school has previously attracted a four year grant from Marie Curie 2006-09 and by that it was also possible to recruit doctoral participants from Eastern Europe as well as from the countries that have less opportunity to provide a doctoral degree in nursing at their universities. Participants were reimbursed for travelling and costs of living. In 2010 a new program was implemented inspired by the debate about research that can inform practice, the guest editorial of the then president of EANS challenging the current designs in nursing research (Hallberg, 2009) and the MRC report on Developing and Evaluating Complex Interventions; New Guidance (MRC, 2008).

From 2011, EANS has been successful in obtaining a five year grant from ESF that partially covers the cost of the summer school. The grant (REFLECTION) is to build up an interdisciplinary European Faculty network of researchers. Countries contributing to the grant are Belgium, Finland, Germany, Norway, The United Kingdom, Slovakia, Sweden and Switzerland.

The aim of the REFLECTION doctoral participants' summer school is to build strong research applying the concept of complex interventions in health care and mixed methods design. The host university contributes with teachers from other disciplines to obtain an interdisciplinary perspective and understanding among participants and scholars. The purpose of EANS is to sustain a forum of European nurse scientists, Fellows and Scholars, to develop and promote knowledge in nursing science and to recognize research and scholarly achievement in the pursuit of excellence. It provides a forum for established and developing nurse researchers to meet, network and develop a European perspective to their work. Thus the doctoral summer school now based on the REFLECTION program financed through a grant from ESF is aiming at moving the frontier of research in nursing forward towards research carrying stronger evidence to be implemented in health care.

Aims and outline of the programme

The EANS Summer School for Doctoral Studies Program is made up of a three year program, as participants progress in their studies. After having participated in the three year program they can apply to become a member of EANS to further developing their research skills. The overarching aims are to;

- equip the new generation of early stage European nursing researchers with knowledge and expertise in advanced translational complex interventions research methods;
- enable these researchers to design, plan and implement programmatic, mixed methods and complex interventions research in health care;
- create a multi-state, common European learning environment for doctoral nursing participants;
- enhance the opportunities for doctoral participants to study, work and undertake research in other European countries.

REFLECTION is leading the drive to equip the next generation of researchers into nursing with knowledge and skills in complex interventions research methods which the current generation has not had access to (MRC, 2010). In 2013, the summer school continued the new curriculum based on the ideas above. Our intention is to ensure that researching complex interventions using a mixed research methods design will become

the norm in research into nursing. The complexity of nursing will be recognized explicitly in research programs which will become increasingly multi-state, multi-disciplinary and programmatic. The Doctoral Summer School is open to nurses on doctoral programs with a Bachelor and/or Master degree according to the entry requirements of their home university. New participants commence the course each year, starting in year 1 and progress through the program. On completion of the 3-year program, participants are awarded, over and above their degree from their own university, a certificate which details the European dimension of their work. Most universities having participants in the summer school give doctoral students credits for their successful participation in the program.

The program is a coherent series of linked summer schools. Participants are able to make significant and lasting collaborative relationships with other participants. Teachers and year group leaders work closely together to ensure the program remains coherent across the three years that participants attend the schools, with each course remaining consistent with programs offered in previous years. Whilst the organization of each summer school is the responsibility of the specific university designated to run the school, an organizing committee consisting of the previous year's and upcoming organizer together with representatives of the REFLECTION steering committee ensures that the schools offer high quality content of academic activities consistent with the curriculum available and continuously critically reviewed and developed. During the first year summer school participants attend for ten days. During the second and third years of their program, participants attend five day courses. Each year 35 new participants are recruited for the first year. Consequently, those participating in year 2010, in the first and second years continued their participation for the second and third years meaning that altogether at most 105 participants participate.

Those who recently finished the summer schools and other new EANS members with recent PhD degrees hold a program of their own in conjunction with the summer school to further develop the networks established during the intensive summer school program and to support their career development. In the 2013 edition of the summer school, this was organised as an Early stage researchers' Pre-Conference with the summer conference.

