

Report to NFOG about Spring Meeting in Stavanger, 2013

Course leader: dr. Ragnar Kvie Sande, Stavanger University Hospital

Location: Stavanger University Hospital, teaching aula 308 (Psychiatry building)

The meeting was successfully completed, from 04.04.13 until 05.04.13.

The schedule ran from 10 a.m until 5 p.m on Thursday and 09 am until 3 pm on Friday. Total 17 lecturers held 16 lectures on varied topics. It included a selection that was to satisfaction to both hospital and private gynecologists, as well as junior doctors in training. No major changes occurred compared to the preliminary program sent with the NFOG application (only minor changes in the time schedule).

We debated ethical issues around late abortions and the changes and their backgrounds in the new chapters in our National Guidelines for Obstetrics.

We had a social event with dinner on the first evening of the course with high attendance, and it promoted successfully socializing and networking for gynecologists from all around the country.

We were lucky to have to guest speakers from Sweden. Lil Valentin talked about the use of gynecologic ultrasound to differentiate between benign and malign ovarian tumors, and Jan Persson talked about economic and other aspects of robotic surgery. Both lecturers got a great evaluation.

Totally 75 persons attended the course. There was a blend of private gynecologists, specialists and junior doctors in training. 33 completed the evaluation sheet, but there were a lot of informal and oral positive feedbacks.

The course got the following evaluation scores based on these evaluation sheets:

1. The professional/academical content of the course reached up to my expectations 4.52 (1- does not agree, 5-agree)
2. The clinical/practical relevance of the course was 4.73 (1-not relevant at all, 5- relevant)
3. The learning method at the course was 4.57 (1-badly adjusted for the learning goal, 5 well adjusted for the learning goal) and 4.17 (1- encouraging passivity, 5- encouraging activity).
4. The course was stimulating for further learning 4.59 (1- little bit, 5- very much).
5. The course teachers took up relevant ethical problems 4.41 (1- does not agree, 5- agree)
6. All in all, the course gave me what I expected 4.6 (1- little bit, 5- very much).
7. The practicals of the course were satisfactory 3.87 (1- does not agree, 5- agree).

Most critical comments were on the location with a small auditorium, simple food service and difficulties with holding the time schedule all the way.

23 evaluation sheets evaluated the lecturers. Based on the evaluation forms Valentin got 4.9 points out of 5 (content 5, relevance 5, presentation 4.9), Persson out 4.72 of 5 (content 4.72, relevance 4.72, presentation 4.72).

The committee had a meeting based on the evaluation forms and feedbacks and made a list of useful tips for the next arranging committee in Tromsø to share our experiences about successes and mistakes.