


ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 1

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	23.5%	8
Intermediate	38.2%	13
Advanced	35.3%	12
Not sure	2.9%	1
<i>answered question</i>		34
<i>skipped question</i>		1302



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	32.4%	11
Mostly	52.9%	18
Partially	11.8%	4
Somewhat	2.9%	1
Not at all	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		34
<i>skipped question</i>		1302

Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	14	19	1	0	0	34
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	11	19	2	1	0	33
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	10	20	3	0	0	33
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	11	19	3	0	0	33
The presentations challenged my thinking	11	17	5	0	0	33
The speakers identified important issues	12	18	2	1	0	33
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	11	15	5	1	0	32
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	13	19	1	0	0	33
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	9	22	1	1	0	33
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the	11	15	2	2	1	31
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop	11	15	4	2	1	33
<i>answered question</i>					34	34
<i>skipped question</i>					1302	1302

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	1328

- Response Text**
- Discussion
  - lectures, interaction with speakers
  - N/a
  - practice
  - Speakers
  - the difference between the available products and the different dosis you can use.

The presentation  
Update & discussion

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	1328

**Response Text**

botulin injections does work in the bladder,but the working mechanism isn't clear at all!  
lack of detailed hand out  
N/a  
None  
None  
Not enough practical tips related to procedure  
Time  
wasn't

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	3
<i>answered question</i>	3
<i>skipped question</i>	1333

**Response Text**

More information/investigation about how it does work and the  
complication:urineretention,haematutia,need for catheterisation.  
No  
Video

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	2
<i>answered question</i>	2
<i>skipped question</i>	1334

**Response Text**


No  
Very good

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	30.3%	10
Good	63.6%	21
Average	6.1%	2
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		33
<i>skipped question</i>		1303

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 1 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Arun Sahai	16	17	1	0	0	4.44	34
Christopher Fry	17	13	3	0	0	4.42	33
Jalesh Panicker	11	18	4	0	0	4.21	33
Thomas Kessler	13	17	3	0	0	4.30	33
answered question							34
skipped question							1302



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc) :


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Arun Sahai	17	16	1	0	0	4.47	34
Christopher Fry	19	13	1	0	0	4.55	33
Jalesh Panicker	14	17	2	0	0	4.36	33
Thomas Kessler	15	17	1	0	0	4.42	33
answered question							34
skipped question							1302



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 2

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	6.4%	3
Intermediate	31.9%	15
Advanced	61.7%	29
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		47
skipped question		1289

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	31.9%	15
Mostly	51.1%	24
Partially	17.0%	8
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		47
skipped question		1289



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	23	20	3	1	0	47
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	16	28	2	0	0	46
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	16	25	5	0	0	46
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	18	20	6	2	0	46
The presentations challenged my thinking	15	23	6	2	0	46
The speakers identified important issues	15	27	4	0	0	46
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	22	20	2	0	1	45
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	23	18	4	1	0	46
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	26	17	3	0	0	46
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	16	19	7	0	3	45
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	17	24	3	2	0	46
answered question						47
skipped question						1289

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	25
answered question	25
skipped question	1311

Response Text
contents and program
Discussion
Excellent content
EXpereinced practitioners sharing experience

Experienced faculty  
 Expertise of speakers  
 Fistula awareness  
 Good presentations  
 Interaction  
 new technicals  
 Novel issues for me  
 Opportunity to learn from experienced practitioners  
 Practical aspects  
 Practising surgeons bringing together experience in developed and developing world  
 Some very good speakers; very knowledgeable  
 Speakers are experienced  
 the different speakers addressed different subjects  
 the need for skilled doctors working on severe problems in an interdisciplinary way. To learn what difference it makes which patients you treat and where (in Europe mostly older women post-radiation or post-operatively / in Africa young women after childbirth etc) and how this influences your treatment  
 The presentations of Sohier Elneil  
 The videos of the surgeries  
 topics  
 Two of the speakers Elneil and De Ridder  
 Up to date treatment of fistula  
 videos

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	24
<i>answered question</i>	24
<i>skipped question</i>	1312

#### Response Text

attendance too low, poor preparation by chairman. New timetable was sent out a few days upfront  
 general knowledge  
 Handouts were incomplete and poor. No access (e.g. Email address) given for speakers.  
 IT difficulties initially leading to loss of time and momentum  
 Less practical tip and tricks  
 more videos  
 n.a.  
 Need new material  
 needs more videos  
 No hand-outs available at the time  
 No information of prevention though touched upon by Elneil  
 None (7x)  
 Not enough time  
 rectovaginal fistula is minimally covered and speakers are not able to answer the participants adequately on this issue  
 Sherif Mourad exceeding his time and just repeating what others had already said.  
 Some presentations overlapped, and some had too many slides, lacking references  
 staff miscommunication

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	20
<i>answered question</i>	20
<i>skipped question</i>	1316

#### Response Text

different and new techniques like videos and poster  
 Ideas on current research and how to get involved  
 more incontinence surgery  
 More on prevention  
 More video surgery

no (10x)  
Rectovaginal fistula  
video of typical fistula repair

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	10
<i>answered question</i>	10
<i>skipped question</i>	1326

**Response Text**


Excellent  
Excellent  
Good workshop  
I was impressed by the close insight the speakers showed into the subject, the way of communicating respectfully with each and concerning the subject  
no  
No  
normal  
should not be repeated

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	46.8%	22
Good	38.3%	18
Average	14.9%	7
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		47
<i>skipped question</i>		1289

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 2 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Sherif Mourad	25	13	6	3	0	4.28	47
Dirk De Ridder	27	16	2	1	0	4.50	46
Sohier Elneil	30	13	3	0	0	4.59	46
Edward Stanford	20	19	4	2	0	4.27	45
Hassan Shaker	20	20	5	1	0	4.28	46
<i>answered question</i>							<b>47</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1289</b>




Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc)

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Sherif Mourad	22	15	6	3	1	4.15	47
Dirk De Ridder	25	16	4	0	0	4.47	45
Sohier Elneil	30	12	4	0	0	4.57	46
Edward Stanford	21	16	4	3	2	4.11	46
Hassan Shaker	18	21	5	0	1	4.22	45
<i>answered question</i>							<b>47</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1289</b>



ICS 2013 Evaluation

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	0.0%	0
Intermediate	54.5%	6
Advanced	45.5%	5
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		1325



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	9.1%	1
Mostly	36.4%	4
Partially	45.5%	5
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		1325

Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	3	6	1	0	1	11
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	4	4	2	0	1	11
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	1	4	5	0	1	11
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	1	6	2	1	1	11
The presentations challenged my thinking	1	4	5	0	1	11
The speakers identified important issues	1	7	2	0	1	11
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	3	4	3	0	1	11
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	3	5	2	0	1	11
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	2	7	1	0	1	11
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	2	5	3	0	1	11
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	1	7	1	1	1	11
<i>answered question</i>						11
<i>skipped question</i>						1325

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	3
<i>answered question</i>	3
<i>skipped question</i>	1333

**Response Text**

general view about the biomechanics of the lower urinary tract  
Knowing what other professionals are studying the World, increasing my knowledge.  
Openess of the presenters.



What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	4
<i>answered question</i>	4
<i>skipped question</i>	1332

**Response Text**

basic science. I thought the discussion left to be desired.  
few interaction between participants  
interaction  
Not much new science.

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	4
<i>answered question</i>	4
<i>skipped question</i>	1332

**Response Text**

Better functional modelling.  
topic not broad enough, more basic science  
The influence of the pelvic floor in the biomechanics of the lower urinary tract.  
Future perspectives: for research and clinical applications  
neurophysiological aspects of urination.

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	3
<i>answered question</i>	3
<i>skipped question</i>	1333

**Response Text**

None (3x)


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping,		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	40.0%	4
Good	50.0%	5
Average	10.0%	1
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		10
<i>skipped question</i>		1326

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 3 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Margot Damaser	4	7	0	0	0	4.36	11
Matthew Fraser	2	8	1	0	0	4.09	11
Longkun Li	0	6	1	0	0	3.86	7
Maryrose Sullivan	3	8	0	0	0	4.27	11
Christopher Chermansky	2	7	2	0	0	4.00	11
<i>answered question</i>							11
<i>skipped question</i>							1325


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Margot Damaser	4	7	0	0	0	4.36	11
Matthew Fraser	1	8	2	0	0	3.91	11
Longkun Li	0	5	1	0	0	3.83	6
Maryrose Sullivan	1	9	1	0	0	4.00	11
Christopher Chermansky	1	8	2	0	0	3.91	11
<i>answered question</i>							11
<i>skipped question</i>							1325


### Speakers rating performance



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 4

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	3.8%	1
Intermediate	11.5%	3
Advanced	84.6%	22
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		26
skipped question		1310

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	46.2%	12
Mostly	42.3%	11
Partially	3.8%	1
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	7.7%	2
answered question		26
skipped question		1310



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	15	9	1	1	0	26
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	13	11	1	1	0	26
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	13	12	0	1	0	26
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	14	10	0	2	0	26
The presentations challenged my thinking	12	12	0	2	0	26
The speakers identified important issues	14	10	0	2	0	26
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	13	9	2	0	1	25
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	15	10	1	0	0	26
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	17	7	1	1	0	26
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	9	9	5	2	1	26
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	8	8	5	2	2	25
answered question						26
skipped question						1310

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	14
answered question	14
skipped question	1322

**Response Text**  
Case Discussions  
case presentations, speakers

clinica relevanz  
 Clinical cases  
 Excellent workshop which was truly interactive and inclusive  
 Excellent workshop. Would strongly recommend. Very interactive and inclusive. Made me think  
 Good choice of cases!! Very challenging ones!  
 Good speakers.  
 High quality  
 interactionadvice  
 it really focussed on the aspects of tape failure  
 LEARNING  
 Practical pints of views for tapes failures on stress urinary incontinence  
 The interaction between the speakers and the participants

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	14
<i>answered question</i>	14
<i>skipped question</i>	1322

#### Response Text

David Waltregny did not use the microphone and was very dominating. Carl Gustav Nilsson and Fiona Burkhard got little chance to speak  
 evidence  
 It was intended to be interactive, but only a few participated. It would be better to divide in groups, or to let the audience push buttons to demonstrate their opinion on different questions.  
 no material  
 None (4x)  
 Not enough attendees  
 nothing  
 PRICE  
 real steps to prevent tape failure  
 Too many people  
 Very few cases to discuss

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	10
<i>answered question</i>	10
<i>skipped question</i>	1326

#### Response Text

material  
 No (5x)  
 Not really  
 Perhaps split the case discussion before and after lunch break  
 prevention of tape failureideal selection of cases  
 Surgical videos. Algorithms

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	7
<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

#### Response Text

Excellent workshop i really enjoyed it!  
 in general it was an excellent work sop  
 nice people  
 No (3x)  
 Well done to David and team!


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	76.9%	20
Good	19.2%	5
Average	0.0%	0
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	3.8%	1
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		1310

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 4 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
David Waltregny	20	4	1	0	1	4.62	26
Fiona Burkhard	15	8	0	2	0	4.44	25
Carl Gustav Nilsson	16	10	0	0	0	4.62	26
answered question							26
skipped question							1310



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
David Waltregny	22	3	0	0	1	4.73	26
Fiona Burkhard	14	9	2	1	0	4.38	26
Carl Gustav Nilsson	15	9	1	0	0	4.56	25
answered question							26
skipped question							1310



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 5

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	0.0%	0
Intermediate	70.4%	19
Advanced	29.6%	8
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		27
skipped question		1309

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	20.0%	5
Mostly	52.0%	13
Partially	24.0%	6
Somewhat	4.0%	1
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		25
skipped question		1311



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	9	14	0	0	1	24
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	5	14	4	1	0	24
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	5	11	6	1	0	23
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	3	14	3	1	0	21
The presentations challenged my thinking	5	10	6	3	0	24
The speakers identified important issues	5	13	4	1	0	23
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	5	13	4	1	0	23
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	11	11	1	0	0	23
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	7	11	4	1	0	23
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	4	7	4	6	2	23
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	4	10	5	2	1	22
answered question						24
skipped question						1312

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	10
answered question	10
skipped question	1326

Response Text

Different way of thinking  
identifying important issues of the topic  
It fitted the topic  
It was based in an organized and clear manner  
Mirapegron  
oportunities for question  
opportunity for discussion with experts  
pathophysiology  
Speakers knowledge

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	10
<i>answered question</i>	10
<i>skipped question</i>	1326

Response Text

conclusions- uncertaine  
Handout  
I did not get any handout  
no comment  
Question  
Speakers  
The level was not to be intended as "advanced"  
to long  
We did not get any handout

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	9
<i>answered question</i>	9
<i>skipped question</i>	1327