The first, second and third years summer school program

The three summer school programs follow the MRC model tightly with the addition of multi method research. This means that the first years' ten days are committed to the development stage and the feasibility and pilot stages of the MRC framework. The second year program is committed to the evaluation stage, the third year program focuses on the implementation stage. Throughout the three years, a stepwise presentation and evaluation of the participants' PhD thesis is carried out in different ways. Apart from lectures, workshops and collaborative task, all participants attended the keynote lectures of the Summer Conference.

In the 2013 edition of the summer conference, keynotes were presented by 1st) Peter Gibb Peter Gibb, Patient Representative and co-founder of Intensive Care Unit Support Teams for Ex-Patients, UK, 2nd) professor Nicky Britten, medical sociologist, University of Exeter, UK, and 3rd) professor Brendan McCormack, nurse scientist, University of Ulster, Belfast, UK. Whereas the first two keynotes focused on consumer involvement in healthcare, professor McCormack lectured on use of mixed methods in healthcare research.

Second and third year participants further actively participated by organizing a debate

and a poster session respectively. The summer school debate is an event in which the second year participants prepare a debate on a debatable topic of significance for nursing research. This year's topic was on the need to involve patients in the implementation of evidence based practice. Third year participants had to demonstrate skills in making presentations via poster and lecture-based media to audiences of peers and senior researchers.

References

Hallberg, IR. (2009). Moving nursing research forward towards a stronger impact on health care practice? *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46(4);407-412.
Medical Research Council. (2008). *Developing and evaluating complex interventions: new guidance*. London: MRC.

3) Assessment of the results and impact of the event on the future directions of the field

Assessment of the activities in the REFLECTION summer school was done covering the evaluation of the organizational and teaching aspects. The results of the latter will be fed back to all individual teachers. The scale for evaluation ranged from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) and the percentages of high scores (4 or 5) were calculated for each activity. The response rates were 97% (n=34), 88% (n=29), and 71% (n=24) for first, second, and third year participants respectively.

Evaluation of the 2013 edition of the Summer School

The *year one* program focused on the development and feasibility/pilot testing stages of researching complex interventions. Most sessions in the first year program were given very high scores. Of the 17 program elements specific to the first year, 16 received high scores (4 or 5 on a scale from 1-5) from more than 80% of the participants, while 10 of the 17 program elements received high scores from more than 90%. The percentage of high scores ranged from 59% (for Identifying and Developing Theory) to 100% (for session on My Phd, and session on Meta Synthesis).

First year participants did not advise any program changes, rather they commented on the inspiration, the great experience and how they met many colleagues and new friends.

First year participants were equally positive on general aspects of the summer school such as quality of teaching (100% high scores, working climate in groups (83% high scores) and general relevance and interest of the summer school (100% high scores).

The *year two* program concerned the evaluation stage of researching complex interventions, which included assessing effectiveness in relation to the expected primary outcome variable, understanding the change process and thus exploring what is commonly addressed as the black box of intervention effectiveness, and in addition assessing cost effectiveness. In addition, the participants of the second year had to prepare the summer school debate had to do a small group presentation of the development of their PhDs; called 'My PhD a health check. The latter activity was their least favourite, with 59% of the participants giving high scores (4 or 5) for this activity. Comments participants made with this activity were that it took too much time and that the groups for this activity were different from the groups for preparing the summer school debate, which some participants found inefficient. The debate itself received high scores from 79% of the participants. All other activities were given high scores within a

range from 72% (sessions on Shared Decision Making and Understanding Change Processes) to 86% of the participants (sessions on assessing Cost-Effectiveness. Some participants commented that the second year programme contained too many group tasks overall and that the time on group tasks could be reduced.

Second year participants were positive on general aspects of the summer school such as quality of teaching (76% high scores) and the general relevance and interest of the summer school (79%), but were somewhat less positive on the group activities (66% high scores), as can be understood from their comments.

