OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR

In order to improve the timeliness of the meeting, brief verbal reports will be given at the Business Meeting. The following notes are designed to accompany the Annual Business Meeting.

AGENDA ITEM No 4: THE PRESIDENT’S REPORT

Foster and support future development of Academic Pathology
A key focus of the Society is to provide support to improve the status of Academic pathology in the UK. We have adopted a broad strategy through our established core activities including direct funding support to developing an undergraduate engagement program. We are actively lobbying the RCPath to recognise the need for curriculum and culture change in cellular pathology training to future proof our profession. I am especially encouraged by the increasing numbers of trainee members and their direct participation in our activities. The trainees sections of our meetings programs are highly valued, of exceptional quality and very well attended. Undergraduate engagement has been extremely effective and rapid through the leadership of our General Secretary, Richard Byers

Links with other professional bodies
We have been meeting with RCPath and are introducing joint Undergraduate Membership of the College and the Society to encourage future medical and science students to join the discipline. We wish to foster closer links between the RCPath particularly with respect to academic pathology and research. The Officers met with the President and other College representatives to discuss the curriculum and opportunities for change. There is a real need to increase the profile and exposure to basic genetics and molecular pathology in training as it will undoubtedly increasingly underpin diagnosis, disease classification and therapeutic management. Personally I feel that research exposure rather than forced learning will be needed to encourage trainees to participate in research and to see research as a key component of a pathologists role, be it self directed research or research support to others.

I have also indicated that I am keen to work with the College in any endeavours to encourage research councils and charities to support clinical research fellowships in pathology. Of course these should be competitive, based on individual merit, but personally I feel they should be open to trainees in all research active training environments rather than exclusively focussed on “centres of excellence”. This could be a really positive way, when linked to early research exposure, to rekindle academic pathology activity throughout the country. I hope I am not too naive in my thinking!

We continue to work closely with the BDIAP. At our meetings of the Officers of the Society and the BDIAP, we have discussed greater cooperation and collaboration. Many of our members are members of the BDIAP and vice versa. There is a joint desire to work together and with the RCPath to improve the research, training and professional environment for pathologists in the UK and for those overseas members and affiliates who look to the UK for guidance. We have agreed to change to a joint annual meeting with the BDIAP from 2015 and will be appointing a new member of staff to work for both Societies to improve our educational web portal.

ACCEA
The Society offered its assistance to Members as allowed by the ACCEA. The Review Panel will be considering members' applications shortly for the 2014 Round.

2014 Committee Awayday
The Committee awayday was held in January when the future of the Society and its objectives were considered.
Our main focus will be:

- Develop effective strategies to support and develop academic pathology
- Greater engagement with other learned Societies and with biomedical scientists
- Greater engagement with undergraduate medical students – we are already achieving this with the introduction of an Undergraduate representative on the Committee
- Promotion of the role of molecular pathology at research and service levels, particular amongst trainee pathologists
- Maintain strong portfolio of research support at grant and meeting levels
- Develop educational strategy to expand support at undergraduate, postgraduate and CPD levels

The Society/Meetings
Adrienne Flanagan took up office as Meetings Secretary in June 2013 and will lead the Society forward with future meeting planning.

Journal of Pathology
Our journal maintains its leading position as the highest ranking monthly pathology journal and I would like to thank Peter Hall for his tremendous efforts in improving its international profile. I am delighted to announce that Simon Herrington will succeed Peter as Editor in Chief of the Journal from January 2015.

Clinical Journal of Pathology
We are delighted to announce that The Society together with Wiley-Blackwell has launched the Clinical Journal of Pathology. This is a sister Journal to the Journal of Pathology with a more clinical focus. It is Online Only and fully Open Access.

Joint Meetings with the British Division of the IAP (BDIAP)
From 2015 these will be held on an annual basis and we are pleased to continue our mutually beneficial engagement with the BDIAP.

European Society of Pathology (ESP)
Pathology London 2014 Ltd was set up as a separate trading body to co-organise and manage the Society’s financial commitment.

Retiring Sub-committee Chairs
Jade Chow has recently retired as Chair of the Educational & Training Sub-committee. I would like to offer my own personal thanks, and those of the Society and the Committee, for Jade’s commitment to the work of the Society.

Nick West will also retire this month as Chair of the Trainees Sub-committee. On behalf of the Society and the Committee, I would like to thank him for all his sterling efforts in taking the Sub-committee forward during his term in office.

