

ICS Education Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday 6th October 2015,

Venue: Palais des Congrès

Room: 512D

Time: 13.00-16.00

Attendees: Ervin Kocjancic (Chair), Frankie Bates, Margot Damaser, Elise De, Enrico Finazzi Agro, Nadir Osman, Christopher Payne, Kari Tikkinen.

Apologies: Alex Digesu, Frederico Furriel, Marijke Slieker-ten Hove, Cara Tannenbaum, Nikolaus Veit-Rubin

Also In Attendance: Avicia Burchill, Nucelio Lemos, Dominic Turner, Naoki Yoshimura, Adrian Wagg

1. Approval of minutes 24th January 2015, London

Motion to approve

MD proposed

KT Seconded

All in favour, motion approved

2. Terms of office and Terms of reference review

EK explained that the committee was very grateful for FB and MD who have agreed to stay on committee. We have been looking for experts in social media/elearning and CME experts.

Adrian Wagg confirmed that the ICS no longer be progressing with becoming a CME provider.

However there are other activities where we can use EF expertise – for example to be able to allow for scientific and education committee to get credits for their reviewing activities. Ek also outlined that the committee used to have some subcommittees but there is no need for them anymore and this will be presented to board.

EK wants to re-stand as committee chair. NO confirmed that he would be happy to continue another term

ACTION POINT: EK re-standing as chair call for nominations.

EK thanked ED for her efforts whilst on the ICS education committee.

3. Core Curriculum

EK explained that at the annual meeting there are no courses just workshops. Courses have a good value and it means ICS stands behind the course. EK felt that we should encourage the creation of these courses and then add the committee activities. This should be evaluated by viewing the slides ahead of time in order to check terminology/standardisation. After that

review the committee can then call for missing topics like Basic Science. MD expressed her thoughts for the kind of basic science workshops that would be of interest to include experimental design, what equipment to buy etc.

CP joined the meeting.

EK asked MD to propose this course for ICS 2016. MD explained that she may not be attending 2016 meeting due to finances.

AB questioned how practical it was to review slides when meeting was months away.

NY joined the meeting

ED explained that making the committees create the course made sense to me but questioned how to we justify to the membership how they were selected and also those committees who have not been asked to prepare a course. EK explained that he would present it to the committee chair meeting tomorrow.

AB explained background to the education courses and why the committee moved away from them. CP explained the board concept to split the website to make a members only areas and the courses online could be a members only benefit. EK suggested that the ICS should trial live remote access workshop viewing. NO felt that the how to publish a paper is always a good workshop.

ACTION POINT: EK will ask the other committees whether they wish to submit a “course”. Basic Science will need to be commissioned by the education committee each year.

A discussion was held with regards to the registrations at free workshops and how they are always higher than paid ones.

ACTION POINT: ICS office to investigate what impact does the free workshops having on those scientific sessions running at same time.

A discussion was held about 2016 and the potential issues of running the ICI sessions at the same time. It was agreed to aim for 33 workshops in Tokyo to include the core education courses. AB requested that the Education Committee do not merge workshop applications.

NL joined the meeting.

A discussion was held about whether to call for 1.5 hour workshops. It was agreed to keep the same guidance for not repeating workshops after three years but it was noted that education courses should be excluded from this restriction.

ACTION POINT: Office to provide information about the retention of core delegates to see whether those coming back each year attend the workshops.

ACTION POINT: When reviewing workshop applications office to provide previous workshop attendance to see what the past attendance has been. Meaning being that if it continues to be a well-attended workshop then education committee can continue to run workshop.

ACTION POINT: Change workshop application guidelines to state that if workshop is well attended and has excellent evaluations the education committee can keep the workshop for more than 3 years.

NL felt that the evaluation/review should be sent with words from the education committee. This was agreed.

ACTION POINT: Education committee to be proactive to contact chairs who should be re-submitting when we send their evaluation form.

A discussion about the tracks for 2016 was held and NL explained that the scientific committee will provide tracks for gynaecologists, basic scientists, urology, conservative management. It was agreed that this can be included in the call for workshop applications.

ACTION POINT: In call for 2016 workshop applications call for workshops that would suit the following: gynaecologists, basic scientists, urology, conservative management

ACTION POINT: On workshop application system as chairs who re-submitting same application to explain what is new this year.

