MCFA member survey on the incorporation of the MCFA as subsection of Euroscience - Results

back to the main survey page

These are the results from 61 submissions (Monday, June 3, 2002 - 19:03)

1 - I support this idea	**11**
2 - I tend to support the idea, but need more information to come to a definite conclusion	**19**
3 - I have no particular opinion	**8**
4 - I tend to reject the idea, but need more information to come to a definite conclusion	**9**
5 - I am against this idea	**14**
Average	**2.9**

Comments

Not in favour and not against... I just can't see the advantage for the MCFA.

I do not think it is a good idea to be a section of another society, whose aims are probably somewhat different from those of MCFA.

there is even more and more significant representation for less administrative effort. the unnecessary competition of organisations aiming for the same goals will only weaken the single one.

I strongly support this idea because I cannot see the MCFA continuing (or rather regaining) a decent "life" with the currently available man/women power, financial resources, management skills or non-skills, commitment from its members, ...etc. EuroScience is not the perfect solution, but (in my humble opinion) it is the only one that currently presents itself.

I agree that MCFA should change but the solution is certainly not to be dissolved in ES (it will arrive soon). Instead why not a MCFA just as moral member of ES (the association by itself and not individuals)?

From the discussion in DF I conclude that the main reason to join is that Euroscience will support solving the administration burden and let active members to concentrate in productive work. This could be truth but I like to know to what extend Euroscience will take up MCFA independence and current assets. If Euroscience strong point is that they have impact in research policy I wish to see proofs about it (e.g. what was their major policy suggestion adopted in the late years) before leaving the administration of MCFA to their hands. It would be very unfortunate to leave the past and the future(?) of some real

good volunteered work to a group to be proven later as European science bullshiters. I have also the bad feeling that some members support the merge for purely opportunistic reasons.

I will post my comments in the DF.

The MCFA has difficulties to focus on what is feasable with the available manpower. This leads to a lack of motivation among the members, which again reduces the availability of members motivated to work for the MCFA. To find out how the MCFA actually can function is a difficult process. Joining Euroscience makes this process even more difficult as the MCFA will have problems to dedicate itself to other aspects than just lobbying. Joining Euroscience is the wrong solution to a hopefully temporary problem. When the aims of the MCFA will become more transparent and more attractive, it would turn out to be a mistake to have joined Euroscience.

The current participation level to the MCFA probably requires it, but there is an objective risk that the association's nature will be lost. I also wonder how many old, and especially new members would accept to pay more than EUR 20 annual fees basically for a science policy association, i.e. doing little (at least in short term) for their individual needs.

I am trying to make up my mind concerning Euroscience. It is difficult. First, I was rather against joining but after reading a lot of interesting comments and messages I will probably vote in favour of joining Euroscience even though I still do not know enough about them. I gained the feeling that the MCFA needs a restart and this will probably be very difficult if there is not any major change - and why not a new challenge? I perceive this challenge as maintaining or redefining a MCFA identity within the broader context of Euroscience+MCFA (a bit like different states/countries within the EU). And since there seem to be risks involved in both options (merging or not) I will go for the more radical change.In fact, how is the final decision taken?

Our membership-base is to broad to be only a section of Euroscience. We have current fellows whose concerns are related to implementation issues of fellowships. Alumni fellows on non-permanent jobs who are concerned with career issues, and finally a growing number of established researchers who has other main and probably broader interests. By becoming a section of Euroscience we can only represent one group (e.g. young researchers). The ideal option is becoming a partner with Euroscience with proportional presentation in Euroscience's board.

The MCFA should became a partner of EuroScience (not a part of EuroScience)

It's pretty difficult for me to judge about the necessitites of joining /merging with Euroscience. There might be some advantages, but there might be also the risk of loosing the independent reputation we have built up so far, not to speak of technical problems, such of sharing information about the members between the two groups. I would like to see the MCFA becoming more prominent in Europe, but I fear that as an annexe to another organisation (even under the best possible scenario), this identity might slowly but surely go down the drain. But if necessary, I still prefer a MCFA subdivision over no MCFA at all.

I don't know what Euroscience is. Need more information.

At face value, I don't like the idea of our MCFA being subsumed into a bigger organisation with different (less diverse) goals & membership. This point has already been well made.

If this helps the MCFA to survive (as part of Euroscience, I think it is acceptable.

I don't see how an association with fewer member should impose its rules and most importantly its aims and way of function to MCFA. Co-operate could be an idea.