Ian Ellis, July 2014

AGENDA ITEM No 5: GENERAL SECRETARY’S REPORT

5.1 Resolution to Amend Articles of Association
As you are aware on the 1st January 2014 the Society incorporated and is now a charitable company. The governing document is now called the Articles of Association rather than the Constitution and Rules.

When the charitable company was established, the Articles noted three categories of membership - ordinary, senior and trainee. It was unintentional and unfortunate to use the word trainee- it should, of course, state concessionary. Therefore, we are proposing to amend the Articles so trainee membership is renamed concessionary membership (Article 14.3).

All concessionary members have always been members of the Society but we must amend our Articles of Association to include this category and ensure our governing document reflects our membership arrangements.
The governance of the Society remains unaltered with officer and sub-committee remits being unchanged.

5.2 2013 Committee Awayday
As mentioned in the President’s report above, the Committee will take forward the various initiatives discussed therein.

5.3 Society Lectures, Medals and Awards
Members are referred to the General Secretary’s notices in the Agenda document for deadlines for nomination/application for this year’s lectures, medals and awards.

5.4 Membership
I am pleased to report that membership numbers have increased once again and, at the time of writing, stand at 1533. As last year, this reflects not only that more people are joining the Society but also that concessionary members are converting to ordinary membership when they move into career grade posts.

5.5 Undergraduate Involvement/Associate Undergraduate Membership
Following the very successful inaugural Undergraduate Forum held at the Edinburgh Pathology 2013 conference, an Undergraduate Network and Blog has been set up by two very keen medical students from Manchester, John McDermott and Morgan Back. John also attends the Committee Meetings as the Undergraduate representative and were present and contributed to the Awayday discussions.

In collaboration with the RCPath the Society will be introducing Associate Undergraduate Membership to encourage greater interaction with the Society. Students will need to be members of the Society in order to apply for Undergraduate Bursary, Intercalated Degree and any other grant schemes as appropriate.

5.6 Website and publications
The content of the website is still review. The Educational Portal will be re-organised before the end of the year.

A Society media policy will also be introduced following the use of Twitter by the Trainees’ Subcommittee and to future-proof communications via such methods. If members have suggestions for improvement of the website, please contact admin@pathsoc.org.

The Society has supported, through the Open Scheme, the development of an innovative book on p53, which is currently being researched by Sue Armstrong. Following the closure of Dundee University Press, who were going to publish this, the author had secured a new agreement with Bloomsbury Press – the scheduled publication date remains September 2014.

5.7 Other Matters
The Society will be applying for trademark status for its logo and name in order to protect its use.

Richard Byers, July 2014

AGENDA ITEM No. 6 – THE TREASURER’S REPORT
The Society exists to promote the Understanding of Disease in the medical and lay community. Healthy finances have allowed us to award additional PhD and Career development research grants using unallocated funds from previous years and we have also continued to support our meetings and educational activities. New grant schemes are being considered following the Society’s Awayday.

Despite these increases in expenditure on our charitable aims, the favourable stock market performance has allowed us to carry forward overall assets of over £8 million, an increase of £903k over the year.

The Society’s investment managers, Cazenove Capital Management were acquired by Schroders during the year although the Charities Team will remain unchanged. The Society is confident in the continued abilities of the Schroders team.
Our main income continues to be the Journal of Pathology. Peter Hall and his Editorial team continue to work extremely hard to keep the performance of the Journal highly competitive. We are grateful to them and all their referees for maintaining the excellence of the Journal. We were also pleased with the introduction of the Clinical Journal of Pathology the Society’s new on-line only Open Access journal launched in 2014. The threat from on-line journals continues and the Society will need to keep a close eye on this and manage its resources accordingly.

The Trustees are grateful to Ros and Julie for their continued diligence in running the Society office and its myriad of functions and support of the Officers. They continue to maintain the Society’s website successfully using external technical assistance as required.

The Society will also be moving to an on-line membership platform where all aspects of membership management will be channelled, including meeting registration and abstracts. The provisional launch date for this will be January 2015. This will improve communication between members and the Society and simplify and speed up meeting registration etc.

The Society’s legal status changed to that of a Charitable Company from 1 January 2014. Professional fees increased in 2013 due to 3 exceptional items, the lease at 2 Carlton House Terrace, the joint meeting with the European Society of Pathology and the legal structure of the Society.