The content of the *year three* program focused on dissemination, surveillance and monitoring, and long-term follow up. Here, high scores were somewhat less frequently given for the sessions on Quality of Reporting & Dissemination (65% scored 4 or 5) and the workshop on Quality Indicators (69%). Other sessions received high scores from 78% to 87% of the participants, with the session on Effective Implementation and Use of Change Strategies and the session on Implementation Research scoring at the high end. The additional sessions in the third year were evaluated very positively, with 92% of the participants giving high scores for the Poster Presentations and 94% giving high scores for the 'After the Summer School' session. Third year participants were arranged in new groups for preparing an implementation research proposal. Some disliked this and had rather kept the old groups from previous years, whereas others thought it worked out fine. Yet several participants and teachers thought the groups were too large. Similar inconclusive comments were given with regard to the conference, where a few participants would have liked more teaching and less time for participating in the conference, while others thought favourably of the current participation in the conference. Finally, third year participants were clearly positive on the quality of teaching (79% high scores, working climate in groups (83% high scores) and general relevance and interest of the summer school (88% high scores).

Finally, most participants from all three years (82%) gave high scores for the relevance and interest of the Summer Conference they -partly- participated in. High scores were also given for aspects of the overall organisation such as pre-meeting communication and information (92%), registration and welcome (94%), and information on the website (83%). The gala dinner on Thursday was very positively evaluated, but the historical venue came with the disadvantage of having three connected rooms rather than one big hall. Although the rooms were open to the other rooms, some participants remarked it would have been nicer to sit in a single large room. In the comments with the evaluation, several participants further remarked that the end time on Friday should be more clear. A clear time was set in advance and communicated as such, but at the spot, group leaders and participants negotiated to stop a few hours early. As a result some participants felt they could have booked an earlier flight.

Conclusion

Overall, participants' comments were very positive. Participants were happy with the programme and thought it was more than worthwhile. Second and third year participants prepared for the event before they travelled to Nijmegen and used email or facebook to exchange on the content of the programme and opportunities to meet and catch up in advance.

The evaluation of the Leuven 2012 edition pointed at the need to streamline the transition from summer school to academic scholarship and EANS membership. With a very positively evaluated 'After the Summer School' session (94% high scores) we probably contributed to this.

The Leuven recommendation to pay more attention to participants' individual PhD trajectories (evaluations from the Leuven edition indicated they expect a formal evaluation) was less easy to accommodate as the formal evaluation of PhD trajectories takes place within the participants' universities, and as second year participants already believe too much time went into the 'My PhD health Check' group work. However, with rather positive evaluations of the poster sessions prepared by the third year participants, a presentation of the status of PhD trajectories is already in place and the third year participants did not comment on a lack of formal evaluations in the 2013 summer school. From the evaluations of the 2013 Summer School in Nijmegen, we can advise:

- to continue of the current curriculum, with ongoing consideration for quality of teaching and where it could be improved further;
- to reconsider the group work in year 2 with a view to the number of hours and consistency of assignment of participants to groups;
- to consider a maximum size for working groups of probably 6;
- to plan for the gala dinner to take place in a single big hall, as this is preferred over several connected rooms;
- to set a time for the end of the programme on the last Friday and instruct group leaders to stick to it.

We can conclude that overall the EANS summer school 2013 was a success. Organizing the summer school cannot be done without adequate facilities and motivated staff, willing to put in a lot of time. However, the event was also rewarding and an opportunity to showcase the local group and its activities for the Nijmegen team. Next year's summer school will take place at The EHESP School of Public Health in Rennes, France.

