



Education Committee Minutes

Tuesday 12th September 2017, Florence, Italy

Chair: Elise De

Members:, Margot Damaser, Enrico Finazzi Agrò, Alex Digesu, Marijke Slieker-Ten Hove, Kari Tikkinen, Nikolaus Veit-Rubin

Apologies: Frankie Bates, Nadir Osman

Also in Attendance: Avicia Burchill, Dominic Turner, Mauro Cervigni, Amy Dobberfuhl, Paula Iguualada-Martinez

Item
1. Consent agenda:
a. Approval London minutes The minutes were approved
b. Committee Terms of Office ED presented Marijke with her certificate and thanked her for work for the committee. The remaining terms of office were discussed and NV confirmed he would renew his term on the committee. MD said that she would renew and in view of the fact she cannot attend the London meeting she wondered whether it best to stand down sooner and ask someone to be co-opted into the place. MD suggested Matthew Fraser ACTION POINT: MD/ED to approach Matthew Fraser and see if he is willing to be co-opted onto the committee. ACTION POINT: Office to ask Frankie Bates whether she intends to renew her position. It was also discussed that Kari's position will finish in 2018 and there is a need for a replacement early career representative on the committee. It was also noted that a permanent replacement for Nadir was needed.
c. Committee Terms of Reference No comments on the terms of reference
2. Online content
a. ICS Institute and ICS TV Sherif explained that the ICS Institute is now live and the education committee is going to grow the ICS Institute to its full capacity. Sherif encouraged committee to go into every detail of the Institute and this will help with the review process. The online face of the Institute was shown to the committee and AB explained the way the schools are separated and how the current video content is separated into educational modules, SOA lectures, abstracts etc. SM explained that each director will be in place only until Philadelphia when they will be replaced by an elected person. They will be responsible to direct content and any working group supporting them. It will be very important that the Directors are active and work within deadlines. Each director will also create centres for surgical training etc and will review the programme of training. SM also suggested that a new school might be added of modern technology. MS asked how the training centers would be funded. SM suggested that this be left to the directors, they could organise themselves or we can use ICS awards. MS further noted that for example she runs a local school and it's a source of income - so this could be interfering with local business models, local attendance for CME. AD suggested that people use the ICS fellowship funding. ED explained that the directors are going to be asking for content to be added, alongside us and the committees so we have to somehow coordinate this so as to not duplicate. MS stated that as long as it's under the ICS flag then we can avoid duplication. ED also



was concerned about vetting the content before being placed on the institute. AB explained that all Directors will need to follow the SOP procedure before anything is placed online. NV suggested to create a rule to remove any content after 5 years for example and this would form a second tire vetting.

ACTION POINT: Education Committee to notify committees and institute directors as to how current projects are currently catalogued and progress charted. Office to post a live version of the projects spreadsheet so that all committees and school directors can cross check any projects.

b. Assessment

ED asked the committee how to we should assess those who watch the ICS online content for their educational outcome. How do we assess that the member understands the content and what they are supposed to learn. ED explained that we have an ICS house style question document written by Adrian Wagg which helped developed the in house questions but that is as far as we have got. ED explained that we have not ignored the learner assessment but we haven't incorporated. ED explained to the committee that she would like to co-opt other members to the committee to help ensure that the amazing content we have is backup by learning assessment. A discussion was held as to whether any committee members had a professional understanding in learning assessment or know of anyone who has the experience. KT offered Thomas Griebing, he is dean of education at Kansas City and is very active in that area. ED also suggested Adrian Wagg on this project and also EF. This was agreed. EF could we consider the CME if we are able to find a partnership with a company. ED prioritised stating that ideally the content has CME points, then ICS certificate and then assessment.

ACTION POINT: Co-opt Adrian Wagg, Thomas Griebing and add Enrico Finazzi Agro to a learning assessment sub-committee.

ACTION POINT: Office to add that learner assessment is to be considered in all SOP's for creating ICS content.

i. New in-app assessment by Attendees

AB explained that the new workshop evaluation system was live in Florence. ED stated that she has used in her workshop and it was great to use and that hopefully it will built in house next year.

ii. New full-workshop assessment by Committee members (to be used in new Faculty Database)

ED explained that this year the workshop reviewer (made up of all committee members) were reviewing the whole workshop rather than just parts of the workshop. Now we have two ways that we can review, in app and people reviewing the workshops.