Response Text

Handout (3x)  
No (4x)  
Very superficial talks in some topics

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	7
<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

Response Text

Documents/handout before workshop to praper myself before talks  
I was a speaker, unable to comment further  
no (4x)

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	29.2%	7
Good	66.7%	16
Average	0.0%	0
Poor	4.2%	1
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		1312




## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 5 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Jacques Corcos	6	14	1	1	0	4.14	22
Marcus Drake	12	9	1	0	0	4.50	22
Francisco Cruz	9	10	3	0	0	4.27	22
Elise De	9	9	3	0	0	4.29	21
Brigitte Schurch	5	12	5	0	0	4.00	22
<i>answered question</i>							22
<i>skipped question</i>							1314

### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing)

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Jacques Corcos	6	14	1	1	0	4.14	22
Marcus Drake	14	7	1	0	0	4.59	22
Francisco Cruz	8	12	1	0	0	4.33	21
Elise De	10	9	2	0	0	4.38	21
Brigitte Schurch	7	7	5	2	1	3.77	22
<i>answered question</i>							22
<i>skipped question</i>							1314

### Speakers rating performance




## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 6

### In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	27.0%	10
Intermediate	48.6%	18
Advanced	21.6%	8
Not sure	2.7%	1
<i>answered question</i>		37
<i>skipped question</i>		1299

### Level Workshop 6



### Has this Workshop met your expectations?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	35.1%	13
Mostly	29.7%	11
Partially	27.0%	10
Somewhat	5.4%	2
Not at all	2.7%	1
<i>answered question</i>		37
<i>skipped question</i>		1299

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	10	25	1	0	0	36
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	8	22	5	1	0	36
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	8	24	4	0	0	36
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	8	21	7	0	0	36
The presentations challenged my thinking	10	22	4	0	0	36
The speakers identified important issues	14	21	1	0	0	36
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	13	21	2	0	0	36
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	12	21	1	1	0	35
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	10	24	2	0	0	36
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	8	18	7	2	0	35
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	8	16	8	1	0	33
<i>answered question</i>						36
<i>skipped question</i>						1300

### What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	17
<i>answered question</i>	17
<i>skipped question</i>	1319

### Response Text

Asses de value of Ultrasound  
 Demonstrations of patients assessments live  
 for a first approach of 3D US it was excellent  
 general idea of perineal and endoanal ultrasound

I have to declare conflict of interest. I am in the faculty of the workshop so you may want to exclude me from the evaluation..

interactivity  
live scans  
passionated speaker  
patient based case presentation was excellent.  
Practical live ultrasound  
presentation  
prof dietz explanation  
Speakers are pretty good  
Stimulating and thought provoking  
The broad experience of the speakers  
The broad experience of the speakers

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	19
<i>answered question</i>	19
<i>skipped question</i>	1317

**Response Text**

almost posterior compartment interest (uro-gyn orientated)  
how to perform perineal and endoanal ultrasound  
I supposed it would be a practical workshop, and it was mainly theoretical.  
I thought it was a practical workshop, and it was essentially theoretical  
Maybe it should be longer  
No handouts  
Tiresome unscientific promotion of all women to have cesarian section.  
The upside -down presentation of ultrasound images, with the reason that this is how it was when Dietz started (being a great innovator in this field, I expected him to be able to present images in a more intuitive anatomical correct way) .  
No practical issues (I hoped that)  
None  
none  
none  
Not everyone has a 4D ultrasound  
Nothing new  
practical  
the participants did not have the chance to perform pelvic ultrasound  
there was not  
There were no practical issues  
Very limited application for my practice

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	13
<i>answered question</i>	13
<i>skipped question</i>	1323

**Response Text**

A comparison of strengths and weaknesses of perineal, vaginal and anal 3/4 D ultrasound would have been nice.  
cfr supra ! 3 compartment interest and knowledge is imminent  
detail step for performing perineal and endoanal ultrasound  
It would be better if we could perform ultrasound as well. This would ease learning.  
no  
No  
None  
Practical issues  
practice  
Something new.  
The utilization of 2D and 3D ultrasound

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	13
<i>answered question</i>	13
<i>skipped question</i>	1323

Response Text


excellent  
 For time to time it was personnal opinions , i am not sure for example that epino's method would prevent avulsion.  
 great workshop  
 Lights in the room was unsatisfactory, either too bright or too dark.  
 N/A  
 No  
 no  
 none  
 Prof Dietz is really good speaker  
 The speakers had a very high level, but I had preferred a practical workshop  
 Very useful

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping,		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	56.8%	21
Good	37.8%	14
Average	5.4%	2
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		37
<i>skipped question</i>		1299

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 6 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Hans Peter Dietz	22	12	2	0	0	4.56	36
Ka Lai Shek	10	24	2	0	0	4.22	36
Kamil Svabik	15	19	2	0	0	4.36	36
Jennifer Kruger	11	20	3	0	0	4.24	34
answered question							37
skipped question							1299




Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing)

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Hans Peter Dietz	24	10	2	0	0	4.61	36
Ka Lai Shek	12	20	4	0	0	4.22	36
Kamil Svabik	17	16	4	0	0	4.35	37
Jennifer Kruger	15	19	3	0	0	4.32	37
answered question							37
skipped question							1299



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 7

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	8.3%	1
Intermediate	33.3%	4
Advanced	50.0%	6
Not sure	8.3%	1
<i>answered question</i>		12
<i>skipped question</i>		1324



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	25.0%	3
Mostly	50.0%	6
Partially	16.7%	2
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	8.3%	1
<i>answered question</i>		12
<i>skipped question</i>		1324

Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	3	6	0	3	0	12
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	3	6	3	0	0	12
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	3	5	2	1	0	11
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	3	5	3	1	0	12
The presentations challenged my thinking	2	4	4	2	0	12
The speakers identified important issues	5	5	1	0	1	12
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	4	6	1	0	0	11
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	5	5	2	0	0	12
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	4	8	0	0	0	12
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	3	5	3	0	0	11
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	2	6	2	2	0	12
<i>answered question</i>					12	12
<i>skipped question</i>					1324	1324

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	1328

**Response Text**

Good review, nice pictures  
 gynae ppt  
 interactive aspect  
 interactive discussion between speakers and participants

Much cirúrgicas contents  
 new approach for children in transitio to adulthood  
 Not sure  
 presenters

#### What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	6
<i>answered question</i>	6
<i>skipped question</i>	1330

#### Response Text

cases  
 few clinical case discussions, only 4  
 Less aspectos of conservative management  
 none  
 Not sure this was really a "cook book" of "how to..." if you were to be presented with a patient who had a congenital problem affecting their bladder/continence.  
 too much information by some of the speakers

#### Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?

Answer Options	Response Count
	4
<i>answered question</i>	4
<i>skipped question</i>	1332

#### Response Text

broadcast recordings of the sessions  
 no  
 other (psychosocial) aspects of care  
 Physiotherapy contentes

#### Any other comments on this Workshop:

Answer Options	Response Count
	4
<i>answered question</i>	4
<i>skipped question</i>	1332

#### Response Text

broadcast recordings of the sessions  
 excellent  
 More clinical approach  
 No


#### Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping,

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	41.7%	5
Good	33.3%	4
Average	16.7%	2
Poor	8.3%	1
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		12
<i>skipped question</i>		1324

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 7 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Giovanni Mosiello	2	7	2	1	0	3.83	12
Giulio Del Popolo	4	5	2	1	0	4.00	12
Laetitia De Kort	1	8	1	1	0	3.82	11
Pallavi Latthe	3	6	1	1	0	4.00	11
Mario De Gennaro	1	4	2	1	0	3.63	8
Wendy Bower	4	5	2	1	0	4.00	12
answered question							12
skipped question							1324



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Giovanni Mosiello	2	7	2	1	0	3.83	12
Giulio Del Popolo	3	8	0	1	0	4.08	12
Laetitia De Kort	3	5	1	1	0	4.00	10
Pallavi Latthe	3	5	2	1	0	3.91	11
Mario De Gennaro	1	3	3	1	0	3.50	8
Wendy Bower	3	7	1	1	0	4.00	12
answered question							12
skipped question							1324






ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 8

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	0.0%	0
Intermediate	33.3%	9
Advanced	66.7%	18
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		27
skipped question		1309

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	29.6%	8
Mostly	44.4%	12
Partially	14.8%	4
Somewhat	7.4%	2
Not at all	3.7%	1
answered question		27
skipped question		1309



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	8	17	1	0	0	26
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	4	21	1	0	0	26
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	8	13	5	0	0	26
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	6	12	8	0	0	26
The presentations challenged my thinking	6	15	2	3	0	26
The speakers identified important issues	7	15	3	1	0	26
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	8	15	3	0	0	26
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	10	15	1	0	0	26
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	9	15	1	0	1	26
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	3	17	4	2	0	26
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	3	14	5	2	1	25
answered question						26
skipped question						1310

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	13
answered question	13
skipped question	1323

Response Text
Comprehensive cover
Covered most topics well
evidence based
good lectures

interactive nature and opportunity to discuss with the speakers  
 It contained speakers of great quality  
 It is relevant for clinical patient healthcare. A very important topic for prolapse treatment  
 multidisciplinary approach  
 nice lectures, good interaction with class.  
 small number of participants, personal atmosphere, enough time for discussion  
 Think twice in using Mesh.  
 Videos te achine  
 x

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	1324

**Response Text**  
 Académico  
 handout?  
 handout? did not receive  
 lack of scientific base of proposed techniques and opinions  
 muddled agenda  
 None (4x)  
 Overlap with information discussed in previous ICS  
 The place was over booked & crowded  
 x

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	9
<i>answered question</i>	9
<i>skipped question</i>	1327

**Response Text**  
 all relevant areas were discussed  
 Incontinence  
 no (4x)  
 scientific base of proposed techniques and opinions  
 x

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	1328

**Response Text**  
 No (5x)  
 Should continue to be part of the ICS workshops


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping,		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	24.0%	6
Good	72.0%	18
Average	4.0%	1
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		25
<i>skipped question</i>		1311

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 8 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Salma Kayani	8	17	1	0	0	4.27	26
Bruno Deval	6	18	1	0	0	4.20	25
Elisabetta Costantini	7	19	0	0	0	4.27	26
Stergios Doumouchtsis	7	19	0	0	0	4.27	26
<i>answered question</i>							26
<i>skipped question</i>							1310


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing)

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Salma Kayani	9	14	3	0	0	4.23	26
Bruno Deval	5	17	4	0	0	4.04	26
Elisabetta Costantini	8	16	2	0	0	4.23	26
Stergios Doumouchtsis	7	17	2	0	0	4.19	26
<i>answered question</i>							26
<i>skipped question</i>							1310

### Speakers rating performance




## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 9

### In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	0.0%	0
Intermediate	33.3%	11
Advanced	66.7%	22
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		33
<i>skipped question</i>		1303

### Level Workshop 9



### Has this Workshop met your expectations?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	36.4%	12
Mostly	48.5%	16
Partially	9.1%	3
Somewhat	3.0%	1
Not at all	3.0%	1
<i>answered question</i>		33
<i>skipped question</i>		1303

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	13	15	3	0	0	31
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	13	15	2	1	0	31
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	12	13	4	2	0	31
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	12	11	8	0	0	31
The presentations challenged my thinking	12	11	7	0	0	30
The speakers identified important issues	14	11	6	0	0	31
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	15	13	3	0	0	31
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	12	16	3	0	0	31
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	11	17	2	1	0	31
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	14	11	3	1	1	30
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	13	10	5	0	0	28
<i>answered question</i>						31
<i>skipped question</i>						1305

### What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	16
<i>answered question</i>	16
<i>skipped question</i>	1320

### Response Text

Active participation of the participants. Its clinical importance.