A discussion was held about applications for different locations. MD it may be that the location affects the applications. KT suggested that the education committee survey the market, it may be that we do something special that will attract the locals. NL stated it may be that we need to have translation.

ACTION POINT: EK and office contact 2016 LOC to see if there are any particular workshops that can be commissioned that would attract locals to attend.

4. Review of workshops:

EK is considering asking for face to face meeting. The webex takes a key leadership but its very hard to conduct and EK wants to run meeting democratically. A discussion was held and all agreed to ask the Board for a face to face meeting in January. EK asked KT to continue with the early career session. It would be good to connect with LOC to contact the local people and explain about the activity. KT would like to have the session scheduled on the first days as its about how to present research findings so worth having on first day.

A discussion was held about the recognition of workshop chairs and speakers. MD explained that other societies pay for workshop chairs.

ACTION POINT: EK to convey to the Board that a reduction in rate for workshop chair/speakers or some other acknowledgement should be granted.

ACTION POINT: Workshop application guidelines and application process to state that all workshops are to be recorded but there is an opt out option.

5. Workshop handout deadline and inclusion on USB

A discussion was held about the workshop handout deadline being so early. DT explained that its possible to remove the handouts from the USB stick and instead provide a link on the stick which will take them via the website which can be updated later.

ACTION POINT: Update workshop application guidelines to state that workshop handout deadline later and that USB will now have a link to handout rather than being on stick.

6. Elearning

EK explained that we have to prepare modules rather than putting up all content of workshop. This requires editing and the CME actions related to this. EK also felt that a fee should be considered or limited to ICS members. Investment needs to be done to allow for live discussions, live sessions and discuss with the speaker live. DT responded to this point and explained that you need the facilities and then pay for a company to record and as this is not our core business then hire all the equipment.

ACTION POINT: DT to review Federico's education review document

ACTION POINT: DT to make 2015 elearning workshops a priority

ACTION POINT: DT to look at the AUA elearning site to see how intuitive it is to search etc

The selection of workshops for elearning was discussed and the office was going to ask that the selection take place after the scientific committee meeting. DT explained that this no longer an issue because all workshops will be recorded.

AB explained that there were comments about receiving the e-learning workshop slides in June which was too early. It was discussed and agreed that we do not need to request slides just the questions. It was agreed that the office will collect the questions, circulate to the elearning review group (NO and NV) and then send amended questions to Roger.

7. Literature review on educational activities at other conferences/ societies FF

EK said FF document was excellent and the committee should edit the paper and then submit to NUU for publication with FF as first author.

ACTION POINT: Office to circulate the document literature review on educational activities to committee and ask for comments within 1 month

8. ICS Course recognition - Create a list of whom should review the new recognition of courses applications

A discussion was held about who should review the course recognition applications. It was agreed that the education committee should review all recognition applications plus relevant committee if there is one.

9. Speaker Selection for Asian events

- a. *Society of Stoma & Continence Rehabilitation Annual Meeting in Feb 2016- speaker required as Kari Bo cannot attend. ICS to pay flights only.*

EK explained that a meeting is to be held on Thursday to discuss this issue as there are no physio roles within Japan and this is a nurses meeting but they have requested a physio talk. Meeting will be held with chairs of nurses and physio committee.

POST SCRIPT NOTE: A full discussion was held with the relevant parties and it was agreed that a physio will be sent (chair of physio committee to provide name). Then at the 2016 meeting there will be a nurse workshop, a physio workshop and then a joint nurse and physio workshop aimed at the locals.

- b. *Japanese Urological Association – 1 hour of 3 lectures slot April 2016. Could be panel discussion, we can suggest two 15-minute lectures and one 30-minute panel discussion. Could be JUA members who are also ICS members but they would like us to think about themes/topics, etc. As JUA's policy, ICS to pay flights AND accommodation.*

EK explained that he would like to send 1 international and 2 locals. Something similar to SIU session to show the multi-disciplinary aspects of the ICS – maybe neurourology. AB suggested Ryuji Sakakibara as he is a member of the Neurourology committee and has finished a paper on parkinsons. It was agreed to ask him and Emmanuel Chartier-Kastler.

ACTION POINT: FB to suggest neuro nurse for the JUA session in April 2016 asap.

10. AOB

None

Meeting Ends