3. Circle Forward: The committee provided updates about themselves.

4. Outstanding item: Educational report in conjunction with Frederico Furriell

AB explained the history of the document and that it required finishing but Frederico has not actioned. Ed asked if anyone finds this interesting and wanted to take it to its conclusion. A discussion was held and it was agreed to leave the project.

ACTION POINT: Advise Frederico Furriell and Frankie Bates know that educational report not proceeding.

5. Outstanding item: NUU video link

AB explained that this was an outstanding item from previous meetings whereby the education committee asked that NUU link back to our website so that people can watch the videos attached to the abstracts. AB explained after a long process this has been done and next year the link will be embedded within the abstract before its sent to Wiley.

6. 2018 Workshop Application

a. New real-time workshop evaluation app!!

As discussed previously the in app workshop evaluation live. Also 4 workshops and a round table using the voting/multiple choice questions within the AB. ED used at workshop and she confirmed it worked well.

b. Update guidelines for multi-disciplinary programmes

AB explained that some workshops were declined as they were not multi-disciplinary but some workshops are not meant to be and therefore needed guidance from the committee to alter either the reviewing or application guidelines. A discussion was held and it was agreed to amend the workshop guidelines to state that its strongly recommended and that will increase your chances of success if the workshop programme is multi-disciplinary and international. This should also be considered when reviewing. It was also agreed that there should be justification as to why those aspects are not included.

ACTION POINT: Update workshop and reviewing guidelines to reflect that its recommended that workshop applications are multi-disciplinary and international. Applicants should justify if the applications are not multi-disciplinary and international.

c. Update guidelines for one-man workshops

AB explained that a workshop was declined this year as only one speaker in the workshop but that it's allowed/stated in the workshop application guidelines and that this was the original concept of the 1.5 hour workshop. A discussion was held and it was agreed to keep it in the application guidelines but that it needs to be clear that the workshop must have scientific and education value.

ADob asked about reviewing and the scoring abstracts as there was some inconsistencies this year in the scoring. EF explained that the scientific committee were addressing this as well but that new abstract system not ready. ED said that if the new system is ready we will use but we will make the reviewing clearer i.e. what does scoring a 2 mean.

ACTION POINT: Alter the workshop guidelines to state that one-speaker workshops are allowed but that the explanation of the educational and scientific value needs to be well defined.

ACTION POINT: Committee to review workshop reviewing guidelines.

d. Deadlines, Handouts

The workshop review process and deadlines for 2018 were reviewed. ED thought the pre meeting conference call was handy. We have to justify the expenses of why to meet in person and that the time is used well.

ACTION POINT: Office to circulate workshop review process and deadlines for 2018 and send a Doodle poll for conference call dates and times.

7. Review of 2018 Education Events

a. Budget (went a long way in 2017!)

The education courses/guest lectures from the year were reviewed. A discussion was held about the CAUN application from Hong Kong which was no longer proceeding due to a change in their leadership but affiliation and request for funding should come through for 2018. The chart of speakers was reviewed and MD was pleased to see that the one funded trip rule makes us diversify the speakers. It was also discussed that it would be good for the education committee to thank speakers for the volunteer work when you see them in Florence.

b. Phoenix Regional Course 2017

ED presented the Phoenix Regional Course and explained that the course is affordable and the faculty is great. We need 80 delegates so ED asked the committee to please reach out and send the information to colleagues.

c. 2018 cadaver course

AB explained that the cadaver course was reviewed by the board and it was agreed to proceed again for another course in Bristol next year.

d. Ongoing 2018 guest lectures and add on courses



AB provided an update on the current 2018 lectures and it was noted that the CAUN event needed to be added to the list. ED explained that SIU requested a 90 minute session and Chris Chapple and perhaps Emmanuel Chartier-Kastler. May request funding for PTs, or colorectal, but most will be self-funded.

MC explained that his university runs a chronic pelvic pain Cadaver course in Paris.

ACTION POINT: Office to send MC application for education course.

ED asked the committee if they are aware of any other requests? EF will ask for SIUD lecture.

A discussion was held around offering fixed amounts to education courses when they have several ICS speakers attending and whether there was a limit to the amount to be spent. It was discussed and agreed that the committee can decide that depending on alliance and the possibility of new members.

e. Shark Tank

ED explained that this was her proposal and is hoping that industry would come to a session where they provide “on the spot” funding. MD thinks that the industry are unlikely to make on the spot decision and recommends ICS judges not industry. MD said she would be happy to advise and would love to see ICS move in that direction.

ACTION POINT: Office to send Shark Tank proposal to committee.