4) Annex 4a - Programme

Year 1 Week 1 – 2013

1 Developing stage ‘Certainty’

1.1. Identifying the evidence base

1.2. Identifying/developing theory

1.3. Process and outcome

Subject responsibility: Professor David Richards

Group Leaders: Professor David Richards, Associate Professor Gunilla Borglin, Dr Christophe Debout

Students host: Remco Ebben

Lecture rooms: Galenus (route 94)

	Monday 24th June	Tuesday 25th June	Wednesday 26th June	Thursday 27th June	Friday 28th June
8.30–9.00	<i>Registration</i>	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>
9.00–10.30	Welcoming faculty & participants Orientation, language, climate, networking. Getting to know your multi-state group	<u>Presentation 1</u> My PhD: Making a Start x 6	<u>Presentation 1</u> My PhD: Making a Start x 6	<u>Presentation 1</u> My PhD: Making a Start x 6	<u>Presentation 2</u> Our Health Care Systems x 6
10.30–11.00	Break	Break	Break	Break	Break
11.00–12.30	Introduction to the MRC complex interventions research framework <i>David Richards</i>	1.1.How do we know what we know? Systematic and other reviews <i>David Richards</i>	Identifying the evidence base: meta synthesis <i>Gunilla Borglin</i>	1.2.Identifying/developing theory and knowledge <i>Maud Heinen</i>	1.3. Relating Process to Outcomes including modelling <i>Walter Sermeus</i>
12.30–13.30	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
13.30–15.00	Introduction to the MRC complex interventions framework continued <i>David Richards</i>	1.1. Systematic reviews and meta analyses of complex interventions <i>David Richards</i>	1.1 Identifying the evidence base: mixed methods reviews <i>Gunilla Borglin</i>	1.2. Using theory to develop interventions: a practical example <i>Maud Heinen</i>	1.3. Relating Process to Outcomes including modelling <i>Walter Sermeus</i>
15.00–15.30	Break	Break	Break	Break	Break
15.30–17.00	Introduction to: <u>Presentation 1:</u> My PhD: Making a Start <u>Presentation 2:</u> Our Health Care Systems <u>Presentation 3:</u> Preparing a research protocol Preparation time for Presentation 2	<u>Presentation 1</u> My PhD: Making a Start x 6	<u>Presentation 1</u> My PhD: Making a Start x 6	<u>Presentation 1</u> My PhD: Making a Start x 6	Networking – time off
SOCIAL	GET TOGETHER 18.00				

Year 1 Week 2 – 2013

2 Feasibility/Pilot Stage ‘Uncertainty’

- 2.1. Testing procedures
- 2.2. Recruitment/retention
- 2.3. Determining sample size

Subject responsibility: Associate Professor Gunilla Borglin

Group Leaders: Christophe Debout & Peter Goossens

Students host: Remco Ebben

Lecture rooms: Galenus (route 94)

Date/time	Monday 1 st of July	Tuesday 2 nd of July	Wednesday 3 rd of July	Thursday 4 th of July	Friday 5 th of July
8.30–9.00	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>	The EANS Summer Conference		<p><u>Presentation 3:</u> Presenting a proposal for development and feasibility research funding</p> <p><i>Karina Lovell Foundation for Healthcare Improvement Research Jury</i></p> <p>Evaluation</p>
9.00–10.30	<p>Welcoming Faculty & students</p> <hr/> <p>9.30 Working in Europe <i>Walter Sermeus</i></p>	<p>2.2. Addressing uncertainty in recruitment/retention <i>Sascha Köpke</i></p>	<p>Welcome and Keynote Address</p>	<p>2.3. Determining sample size considerations for qualitative studies <i>Brendan McCormack</i></p>	
10.30-11.00	Break	Break	Break	Break	
11.00-12.30	<p>Mixed Method Design <i>Gunilla Borglin</i></p>	<p>2.3. Determining samples size considerations for intervention studies and surveys <i>Peter Griffiths</i></p>	<p><u>Presentation 3:</u> Group Activity: Preparing a development and feasibility research protocol for funding</p>	<p><u>Presentation 3:</u> Group Activity: Preparing a development and feasibility research protocol for funding</p>	
12.30-13.30	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	
13.30–15.00	<p>2.1. Testing procedures: addressing clinical uncertainty <i>David Richards</i></p>	<p><u>Presentation 3:</u> Group Activity: Preparing a development and feasibility research protocol for funding</p>	<p>Keynote address</p>	<p>The EANS Summer School debate</p>	
			Coffee Break (14.30-15.00)		
15.00–15.30	Break	Break		Break	
15.30–17.00	<p>2.1. Testing procedures: addressing acceptability and feasibility <i>David Richards</i></p>	<p><u>Presentation 3:</u> Group Activity: Preparing a development and feasibility research protocol for funding</p>	<p>Introducing the poster session by participants</p>	<p>Keynote Address</p>	
			<p>Poster viewing, networking and poster evaluation</p>	<p>End of Conference</p>	
SOCIAL	GET TOGETHER 18.00			GALA DINNER	