The Society has also set up a limited company, Pathology London 2014 Ltd, to handle all aspects of the joint meeting with the European Society of Pathology. This is to ring-fence the income and expenditure related to the meeting and protect the assets of the Society.

The Society will also be applying for Charitable Status in Scotland shortly. Similarly in Ireland and Northern Ireland when this becomes available.

Nick Rooney, July 2014

AGENDA ITEM No. 7 – MEETINGS SECRETARY’S REPORT

2013
18-21 June Edinburgh Pathology 2013, Joint Meeting with the BDIAP
This meeting, our 7th Joint Meeting with the BDIAP, was held at the Edinburgh International Conference Centre. This proved to be a successful, enjoyable and well attended event at an excellent venue. The Conference Dinner and entertainment were well received. We would like to thank Professors David Salter and Alistair Williams for their work and commitment in putting together the excellent and well received programme and for hosting this meeting.

The Society’s first Undergraduate forum was held during the meeting, which proved very successful and will be repeated at future meetings. An undergraduate forum is scheduled within the London Congress in August/September.

- Abstracts submitted - 170 comprising 10 Plenary Oral, 48 Oral and 112 Poster presentations
- Delegates - in total, excluding invited speakers - 254
- Feedback details (Appendix A)

Future Meetings

2014
30 August-3 Sept Joint Meeting with the European Society of Pathology, ExCeL, London

2015
2-6 February Pathological Society Winter School, London
23-25 June Dublin Pathology 2015, Joint Meeting with the BDIAP

2016
7-8 January Winter Meeting, London (Host/Date to be confirmed)*
28-30 June Nottingham Pathology 2016, Joint Meeting with the BDIAP
*The format of the Society’s Winter Meetings was discussed during the Committee Awayday in January 2014. There will be no Winter meeting in 2015 due to the Joint Congress with ESP being held later during the year.

It was agreed that the focus should remain as an Educational event with some poster presentations and plenary oral presentations.

We plan to re-instate the Winter Meeting in January 2016 in London. Host is yet to be identified.

Adrienne Flanagan, July 2014

AGENDA ITEM No. 8.1 EDUCATION SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT
EDUCATION SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT
The Education subcommittee conduct all activity by teleconference. The Sub-committee meets twice a year to discuss Education grant funding and any other matters of relevance to education of the Society members. Minutes of these meetings are available from the Society office. An overview of the Education Sub-committee activity for 2013 is detailed below:

Education Grant Scheme Budget

**Undergraduate elective bursary and prize**
The undergraduate bursary deadline dates were, 28 February and 10 May in 2013. 50 applications were received of which 28 were funded. A total spend of £28,700 for 2013.

Each recipient of a bursary is required to submit a report. The applicant judged to have submitted the best elective report over the yearly cycle receives a prize and is invited to present their work at a future Society Meeting. The winner of the elective bursary prize for 2013 was awarded to Ju Vern Ew (University College Dublin): “Investigation Of Pseudogenes In Breast Cancer”.

**Undergraduate Essay Competition**
This essay prize is offered annually and the winner is invited to receive the £500 prize at the Society winter Meeting the following year. Kate Sutton from the University of Leeds, the winner of the 2013 essay prize entitled “How ’personalised’ is personalised medicine? What are the Challenges for pathology in delivering this for patients?” will be presented at the joint meeting with the ESP, London, in August/September 2014.

The title of the 2014 prize essay is: “Digital Pathology: will machines replace the pathologist and a microscope?”

The winning essay can be found on the Society website.

**Intercalated Degree**
10 applications were received from students from 4 medical schools; 5 from the University of Leicester, 1 from University of Manchester, 1 from University of Sheffield and 1 from Newcastle University. 8 applications were funded. A total spend of £38,825 for 2013.

It is emphasised that each student receiving a Society award would be expected to submit their work, either as an oral presentation or poster, at the winter meeting following completion of their degree. Supervisors would be politely reminded to encourage their students to do this.

In 2014 the fee structure of the intercalated degree was changed. The stipend has been increased to £4,500.00 and consumables of £1,500.00 have been added.

