

Can registries and audits improve patient outcomes - a Tasmanian perspective?

Friday, 3 November 2017, 12.30pm to 2.00pm

Note: Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

All surgical Fellows that attended provided feedback.

1.	The Program	Responses		Average
1.1	The program was relevant to my role.	6	100%	4.2
1.2	The program outcomes were explained.	6	100%	3.7
1.3	The pace was adequate to meet my needs.	6	100%	3.8
1.4	The workshop material was useful during the program.	6	100%	3.8
2.	The Environment	Responses		Average
2.1	Upon arrival I was made to feel welcome.	6	100%	3.5
2.2	The setup of the room and venue was suitable.	6	100%	3.8
2.3	The facilities were clean and well presented.	6	100%	4.0
3.	The Facilitators	Responses		Average
3.1	The facilitators' presentations were well paced and suited to the group.	5	83%	4.2
3.2	The facilitators' encouraged participation and discussions.	5	83%	4.4
4.	The Workshop	Responses		Average
4.1	'Review of the Australian and New Zealand Audits of Surgical Mortality (ANZASM) over the last 3 years'	5	83%	4.2
4.2	'Australia and New Zealand Prostate Cancer Clinical Registry (PCR)' presentation was well paced and suited to the group.	5	83%	4.0
4.3	'Australia and New Zealand Bariatric Surgery Registry' presentation was well paced and suited to the group.	4	67%	4.0
5.	Program Results	Responses		Average
5.1	I have gained valuable knowledge and skills from this program.	6	100%	3.8
5.2	I can apply the skills and knowledge from this program in my role.	6	100%	4.0

Additional Comments:

- Please continue with collaborative Victorian events
- Would like to see other procedural events. (e.g. Cardiology, radiology and gastroenterology).