8. Goals for 2018 - Power point

a. Continued momentum on new ICS Online Education

i. Current list of completed and targeted Modules and Videos

ED confirmed that the review of the ICS online content was in great shape with new institute

ii. Recommend creation of a Tutorial for how to use the Website

ED requested that once DT is happy then ask to prepare a video on how to navigate the website – how to find forum/how to communicate.

ACTION POINT: DT to prepare a video on how to navigate the website.

b. Faculty database overhaul

i. Demo of current faculty database

AB and DT showed the committee the current faculty database which is not too bad apart from the content is out of date. We keep recycling speakers and we have a current database which is unused. ED would like to develop new faculty database with DT’s input. The current questions were reviewed. MD questioned why ask language when she thought that all ICS talks were in English but it was agreed to leave that question in case of social relevance. MD also suggested to drop the question about self-funding. DT suggested that people just update their biography on the ICS membership record. EF suggested year of graduation.

ED asked DT when he could action these requested changes to the faculty database and DT suggested that he could make changes in the last quarter of 2017. It was also discussed whether this should be open to the public as it may help people requesting ICS funding to select speakers. It was agreed that people adding themselves to the database should be able to tick to choose public viewing or not. ED suggested that once changes done we will invite all members to identify themselves as speakers – at the same time distribute application to request speakers (maybe we will get some new societies)

- Field
- Location
- Keywords – where do they consider themselves to be expert lecturers
- Affiliated Societies
- Languages
- Self-Funding for travel

ACTION POINT: DT to upgrade the faculty database

AOB



KT asked about the rule on taking photos during the meeting and using twitter as the housekeeping notices state that no photos allowed. It was agreed to amend the housekeeping notice for sessions chairs to state that photos are allowed but try not to interfere with proceedings and also to remind people that workshop slides are available on the website post meeting.
ACTION POINT: Session chair guidelines to be amended with regards to taking photos.

KT had a question for the committee and explained that the early career session was to help people present and improve their skills and to bring more people to the ICS meetings. KT explained that Kari Bo questioned the new presentation award whilst its nice its likely that the native speakers will win. KT explained that they had already been pre-selected and questioned whether to offer them all awards. A discussion was held and it was agreed to give them all a certificate/award. AD suggested to consider free registration for next year as an award next time.



Education Committee Minutes

Tuesday 12th September 2017, Florence, Italy

Chair: Elise De

Members:, Margot Damaser, Enrico Finazzi Agrò, Alex Digesu, Marijke Slieker-Ten Hove, Kari Tikkinen, Nikolaus Veit-Rubin

Apologies: Frankie Bates, Nadir Osman

Also in Attendance: Avicia Burchill, Dominic Turner, Mauro Cervigni, Amy Dobberfuhl, Paula Iguualada-Martinez

Item
1. Consent agenda:
a. Approval London minutes The minutes were approved
b. Committee Terms of Office ED presented Marijke with her certificate and thanked her for work for the committee. The remaining terms of office were discussed and NV confirmed he would renew his term on the committee. MD said that she would renew and in view of the fact she cannot attend the London meeting she wondered whether it best to stand down sooner and ask someone to be co-opted into the place. MD suggested Matthew Fraser ACTION POINT: MD/ED to approach Matthew Fraser and see if he is willing to be co-opted onto the committee. ACTION POINT: Office to ask Frankie Bates whether she intends to renew her position. It was also discussed that Kari's position will finish in 2018 and there is a need for a replacement early career representative on the committee. It was also noted that a permanent replacement for Nadir was needed.
c. Committee Terms of Reference No comments on the terms of reference
2. Online content
a. ICS Institute and ICS TV Sherif explained that the ICS Institute is now live and the education committee is going to grow the ICS Institute to its full capacity. Sherif encouraged committee to go into every detail of the Institute and this will help with the review process. The online face of the Institute was shown to the committee and AB explained the way the schools are separated and how the current video content is separated into educational modules, SOA lectures, abstracts etc. SM explained that each director will be in place only until Philadelphia when they will be replaced by an elected person. They will be responsible to direct content and any working group supporting them. It will be very important that the Directors are active and work within deadlines. Each director will also create centres for surgical training etc and will review the programme of training. SM also suggested that a new school might be added of modern technology. MS asked how the training centers would be funded. SM suggested that this be left to the directors, they could organise themselves or we can use ICS awards. MS further noted that for example she runs a local school and it's a source of income - so this could be interfering with local business models, local attendance for CME. AD suggested that people use the ICS fellowship funding. ED explained that the directors are going to be asking for content to be added, alongside us and the committees so we have to somehow coordinate this so as to not duplicate. MS stated that as long as it's under the ICS flag then we can avoid duplication. ED also



was concerned about vetting the content before being placed on the institute. AB explained that all Directors will need to follow the SOP procedure before anything is placed online. NV suggested to create a rule to remove any content after 5 years for example and this would form a second tire vetting.