**Seminars for Students Scheme**
The Education Sub-committee are very keen to support the pursuit of pathology by undergraduates. However no applications were received in 2013. It was thought that information regarding the scheme was not getting to the undergraduates even though this scheme is now included and advertised on the undergraduate blog. It was suggested that a list of medical school contacts be prepared and the information regarding the seminars for students scheme be emailed directly to the contacts.
**Educational Grant scheme**
There were 4 Education grant applications in 2013 as follows; Prof P Quirke, University of Leeds for the development of a Powerwall; Dr S Smith & Dr R Ganesan, University of Wolverhampton for the development of a novel ‘flipped delivery’ of pathology teaching; Dr P Gallagher & Dr H Doran, Southampton General Hospital to support the UK Cardiac Pathology Network Annual Education Meeting and Dr O Rotimi, University of Leeds to support remote teaching of histopathologists in Nigeria using digital slides. Reports of these awards can be found on the Society website. A total spend of £12,750 for 2013.

**Path Soc Winter School**
The Winter School ran under the leadership of Catherine Horsfield and Alison Winstanley for the second time.

The London Deanery funded 29 places at this year’s Winter School. 39 delegates attended in total, of the 39 delegates, 1 was from Jordan, 5 were from Ireland and the remaining 33 were from Great Britain. The course was a resounding success and feedback was very positive. The London Deanery will no longer be funding the Pathological Society Winter School.

**Objectives for 2014**
In 2014 the Education Subcommittee general goals are to promote pathology to undergraduates, improve recruitment into specialist training, engage with junior and senior doctors in other specialties, better serve the academic needs of trainees and promote education in molecular pathology to pathologists at all levels. Specific goals include the reorganisation of educational material on the education portal, increasing uptake of education grants through advertising and marketing and instigating membership of the society for undergraduates. We will instigate a pathology ambassador scheme, encompassing at least all major centres, with the aim that a senior trainee or dynamic consultant can act as a gatekeeper/advisor for local resources and can possibly arrange pathology “taster days” for local F1 doctors. We will also engage with societies related to molecular pathology to foster long term joint strategies for research and diagnostics.

Maurice Loughrey will step down from this Sub-committee in July 2014 and we thank him for his excellent contribution.  

Elizabeth Soilleux, July 2014

**AGENDA ITEM No. 8.2 REPORT OF RESEARCH SUB-COMMITTEE**
The Research Sub-committee are responsible for promoting and supporting the research aims of the Society. The Sub-committee meets twice a year, by teleconference, to discuss Research grant funding and any other matters of relevance to the Research aims of the Society. Minutes of these meetings are available from the Society office. An overview of the Research Sub-committee activity for 2013 is detailed below:

**Research Grant Schemes**

**Small Grants Scheme**
The deadline dates remained as 01 April and 01 October for 2013. 7 applications were received of which 4 were funded. A total spend of £39,718.20.

**PhD Studentships Scheme**
A total of 10 applications were received in 2013. 2 PhD’s were awarded to Prof S Coupland, University of Liverpool and Prof L Jones, Queen Mary’s School of Medicine & Dentistry.

**Pathological Society & Jean Shanks Foundation Pathological Research Training Fellowships Scheme**
Dr Harry Haynes of Southmead University, Bristol was awarded the 2013 Joint Research Training Fellowship with the Jean Shanks Foundation for his project ‘investigating the novel marker PPAR to better predict diagnosis and prognosis in human gliomas’.
Career Development Fellowships Scheme
1 award was made to Dr Raza Ali, Cambridge Research Institute for his project ‘Development of novel in situ hybridisation assays for identification of integrated genomic subtypes of breast cancer’. A total spend of £99,073 over three years.

Sino-European Collaborative Awards Scheme
No applications were received in 2013.

International Collaborative Awards Scheme
No applications were received in 2013.

Equipment Awards Scheme
4 applications were received of which 2 were funded as follows: Dr Grabsch & Dr Speirs, University of Leeds for the purchase of an automated tissue arrayer and Dr Pillay, UCL for a high end workstation and computer, a total spend of £14,469.

Visiting Fellowships Scheme
2 applications were received and funded as follows; Dr S Fitzgerald, Dublin City University for the project ‘Elucidating the complex relationship between stromal and epithelial compartments in colorectal cancer using Laser Capture Microdissection’ and Dr Staunton, University College Dublin for the project ‘Protein expression profiles of cancer foci in prostate cancer: a clinically focussed strategy for discovery of biomarkers’. A total spend of £7,422.50

Reports on use of research funds
Reports on the use of research funds are expected within a year of the end of the funding period. Several report have been received over the past year and have been posted on the Society website.