Year 2 - 2013					
3 Evaluation Stage		<i>Subject responsibility: Sascha Köpke</i>			
3.1. Assessing effectiveness 4hr		<i>Group leaders: Julie Taylor and Brendan McCormack</i>			
3.2. Understanding change process 3hr		<i>Students host: Floor Ploos van Amstel</i>			
3.3. Assessing cost effectiveness 2.25hr		<i>Lecture rooms: Moeys A (route 96), except indicated otherwise</i>			
Date/time	Monday 1st of July	Tuesday 2nd of July	Wednesday 3rd of July	Thursday 4th of July	Friday 5th of July
8.30–9.00	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>	The EANS Summer Conference		<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>
9.00–10.30	Welcoming Faculty & students 3.1_1 Assessing effectiveness <i>Sandra Zwakhalen</i>	My PhD: a Health Check: preparation in groups	EANS Conference: registration, keynote and coffee	Lecture: Shared decision making – a nursing topic? 3.3_1. Assessing cost effectiveness <i>Silvia Evers</i> Room: Majoor A (route 95)	My PhD: a Health Check: Presentation x 3
10.30-11.00	Break	Break	Break	Break	Break
11.00-12.30	3.1_1 Assessing effectiveness <i>Sandra Zwakhalen</i>	3.2_1 Understanding change processes <i>Sascha Köpke</i>	3.2_2 Understanding change processes <i>Sascha Köpke</i> Room: Moeys B (route 99)	3.3_1. Assessing cost effectiveness <i>Silvia Evers</i> Room: Majoor A (route 95)	My PhD: a Health Check: Presentation x 3
12.30-13.30	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
13.30–15.00	3.1_2 Assessing effectiveness <i>Sandra Zwakhalen</i>	Ethics and clinical trials <i>Helena Leino-Kilpi</i>	Keynote address Coffee Break (14.30-15.00)	The EANS Summer School debate	Evaluation & Goodbye
15.00–15.30	Break	Break	Introducing the poster session by participants	Break	
15.30–17.00	The EANS Summer School debate: planning	My PhD: a Health Check: preparation in groups	Poster viewing, networking and poster evaluation	Keynote Address	
				End of Conference	
SOCIAL	GET TOGETHER			GALA DINNER	

Year 3 – 2013							
4. Implementation stage		<i>Subject responsibility:</i> Professor Theo van Achterberg					
4.1. Dissemination		<i>Group leaders:</i> Professor Adelaida Zabalegui & Sivera Berben					
4.2. Surveillance & monitoring		<i>Students host:</i> Silvio van den Heuvel					
4.3. Long term follow-up		<i>Lecture rooms:</i> Majoor B (route 98)					
Date/time	Monday 1st of July	Tuesday 2nd of July	Wednesday 3rd of July	Thursday 4th of July	Friday 5th of July		
8.30–9.00	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>	<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>	The EANS Summer Conference See conference programme		<i>Arrival in classroom and preparation for day</i>		
9.00–10.30	Welcoming Faculty & students	Surveillance & monitoring: Developing quality indicators workshop <i>Jozé Braspenning</i>			Presenting a proposal for implementation research <i>Karina Lovell Foundation for Healthcare Improvement Research Jury</i>		
10.30-11.00	Break	Break			Break		
11.00-12.30	Dissemination: Quality of reporting and effective dissemination <i>Ralph Möhler</i>	Long-term follow-up: Use of audits & routine data sources <i>Koen Van den Heede</i>			After the EANS summer school <i>EANS Board Representatives</i>		
12.30-13.30	Lunch	Lunch			Lunch		
13.30–15.00	Dissemination: Barriers & facilitators for implementation <i>Maud Heinen</i>	Implementation research <i>Marlies Hulscher</i>			Evaluation & Goodbye		
15.00–15.30	Break	Break					
15.30–17.00	Dissemination: Effective implementation & use of change strategies <i>Theo van Achterberg</i>	Preparing an implementation research proposal <i>Group leaders & Theo van Achterberg</i>					
SOCIAL	GET TOGETHER					GALA DINNER	