Complications are when surgeons have to admit faults  
 Evaluation, Intervention, and Resolution, Complications of Incontinence and Prolapse Surgery  
 excellent speakers  
 Experienced clinicians  
 Good speakers  
 Hand outs for reference later  
 interactions and collegial exchange  
 Managing mesh complications and diagnosis  
 Proper handouts where undivided attention could be given to the speakers  
 speakers were excellent  
 The content provided me with information and knowledge that will be helpful in my work and hands out  
 before the workshop was very helpful.  
 The evaluation, intervention, and resolution of complications of Incontinence and Prolapse Surgery  
 The interaction between the speakers and the floor  
 The panel! Great group of experts with wide experience  
 too short

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	17
<i>answered question</i>	17
<i>skipped question</i>	1319

#### Response Text

A bit too basic  
 all aspect was relevant  
 Alls points discussed were interesting  
 could have used a little more time for questions/discussion  
 I did not recieve handouts during this workshop. They were only available online which I should have know  
 beforehand  
 I think it was very appropriate  
 It was too long for the content  
 Non  
 none noted  
 Not detailed enough  
 Not enough time  
 pain topic was baddly covered  
 Questions not offered after each talk  
 Questions to be taken after each talk  
 space in room  
 time limitations  
 X

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	1324

#### Response Text

I do not think  
 I would prefer more case discussions  
 More case presentations and case specific discussions  
 No (8x)  
 No, there isn't. I think their discussed everything and nothing would included

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	9
<i>answered question</i>	9

## Response Text

No (7x)  
well done  
X


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	41.9%	13
Good	48.4%	15
Average	9.7%	3
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		31
<i>skipped question</i>		1305

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 9 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Howard Goldman	15	13	2	0	0	4.43	30
Sandip Vasavada	16	12	2	0	0	4.47	30
Roger Dmochowski	18	10	2	0	0	4.53	30
Tristi Muir	13	13	3	1	0	4.27	30
answered question							30
skipped question							1306




Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Howard Goldman	15	14	1	0	0	4.47	30
Sandip Vasavada	16	12	2	0	0	4.47	30
Roger Dmochowski	16	11	2	0	0	4.48	29
Tristi Muir	15	14	1	0	0	4.47	30
answered question							30
skipped question							1306



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 10

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	4.2%	2
Intermediate	29.2%	14
Advanced	64.6%	31
Not sure	2.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>		48
<i>skipped question</i>		1288



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	25.5%	12
Mostly	61.7%	29
Partially	8.5%	4
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	4.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>		47
<i>skipped question</i>		1289

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	10	31	2	3	1	47
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	12	30	3	2	0	47
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	11	30	3	2	1	47
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	12	27	4	3	1	47
The presentations challenged my thinking	13	24	6	4	0	47
The speakers identified important issues	16	25	4	2	0	47
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	18	24	2	2	0	46
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	12	25	6	1	1	45
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	16	25	4	1	0	46
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	11	19	9	5	1	45
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	15	18	10	2	1	46
<i>answered question</i>						47
<i>skipped question</i>						1289

### What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	20
<i>answered question</i>	20
<i>skipped question</i>	1316

### Response Text

Academic  
All of it  
case presentations  
Case presentations



Clarifying problems  
 Discussions  
 Dr. Shaefer's talk.  
 Good scientific and educational level of speakers  
 I learned about new aspect of urodynamic study.  
 Important pitfalls in standard urodynamics and how to recognize them.  
 None really  
 Overall very good speakers, consistent emphasis on evaluating the quality of the studies  
**SOLVING PROBLEMS**  
 The quality of speakers  
 The speakers  
 to review urodynamics and its standards  
 Very educational  
 Very High scientific and clinical aspect - excellent combination  
 very useful  
 Well organised

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	19
<i>answered question</i>	19
<i>skipped question</i>	1317

#### Response Text

All of this was theoretical  
 Disagreement on practice in standardisation  
 Less opportunity for Q and A  
 May be longer time.  
 none  
 not many time to discuss  
 References to very old data, lack of up to date evidence  
 Short time  
 Short time  
 Some speakers difficult to understand because of accent  
 Some speaker's languages  
 sometime I got the feeling that some of the specific urodynamic definitions got mixed up  
 The last speaker. The presentation appeared as just a summing up of cases. Not really interesting.  
 Time keeping. The presentation on Videourodynamics  
 time limitation for questions  
 Too long  
 too long  
 Unbalanced. Several talks on obstruction that were redundant, inadequate time on stress incontinence and prolapse. Some speakers went too far over time.  
 Urodynamics and cervical cancer talk, followed closely by urodynamics and stress incontinence talk.

Is there anything you feel should have been included that	
Answer Options	Response Count
	11
<i>answered question</i>	11
<i>skipped question</i>	1325

#### Response Text

hands - on urodynamic  
 Lots - MORE TRACINGS of subtle urodynamic findings, how to interpret them, and results of treatment based on that treatment. Trouble-shooting problems with urodynamics. Urodynamics in pelvic prolapse.  
 More cases of male and female BOO. Urodynamics in patients with voiding dysfunction etc after pelvic floor surgery...  
 More clinical cases to discuss  
 More time  
 News in the guidelines should be presented more strongly  
 No (5x)  
 Urodynamics evaluation of postop obstruction and patients with pelvic pain, and any other clinical scenario for which the evidence base exists. None of this was presented.

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	7
<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

### Response Text

Horrible. Too many of the talks were just old re-hashed clinical talks, the content of which the entire audience should have known already, especially male oab. SUI talk was wasted with 15 minutes of background as to why routine uds are not indicated in the index patient, which could have been done in a few minutes followed by real cases where the uds are actually helpful and how to use them in practice. Too many talks/speakers were scheduled! All talks went too long allowing no time for questions and discussion, because nobody wanted to put us further behind. Course was advertised to go until 6 pm but on arrival to course we found that it was planned until 6:30, meaning for those of us who had made alternative plans we missed the most useful part of the course (cases) because we had to leave. I have never been more disappointed with an educational course.

More discussion time and more cases

None (3x)

Practical

that fine


Please rate the Chairpersons' ability to act as Chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	42.2%	19
Good	44.4%	20
Average	8.9%	4
Poor	4.4%	2
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		45
<i>skipped question</i>		1291

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 10 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Werner Schaefer	26	17	0	1	0	4.55	44
Liao Limin	10	24	6	3	0	3.95	43
Jose Batista	15	22	4	1	0	4.21	42
Montserrat Espuna	15	18	10	0	1	4.05	44
Jeffrey Weiss	24	19	1	0	0	4.52	44
Christopher Payne	23	19	2	0	0	4.48	44
Antony Stone	17	17	2	1	1	4.26	38
Victor Nitti	20	15	3	0	0	4.45	38
Karl Kreder	15	25	1	0	0	4.34	41
<i>answered question</i>							<b>44</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1292</b>


**Speakers rating content**



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Werner Schaefer	23	19	1	0	1	4.43	44
Liao Limin	9	22	6	4	1	3.81	42
Jose Batista	15	22	4	1	0	4.21	42
Montserrat Espuna	15	19	7	0	1	4.12	42
Jeffrey Weiss	23	20	1	0	0	4.50	44
Christopher Payne	21	20	2	0	0	4.44	43
Antony Stone	15	22	2	0	1	4.25	40
Victor Nitti	21	16	1	0	0	4.53	38
Karl Kreder	18	22	1	0	0	4.41	41
<i>answered question</i>							<b>44</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1292</b>


**Speakers rating performance**



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 11

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	18.8%	3
Intermediate	25.0%	4
Advanced	50.0%	8
Not sure	6.3%	1
answered question		16
skipped question		1320

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	31.3%	5
Mostly	31.3%	5
Partially	25.0%	4
Somewhat	12.5%	2
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		16
skipped question		1320



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	6	8	2	0	0	16
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	2	9	4	0	0	15
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	3	5	6	1	0	15
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	2	8	4	1	0	15
The presentations challenged my thinking	2	4	8	1	0	15
The speakers identified important issues	2	6	5	2	0	15
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	3	6	6	0	0	15
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	3	10	2	0	0	15
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	3	8	4	0	0	15
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	1	7	6	1	0	15
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	2	7	5	1	0	15
answered question						16
skipped question						1320

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	6
answered question	6
skipped question	1330

**Response Text**

Complete overview of all aspects  
do not remember, filled in the evaluation form on the event just after the workshop  
Good presentation  
Interaction

systemic aspect  
The simplification of the difficult subject Matthew Fraser was talking about

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	5
<i>answered question</i>	5
<i>skipped question</i>	1331

**Response Text**  
None  
One of the speakers couldn't come  
one speaker could not do his presentation  
Poor clinical co-relation  
the absence of the last speaker

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	5
<i>answered question</i>	5
<i>skipped question</i>	1331

**Response Text**  
No (3x)  
Yes, more clinically relevant aspects  
little therapeutical inputs,

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	1
<i>answered question</i>	1
<i>skipped question</i>	1335

Number	Response Text
1	No


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	25.0%	4
Good	37.5%	6
Average	37.5%	6
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		16
<i>skipped question</i>		1320

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 11 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Matthew Fraser	4	8	2	1	0	4.00	15
Lori Birder	4	9	2	0	0	4.13	15
Emeran Mayer	1	8	0	0	0	4.11	9
answered question							16
skipped question							1320


Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Matthew Fraser	3	8	0	3	1	3.60	15
Lori Birder	4	9	2	0	0	4.13	15
Emeran Mayer	1	7	0	0	0	4.13	8
answered question							16
skipped question							1320

Speakers rating performance



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 12

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	33.3%	3
Intermediate	55.6%	5
Advanced	11.1%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		9
<i>skipped question</i>		1327



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	33.3%	3
Mostly	55.6%	5
Partially	11.1%	1
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		9
<i>skipped question</i>		1327

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	2	7	0	0	0	9
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	2	6	1	0	0	9
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	3	6	0	0	0	9
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	1	5	3	0	0	9
The presentations challenged my thinking	2	5	2	0	0	9
The speakers identified important issues	3	6	0	0	0	9
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	3	5	1	0	0	9
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	3	6	0	0	0	9
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	3	6	0	0	0	9
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	1	4	2	0	2	9
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	1	3	3	0	1	8
<i>answered question</i>						9
<i>skipped question</i>						1327

### What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	4
<i>answered question</i>	4
<i>skipped question</i>	1332

### Response Text

Health promotion focus

Inspiration and experience shared as to concrete actions to undertake in lokal community  
nil

The presentation of the methods to increase awareness of the public

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	3
<i>answered question</i>	3
<i>skipped question</i>	1333

#### Response Text

nil

Urinary incontinence is a team work and in this workshop the team members and their responsibilities were not defined clearly.

Variable speaker quality

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was	
Answer Options	Response Count
	3
<i>answered question</i>	3
<i>skipped question</i>	1333

#### Response Text

A stronger health promotion focus

nil

Other team members could be presented as well.

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	2
<i>answered question</i>	2
<i>skipped question</i>	1334

#### Response Text

nil

The concept of health promotion could be a good topic for the main program


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping,		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	25.0%	2
Good	75.0%	6
Average	0.0%	0
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		8
<i>skipped question</i>		1328



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 12 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average
Rowan Cockerell	2	7	0	0	0	4.22
Louise Kurczycki	2	5	0	0	0	4.29
Margaret Sherburn	5	3	0	1	0	4.33
Joan Ostaskiewicz	0	7	2	0	0	3.78
						<i>answered question</i>
						<i>skipped question</i>



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, time)


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average
Rowan Cockerell	0	8	1	0	0	3.89
Louise Kurczycki	2	5	1	0	0	4.13
Margaret Sherburn	4	4	1	0	0	4.33
Joan Ostaskiewicz	1	7	1	0	0	4.00
						<i>answered question</i>
						<i>skipped question</i>



Joan Ostaskiewicz



Response Count
9
7
9
9
9
1327



ing etc) :

Response Count
9
8
9
9
9
1327






## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 13

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	12.5%	3
Intermediate	12.5%	3
Advanced	75.0%	18
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		1312

### Level Workshop 13



Has this Workshop met your expectations?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	20.8%	5
Mostly	41.7%	10
Partially	33.3%	8
Somewhat	4.2%	1
Not at all	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		1312

Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	7	16	1	0	0	24
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	6	16	2	0	0	24
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	4	12	5	3	0	24
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	5	15	3	1	0	24
The presentations challenged my thinking	7	13	2	2	0	24
The speakers identified important issues	4	18	1	0	0	23
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	6	17	1	0	0	24
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	8	15	1	0	0	24
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	8	12	1	3	0	24
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	4	14	4	1	1	24
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	3	10	7	1	1	22
<i>answered question</i>						24
<i>skipped question</i>						1312

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12

#### Response Text

Chairman  
Chris Fry gave an interesting talk  
combining different points of view  
Dr Digesu lecture was very interesting. I learn a lot from this talk  
Experts opinions. Challenging discussion  
Innovative  
just exposure to new ways of thinking about OAB  
Knowledge of the presenters  
Many new ideas for me  
the different methods to identify biomarkers, the question what a biomarker is and what I want from a biomarker, where biomarkers are found  
The photos  
The vetting of new ideas. Stimulated ideas for research projects

#### What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	11
<i>answered question</i>	11
<i>skipped question</i>	1325

#### Response Text

clinical relevance was not stressed enough  
Handout  
how these aspects might help us in the future  
It was a bit too general  
lack of interactivity  
Little applicability to current practice.  
My lack of knowledge  
None  
Questions  
That it was not at an advanced level of information  
We did not get a handout

#### Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?