The Research Sub-committee would like to thank Prof Jo Martin and Prof Massimo Pignatelli who retire in July 2014 and have been a valuable part of the Research Sub-committee. A warm welcome to Prof Andy Hanby, University of Leeds and Dr Fernanda Amary, University College London, who join the Sub-committee July 2013.

The Research subcommittee will follow a strategy to support the society’s mission of “understanding disease” through high-quality research. In the next 5 years, we will aim to:

- Develop and refine funding schemes accessible to and suited to the needs of all members of the society.
- Support research collaboration with industry
- Facilitate development of expertise in animal pathology within the Society
- Establish an annual summer school to provide training in molecular diagnostics
- Establish links with other professional societies (both within the UK and abroad)

Mohammed Ilyas, June 2014

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8.3 REPORT OF THE TRAINEES’ SUB-COMMITTEE

Overview
The trainees’ sub-committee is responsible for representing the trainee membership of the Society. As a sub-committee we work with the trainee community to raise awareness of the Society and the benefits of membership. We aim to facilitate trainees in their research, education and academic pursuits through the Society.

Trainee membership of the Society continues to increase with a high conversion rate to ordinary membership at the end of training. The sub-committee published its first bi-annual newsletter in January that was well received. The summer edition is scheduled for release after the summer European Congress of Pathology.

This year signalled the end of Nick West’s term as Chair of the trainee sub-committee and we would like to take this opportunity to thank him for being an inspirational and supportive Chair. Gemma Petts has been elected as the next Chair of the trainee sub-committee and her three-year term starts in July 2014. We also say goodbye and thank you to sub-committee members Sarah Bell, John Brain, Elizabeth Byrne
and Brendan Doyle. We look forward to welcoming their replacements who will be elected at the AGM this summer.

**Education**

Following the Society Away Day, the trainees’ sub-committee has started to work closely with the education sub-committee to outline topics and learning objectives for on-line tutorials on molecular and research techniques. The trainees’ sub-committee continues to produce the ‘Case of the Month’, an educational resource available on the Society’s website.

A survey of concessionary (predominantly trainees) members’ showed extremely high levels of satisfaction (98.5% satisfied) with the journal ‘Diagnostic Histopathology’ that they receive as part of their membership.

**Meetings**

The sub-committee is continuing to organise the popular ‘Meet the Expert’ sessions, covering haematopathology and liver pathology at the Congress in the summer. The sub-committee has also organised a symposium on Next Generation Sequencing and a slide seminar aimed at senior (FRCPath part 2 level) trainees for the summer Congress. The slide seminar is organised and hosted in collaboration with trainees from the European Society of Pathology.

Good progress has already been made in the organisation of the trainee sessions for the 2015 summer meeting in Dublin jointly hosted with the BDIAP. We have established a good working relationship with the BDIAP Trainee Councillor and look forward to working closely with them in the future.

**Research**

The Society’s research grants continue to be a source of funding for many trainees, giving them the opportunity to develop and mature academic careers. The trainees’ sub-committee continues to advertise and support these initiatives.

**Website and Social Media**

In the last year the trainees’ sub-committee has carried out a review of the educational portal that was fed back to the Society. There is now a major plan for improvement and development of the portal and it is hoped that the review will be of continued use in this.

The Twitter account that was started in 2013 now has 198 followers and continues to function as a channel for advertising the activity of the trainees’ sub-committee and Society in general.

Gemma Petts, July 2014

---

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 9 - REPORT OF THE EDITOR IN CHIEF, JOURNAL OF PATHOLOGY AND CLINICAL JOURNAL OF PATHOLOGY**

**Overview of my tenure as Editor in Chief**

This will be my last report as Editor in Chief so it may be worth highlighting developments in the last 7 years. I had hoped to be able to provide a new Impact Factor at this time, but this will now not be released until late July. I anticipate maintenance of our absolute IF and relative position.

I should like to emphasise that any progress made was only possible because of

1. the firm foundation put in place by Peter Toner and Simon Herrington’s tenures as EiC and
2. the excellent team effort from Senior & Associate Editors, Nicky Cotterill (from Editorial Office to whom manuscript handling is outsourced) and a series of support staff from Wiley Blackwell, most notably Jeremy Theobald, Jo Wixon and (currently) Rupert Cousens.