ACTION POINT: Education Committee to notify committees and institute directors as to how current projects are currently catalogued and progress charted. Office to post a live version of the projects spreadsheet so that all committees and school directors can cross check any projects.

b. Assessment

ED asked the committee how to we should assess those who watch the ICS online content for their educational outcome. How do we assess that the member understands the content and what they are supposed to learn. ED explained that we have an ICS house style question document written by Adrian Wagg which helped developed the in house questions but that is as far as we have got. ED explained that we have not ignored the learner assessment but we haven't incorporated. ED explained to the committee that she would like to co-opt other members to the committee to help ensure that the amazing content we have is backup by learning assessment. A discussion was held as to whether any committee members had a professional understanding in learning assessment or know of anyone who has the experience. KT offered Thomas Griebing, he is dean of education at Kansas City and is very active in that area. ED also suggested Adrian Wagg on this project and also EF. This was agreed. EF could we consider the CME if we are able to find a partnership with a company. ED prioritised stating that ideally the content has CME points, then ICS certificate and then assessment.

ACTION POINT: Co-opt Adrian Wagg, Thomas Griebing and add Enrico Finazzi Agro to a learning assessment sub-committee.

ACTION POINT: Office to add that learner assessment is to be considered in all SOP's for creating ICS content.

i. New in-app assessment by Attendees

AB explained that the new workshop evaluation system was live in Florence. ED stated that she has used in her workshop and it was great to use and that hopefully it will built in house next year.

ii. New full-workshop assessment by Committee members (to be used in new Faculty Database)

ED explained that this year the workshop reviewer (made up of all committee members) were reviewing the whole workshop rather than just parts of the workshop. Now we have two ways that we can review, in app and people reviewing the workshops.

3. Circle Forward: The committee provided updates about themselves.

4. Outstanding item: Educational report in conjunction with Frederico Furriell

AB explained the history of the document and that it required finishing but Frederico has not actioned. Ed asked if anyone finds this interesting and wanted to take it to its conclusion. A discussion was held and it was agreed to leave the project.

ACTION POINT: Advise Frederico Furriell and Frankie Bates know that educational report not proceeding.

5. Outstanding item: NUU video link

AB explained that this was an outstanding item from previous meetings whereby the education committee asked that NUU link back to our website so that people can watch the videos attached to the abstracts. AB explained after a long process this has been done and next year the link will be embedded within the abstract before its sent to Wiley.

6. 2018 Workshop Application

a. New real-time workshop evaluation app!!

As discussed previously the in app workshop evaluation live. Also 4 workshops and a round table using the voting/multiple choice questions within the AB. ED used at workshop and she confirmed it worked well.

b. Update guidelines for multi-disciplinary programmes

AB explained that some workshops were declined as they were not multi-disciplinary but some workshops are not meant to be and therefore needed guidance from the committee to alter either the reviewing or application guidelines. A discussion was held and it was agreed to amend the workshop guidelines to state that its strongly recommended and that will increase your chances of success if the workshop programme is multi-disciplinary and international. This should also be considered when reviewing. It was also agreed that there should be justification as to why those aspects are not included.

ACTION POINT: Update workshop and reviewing guidelines to reflect that its recommended that workshop applications are multi-disciplinary and international. Applicants should justify if the applications are not multi-disciplinary and international.

c. Update guidelines for one-man workshops

AB explained that a workshop was declined this year as only one speaker in the workshop but that it's allowed/stated in the workshop application guidelines and that this was the original concept of the 1.5 hour workshop. A discussion was held and it was agreed to keep it in the application guidelines but that it needs to be clear that the workshop must have scientific and education value.

ADob asked about reviewing and the scoring abstracts as there was some inconsistencies this year in the scoring. EF explained that the scientific committee were addressing this as well but that new abstract system not ready. ED said that if the new system is ready we will use but we will make the reviewing clearer i.e. what does scoring a 2 mean.

ACTION POINT: Alter the workshop guidelines to state that one-speaker workshops are allowed but that the explanation of the educational and scientific value needs to be well defined.

