



ADEA Program Organising Committee for the 2011

ADS/ADEA Annual Scientific Meeting 29th August – 31st August

Gold Coast Convention Exhibition Centre

AGENDA

Meeting Held via Teleconference on: Tuesday 25th Sept 2012, 12noon WST

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Item
1. Attendance/ Apologies	Attendance: Rebecca, Linda, Mark, Terry, Denise, Trish Apologies: Kirsty, Deb	Last meeting of current POC. ADEA POC 2013-2014 EOI posted today
2. Minute Taking	Trish	
3. Review 2012 ASM		
3.2 Roche Day	Overall day went really well: issues noted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many people registered in afternoon did not show • Good participation even with small audience • Some resources went astray – managed well 	Ongoing discussion re Roche day. In particular communication between Roche, NO and POC – To be noted further in Chairs report to Board
3.3 Symposiums	Positive verbal feedback. More information available following results of delegate feedback survey. Noted that after morning tea Friday is a problem time with many people leaving the conference to travel home. Last symposium was excellent but poorly attended.	Further discussion required to try and keep delegates interested until end of conference. Also need to know what ADS is putting against ADEA symposiums. Issues to be noted further in Chairs report to board.
3.4 Abstracts	Quality of abstracts continues to decline. Again needing to lower cut off to achieve sufficient number. Number of abstracts presented	Timely discussions and action to support members to develop and submit quality abstracts.

<p>3.5 Awards</p>	<p>getting less. Feedback from Michelle Robins and Victoria Stevenson who assisted in abstract reviewing suggested that authors need to check a box to say they have followed the guidelines for writing abstracts. Many abstracts did not meet current guidelines or nominate categories.</p> <p>Judging training went well, almost full attendance. As abstracts were not all noted under appropriate categories decisions had to be made as to what criteria they were judged under. This proved difficult as some appeared to have characteristics of both categories. E.g scientific, programme, resource development Quality activity or Case study /service delivery</p> <p>Collating results – time consuming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two different scoring criteria • Difficult to sort members from non members requires NO input to verify membership status 	<p>Recommendations to be noted in Chairs report to board.</p> <p>Recommend standardised scoring total. Recommend separate scoring sheets for each of the five categories.</p>
<p>4. Recommendations for Board and 2013 committee</p>	<p>To commence planning activities in October 2012</p>	<p>Denise to provide report tabling recommendations.</p>
<p>5. Other Business</p>	<p>Thank you to Denise and other outgoing POC members.</p>	