Annex 4b: Full list of speakers and participants

Speakers

Title	Name	Surname	Country
Dr	Jozé	Braspenning	The Netherlands
Dr	Maud	Heinen	The Netherlands
Dr	Koen	Van den Heede	Belgium
Professor	Marlies	Hulscher	The Netherlands
Dr	Walter	Sermeus	Belgium
Dr	Peter	Griffiths	UK
Dr	Sandra	Zwakhalen	The Netherlands
Professor	Helena	Leino-Kilpi	Finland
Professor	Silvia	Evers	The Netherlands
Dr	Ralph	Möhler	Germany
Dr	Christophe	Debout	France
Professor	Peter	Goossens	The Netherlands
Dr	Gunilla	Borglin	Sweden
Professor	David	Richards	UK
Dr	Brendan	McCormack	Ireland
Dr	Julie	Taylor	UK
Professor	Sascha	Köpke	Germany
Ms	Sivera	Berben	The Netherlands
Professor	Theo	van Achterberg	The Netherlands

Title	Name	Surname	Country	Year
Mr	Johan	Åhlin	Sweden	1st
Ms	Sonja	Beckmann	Switzerland	1st
Ms	Mari Synnøve	Berge	Norway	1st
Ms	Ann Kristin	Bjørnnes	Norway	1st
Ms	Indre	Brasaite	Lithuania	1st
Mr	Andrew David	Dainty	United Kingdom	1st
Ms	Els	Devriendt	Belgium	1st
Ms	Cecile	Dury	Belgium	1st
Mr	Remco	Ebben	The Netherlands	1st
Ms	Maria Svedbo	Engström	Sweden	1st
Ms	Maren	Falch Lindberg	Norway	1st
Ms	Heidrun	Gattinger	Switzerland	1st
Ms	Camilla	Göras	Sweden	1st
Ms	Gloria	Greß	Germany	1st
Ms	Birgit	Heckemann	France	1st
Ms	Loreena	Hill	United Kingdom	1st
Ms	Elisabet Arribas	Ibar	Spain	1st
Mr	Sebastien	Kerever	France	1st
Ms	Lorna	Lawther	United Kingdom	1st
Ms	Connie	Lethin	Sweden	1st
Ms	Sara	Levati	United Kingdom	1st
Ms	Laura-Maria	Murtola	Finland	1st
Ms	Maria Victoria	Navarta-Sanchez	Spain	1st
Ms	Claudia Jorge de Sousa	Oliveira	Portugal	1st
Ms	Tarja	Poikkeus	Finland	1st
Ms	Anne Christin	Rahn	Germany	1st
Ms	Ulla	Riis Madsen	Denmark	1st
Ms	Maria	Rudkjaer Mikkelsen	Denmark	1st
Ms	Carmen	Sadikovic	Sweden	1st
Ms	Hannele	Saunders	Finland	1st
Ms	Eriikka	Siirala	Finland	1st
Ms	Liesbeth	Van Humbeeck	Belgium	1st
Ms	Catharina J.	van Oostveen	The Netherlands	1st
Mr	Henk	Verloo	Switzerland	1st
Ms	Tuija	Ylitörmänen	Finland	1st

