

## Course report

### EFSUMB Euroson School “Musculoskeletal sonography course for rheumatologists – basic level”, Innsbruck (Austria) 2017

Innsbruck, September 18<sup>th</sup> 2017

Dear Lynne,

Please find enclosed the report of the EFSUMB scientifically endorsed “**Musculoskeletal sonography course for rheumatologists – basic level**”, that was held from September 14<sup>th</sup> to September 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017 in Innsbruck.

We enclosed the names of the faculty, demographic data regarding the participants and the evaluation`s results. If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

Christina Duftner, MD/PhD

Michael Schirmer, MD/Assoc. Prof.

Christina Duftner, MD/PhD

Michael Schirmer, MD/Assoc. Prof.

Innsbruck Medical University

Clinical Department of Internal Medicine II

6020 Innsbruck, Austria

Phone: +43-676-5826844

Phone: +43-664-73686936

FAX: +43-5337-2315-75

Fax: +43-512-551688

E-mail: [christina.duftner@gmx.at](mailto:christina.duftner@gmx.at)

E-mail: [schirmer@live.at](mailto:schirmer@live.at)

**MUSCULOSKELETAL SONOGRAPHY COURSE FOR RHEUMATOLOGISTS**  
**- BASIC LEVEL -**  
**Innsbruck, September 14<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

**FACULTY / INSTRUCTORS**

The speakers and instructors were international and national rheumatologists with activity in the field of musculoskeletal sonography:

*Christian Dejaco, Italy*  
*Christina Duftner, Austria*  
*Petra Hánová, Czech Republic*  
*Wolfgang Hartung, Germany*  
*Annamaria Iagnocco, Italy*  
*Peter Mandl, Hungary/Austria*  
*Wolfgang Schmidt, Germany*

**PRACTICAL SESSIONS**

For hands-on scanning participants were divided into 5 groups. Each group was composed of 1 model/patient, 5-6 course participants and 1 faculty member.

**PARTICIPANTS**

There were a total of 26 participants: 22 rheumatologists from Austria, 1 medical PhD student from Austria, 1 orthopedic specialist from Austria, 2 pediatricians from Lithuania.

**EVALUATION**

Nineteen out of 26 participants (73.1%) returned the evaluation forms. Participants were asked to evaluate each faculty member regarding a) comprehensiveness of slides, b) medical competence, c) didactic competence, d) practical relevance of the presentation, e) hands-on scanning. In addition we questioned for an overall rating concerning: a) practical relevance of the course, b) actuality, c) course records. Ratings ranged from 1(=best) to 5 (=worst).

Participants were also asked to evaluate the course regarding educational goals, course duration, size of the groups (hands-on scanning) and the course services.

**Table 1.** Evaluation of faculty (response rate 73.1%, only valid answers shown)

Faculty	Category	Rating				
		1	2	3	4	5
Dejaco	comprehensiveness of slides	19	0	0	0	0
	medical competence	19	0	0	0	0
	didactic competence	18	1	0	0	0
	practical relevance	18	1	0	0	0
	hands-on scanning	18	0	0	0	0
Duftner	comprehensiveness of slides	18	1	0	0	0
	medical competence	18	1	0	0	0
	didactic competence	17	2	0	0	0
	practical relevance	18	1	0	0	0
	hands-on scanning	17	1	0	0	0
Hánová	comprehensiveness of slides	15	4	0	0	0
	medical competence	18	1	0	0	0
	didactic competence	13	5	1	0	0
	practical relevance	19	0	0	0	0
	hands-on scanning	17	1	0	0	0
Hartung	comprehensiveness of slides	15	3	0	0	0
	medical competence	17	1	0	0	0
	didactic competence	16	2	0	0	0
	practical relevance	17	1	0	0	0
	hands-on scanning	16	2	0	0	0
Iagnocco	comprehensiveness of slides	14	3	0	0	0
	medical competence	14	1	0	0	0
	didactic competence	12	5	0	0	0
	practical relevance	11	2	0	0	0
	hands-on scanning	9	0	0	0	0

Mandl	comprehensiveness of slides	19	0	0	0	0
	medical competence	19	0	0	0	0
	didactic competence	13	4	2	0	0
	practical relevance	18	1	0	0	0
	hands-on scanning	16	2	0	1	0
Schmidt	comprehensiveness of slides	18	0	0	0	0
	medical competence	18	0	0	0	0
	didactic competence	18	0	0	0	0
	practical relevance	18	0	0	0	0
	hands-on scanning	17	0	0	0	0

Data show the number of individual ratings.

**Table 2 (a-c).** Evaluation of the course (response rate 73.1%, only valid answers shown)

a)

Category	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
Overall practical relevance of the course	19	0	0	0	0
Overall actuality of the course	18	1	0	0	0
Course records	16	0	0	0	0

b)

	Yes	In part	No
Educational goal was reached	17	1	0

c)

	Adequate	Inadequate
Duration of the course	14	3*
Size of the group	19	0
Service regarding the course	18	0

\*comments: `could be longer` (1x), `Saturday's program was too long`

Other comments: `perfect`, `thank you`, `duration of hands-on could be longer`,  
`overall a very good course with quite a lot of information in a short period of time, in  
the end a little bit exhausting`