When I set out as Editor in January 2008 I had a number of goals:

1. To consolidate and build upon prior success
2. To maintain our focus on mechanisms of ‘understanding disease’
3. To improve our time to first and final decisions, and time to publication
4. To develop our international profile and move away from a perception of being national or merely European.
5. To be a high profile journal with reach beyond the scope of “traditional pathology”
6. To expand the breadth of our reach to compete with other general and specialist journals
7. To broaden the brand and to use the brand to strengthen and develop our position

I believe we have achieved 6 of these and the launch of Clinical Journal of Pathology provides the basis for achieving number 7.

We now have a truly international journal widely regarded as being the pre-eminent research pathology journal; examination of papers published in the Journal of Pathology shows they are from many areas and disciplines beyond pathology. Evidence of our success is seen in a doubling in submissions in the last 7 years, thus allowing us to be increasingly selective in what we publish. In addition we now are the first port of call for many North American and other International research groups of high standing.

We have achieved this because of four key details:

1) We now have an international Editorial team (currently 4 in North America and one in Asia plus the rest in Europe).
2) We have a very proactive approach from the Editor in Chief, traveling widely and actively seeking authors and reviewers.
3) We have a total commitment to timely and high quality peer review. Our time to first decision is currently 8 days and to final decision 13 days. We have a fantastic triage process that only allows the very best into the review process – driving quality. Our acceptance rate is 12% of submissions. We publish papers within 7 days of acceptance as pre--- prints (but with DOI).
4) We have a very timely response to all communications from reviewers and authors, providing a sense of engagement and commitment. I would contend that this approach, while time consuming, provides a ‘shop window’ that reflects well on the Journal. We are admired for our professionalism.

I would urge that maintenance of the Journal’s position depends upon these four attributes being continued and further developed. A retreat to a parochial, UK---orientated stance would be a major mistake. To maintain and further develop the Journals position will require major investment and effort. To stand still is to go backwards!

Overview of the last year
2013 was the best year ever for the Journal of Pathology. The Impact factor reached 7.585 and is the highest of any research general pathology journal (again!). Notice our position in comparison with the American Journal of Pathology. Our IF exceeds that of Oncogene and is comparable to many specialist journals in related areas such as Cancer, Cell and Molecular Biology and Genetics. The rise in IF is best seen over a long time frame (see Figure 1). There is some variation but this reflects the metric being a mean of a skewed distribution.

Figure 1: Impact factor over time
**Growth in submissions in last 5 years**

The level of submissions is at an all—time high of 1080 for the year 2013. We have nearly doubled in the last 5 years (See Figure 2). Submissions for 2014 remain very strong.

*Figure 2: Submissions 2009 to 2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the continued increase in submissions the procedures in place make sure that we have timely and effective control over acceptance rates thus ensuring we remain within page budgets. This also allows us to be increasingly stringent.

Our time to first decision is 8 days and to final decision 13 days. These are means of skewed distributions but are highly impressive! Both figures reflect our triage process by which three of the Editorial team consider all submissions within 72 hours. About 75% of all submissions are ‘referred’ at this stage – that is not put into the review process and returned to the authors.

While the overall accept rate is ~12%, it is ~50% for those papers that get through this stringent editorial triage process.

All issues have been published on time, including the 2014 Annual Review Issue. This was Guest Edited by Adrian Jubb, Hartmut Koeppen and Jorge Reis-Filho. Entitled *Pathology in Drug Discovery & Development*, it has a comprehensive array of articles and we anticipate that it will be popular. The 2015 ARI is already in preparation and will be entitled *Viruses and Disease*, with Simon Herrington, Phil Coates and Paul Duprex (Boston USA) as Guest Editors.

Over and above the ARI we have published regular review articles and introduced a new class of review called “*In Brief*”: 2—3 page summaries of important areas.

We have kept the core editorial team the same and anticipate no changes until a new Editor is appointed to replace me by end of 2015. Eric White (Michigan), David Bonthron (Leeds) and Phil Coates (Dundee) are senior editors and work closely with me. The associate editors are Hartmut Koeppen (San Francisco), David Huntsman (Vancouver), Jorge Reis Filho (New York), Ming Du (Cambridge) and Nathalie Wong (Hong Kong).

The international nature of the team is hugely important to ensure our visibility as an International journal and to avoid perception of being a parochial, UK-centric journal. *Our continued success reflects this international approach.*

Our Publishing manager, Rupert Cousens, is very experienced and a great addition to the team starting in October 2013. Other Wiley staff remain in place.
Projects for 2014 included an overhaul of the Author Guidelines and review of the Editorial Board. The former is now complete; the latter is ongoing and it is anticipated that it will be completed by the new Editor in Chief, who can then build their own team.