Answer Options	Response Count
	6
<i>answered question</i>	6
<i>skipped question</i>	1330

#### Response Text

handout  
No (3x)  
not really - most was real scientific and based on a special knowledge in different science parts (i.e.: biochemistry, physiology, etc.)  
Practicing

#### Any other comments on this Workshop:

Answer Options	Response Count
	3
<i>answered question</i>	3
<i>skipped question</i>	1333

#### Response Text

Alot of irrelevant discussion of the topic  
Good  
handout?!It was not Dr. Khullar it was his "assistant"... I forgot the name

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	50.0%	11
Good	45.5%	10
Average	4.5%	1
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		22
<i>skipped question</i>		1314





arkers can be found


3, genetics, etc)

## ICS 2013 Evaluation

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Christopher Fry	14	8	1	0	0	4.57	23
Karl-Erik Andersson	12	5	4	1	0	4.27	22
Vikram Khullar	8	10	2	0	0	4.30	20
Celia Cruz	11	10	2	0	0	4.39	23
Arun Sahai	10	11	1	1	0	4.30	23
<i>answered question</i>							24
<i>skipped question</i>							1312


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Christopher Fry	15	7	1	0	0	4.61	23
Karl-Erik Andersson	13	5	3	1	0	4.36	22
Vikram Khullar	11	7	2	0	0	4.45	20
Celia Cruz	11	10	2	0	0	4.39	23
Arun Sahai	12	9	2	0	0	4.43	23
<i>answered question</i>							24
<i>skipped question</i>							1312


### Speakers rating performance



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 14

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	28.9%	13
Intermediate	55.6%	25
Advanced	15.6%	7
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		45
skipped question		1291

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	24.4%	11
Mostly	57.8%	26
Partially	17.8%	8
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		45
skipped question		1291



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	10	30	4	0	0	44
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	8	31	1	0	0	40
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	12	26	4	1	0	43
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	8	28	5	0	0	41
The presentations challenged my thinking	12	20	9	0	0	41
The speakers identified important issues	11	27	3	0	0	41
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	12	18	7	1	2	40
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	8	29	2	1	0	40
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	11	27	3	0	0	41
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	5	22	6	5	1	39
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	5	17	15	0	2	39
answered question						44
skipped question						1292

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	15
answered question	15
skipped question	1321

**Response Text**

-

case presentations

different perspectives

each speaker presenting 'nocturia' from a different perspective - from practical steps in clinical assessment through to epidemiology  
Good overview of nocturia and what is currently known. Speakers were excellent  
Interaction  
it started basic and developed into higher level. New knowledge for me regarding sleeping disorders  
ok  
The high quality of the presenters  
the nomination of Philip van Kerrebroeck  
the overview  
The updates  
The use of medication  
understand the therapies offered to patients for mehorar their quality of life  
Well presented with case studies

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	14
<i>answered question</i>	14
<i>skipped question</i>	1322

Response Text

A Little difficult about the expected background for the reason of the mortalities.  
few novelties in causes of this symptoms focus on treatment  
Lack of advanced information  
Limutred number of participants  
none  
None  
none noted  
Not enough time for all the data presented to be 'absorbed'  
ok  
Somewhat repetitive content; workshop could have been shorter  
the discussion of Karel Everaert  
too much information on the slights (some speakers)

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	10
<i>answered question</i>	10
<i>skipped question</i>	1326

Response Text

No (5x)  
None  
nothing  
ok

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	7
<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

Response Text

No  
none (2x)  
ok  
well updated and organized with participation of the availability of plenary

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	46.5%	20
Good	53.5%	23
Average	0.0%	0
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		43
<i>skipped question</i>		1293

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 14 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Karel Everaert	18	22	1	0	0	4.41	41
Philip Van Kerrebroeck	16	25	1	0	0	4.36	42
Jeffrey Weiss	18	22	1	0	0	4.41	41
Kari Tikkinen	15	21	4	0	0	4.28	40
An-Sofie Goessaert	15	21	2	0	0	4.34	38
<i>answered question</i>							43
<i>skipped question</i>							1293


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Karel Everaert	17	23	1	0	0	4.39	41
Philip Van Kerrebroeck	16	23	2	0	0	4.34	41
Jeffrey Weiss	17	23	1	0	0	4.39	41
Kari Tikkinen	14	19	5	0	0	4.24	38
An-Sofie Goessaert	15	21	2	0	0	4.34	38
<i>answered question</i>							43
<i>skipped question</i>							1293

### Speakers performance rating



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 15

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	23.5%	12
Intermediate	49.0%	25
Advanced	25.5%	13
Not sure	2.0%	1
<i>answered question</i>		51
<i>skipped question</i>		1285



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	33.3%	17
Mostly	35.3%	18
Partially	21.6%	11
Somewhat	7.8%	4
Not at all	2.0%	1
<i>answered question</i>		51
<i>skipped question</i>		1285

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	22	20	7	0	1	50
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	11	28	9	0	1	49
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	13	23	12	1	1	50
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	11	26	10	2	1	50
The presentations challenged my thinking	9	24	11	5	1	50
The speakers identified important issues	14	22	12	1	1	50
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	13	24	9	3	1	50
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	11	28	6	3	1	49
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	15	26	6	1	1	49
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	9	19	12	5	4	49
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	8	23	13	1	3	48
<i>answered question</i>						50
<i>skipped question</i>						1286

### What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	25
<i>answered question</i>	25
<i>skipped question</i>	1311

### Response Text

A comprehensive overview of male urinary incontinence  
 As a physiotherapist the workshop confirmed that I am managing my patients in the right way.  
 give and take with panel  
 good lecturers, good opportunities to ask questions

heather explanation  
 I do not remember much...  
 Integral orientation  
 Interactive lesson  
 Multidisciplinary work was showed  
 new developments  
 overview  
 Practical approaches  
 quality of presenters and chairs  
 rehabilitation options  
 speakers  
 the actuality of problem (post-surgical incontinence)  
 the common way to start the management of male IUS  
 The contents of tratamiento  
 the enthousiasme of the proffessionals give uw extra motivation for our work.  
 I wished Heather would come to settle in Belgium :). I learned a lot of her on a easy way  
 the holistic view of the problem  
 The physiotherapist presentation. This workshop if anything, reassured me on my daily clinical practice.  
 The second speaker  
 the speakers  
 The spread of topics and views  
 Well balanced faculty and comprehensive coverage of the topic.

#### What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	22
<i>answered question</i>	22
<i>skipped question</i>	1314

#### Response Text

a poor interactivity among Speakers  
 Depth of some presentations  
 description of pelvic floor center  
 dont have material  
 huebner was interesting in show the pharmaceuticall companies events  
 I did not feel throughout the presentation that they knew each other's role.  
 I felt that they did not work as a team. As the medical team did not know what the physiotherapist role was exactly.  
 It could have been longer  
 Lack of vesiono f a ohisitian specilialis in rehabilitation  
 N/a  
 no material  
 none (2x)  
 Not same opinion of basic aspects between speakers  
 nothing  
 Presentations not available on sick to participants  
 Rganisation of a continente center  
 some overlap in lectures  
 The level  
 the surgical experience of speakers  
 The third speaker  
 very basic

#### Is there anything you feel should have been included that was

Answer Options	Response Count
	20
<i>answered question</i>	20
<i>skipped question</i>	1316

#### Response Text

a material with the content of the speakers  
 Complication post surgery  
 complications in treatment, prothesiology



i need different opinion from different surgeon  
material, like printed dias or something  
more case studies  
more FKT techniques  
more strong information  
No (8x)  
None  
Some video presentations  
The importance of training automatisme and not only the strength in a rehabilitation program  
To develop a kind of algorithm

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	14
<i>answered question</i>	14
<i>skipped question</i>	1322

Response Text

a good workshop  
a good workshop  
interesting on males in a predominant female field  
No (6x)  
none  
None  
Quite interesting for future meetings, but making some changes about contents  
very expensive  
where are the materials? last time I visited an ICS WS I've received the printed dias


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping,		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	49.0%	24
Good	40.8%	20
Average	10.2%	5
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		49
<i>skipped question</i>		1287

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 15 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Ervin Kocjancic	27	16	5	0	0	4.46	48
Wilhelm Huebner	24	19	1	3	0	4.36	47
John J. Smith	20	23	4	1	0	4.29	48
Enrico Finazzi Agro	19	19	7	1	0	4.22	46
Heather Lynn Moky	19	25	2	0	1	4.30	47
<i>answered question</i>							<b>48</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1288</b>


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Ervin Kocjancic	24	20	4	0	0	4.42	48
Wilhelm Huebner	23	20	4	1	0	4.35	48
John J. Smith	23	23	1	1	0	4.42	48
Enrico Finazzi Agro	15	24	5	2	0	4.13	46
Heather Lynn Moky	22	21	3	1	0	4.36	47
<i>answered question</i>							<b>48</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1288</b>

### Speakers rating performance



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 16

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	39.1%	9
Intermediate	43.5%	10
Advanced	13.0%	3
Not sure	4.3%	1
<i>answered question</i>		23
<i>skipped question</i>		1313



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	13.0%	3
Mostly	56.5%	13
Partially	21.7%	5
Somewhat	8.7%	2
Not at all	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		23
<i>skipped question</i>		1313

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	6	16	0	1	0	23
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	4	18	0	1	0	23
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	3	13	5	1	0	22
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	4	16	3	0	0	23
The presentations challenged my thinking	3	10	8	1	0	22
The speakers identified important issues	4	18	1	0	0	23
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	5	16	0	1	0	22
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	6	15	1	0	0	22
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	5	14	3	0	0	22
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	3	10	5	4	0	22
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	3	8	7	4	0	22
<i>answered question</i>						23
<i>skipped question</i>						1313

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	9
<i>answered question</i>	9
<i>skipped question</i>	1327

### Response Text

aaa  
Discussions  
Julia Herbert  
Multidisciplinary  
Outlet Obstruktion  
The anatomy and pathophysiology of ODS  
The speakers were experts in the field  
Very good radiological imaging examples  
very helpful

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Count	
	10	
<i>answered question</i>	10	
<i>skipped question</i>	1326	

### Response Text

aaa  
Amount of information included in the anatomy lecture - too much delivered too quickly  
Aspects of clinical diagnosis were not well represented  
could not learn the conservative treatment  
Did n't pay adequate time on management of ODS especially operative techniques.  
no  
None (2x)  
Not many of us have access to lots of imaging for obstructive defecation: a more hands-on approach with clinical apt would have been more applicable.  
Some sessions were rushed and questions not answered appropriately

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?		
Answer Options	Response Count	
	9	
<i>answered question</i>	9	
<i>skipped question</i>	1327	

### Response Text

aaa  
conservative treatmentthe timing to refer to the expertessential examination which non-expert should do  
Diagnostic options  
More time for conservative management  
no (3x)  
None (2x)

Any other comments on this Workshop:		
Answer Options	Response Count	
	6	
<i>answered question</i>	6	
<i>skipped question</i>	1330	

### Response Text

aaa  
Anders Mellgren did not meet, the stand in did a fairly good job.  
need to keep on the next conference  
No (2x)  
None


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count

Excellent	17.4%	4
Good	60.9%	14
Average	17.4%	4
Poor	4.3%	1
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		23
<i>skipped question</i>		1313

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 16 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Giulio Aniello Santoro	5	14	3	1	0	4.00	23
Anders Mellgren	6	14	1	0	0	4.24	21
S. Abbas Shobeiri	5	16	2	0	0	4.13	23
Pawel Wieczorek	8	13	1	0	0	4.32	22
Julia Herbert	8	11	0	0	1	4.25	20
answered question							23
skipped question							1313



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Giulio Aniello Santoro	6	12	4	1	0	4.00	23
Anders Mellgren	7	13	1	0	0	4.29	21
S. Abbas Shobeiri	8	11	4	0	0	4.17	23
Pawel Wieczorek	8	13	1	0	0	4.32	22
Julia Herbert	13	8	0	0	0	4.62	21
answered question							23
skipped question							1313



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 17

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	45.7%	21
Intermediate	47.8%	22
Advanced	6.5%	3
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		46
skipped question		1290

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	21.7%	10
Mostly	50.0%	23
Partially	23.9%	11
Somewhat	4.3%	2
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		46
skipped question		1290



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	11	27	7	1	0	46
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	12	25	9	0	0	46
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	11	28	7	0	0	46
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	9	23	14	0	0	46
The presentations challenged my thinking	6	24	14	2	0	46
The speakers identified important issues	10	27	7	1	0	45
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	13	22	9	1	0	45
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	12	28	6	0	0	46
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	12	29	5	0	0	46
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	8	22	11	4	1	46
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	9	21	11	3	1	45
answered question						46
skipped question						1290

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	19
answered question	19
skipped question	1317

**Response Text**

-

All speakers were interesting

Clinical relevance to practice.