ACTION POINT: Committee to review workshop reviewing guidelines.

d. Deadlines, Handouts

The workshop review process and deadlines for 2018 were reviewed. ED thought the pre meeting conference call was handy. We have to justify the expenses of why to meet in person and that the time is used well.

ACTION POINT: Office to circulate workshop review process and deadlines for 2018 and send a Doodle poll for conference call dates and times.

7. Review of 2018 Education Events

a. Budget (went a long way in 2017!)

The education courses/guest lectures from the year were reviewed. A discussion was held about the CAUN application from Hong Kong which was no longer proceeding due to a change in their leadership but affiliation and request for funding should come through for 2018. The chart of speakers was reviewed and MD was pleased to see that the one funded trip rule makes us diversify the speakers. It was also discussed that it would be good for the education committee to thank speakers for the volunteer work when you see them in Florence.

b. Phoenix Regional Course 2017

ED presented the Phoenix Regional Course and explained that the course is affordable and the faculty is great. We need 80 delegates so ED asked the committee to please reach out and send the information to colleagues.

c. 2018 cadaver course

AB explained that the cadaver course was reviewed by the board and it was agreed to proceed again for another course in Bristol next year.

d. Ongoing 2018 guest lectures and add on courses



AB provided an update on the current 2018 lectures and it was noted that the CAUN event needed to be added to the list. ED explained that SIU requested a 90 minute session and Chris Chapple and perhaps Emmanuel Chartier-Kastler. May request funding for PTs, or colorectal, but most will be self-funded.

MC explained that his university runs a chronic pelvic pain Cadaver course in Paris.

ACTION POINT: Office to send MC application for education course.

ED asked the committee if they are aware of any other requests? EF will ask for SIUD lecture.

A discussion was held around offering fixed amounts to education courses when they have several ICS speakers attending and whether there was a limit to the amount to be spent. It was discussed and agreed that the committee can decide that depending on alliance and the possibility of new members.

e. Shark Tank

ED explained that this was her proposal and is hoping that industry would come to a session where they provide “on the spot” funding. MD thinks that the industry are unlikely to make on the spot decision and recommends ICS judges not industry. MD said she would be happy to advise and would love to see ICS move in that direction.

ACTION POINT: Office to send Shark Tank proposal to committee.

8. Goals for 2018 - Power point

a. Continued momentum on new ICS Online Education

i. Current list of completed and targeted Modules and Videos

ED confirmed that the review of the ICS online content was in great shape with new institute

ii. Recommend creation of a Tutorial for how to use the Website

ED requested that once DT is happy then ask to prepare a video on how to navigate the website – how to find forum/how to communicate.

ACTION POINT: DT to prepare a video on how to navigate the website.

b. Faculty database overhaul

i. Demo of current faculty database

AB and DT showed the committee the current faculty database which is not too bad apart from the content is out of date. We keep recycling speakers and we have a current database which is unused. ED would like to develop new faculty database with DT’s input. The current questions were reviewed. MD questioned why ask language when she thought that all ICS talks were in English but it was agreed to leave that question in case of social relevance. MD also suggested to drop the question about self-funding. DT suggested that people just update their biography on the ICS membership record. EF suggested year of graduation.

ED asked DT when he could action these requested changes to the faculty database and DT suggested that he could make changes in the last quarter of 2017. It was also discussed whether this should be open to the public as it may help people requesting ICS funding to select speakers. It was agreed that people adding themselves to the database should be able to tick to choose public viewing or not. ED suggested that once changes done we will invite all members to identify themselves as speakers – at the same time distribute application to request speakers (maybe we will get some new societies)

- Field
- Location
- Keywords – where do they consider themselves to be expert lecturers
- Affiliated Societies
- Languages
- Self-Funding for travel

ACTION POINT: DT to upgrade the faculty database

AOB



KT asked about the rule on taking photos during the meeting and using twitter as the housekeeping notices state that no photos allowed. It was agreed to amend the housekeeping notice for sessions chairs to state that photos are allowed but try not to interfere with proceedings and also to remind people that workshop slides are available on the website post meeting.
ACTION POINT: Session chair guidelines to be amended with regards to taking photos.

KT had a question for the committee and explained that the early career session was to help people present and improve their skills and to bring more people to the ICS meetings. KT explained that Kari Bo questioned the new presentation award whilst its nice its likely that the native speakers will win. KT explained that they had already been pre-selected and questioned whether to offer them all awards. A discussion was held and it was agreed to give them all a certificate/award. AD suggested to consider free registration for next year as an award next time.