Finally, we have now launched Clinical Journal of Pathology. It is unfortunate that the timeline I have previously proposed has slipped considerably because of delays imposed by the Societies lawyers. However, we had a successful soft launch at USCAP. We already have an invited review and two original papers in press as well as a joint Editorial with Journal of Pathology. Sources of submission include direct submissions through the Manuscript Central website as well as transfers from submissions to Journal of Pathology.

We are in a fantastic position as an internationally recognised “brand” and as I have argued for several years that we can utilize this position to drive a second journal with a more clinical slant. This will be a significant ‘benefit of membership’ as well as leveraging benefit to the Society in other ways. The Society needs to use this brand much more effectively and I remain disappointed at the lack of imagination from the Officers in this regard.

Conclusions
The Journal of Pathology is a fantastic success story. The past 7 years have been incredibly successful.

The success of the journal is built on the hard work of a whole team, that I have led, and their efforts should be noted by the Society.

Trying to stay in the same place is not a viable option; the Journal needs to constantly improve and innovate just to maintain the same position.

Very significant investment of both time and money will be needed to maintain, and develop, the Journal.

Peter Hall, July 2014

UNDERGRADUATE NETWORK REPORT (NOT ON AGENDA)
The Pathological Society's undergraduate initiative began in earnest at the joint meeting with the BDIAP, held in Edinburgh during the summer of 2013. The project is currently administrated by four medical students, working collaboratively from Manchester and Leeds Universities. The initiative has been thoroughly supported by the Society and its members; a fact demonstrated the significant progress made over the last 12 months.

The scheme broadly aims to increase undergraduate awareness and involvement with the Society and pathology more generally. To do this, there has been a concerted effort to promote pathology on both the local and national level. The following list details the main areas of activity in the project’s inaugural year.

• Initially, to establish a means for promoting the scheme's activities to undergraduates, a method was required to contact individual medical students across the UK. We now have a "network" of students with a presence at 23 of the 33 British medical schools. The undergraduate committee maintains regular communication with this network, promoting the Society's activities and distributing relevant material.

• The establishment of the undergraduate committee has given the medical student a voice within the society. One member of the committee sits as a non-voting member on the executive committee whilst another is available to sit on the trainee's committee. The positive nature with which the society's hierarchy has welcomed undergraduates is
encouraging, ensuring that the activities of the institution will consider the undergraduate perspective.

- On a national level, the society has supported the hosting of several events aimed at encouraging undergraduate involvement with the specialty.

  A. The Royal College was host to a launch event for the network which invited its members from across the UK. Speakers were invited to discuss the role of pathology in undergraduate education and the relevance of the specialty to research and the NHS. All attendees were very positive about the afternoon and the event demonstrates the capacity of the network to establish events on a national level.

  B. The Pathological Society is running a Pathology Summer School aimed at undergraduates in collaboration with the RCPPath and the BDIAP. This event was promoted by the Society's network and, encouragingly, there has been a considerable level of interest.

  C. The undergraduate forum is now a fixture on the agenda at any Society scientific meeting. This session invites undergraduates to present their work to peers and doctors alike, providing an opportunity for members of the specialty to see undergraduate interest in pathology and pathological research. The first of these sessions was held in Edinburgh 2013 at the joint meeting with the BDIAP and similar sessions have now been confirmed for the 2014 meeting in London and the 2015 meeting in Dublin.

The upcoming session in London boasts the presentation of the top 6 ranked undergraduate abstracts, followed debate on undergraduate research between Dr Nigel Kirkham and Professor Michael Wells.

- On a local level, the initiative aims to support the establishment of satellite societies through the provision of advice and sources of funding. These Societies will be ran locally and will be the primary avenue by which the activities of the Society can be effectively promoted. Imperial, Bristol and Aberdeen are the first to establish these satellite societies.

- The Society will be soon launching its’ undergraduate membership which will further serve to crystallise the link between the institution and the medical student. The exact details of the membership are still under discussion and will be published as a separate document once ratified by the committee. Importantly, the RCPPath has agreed to work with the Society to collaboratively promote undergraduate activities, agreeing that dividing undergraduate attention and interest will not be beneficial to either institution. Undergraduate membership is therefore likely to be reciprocal between the Societies.