Content  
 Experience from different specialty  
 focus on 1 treatment option  
 guidelines, evaluation  
 Introductory  
 It was according to practical use.  
 opening session on assessment and basics of UI; session on urgency and urge UI -- both were very practical  
 and geared to the introductory level  
 Overview on pessaries.  
 Physiotherapy  
 practical demonstration of pelvic muscle exercise  
 speakers are excellent  
 The content of the presentations  
 The expertise of all speakers  
 the topic.  
 The workshop is presented by experienced speaker.  
 Types of treatments and incontinence anatomy.

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	16
<i>answered question</i>	16
<i>skipped question</i>	1320

#### Response Text

-  
 1. skin care speaker spent far too much time on research and did not emphasise what the basic nurse would do to prevent or treat skin problems; 2. round table session was too short presentations by speakers -- instead it was monopolised by two speakers.  
 Hand out not sufficient  
 length of presentations (too short)  
 N/A  
 nil  
 Non English speakers and having to rely on translations which was not explained at outset.  
 none (2x)  
 Physical therapy methods were not discussed in detail.  
 Some local (Spanish) speaker who was more enthusiastic than understood.  
 The emotional urinary incontinence's aspects.  
 The handout supplied  
 There was handout  
 Time for answer questions may not be enough.  
 too basic

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	16
<i>answered question</i>	16
<i>skipped question</i>	1320

#### Response Text

-  
 A handout with the content of the presentations and references  
 Handout  
 I think probably too much was included. It may be best to have only an assessment workshop with models and stations for practice and limited enrolment to local nurses.  
 introducing different types of pelvic floor exercise. How's difference between, how to do and frequency for doing.  
 N/A  
 No (6x)  
 Other physical therapy methods such as biofeedback and electrical stimulation could have been discussed.  
 Some practical aspects relating to the management of incontinence in the elderly



The specific intervention with the urinary problem and the emoticional aspects.  
Yes: 1. vaginal cones, vaginal spheres - both neglected, 2. more information on pelvic floor exercises execution.

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	1328

Response Text

-  
It might have been interesting to focus more on urodynamics  
language translation was appreciated.  
No (4x)  
Session teaching how to perform right pelvic floor exercise should be included.


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	24.4%	11
Good	48.9%	22
Average	24.4%	11
Poor	2.2%	1
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		45
<i>skipped question</i>		1291

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 17 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Donna Bliss	15	25	4	0	0	4.25	44
Sharon Eustice	16	27	2	0	0	4.31	45
Kathleen Hunter	13	28	2	0	0	4.26	43
Lesley Hanson	11	26	7	0	0	4.09	44
Ines Ramirez Garcia	16	18	6	0	0	4.25	40
Maria Jose Palau	11	22	6	1	0	4.08	40
Amelia Perez	13	19	7	2	1	3.98	42
Francisco Milla	11	19	7	4	1	3.83	42
<i>answered question</i>							<b>45</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1291</b>


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Donna Bliss	17	26	1	0	0	4.36	44
Sharon Eustice	16	27	1	0	0	4.34	44
Kathleen Hunter	13	30	1	0	0	4.27	44
Lesley Hanson	12	27	4	0	0	4.19	43
Ines Ramirez Garcia	15	22	4	0	0	4.27	41
Maria Jose Palau	13	22	4	1	0	4.18	40
Amelia Perez	14	19	5	3	1	4.00	42
Francisco Milla	12	20	7	3	1	3.91	43
<i>answered question</i>							<b>44</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1292</b>


### Speakers rating performance



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 18

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	0.0%	0
Intermediate	47.8%	11
Advanced	52.2%	12
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		23
skipped question		1313

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	17.4%	4
Mostly	21.7%	5
Partially	52.2%	12
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	8.7%	2
answered question		23
skipped question		1313



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	5	12	2	2	0	21
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	4	10	5	1	1	21
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	2	8	7	3	1	21
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	3	9	6	3	0	21
The presentations challenged my thinking	2	6	9	4	0	21
The speakers identified important issues	2	14	4	1	0	21
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	4	8	4	4	0	20
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	4	11	3	2	0	20
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	3	8	8	2	0	21
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	2	8	11	0	0	21
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	2	6	9	3	0	20
answered question						21
skipped question						1315

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	9
answered question	9
skipped question	1327

**Response Text**

faculty  
good speakers  
how to treat complications and pain

Materials for female pelvic floor reconstruction  
None  
None. This was a dreadful workshop and should NOT be repeated  
Pelvic floor reconstruction using biological materials  
Stimulated interest on biological meshes  
Thread pelvic floor reconstruction was very interesting

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	11
<i>answered question</i>	11
<i>skipped question</i>	1325

**Response Text**  
biomaterials are not a relevant topic anymore  
biomaterials are out of scope.  
Did not address the issues of the title properly, ie biological materials  
I haven't seen any weakness.  
I haven't seen any weekness  
none  
none  
not enough for physiotherapist  
there were few  
This was a dreadful workshop in most respects and should not be repeated at a future meeting. It did not address the issues of biological mesh in any detail  
Too much emphasis on the basic science

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	9
<i>answered question</i>	9
<i>skipped question</i>	1327

**Response Text**  
A comparison between biological and synthetic meshes  
It did not address the question raised, ie biological materials. It should have addressed the science of biological materials  
No (3x)  
none  
samples of the materials  
Science of biological materials and challenges  
the roll of physiotherapist in the treatment

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	6
<i>answered question</i>	6
<i>skipped question</i>	1330

**Response Text**  
It was an apology for the use of synthetic mesh.  
Nil  
no  
none  
Not interactive  
should not be repeated

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	19.0%	4
Good	57.1%	12
Average	14.3%	3
Poor	9.5%	2
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		21
<i>skipped question</i>		1315

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 18 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Ajay Singla	5	9	5	1	0	3.90	20
Dirk de Ridder	5	10	4	1	0	3.95	20
Rahmi Onur	4	12	3	0	0	4.05	19
Paulo Palma	5	10	4	0	0	4.05	19
Amit Chakrabarty	3	8	6	2	0	3.63	19
<i>answered question</i>							20
<i>skipped question</i>							1316


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Ajay Singla	5	10	4	0	0	4.05	19
Dirk de Ridder	6	11	3	0	0	4.15	20
Rahmi Onur	5	12	2	0	0	4.16	19
Paulo Palma	5	12	2	0	0	4.16	19
Amit Chakrabarty	3	11	4	1	0	3.84	19
<i>answered question</i>							20
<i>skipped question</i>							1316


### Speakers rating performance



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 19

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	32.1%	9
Intermediate	42.9%	12
Advanced	25.0%	7
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		28
skipped question		1308

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	25.9%	7
Mostly	33.3%	9
Partially	29.6%	8
Somewhat	11.1%	3
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		27
skipped question		1309



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	9	13	5	0	0	27
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	9	12	5	1	0	27
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	9	10	7	0	1	27
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	9	13	3	1	1	27
The presentations challenged my thinking	9	11	7	0	0	27
The speakers identified important issues	10	12	5	0	0	27
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	9	15	2	0	1	27
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	11	15	1	0	0	27
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	11	12	2	0	1	26
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	5	11	6	3	1	26
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	6	8	6	3	1	24
answered question						27
skipped question						1309

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	11
answered question	11
skipped question	1325

Number	Response Text
1	hands on clinical practice
2	Informative

- 3 multinational approach differ from country to country . political choices de
- 4 A worldwide phenomena
- 5 enthusiatic speakers
- 6 Presentation of the Continence Foundation Australia
- 7 diversity
- 8 The belgium presentations
- 9 knowledge in general
- 10 speaker
- 11 Breadth of speakers' expertise and variety

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	9
<i>answered question</i>	9
<i>skipped question</i>	1327

Number	Response Text
1	N/A
2	Boasting
3	A bit repetitive
4	nothing
5	most people cannot due what CFA does due to no government funding
6	when someone did ask a question they didn,t use the microphone!
7	microphone use
8	non
9	I did not receive a handout

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?

Answer Options	Response Count
	7
<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

Number	Response Text
1	Workshop was very basic could be at least intermediate level
2	Workshop in constipation
3	none
4	no
5	no
6	no
7	No

Any other comments on this Workshop:

Answer Options	Response Count
	7
<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

Number	Response Text
1	Very good and very professional workshops
2	no comments
3	Very useful
4	see answer 5.
5	when questions were asked they didn't use microphones so it was not to f
6	no
7	No



Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping,		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	48.0%	12
Good	40.0%	10
Average	4.0%	1
Poor	8.0%	2
Very poor	0.0%	0
answered question		25
skipped question		1311




cide the best for the population.

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 19 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Tamara Dickinson	12	12	2	1	0	4.30	27
Barry Cahill	11	11	3	1	0	4.23	26
Sherif Mourad	10	10	5	1	0	4.12	26
Elisabeth Bakker	15	10	1	0	0	4.54	26
Diane Newman	13	9	4	0	0	4.35	26
<i>answered question</i>							27
<i>skipped question</i>							1309


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Tamara Dickinson	13	11	3	0	0	4.37	27
Barry Cahill	12	9	5	0	0	4.27	26
Sherif Mourad	10	9	7	0	0	4.12	26
Elisabeth Bakker	15	10	1	0	0	4.54	26
Diane Newman	13	9	3	0	0	4.40	25
<i>answered question</i>							27
<i>skipped question</i>							1309

### Speakers rating performance



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 20

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	0.0%	0
Intermediate	25.0%	8
Advanced	75.0%	24
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		32
<i>skipped question</i>		1304



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	25.0%	8
Mostly	53.1%	17
Partially	15.6%	5
Somewhat	6.3%	2
Not at all	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		32
<i>skipped question</i>		1304

Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	11	20	0	0	0	31
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	7	22	2	0	0	31
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	9	17	5	0	0	31
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	9	18	4	0	0	31
The presentations challenged my thinking	9	14	6	1	0	30
The speakers identified important issues	11	18	2	0	0	31
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	12	16	3	0	0	31
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	10	20	1	0	0	31
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	11	18	2	0	0	31
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	6	17	4	1	1	29
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	6	12	10	1	1	30
<i>answered question</i>						31
<i>skipped question</i>						1305

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	15
<i>answered question</i>	15
<i>skipped question</i>	1321

### Response Text

Again the panel was an impressive collection of experts in the field of female bladder dysfunction  
can't really say  
Clinic cases  
clinically relevant  
faculty  
Interaction and good discussion as well as presentations  
Introduction  
presentation  
prevention of voiding disfunction after surgery  
The broad experience of speakers  
The broad experience of the speakers  
The content and learning will be helpful in my work  
the evaluation and diagnosis voiding disfunction after sling surgery.  
The practical aspect that was adopted.  
Very good speakers

### What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	13
<i>answered question</i>	13
<i>skipped question</i>	1323

### Response Text

A somewhat basic approach. I was expecting a more in depth discussion  
after break discussion  
all in all ok  
Conclusion  
Could not obtain the talks from the website. Slides presented very helpful for future reference  
Guidelines  
many aspects wich are still dificult to resolve in this disfunction  
no new information  
None (3x)  
questions from audience were weak  
The number complications presented were exaggerate.

### Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?

Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	1324

### Response Text

better techniques in treating voiding dysfunction  
It would be nice if this or an additional workshop could cover male slings  
No (8x)  
The management of complications after surgery, more precisely  
therapy when there is the possibility for no surgery

### Any other comments on this Workshop:

Answer Options	Response Count
	7
<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

### Response Text

discussion only for urologist not for pelvic floor physiotherapist  
No (4x)  
None  
prevention of voiding disfunction


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	40.6%	13
Good	53.1%	17
Average	6.3%	2
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		32
<i>skipped question</i>		1304

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 20 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
David Castro-Diaz	15	14	2	1	0	4.34	32
Tufan Tarcn	15	14	3	0	0	4.38	32
Christopher Chapple	19	10	2	0	0	4.55	31
answered question							32
skipped question							1304



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
David Castro-Diaz	13	13	6	0	0	4.22	32
Tufan Tarcn	17	12	3	0	0	4.44	32
Christopher Chapple	19	10	3	0	0	4.50	32
answered question							32
skipped question							1304





## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 21

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	15.0%	3
Intermediate	55.0%	11
Advanced	30.0%	6
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		20
<i>skipped question</i>		1316



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	30.0%	6
Mostly	35.0%	7
Partially	30.0%	6
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	5.0%	1
<i>answered question</i>		20
<i>skipped question</i>		1316

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	6	12	2	0	0	20
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	5	13	2	0	0	20
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	6	10	3	0	0	19
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	6	11	2	0	0	19
The presentations challenged my thinking	6	10	4	0	0	20
The speakers identified important issues	9	7	4	0	0	20
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	9	6	5	0	0	20
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	10	9	1	0	0	20
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	10	8	2	0	0	20
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	5	6	5	3	0	19
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	5	8	5	1	0	19
<i>answered question</i>						20
<i>skipped question</i>						1316

### What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	13

<i>answered question</i>	13
<i>skipped question</i>	1323

#### Response Text

clear exposition  
 CONTENT.OPPORTUNITIES TO MAKE QUESTIONS.  
 Excellent speakers  
 High quality of speakers  
 innovation  
 Management of neurogenic bladder based on classification of bladder disease  
 Neuro anatomi+fysiology  
 neurourology - neuroanatomy  
 None  
 Physiology and anatomi in patients with neurological diagnoses (first speaker)  
 The first speaker  
 The first speaker, anatomi an neurophysiology  
 To learn about the different inkontinence problems in different Neuro patients

#### What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	13
<i>answered question</i>	13
<i>skipped question</i>	1323

#### Response Text

Almost too short  
 Handouts were no provided in printed option  
 None (3x)  
 schort time  
 Tecnical procedures  
 The technical issue  
 therapy  
 To basic  
 treatment

#### Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?

Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	1324

#### Response Text

? (2x)  
 No (9x)  
 not really

#### Any other comments on this Workshop:

Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	1328

#### Response Text

Excellent  
 HIGH SCIENTIFIC LEVEL  
 No (5x)  
 We could learn many practical aspects of this subspseciality being useful in daily urological practice

#### Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
----------------	------------------	----------------

Excellent	65.0%	13
Good	35.0%	7
Average	0.0%	0
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		20
<i>skipped question</i>		1316

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 21 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Helmut Madersbacher	12	7	0	0	0	4.63	19
John Heesakkers	9	8	1	0	0	4.44	18
Marcio Averbeck	9	7	2	0	0	4.39	18
Thomas Kessler	10	9	0	0	0	4.53	19
answered question							19
skipped question							1317




Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Helmut Madersbacher	12	7	0	0	0	4.63	19
John Heesakkers	11	7	0	0	0	4.61	18
Marcio Averbeck	10	5	1	1	0	4.41	17
Thomas Kessler	11	8	0	0	0	4.58	19
answered question							19
skipped question							1317



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 22

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	3.3%	1
Intermediate	56.7%	17
Advanced	36.7%	11
Not sure	3.3%	1
<i>answered question</i>		30
<i>skipped question</i>		1306



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	22.6%	7
Mostly	45.2%	14
Partially	25.8%	8
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	6.5%	2
<i>answered question</i>		31
<i>skipped question</i>		1305

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	10	15	5	1	0	31
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	8	12	7	4	0	31
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	10	13	6	2	0	31
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	7	13	8	2	0	30
The presentations challenged my thinking	9	10	10	2	0	31
The speakers identified important issues	8	15	7	1	0	31
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	8	18	3	1	1	31
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	9	15	6	1	0	31
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	8	16	4	3	0	31
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	7	14	5	4	1	31
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	6	9	11	4	1	31
<i>answered question</i>						31
<i>skipped question</i>						1305

### What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	17
<i>answered question</i>	17
<i>skipped question</i>	1319

### Response Text

Anatomy  
broad thinking in pain syndromes  
clear overview Literature

Diversity  
 good speakers  
 holistic approach  
 information presented  
 interdisciplinary approach  
 It addressed an important clinical aspect.  
 Patient presentation  
 Ragi  
 Ragi Doggweiler  
 Ragy Dogweiler  
 speakers were collaborating in harmony  
 great open minded information  
 the presentation of Ragi Doggweiler  
 Topics  
 very specific Interstitial Cystitis patient treatment, also very interesting was Ragi Doggweiler's lecture

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	14
<i>answered question</i>	14
<i>skipped question</i>	1322

### Response Text

First two presentations: to much slides wich where read out loud, little information besides the slides  
 Kristene  
 Kristene Whitmore was rushing, handout was incomplete  
 N.A.  
 Neuroplasticity  
 no aspects  
 not enough time for questions  
 patient advocate should have had more time.  
 Short time.  
 somewhat on the edge of science..  
 The presentation of K. Whitmore  
 there should have been some handouts about the experiential part  
 to much data  
 Topic blend

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	11
<i>answered question</i>	11
<i>skipped question</i>	1325

### Response Text

more about physiotherapy  
 More PT  
 More PT  
 More time for discusion.  
 N.A.  
 Neuroplasticity  
 no (3x)  
 relation to daily prattice  
 see above

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	1328

Response Text

-  
It is useful to invite a patient / patient association  
no (2x)  
None  
Ragi Doggweiler was really good - both the theoretical and practical  
Refreshing point of view  
see aboveand there was a pleasant athmosophere


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	48.4%	15
Good	45.2%	14
Average	6.5%	2
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
answered question		31
skipped question		1305

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 22 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Ragi Doggweiler	20	8	3	0	0	4.55	31
Kristene Whitmore	11	11	5	2	0	4.07	29
Michele Spinelli	10	13	8	0	0	4.06	31
Barbara Mündner-Hensen	13	13	5	0	0	4.26	31
answered question							31
skipped question							1305


Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Ragi Doggweiler	20	8	3	0	0	4.55	31
Kristene Whitmore	11	11	4	4	0	3.97	30
Michele Spinelli	10	11	10	0	0	4.00	31
Barbara Mündner-Hensen	13	15	3	0	0	4.32	31
answered question							31
skipped question							1305


Speakers rating performance





## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 23

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	18.5%	5
Intermediate	48.1%	13
Advanced	29.6%	8
Not sure	3.7%	1
<i>answered question</i>		27
<i>skipped question</i>		1309



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	33.3%	9
Mostly	44.4%	12
Partially	3.7%	1
Somewhat	14.8%	4
Not at all	3.7%	1
<i>answered question</i>		27
<i>skipped question</i>		1309

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	8	16	1	0	1	26
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	6	16	3	0	1	26
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	7	13	5	0	1	26
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	8	12	5	0	1	26
The presentations challenged my thinking	6	10	8	0	2	26
The speakers identified important issues	7	12	5	1	1	26
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	6	13	5	1	1	26
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	8	13	4	0	1	26
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	8	14	3	0	1	26
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	6	10	6	1	3	26
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	5	12	6	0	3	26
<i>answered question</i>						26
<i>skipped question</i>						1310

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	9
<i>answered question</i>	9
<i>skipped question</i>	1327

### Response Text

Excellent workshop overall. Well organized and very good, evidence-based content. Excellent speakers with a variety of perspectives on the topics, and very good organizer.

Good speakers.

Great speakers with experience in the field:

Great speakers, passionate about the topic

guidelines drug & bladder

High quality of speakers

Indication of catheterization

presentation of pilot study for self management & introduction to the EAUNS guidelines

THE INTERACTION

### What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	7
<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

### Response Text

limited new information on catheter design and manufacturing processes.

no comment

None (3x)

One speaker who spoke about her research (show & tell)

Sometimes they speak very difficult english

### Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?

Answer Options	Response Count
	6
<i>answered question</i>	6
<i>skipped question</i>	1330

### Response Text

No (3x)

None (2x)

this may be a personal interest, but understanding the manufacturing process of medical devices goes a long way to physician/nursing understanding of appropriate use

### Any other comments on this Workshop:

Answer Options	Response Count
	6
<i>answered question</i>	6
<i>skipped question</i>	1330

### Response Text

excellent

Excellent workshop on important topic.

I was a speaker but I also loved what the others said. So I cannot rate this any further and maybe should not have checked workshop.

no (3x)

### Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	28.0%	7
Good	72.0%	18
Average	0.0%	0
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		25
<i>skipped question</i>		1311

ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 23 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Diane Newman	12	9	2	1	0	4.33	24
Sharon Eustice	9	8	5	0	1	4.04	23
Tomas Griebling	9	13	1	1	0	4.25	24
Mary Wilde	8	9	5	0	1	4.00	23
answered question							24
skipped question							1312


Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Diane Newman	13	8	2	0	1	4.33	24
Sharon Eustice	9	8	3	1	1	4.05	22
Tomas Griebling	9	11	1	0	1	4.23	22
Mary Wilde	9	8	4	0	1	4.09	22
answered question							24
skipped question							1312

Speakers rating performance




## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 24

### In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	1.7%	1
Intermediate	28.8%	17
Advanced	69.5%	41
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		59
<i>skipped question</i>		1277

### Level Workshop 24



### Has this Workshop met your expectations?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	31.7%	19
Mostly	45.0%	27
Partially	13.3%	8
Somewhat	3.3%	2
Not at all	6.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>		60
<i>skipped question</i>		1276

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	27	30	2	0	0	59
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	23	29	5	2	0	59
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	18	31	7	2	1	59
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	21	30	5	3	0	59
The presentations challenged my thinking	22	27	3	6	1	59
The speakers identified important issues	23	26	5	3	1	58
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	24	24	9	2	0	59
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	25	25	5	4	0	59
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	23	26	7	2	1	59
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	17	22	14	4	0	57
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	17	27	9	4	0	57
<i>answered question</i>						59
<i>skipped question</i>						1277

### What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	25

<i>answered question</i>	25
<i>skipped question</i>	1311

Number	Response Text
1	The broad experience of the speakers
2	Videos and practical tips
3	this is a illegal survey
4	The speakers identified important issues
5	Video clips.
6	practice conclusions
7	very scientific
8	the clinical part/importance of the topic
9	Up to date surgical aspects and good knowledge
10	surgical techniques
11	Defining success of plication surgery
12	referred complicationsbased evidence
13	esential concepts
14	Case discussions were highly interesting
15	speakers
16	The new aplications
17	Clinical use.
18	Good, dynamic speakers.
19	addressing the non implantation techniques
20	Interaction
21	all workshops is very interesting
22	The speakers have made me question some of my practices and might actually apply some
23	none
24	Vaginal approach to the treatment
25	Video presentations

<b>What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?</b>	
Answer Options	Response Count
	24
<i>answered question</i>	24
<i>skipped question</i>	1312

## Response Text

All the cases presented at the end were mesh complications. I would rather have seen preoperative cases and talk more about decision making in choosing a particular approach to a particular patient.

Can't think of any.

cases seemed a bit redundant mesh complications

certain conlusions being repeated

Difficulty in understanding some speakers because of accent

Epidemiology

i like all workshop

It was extremely American in its approach to POP surgery. The title was approaches to POP surgery, thus there should have been speakers with different points of view.

limited number of cases

more case interpretation was needed.

my english is not good for evaluation

my english is regular .Its posible i don't undestan every.

None (3x)

Speaker did not respect audient opion

Speaker's egos

superficial approach of great amount of topics

The hand out was insufficient

The main topic was mesh surgey and its complications. Vaginal approach to prolapse surgery was not mentioned at all.

The speakers do not mention about functional outcomes ( in tetrms of vaginal pain, constipation, voiding disfunction).

Too many people. difficult to understand. too theoretical  
 too many slides  
 too much personal opinions

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?		
Answer Options	Response Count	
	23	
<i>answered question</i>		23
<i>skipped question</i>		1313

#### Response Text

Above.  
 manchester operation for example (not included)  
 More surgical video  
 More time for Questions  
 No (11x)  
 none  
 other types of cases  
 See above.  
 something like lesson, evidence based  
 Surgical videos. Algorithms  
 The speakers do not mention about functional outcomes ( in tetrms of vaginal pain, constipation, voiding disfunction).  
 There is not enough time for comment  
 yes

Any other comments on this Workshop:		
Answer Options	Response Count	
	13	
<i>answered question</i>		13
<i>skipped question</i>		1323

#### Response Text

American and Australian people should speak slowly and English, not slng language  
 Chair of workshop did have allow me to have my comment  
 No (8x)  
 Very good overall, great interactivity and inviting presenters.  
 weak course  
 Workshop should be there to learn from expert - It is not there to boast egos or belittle participants asking questions.

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	50.8%	30
Good	40.7%	24
Average	6.8%	4
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	1.7%	1
<i>answered question</i>		59
<i>skipped question</i>		1277




changes.



