**SURVEY ENMC YOUNG SCIENTIST PROGRAMME**

The survey covered five topics:

* The quality of the workshop itself (question 1)
* The impact the workshop had on the career of the young scientists (questions 2 to 4)
* The role of the workshop in bridging the gap between young and senior scientists (question 5)
* The ENMC Young Scientist Programme: suggestions for improvements (questions 6-9)
* Any other suggestions (question 10)

The following scores between 1 and 5 could be chosen, open comments were encouraged. The survey was treated anonymously.

1 Poor

2 Fair

3 Neutral

4 Good

5 Excellent

N/A Not applicable/not able to complete

**RESPONSE RATE:**

Of the n=39 persons we wrote, n=20 responded which is a response rate of 53%.

**QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

**TOPIC 1: THE QUALITY OF THE WORKSHOP**

***Q1: How do you score the ENMC workshop you attended?***

-the average scores for all sub-questions were between 4.11 and 4.95. The scores were lower in the specific questions about the fulfilment of Workshop outcomes and the follow-up work after the workshops.

-participants liked the fact that unpublished data were shared; interactions with senior and junior investigators were happening, one person replied that it was difficult to come to conclusions on Sunday; one felt that in the follow-up process the integration of the young scientist could have been better and another one that not all commitments were followed up.

**TOPIC 2: The impact the workshop had on the career of the young scientists**

***Q2: Are you still working in the NMD field?***

18/20 (90%) still works in the NMD field, because of: own interest in the field the collaborative atmosphere, the availability of good role models (i.e. good examples of senior researchers, who are at leading positions in the NMD field, and use their charismatic and diplomatic skills to be successful), the availability of funding, the possibility to combine clinical and research work. Six participants answered that the probability to stay in the NMD field depends on available funding/positions.

***Q3: What is your current position?***

PhD-student: 5

Post-doc: 4

Consulting neurologist: 3

Assistant professor: 3

Genetic counsellor: 2

Instructor: 1

Medical director pharma: 2

***Q4: Did the ENMC workshop contribute to your career within the NMD field?***

19/20 (95%) responded with YES. One responded NO, because her work is indirectly related to the NMD field.

***If yes, what did it bring you?***

* Position elsewhere: 0
* Collaborative research: 14/20 (70%)
* Collaborative publication: 10/20 (50%)
* Invited to present research on other occasions: 4/20 (20%)
* Research proposal together with other participants: 10/20 (50%)
* Broadening network: 19/20 (95%)
* Sharing materials: 5/20 (25%)
* Increased reputation in the own institute: 12/20 (60%)
* Other: 2/20 (10%) such as:
* Contact with patients at the workshop
* Improved knowledge in NMD
* Research started to be funded after the ENMC workshop, because the possibility to meet with senior scientists broadened the network and facilitated grants acceptance

**TOPIC 3: The role of the WORKSHOP in bridging the gap between young and senior scientists**

***Q5: To what extent did the ENMC workshop and the ENMC Young Scientist Programme help to bridge the gap between the senior and junior participants?***

Workshop was successful in overcoming the (possible) gap: Score = 4,5

***What ENMC should keep doing:***

* Keep the meeting small and personal, and let it last for a couple of days, so everybody can interact with each other and start building up network relationships
* Keep the friendly, open and non-intimidating atmosphere
* Keep offering the informal opportunities (dinner, breaks) for interactions between senior and junior scientists (6 persons mentioned this!)
* Keep inviting young scientists to workshops and provide them a presentation timeslot
* Continue the Young Scientist Programme as it is

***Ideas for improvement and implementation:***

* Perhaps a 1 on 1 session (10-15 minutes) – speed date type of discussion between the young investigator and each member of the organisers committee
* Increase the number of young scientist per workshop to two, to avoid that they may feel lost and that they can work as a duo together with the organisers on the preparation, the execution, and the reporting of the meeting
* Perhaps one more timeslot for young investigators was suggested to increase their visibility
* Create the opportunity to collaborate with senior experts through research or training after workshop
* Organise hands-on, practical exchange workshops with juniors and seniors
* Set up a confidential list of future plans at the end of the ENMC workshop, that could be used in grant applications to strengthen the value of the grant.
* Intensify the collaborations between junior and senior scientists in the follow-up work after the workshop

**TOPIC 4: The ENMC Young Scientist Programme: suggestions for improvements**

***Q6: How did the Young Scientist Programme come to your attention?***

1. Via the ENMC website (spontaneous application by the young scientist him/herself): 1
2. I work in lab/clinic of one of the organisers: 12
3. ENMC had an extra seat available: 11

Here there was some overlap in answers 2 and 3, because they sometimes lead to the other and vice versa. They can be collected together as invitation of young scientists *driven by the organisers*. With regards to the low score on answer 1, apparently the candidates are not looking explicitly *spontaneously themselves* at the ENMC website for workshops to attend but are dependent on proactive organisers (answer 2) and signalling by ENMC (answer 3).

***Q7: Would you have attended the workshop also without the Young Scientist Programme?***

YES: 7/20 (35%), comment by a USA-based young scientist: “yes, but funding is a prerequisite”

Many times the young scientists are already listed as regular participants in the programme. When we start to bring the Young Scientist Programme to the attention of the organisers, the idea comes up to make these participants young scientists to arrange the funding.

NO: 13/20 (65%)

13/20 respondents would not have attended the workshop without the ENMC Young Scientist Programme despite being in the network. This is showing that they were invited only because ENMC had the funding and asked specifically for an additional young participant.

***Q8: What do you see as a potential new follow up of the Young Scientist Programme?***

Keep is as it is: 13/20, suggested improvements:

* Connect all young scientists who participated in the ENMC programme in a registry to foster networking and mutual collaboration
* Allow for a minimum of 2 young scientists per workshop that work as a duo
* Young scientist as a co-author of the full report (they need the publication)
* Involve young scientists in the follow-up work after the workshop.

Suggestions for new programme: 4/20 with the following suggestions:

* Workshop with only young scientists to support exchange of research data, career paths, an exchanging event (n=4 respondents)
* Create possibility of internships/ exchange visits (said 2 respondents)
* Create a fellowship programme for trainees (said 1 respondent)
* Mentorship in the field outside of someone’s own lab/program (said 2 respondents)

Number of persons not responding to this question: 4/20

***Q9: How do you score the name “Young Scientist Programme”?***

Score=4,8

Comments: Name fits well (6 respondents), it describes exactly what it is with the aim to be exposed to leaders in the NMD field. The name was appreciated because both MD and PhD are seen as scientists. The name reflects well the great opportunity to broaden the own network and start collaborations.

**TOPIC 5: any other suggestionS**

***Q10: Any other remarks/suggestions?***

* Venue, shared meals, discussions and socialising slots were very much appreciated.
* A mentor-mentee programme was proposed with the question if ENMC could be supportive on this.
* Interactive subgroup activities during the workshop to increase the interaction between the senior and junior investigators.
* Follow-up is important (one respondent had a very bad experience in taking notes during the workshop, waited 4 years without hearing anything, to find out that the paper was written by the other young scientist and the organisers).
* Involve the young scientists who are involved in writing the full NMD paper and let them be acknowledged by being one of the co-authors.