Title	Name	Surname	Country	Year
Ms	Ulrika	Bengtsson	Sweden	2nd
Ms	Karin	Bölenius	Sweden	2nd
Ms	Margarita	Corry	Republic of	2nd
Ms	Rannveig	Jónasdóttir	Iceland	2nd
Ms	Sanna	Koskinen	Finland	2nd
Ms	Cäcilia	Krüger	Germany	2nd
Ms	Maria-Anna	Laekeman	Belgium	2nd
Ms	Tone Elin	Mekki	Norway	2nd
Ms	Melanie	Messer	Germany	2nd
Ms	Mary Grace	Mifsud	Malta	2nd
Ms	Kjersti	Oterhals	Norway	2nd
Ms	Rebecca	Palm	Germany	2nd
Ms	Mira	Palonen	Finland	2nd
Ms	Floor	Ploos van Amstel	The Netherlands	2nd
Ms	Gitte Susanne	Rasmusen	Denmark	2nd
Ms	Ester	Risco Vilarasau	Spain	2nd
Ms	Miriam	Rodriguez	Spain	2nd
Ms	Tuva	Sandsdalen	Norway	2nd
Ms	Kristien	Scheepmans	Belgium	2nd
Ms	Jekaterina	Shteinmiller	Estonia	2nd
Ms	Siv	Skarstein	Norway	2nd
Ms	Joanne Lesley	Skellern	UK	2nd
Ms	Maartje	van der Kluit	The Netherlands	2nd
Ms	Aurélie	Van Lancker	Belgium	2nd
Ms	Annick	Vanclooster	Belgium	2nd
Ms	Filipa	Ventura	Portugal	2nd
Ms	Ellen	Vlaeyen	Belgium	2nd
Ms	Tiina	Yli-uotila	Finland	2nd
Ms	Franziska	Zúñiga	Switzerland	2nd
Ms	Outi	Kähkönen	Finland	2nd
Ms	Agnė	Jakavonytė-Akstinienė	Lithuania	2nd
Ms	Karen	Steenwinkel Pedersen	Denmark	2nd
Ms	Boel	Sandström	Sweden	2nd

Title	Name	Surname	Country	Year
Ms	Songül	Aktaş	Turkey	3rd
Ms	Carmela	Arteaga Jorda	Spain	3rd
Mr	Luk	Bruyneel	Belgium	3rd
Ms	Ines	Buscher	Germany	3rd
Ms	Odete Sofia	da Silva Lomba de Araújo	Portugal	3rd
Ms	Kristel	de Vliegheer	Belgium	3rd
Mr	Martin	Dichter	Germany	3rd
Ms	Catherine	Dunn	UK	3rd
Ms	Cecile	Dupin	France	3rd
Ms	Niina	Eklöf	Finland	3rd
Ms	Nuria	Esandi Larramendi	Spain	3rd
Ms	Bruna Raquel	Figuera Ornelas de Gouveia	Portugal	3rd
Ms	Nina	Hahtela	Finland	3rd
Ms	Catharina	Lindberg	Sweden	3rd
Ms	Vivi	Lycke Christensen	Norway	3rd
Ms	Titilayo	Oshodi	UK	3rd
Mr	Theodoros	Pesiridis	Greece	3rd
Ms	Christiane	Schwarz	Germany	3rd
Ms	Rosmarie	Sprenger	Switzerland	3rd
Ms	Kari	Sundsli	Norway	3rd
Ms	Eva	Sving	Sweden	3rd
Mrs	Elin	Taube	Sweden	3rd
Ms	Connie	Timmermann	Denmark	3rd
Ms	Marija	Trus	Lithuania	3rd
Ms	Astrid	Tuinman	Netherlands	3rd
Mr	Silvio	van den Heuvel	Netherlands	3rd
Ms	Anette	Winger	Norway	3rd
Ms	Sigrídur	Zoëga	Iceland	3rd
Ms	Josephine	Attard	Malta	3rd
Ms	Cecilia	Olsson	Sweden	3rd
Ms	Odetta	Vitkuniene	Lithuania	3rd
Ms	Antoinette	Conca	Schweiz	3rd
Mr	Mercè	Comes	Spain	3rd
Ms	Dorthe	Sørensen	Denmark	3rd