

ICS 2015 Evaluation - Workshop 18: Improving Continence Before and After Radical Prostatectomy

What is your profession?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Urologist	31,0%	13
Gynaecologist	0,0%	0
Uro-gynaecologist	0,0%	0
Physiotherapist	52,4%	22
Nurse	11,9%	5
Researcher	4,8%	2
Other (please specify)		2
<i>answered question</i>		42
<i>skipped question</i>		729

Other (please specify)

Geriatrician
neurourologist

In your opinion, which level was this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Introductory	2,4%	1
Intermediate	73,8%	31
Advanced	21,4%	9
Not sure	2,4%	1
<i>answered question</i>		42
<i>skipped question</i>		729

Has this Workshop met your expectations?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Completely	31,0%	13
Mostly	47,6%	20
Partially	21,4%	9
Somewhat	0,0%	0
Not at all	0,0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		42
<i>skipped question</i>		729

What was the strongest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	759

Response Text

Current information - updated current knowledge
 Diagnostic and management scheme for patients with post- prostatectomy incontinence
 evidence on care around prostatectomy involving incontinence
 Good quality of information and evidence
 knowledge
 not sure

preoperative physiotherapy New evidence
 Speakers
 The expertise of the speakers
 The information was pertinent for practice and the promotion of a multidisciplinary approach including physiotherapy excellent.
 the pre-operative physiotherapy:lots of evidence.Very good.
 the topic itself, the diversity of lecturers

What was the weakest aspect of this Workshop?

Answer Options	Response Count
	10
<i>answered question</i>	10
<i>skipped question</i>	761

Response Text

Again no handout available ?....
 details
 It was strong
 Lack of studies in one of the techniques offered for treatment
 Lack of time, very fast. Sometime difficult to follow
 no
 No thing
 post operative physio: I didn't learn anything new
 Review of surgical techniques
 Too short time to speak for every speaker

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>	765

Response Text

additional aspects of continence management. continence aids,
 psychosocial aspects of incontinence and ED after RPE
 operative technique

ICS 2015 Evaluation - WS18 Overall Rate

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	16	21	3	0	0	40
The content was as described in the programme/promotional material	14	25	1	0	0	40
The content provided me with information that will be helpful in my work	15	20	4	0	0	39
The format was effective in eliciting knowledge and ideas	13	25	1	0	0	39
The presentations challenged my thinking	12	18	9	0	0	39
The speakers identified important issues	16	17	5	0	0	38
The speakers did not make presentations based on biased opinions towards certain products/drugs/companies etc	18	17	3	0	0	38
There were enough opportunities to ask questions	17	17	2	1	1	38
The speakers thoroughly answered participants' questions	17	19	2	0	0	38
The handout supplied sufficiently supports the Workshop	9	19	7	0	1	36
I intend to refer to the handout after the Workshop for reference	10	21	5	0	1	37
Met Stated Objective: Review current evidence about the usefulness of physiotherapeutic treatment previous to radical prostatectomy in the prevention of incontinence	15	21	2	0	0	38
Met Stated Objective: Outline a diagnostic and management scheme for patients with post-prostatectomy incontinence	13	21	4	0	0	38
Met Stated Objective: Explain the treatment options and timing in post prostatectomy incontinence	13	21	4	0	0	38
<i>answered question</i>						40
<i>skipped question</i>						731

ICS 2015 Evaluation - WS18 Overall Rate