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 24 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Philippe Zimmern	30	22	3	2	1	4.34	58
Kimberly Kenton	29	21	5	3	0	4.31	58
Sandip Vasavada	32	21	4	1	0	4.45	58
answered question							58
skipped question							1278



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing)


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Philippe Zimmern	30	23	1	2	2	4.33	58
Kimberly Kenton	28	20	5	4	0	4.26	57
Sandip Vasavada	31	21	2	2	1	4.39	57
answered question							58
skipped question							1278



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 25

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	9.5%	2
Intermediate	47.6%	10
Advanced	42.9%	9
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		21
skipped question		1315

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	19.0%	4
Mostly	47.6%	10
Partially	14.3%	3
Somewhat	14.3%	3
Not at all	4.8%	1
answered question		21
skipped question		1315



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	1	16	2	1	0	20
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	2	15	1	1	1	20
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	3	11	1	3	2	20
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	3	11	3	3	0	20
The presentations challenged my thinking	4	13	3	0	0	20
The speakers identified important issues	2	15	3	0	0	20
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	2	13	4	1	0	20
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	6	12	1	1	0	20
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	4	14	2	0	0	20
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	2	13	2	2	0	19
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	1	12	4	3	0	20
answered question						20
skipped question						1316

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	13
answered question	13
skipped question	1323

Response Text

Clarity and Knowledge of the presenters  
 Communication on personal experience of the clinical experts  
 Detailed introduction to tissue engineering  
 Experts opinions  
 Experts' presentations  
 Good introduction to the topic and a good discussion about ethics  
 good question, I don't really know because it was quite different to my expectations  
 legal pitfalls about clinical applications of cell therapy and tissue engineering  
 quite another perspective, refreshing  
 time allotment  
 Tissue Engineering  
 Topic  
 Views of lectures

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	10
<i>answered question</i>	10
<i>skipped question</i>	1326

#### Response Text

I do not know  
 My lack of in-depth knowledge before hand  
 No weakness  
 None  
 research details about cell and tissue manipulation  
 Tissue engineering had superficial material, no handout or print out from speakers!  
 Too advanced for clinicians that not already has planned to do stem cell research  
 too many company based presentations which were not really helpful from investigational or scientific aspects. This was disappointing and not good value for money!!  
 Too much info on legal and ethical issues that were related to the EU, many countries are not members.  
 Very little info on the current status and applications coming.  
 Too much presentations on industry products

Is there anything you feel should have been included	
Answer Options	Response Count
	6
<i>answered question</i>	6
<i>skipped question</i>	1330

#### Response Text

Details about pitfalls in cell and tissue engineering thinking in research  
 Future trends in cell therapy and tissue engineering - research and clinical applications  
 Handouts of the talks, at least a copy of the slides!  
 Much more aspects reg. current research and development of TE in Uro, it was neither comprehensive nor neutral  
 No (3x)

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	6
<i>answered question</i>	6
<i>skipped question</i>	1330

#### Response Text

I left the workshop after two speakers.  
 It was a workshop for stem cell researchers, not for clinicians  
 Too long lessons  
 see above: I'd have expected presentations from scientists or clinicians but not from companies. The lectures were not useless but not appropriate at all for a paid workshop!!

they spent extensive time to describe legal aspects of German/European regulatory agencies, I believe that it was a too specific issue.

Very good


Very good

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	47.4%	9
Good	42.1%	8
Average	0.0%	0
Poor	5.3%	1
Very poor	5.3%	1
answered question		19
skipped question		1317

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 25 - Speakers


Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Karl-Dietrich Sievert	10	9	0	1	0	4.40	20
Margot Damaser	10	8	2	0	0	4.40	20
Rainer Marksteiner	4	10	5	0	0	3.95	19
Juergen Bednarz	4	6	7	1	0	3.72	18
Silke Busch	3	9	3	1	0	3.88	16
<i>answered question</i>							20
<i>skipped question</i>							1316



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Karl-Dietrich Sievert	12	7	1	0	0	4.55	20
Margot Damaser	12	7	1	0	0	4.55	20
Rainer Marksteiner	5	12	2	0	0	4.16	19
Juergen Bednarz	4	8	5	1	0	3.83	18
Silke Busch	4	11	1	1	0	4.06	17
<i>answered question</i>							20
<i>skipped question</i>							1316





1

2






ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 26

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	44.0%	11
Intermediate	44.0%	11
Advanced	12.0%	3
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		25
<i>skipped question</i>		1311

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	32.0%	8
Mostly	36.0%	9
Partially	20.0%	5
Somewhat	8.0%	2
Not at all	4.0%	1
<i>answered question</i>		25
<i>skipped question</i>		1311



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	7	15	3	0	0	25
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	6	13	4	1	0	24
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	6	16	2	1	0	25
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	7	13	3	0	0	23
The presentations challenged my thinking	6	12	7	0	0	25
The speakers identified important issues	10	11	3	0	0	24
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	7	14	3	0	0	24
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	10	11	3	0	0	24
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	9	13	3	0	0	25
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	8	12	4	0	0	24
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	6	14	4	0	1	25
<i>answered question</i>						25
<i>skipped question</i>						1311

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	15
<i>answered question</i>	15
<i>skipped question</i>	1321

Response Text

Easy to understand  
Good small group arrangement  
Speaker answer individual questions  
interaction  
Interaction  
Interactive  
It provide a practical course offering an interactive "hands on" environment for practitioners to improve their skills in urodynamics.  
methods  
more practice and useful  
Practical aspects  
presentations  
small groups, rotating system, information packages  
The interactive aspect. I think the speakers were excellent in including the participants by asking questions og helping with the answers.  
The speakers were very approachable and helpful  
very interactive  
when I signed up for the workshop I had an different idea of what the content of the workshop was.  
I do not Work with doctors therefore I only do a urinflowchart and therefor I choose this BASIC workshop. I left in the break.

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	1328

**Response Text**  
It supplied less instruction.  
N/a  
None (2x)  
Temperature in the room  
The time is too short  
too basic (2x)

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	1328

**Response Text**  
Emphasize curves interpretation  
how to interpret the charts  
model  
N/A  
No (4x)

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	7
<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

**Response Text**  
I really enjoyed this workshop  
Involved practitioners are too few.  
N/A  
No (2x)  
useful  
Very practical workshop

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	41.7%	10
Good	50.0%	12
Average	8.3%	2
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		1312

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 26 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Hashim Hashim	13	9	2	0	0	4.46	24
Marcus Drake	14	7	2	0	0	4.52	23
Andrew Gammie	11	9	2	0	0	4.41	22
Becky Clarkson	10	8	4	0	0	4.27	22
<i>answered question</i>							24
<i>skipped question</i>							1312


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Hashim Hashim	11	10	1	1	0	4.35	23
Marcus Drake	11	10	3	0	0	4.33	24
Andrew Gammie	9	11	2	0	0	4.32	22
Becky Clarkson	9	9	4	0	0	4.23	22
<i>answered question</i>							24
<i>skipped question</i>							1312

### Speakers rating performance



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 27

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	7.4%	2
Intermediate	11.1%	3
Advanced	81.5%	22
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		27
<i>skipped question</i>		1309



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	33.3%	9
Mostly	25.9%	7
Partially	25.9%	7
Somewhat	14.8%	4
Not at all	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		27
<i>skipped question</i>		1309

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	8	9	5	4	1	27
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	8	10	5	4	0	27
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	8	11	5	3	0	27
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	10	9	4	3	0	26
The presentations challenged my thinking	10	9	7	1	0	27
The speakers identified important issues	9	12	5	1	0	27
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	5	12	5	2	3	27
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	6	13	5	3	0	27
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	6	13	7	1	0	27
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	4	12	4	7	0	27
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	4	12	6	5	0	27
<i>answered question</i>						27
<i>skipped question</i>						1309

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	1324

### Response Text

Approach  
case based discssion  
extremely beautifull imageing of the pelvic floor  
Importance of anatomical disorders  
it's an interesting theme if the speakers make it  
Methodology of presentation  
practical aspects with demonstration on ultrasound machines  
pre test and post test  
the expertise of the faculty  
the presentation of what we could expect from 3D US  
The variety of speakers  
very helpful

### What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	14
<i>answered question</i>	14
<i>skipped question</i>	1322

### Response Text

Less practical, you need the same commercial US machine and software  
More time for hands-on experience with gadgets  
no  
No hands on ultrasound  
No patient for demonstration  
None (2x)  
not enough time  
not enough time - an all day workshop would have been great.  
the length of the workshop, this needs to be a full day to allow more hands on  
The presentation of the different probes  
and the presentation of practical management "Because US is so easy to do"  
the pretest and posttest not useful for us only for them,  
Too little time to go through the actual scans. Too much time on making a test.  
We lost a lot of time with the pre and post-test

### Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?

Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	1324

### Response Text

A more thorough introduction to the the scans  
As it said it was an advanced course I thought that we would be able to learn more details of interpretation of the images but most of the participants didn't have any experience with the equipment used..  
Covered all aspects I was looking for.  
explanatios  
hands on ultrasound  
Hands-on practise  
hands-on training on a pelvis model  
more applications for daaily practice  
More clarity  
no  
practice / filml would have like more details how to manage US  
time to use the ultrasound in person

### Any other comments on this Workshop:

Answer Options	Response Count
----------------	----------------

	6
<i>answered question</i>	6
<i>skipped question</i>	1330

### Response Text

Excellent and comprehensive workshop  
i would like to thank all the intervenants  
need to be kept on next conference  
None  
overall good  
we lost a lot of time wit the tests they gave us


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	38.5%	10
Good	46.2%	12
Average	15.4%	4
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		1310

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 27 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
S. Abbas Shobeiri	14	8	2	2	0	4.31	26
Giulio Aniello Santoro	10	13	3	0	0	4.27	26
Pawel Wieczorek	13	10	2	1	0	4.35	26
Lieschen Quiroz	11	10	4	1	0	4.19	26
<i>answered question</i>							26
<i>skipped question</i>							1310


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc):

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
S. Abbas Shobeiri	15	8	1	1	0	4.48	25
Giulio Aniello Santoro	11	11	2	1	0	4.28	25
Pawel Wieczorek	14	8	2	1	0	4.40	25
Lieschen Quiroz	11	11	2	1	0	4.28	25
<i>answered question</i>							25
<i>skipped question</i>							1311

### Speakers rating performance






ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 28

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	0.0%	0
Intermediate	23.8%	10
Advanced	73.8%	31
Not sure	2.4%	1
answered question		42
skipped question		1294

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	35.7%	15
Mostly	50.0%	21
Partially	9.5%	4
Somewhat	4.8%	2
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		42
skipped question		1294



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	13	20	3	3	0	39
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	9	26	4	0	0	39
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	14	20	5	0	0	39
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	9	25	5	0	0	39
The presentations challenged my thinking	10	22	7	0	0	39
The speakers identified important issues	12	23	4	0	0	39
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	10	21	7	1	0	39
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	9	27	3	0	0	39
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	9	22	7	1	0	39
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	6	21	6	2	2	37
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	9	19	9	0	2	39
answered question						39
skipped question						1297

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	21
answered question	21
skipped question	1315

Response Text

a correct evaluation of actual role of SNS and PNS  
a valid guidance to comprehend NMS  
Hi level of the presenters. Good time for discussion.  
high level of experience of speakers  
Interdisciplinarity  
its clinical application by the sponsored company on some attendant  
Knowledgable presenters  
No comment  
none  
PF neuropathology  
Presentation  
presenters  
real experts  
speakers  
The level was really "advanced"  
The speakers  
topics  
very didactic and useful for my clinical practice  
Very experienced clinicians  
well organised. very useful content for my learning.  
Well organized

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	18
<i>answered question</i>	18
<i>skipped question</i>	1318

#### Response Text

a poor PTNS presentation  
Could have added a little more basic science. Most people already know how SNS works on the macro-level.  
Less time for practical aspects than expected  
Nil  
no  
No comment  
None (5x)  
none . Although there was some opportunity on hands -on. It would be more useful to have further hands-on on sacral neuromodulation and aftercare.  
nothing  
PTNS evaluation  
the weak English language by speakers  
There should be more and shorter presentations to promote even more discussion.  
Too much intervention from the industry.  
too schort time

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	15
<i>answered question</i>	15
<i>skipped question</i>	1321

#### Response Text

above  
as above  
More demonstrative surgery - videos  
More on diagnosis. Such a high level workshop should not be only in neuromodulation, but on lumbosacral neuropathies.  
no (6x)  
No comment  
none  
SNS in jatrogenic urinary retention (after extended pelvic surgery)

some basic science  
voice recording of the sessions besides the handouts

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	1324

**Response Text**  
Excellent Overview  
No (9x)  
none  
voice recording of the sessions besides the handouts


Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	59.0%	23
Good	38.5%	15
Average	2.6%	1
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		39
<i>skipped question</i>		1297

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 28 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Sohier Elneil	23	14	2	0	0	4.54	39
Michele Spinelli	21	13	5	0	0	4.41	39
Alex Digesu	14	20	4	1	0	4.21	39
Daniel Engeler	11	23	5	0	0	4.15	39
Jalesh Panicker	13	21	5	0	0	4.21	39
<i>answered question</i>							39
<i>skipped question</i>							1297


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing


Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Sohier Elneil	24	11	4	0	0	4.51	39
Michele Spinelli	18	14	8	0	0	4.25	40
Alex Digesu	18	16	4	1	0	4.31	39
Daniel Engeler	14	18	7	0	0	4.18	39
Jalesh Panicker	13	19	7	0	0	4.15	39
<i>answered question</i>							40
<i>skipped question</i>							1296

### Speakers rating performance



## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 29

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	9.5%	4
Intermediate	40.5%	17
Advanced	50.0%	21
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		42
<i>skipped question</i>		1294



Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	31.0%	13
Mostly	38.1%	16
Partially	21.4%	9
Somewhat	4.8%	2
Not at all	4.8%	2
<i>answered question</i>		42
<i>skipped question</i>		1294

### Please rate the following comments:

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	14	12	4	11	0	41
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	14	17	6	4	0	41
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	17	13	6	4	1	41
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	14	17	9	1	0	41
The presentations challenged my thinking	15	14	8	4	0	41
The speakers identified important issues	17	15	7	2	0	41
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	19	17	4	1	0	41
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	18	19	4	0	0	41
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	21	16	4	0	0	41
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	11	16	7	5	2	41
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	13	15	5	6	1	40
<i>answered question</i>						41
<i>skipped question</i>						1295

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	21
<i>answered question</i>	21
<i>skipped question</i>	1315

Number	Response Text
1	Good review of the research
2	chair
3	Chantale Dumoulin was easy to understand and well prepared.
4	palpation
5	digital evaluation Chantale Dumouling
6	Nice overview over the subject with corresponding literature
7	Palpation
8	Digital palpation
9	The relation between the presentations was clear: everyone had her own i
10	Very instructive on PFM digital evaluation, clinical recommendations by C
11	The new studies
12	the overview of treatment methods
13	Very practical for everyday work.
14	the overview
15	The content
16	The content
17	for practice
18	Evidence
19	multimodality
20	a critical review of pelvic floor evaluation
21	The content of the presentation

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	19
<i>answered question</i>	19
<i>skipped question</i>	1317

Number	Response Text
1	Too much research !! You would just get lost in all of it. Not enough talk c
2	less news
3	None
4	Electromiography
5	the parts manometry en dynamometry
6	to much data
7	EMG
8	Electromiography
9	The length of the workshop: too long
10	THE lenght
11	Perhaps more inter active
12	the length
13	none
14	none
15	to long
16	Practice
17	too long
18	I had too little answers on how the physiotherapists will use this informatio
19	There was not handout enough for all audience.

Is there anything you feel should have been included	
Answer Options	Response Count
	17
<i>answered question</i>	17
<i>skipped question</i>	1319

Number	Response Text
1	expected more practical tools
2	No
3	relation to daily practise

	4	No
	5	No
	6	no
	7	A casus
	8	Na
	9	No.
	10	no
	11	no
	12	no
	13	case study
	14	No
	15	s. question 5
	16	Hands on
	17	More handouts with the slides of the presentation and references. Some d

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	9
<i>answered question</i>	9
<i>skipped question</i>	1327

Number	Response Text
	1 good speakers, you know alot of tiem went into it, but dry
	2 By the title of the workshop, I had certain expectations.I am a physiothera
	3 -
	4 see 5.
	5 Na
	6 a workshop only digital palpation
	7 none
	8 No
	9 Hands on

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping,		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	43.9%	18
Good	53.7%	22
Average	2.4%	1
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		41
<i>skipped question</i>		1295





task but the relationship between was quite clear.  
:hantale DumoulinInstructions on Ultrasound examination and evidence and methodology

outside of the research

on and apply special training methods

emonstrantion using mannequin. For example, to demonstrate the pelvis examination.

pist and had hoped that the emphasis of this workshop should be on the psysiotherapie practice.The workshop was more on th






e different ways of measuring.

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 29 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Chantale Dumoulin	25	15	0	0	0	4.63	40
Melanie Morin	26	15	0	0	0	4.63	41
Jennifer Kruger	19	19	2	1	0	4.37	41
Petra J. Voorham-van der Zalm	10	16	14	0	1	3.83	41
<i>answered question</i>							<b>41</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1295</b>


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc) :

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Chantale Dumoulin	29	12	0	0	0	4.71	41
Melanie Morin	27	13	2	0	0	4.60	42
Jennifer Kruger	19	17	5	1	0	4.29	42
Petra J. Voorham-van der Zalm	10	18	9	4	1	3.76	42
<i>answered question</i>							<b>42</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1294</b>


### Speakers rating performance



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 30

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	40.0%	28
Intermediate	45.7%	32
Advanced	11.4%	8
Not sure	2.9%	2
<i>answered question</i>		70
<i>skipped question</i>		1266

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	20.3%	14
Mostly	40.6%	28
Partially	21.7%	15
Somewhat	7.2%	5
Not at all	10.1%	7
<i>answered question</i>		69
<i>skipped question</i>		1267



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	24	37	7	1	0	69
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	20	31	15	3	0	69
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	16	33	13	5	1	68
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	16	33	16	3	0	68
The presentations challenged my thinking	12	29	17	9	1	68
The speakers identified important issues	17	39	8	3	0	67
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	25	31	9	2	1	68
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	24	38	5	0	0	67
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	28	34	5	1	0	68
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	16	26	19	4	0	65
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	16	24	19	6	1	66
<i>answered question</i>						69
<i>skipped question</i>						1267

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	33
<i>answered question</i>	33
<i>skipped question</i>	1303

## Response Text

-  
? (3x)  
aaa  
applicability  
Beth Shell's lectures were understandable and interesting  
Beth Shellys  
botox  
Content  
didactic aspect in Beth Shelly's talk  
Different experience  
Everybody with a physiotherapist education could attend and understand this workshop  
exercices  
for registration to the most of the works hope was all full  
General introductionnal knowledge  
good information presented and translation of the workshopLocal speakers  
Good organization  
Great introduction to this area by experienced clinicians. Beth and Margaret were both fantastic.  
It was related to daily regular practice  
It was very appropriate to use in current medical practice.  
it's good to work with.  
Pelvic floor and trunk mescle  
Practical rehabilitative management  
The ability to just focus on the physiotherapy aspect of pelvic floor dysfunction.  
The pelvic floor anatomy class  
The PF anatomy class, very good!  
theory  
theory  
To prevent the pelvic flor dysfunction  
transmition of experience of the speakers  
varying topics in a nutshell  
Very good speakers

## What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	33
<i>answered question</i>	33
<i>skipped question</i>	1303

## Response Text

-  
A bit didactic?  
aaa  
clinic  
clinic  
Diagnosis of pelvic floor dysfunction  
Doreen McClurg - incomprehensible Scottish English, too general  
Electrical stimulation and biofeedback  
For skilled physio who have work with pelvic floor disorders, there were nothing new at all  
Handout  
I received no handout  
It was biginners level  
It was not for trained Physios - more for beginners  
It was to basic for me. I think in a congress for espesialists it should be more advanced or they should offer a workshop with the same topic, but mor advanceds  
It was very basic  
no  
no comment  
none  
None of the methods other than pelvic exercises were included such as electromagnetic chair, biofeedback, cones, etc.



None of the physical therapy methods such as electrical stimulation, biofeedback were explained.  
 One speaker hard to understand  
 pelvic floor physiotherapy  
 ptns  
 PTNS was not very new and not useful for physiotherapist.  
 sometimes too basic  
 Speaker from AUSTRALIA  
 The basic level.  
 The level of the workshop was very much introductory. For physio's who have work with pelvic floor problems, there were absolutely nothing new.  
 The level was to low.  
 They didn't apport me any new information. All speakers went around the same topics without providing new insights or options of treatment.  
 too basic. Learned about basic anatomy, subjects that we see at the university.  
 Too simple too introductory  
 topics on adjunctive treatments

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	26
<i>answered question</i>	26
<i>skipped question</i>	1310

Response Text

?More challenging knowledge  
 A LOT OF THINGS  
 aaa  
 Discussion of the other physical therapy methods such as electromagnetic chair, biofeedback, and cones, etc would have been better.  
 Dysfunctional patterns of pelvic floor muscles activation  
 Handout  
 Higher level, this was very much beginners level  
 I feel it was offered as a free workshop but the level of presentation was very basic , the level could have at least intermediate  
 I think that the physical therapy methods should have been added as well.  
 It would be nice if it had been a little more advanced. New learning  
 Knowledge at a higher level. It was very much beginners level  
 More advanced level  
 New topics, new knowledge, new studies, etc.  
 No (4x)  
 no idea  
 none (2x)  
 not in this context  
 specific aspects on male treatment  
 What to do in patients that are not able to identify their muscles to work in pelvic floor rehabilitation ?

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	18
<i>answered question</i>	18
<i>skipped question</i>	1318

Response Text

good presenters and chair. But cant talk anything interesting.  
 I liked it a lot  
 I think, it was too basic  
 No (7x)  
 no comments  
 no its was a good one.  
 None (2x)  
 This workshop didn't meet my expectation.

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	43.3%	29
Good	47.8%	32
Average	7.5%	5
Poor	1.5%	1
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		67
<i>skipped question</i>		1269

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 30 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Margaret Sherburn	29	28	6	1	0	4.33	64
Doreen McClurg	23	25	14	2	0	4.08	64
Beth Shelly	33	23	6	1	1	4.34	64
Ines Ramirez Garcia	21	30	12	0	1	4.09	64
Emilia Sanchez Ruiz	23	25	14	0	1	4.10	63
<i>answered question</i>							64
<i>skipped question</i>							1272


### Speakers rating content



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc) :

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Margaret Sherburn	30	30	5	0	0	4.38	65
Doreen McClurg	25	23	9	7	0	4.03	64
Beth Shelly	37	24	4	0	0	4.51	65
Ines Ramirez Garcia	19	30	11	4	1	3.95	65
Emilia Sanchez Ruiz	20	27	13	4	0	3.98	64
<i>answered question</i>							65
<i>skipped question</i>							1271


### Speakers rating performance



ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 31

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	4.2%	1
Intermediate	29.2%	7
Advanced	66.7%	16
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		24
skipped question		1312

Has this Workshop met your expectations?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	62.5%	15
Mostly	37.5%	9
Partially	0.0%	0
Somewhat	0.0%	0
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		24
skipped question		1312



Please rate the following comments:						
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
The length of this Workshop was the correct length	14	7	2	1	0	24
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	12	12	0	0	0	24
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	18	5	1	0	0	24
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	16	7	1	0	0	24
The presentations challenged my thinking	13	10	1	0	0	24
The speakers identified important issues	16	8	0	0	0	24
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	12	10	1	0	0	23
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	17	6	1	0	0	24
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	18	5	0	1	0	24
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	14	7	2	0	1	24
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	15	7	2	0	0	24
answered question						24
skipped question						1312

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	18
answered question	18
skipped question	1318

**Response Text**  
Clinical approach

Excellent in all aspects except for the lack of handouts. Nobody attendign had the handouts, the lecturers had prepared them and expected us to have them. Nobody could help; nor hostess, nor at the ICS-desk.  
hands on  
hands on and a real! workshop  
hands on training  
it covered all the expected points  
open mind for discussion and patience with questions, eager to teach  
practical  
Practical aspect of the course  
Practical skills  
Sphinteres practice  
the hands on  
The hands on disectionThe interactivity with questrions and answers  
Thorough coverage of all aspect of the subject  
Very educational-  
Very good lectures, practice  
very helpful  
VIDEOS

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	14
<i>answered question</i>	14
<i>skipped question</i>	1322

#### Response Text

big room for few people..  
Feedback on performance  
It should last longer  
LIMIT TIME  
no  
Nobody attending the workshop had the handouts, the lecturers had prepared them and expected us to have them. Nobody could help; nor workshop hostess, nor at the ICS-desk.  
none (2x)  
Not allowed to take pictures to slides  
practical part was too short  
The handouts could have included more of the information on the presentation slides  
the length  
There was no handout  
time, too short

Is there anything you feel should have been included that was not?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	11
<i>answered question</i>	11
<i>skipped question</i>	1325

#### Response Text

Could have included some recommendations for the rehabilitation post-repairs as there was 2 physiotherapists in the audience  
No (6x)  
none  
nothing  
Secondary repair?  
teaching materials

Any other comments on this Workshop:	
Answer Options	Response Count
	7

<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1329

Response Text

Be less commercial and share information material

excellent

need to be kept on next conference

no

none

perfect


Very good workshop , surprised that it was not full

Please rate the chairpersons' ability to act as chair (i.e. timekeeping, coordinating speakers and sessions etc):		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	87.0%	20
Good	13.0%	3
Average	0.0%	0
Poor	0.0%	0
Very poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		23
<i>skipped question</i>		1313

## ICS 2013 Evaluation - Workshop 31 - Speakers

Please rate the speakers on the content of their lecture:

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Abdul Sultan	22	1	0	0	0	4.96	23
Ranee Thakar	20	1	1	1	0	4.74	23
<i>answered question</i>							<b>23</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1313</b>



Please rate the speakers on their speaking performance (i.e. understandable language, slides, timing etc) :

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Abdul Sultan	22	2	0	0	0	4.92	24
Ranee Thakar	21	2	0	1	0	4.79	24
<i>answered question</i>							<b>24</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>1312</b>