The integration of extensive undergraduate activity throughout the Pathological Society over the last year has been warmly received. The committee have received encouragement from members across the world who have heard about the project. The wide spread support for this initiative, coupled with an encouraging undergraduate interest, suggests that the project will continue to grow across the next year and beyond.

  John McDermott, Undergraduate Representative, July 2014
### Programme Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The title of the</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The meeting was</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The meeting</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Adequate time</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The meeting met</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) The facilities,</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) The AV facilities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question: 139*

More tables needed for eating at.

Aside from the previous comment regarding the absence of breakfast at the breakfast session, the catering was of a particularly high quality.

A much better focus this time on diagnostic matters and information that is relevant to diagnostic pathology in the present.

This meeting was one of the best 'pathsoc' meetings I have been to. The Tuesday morning meeting was particularly relevant.

Rooms allocated for renal and bone pathology very poor. Fintry lecture theatre excellent.

make more clinically relevant

The renal part of the meeting was not really relevant to my practice. The dermatopathology sessions were good overall good to excellent std of talks

Handouts of the lectures or a memory stick are absolutely essential to try to remember and collate new material weeks to months after the meeting was held as at the USCAP meeting.

This is cutting edge stuff, with a good proportion of sessions relating to current concepts in diagnostic pathology. A very worthwhile week.

great catering!

Too many clashes between educational events for trainees and research meetings.

Lots of people in the secondary meeting rooms struggled with the Mac system/PowerPoint equivalent - a bit more help would have been good, but other than that facilities and in particular catering were excellent.

The low number of attendants may reflect the lack of great pathologists holding chairs today and the fact that the society is the personal fiefdom of a group of individuals, but it is a very sad state of affairs. The far superior performance of the American participants indicates the need for re-thinking/changing attitudes, if UK Pathology should remain a major international force.

fantastic conference venue

Excellent - highly informative and enjoyable.
CPD/Delegate Evaluation Form Edinburgh Pathology 2013, 18-21 June

Symposium: Future of Translational Research and Molecular Pathology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Dr I Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Prof C Gourley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Dr D Gonzalez de Castro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Dr S Deans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Prof C Womack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

Excellent session very informative and educational and pitched the right level.
Excellent. More please.
These were informative but not particularly educational presentations.
Nice mix of backgrounds to get different perspectives
make more clinically relevant
An interesting session looking at the future of pathology.
Dr David Gonzalez de Castro has strong command of his discipline, very impressive.

Symposium: Upper Gastrointestinal Pathology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof TJ Stephenson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Dr NAS Wong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Mr CJ Peters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Prof NA Shepherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

High I suppose but a bit boring
These were presentations of high educational content.
Good stuff for the general pathologist.
Shepherd did not deliver anything new and his rather cavalier approach raises criticism. Wong’s bad presentation compares unfavourably with the GIST lecture of a previous meeting (June, 2012). Peters offered some useful information, but nothing more. Stephenson: most convincing of the group, but it remains to be seen if he is able to produce a great lecture.

Trainees’ Symposium: The Part 2 Histopathology Exam and New Royal College of Pathologists’ Curriculum - What They Mean to You?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Dr KP West</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Dr DM Bailey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Dr NH Anderson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Dr JA Henry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Dr N Kirkham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Prof SB Lucas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Dr E Benbow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
- The whole session was very useful and interesting
- A very useful forum for both trainees and trainers
- Brilliant session, made junior trainees like myself realise that there is a chance to pass the part 2 with the right approach, thank you
- Very interesting from the perspective of where the training process will be going in the future
- Highly informative and useful talks on the various exams and curriculum changes
- Very good overview; made it seem do-able.
- HIGHLY APPRECIATED

Pathological Society 10th Doniach Lecture: Simplicity and Complexity - Improving Outcomes in Bowel Cancer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof P Quirke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
- Excellent lecture
- Very good
- Excellent afternoon session on histopath exam
- Outstanding
- Good "role model" talk!!
- Very interesting career and a good insight into how changes in practice are made
- Great recognition for someone who has done a great deal for the pathological community
- It would be interest to compare Florey's and Quirke'a achievements. One wonders whether Ellis shall be the choice for the 11th Doniach Lecture.
- Wonderful talk: well done Phil.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent and wide ranging talk very impressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantastic lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW THINGS FOR ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trainees Breakfast Session - Post-Mortem Histology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof SB Lucas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>answered question</strong> 28</td>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong> 130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Symposium: Gynae-Endometrial Pathology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof GL Mutter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Prof WG McCluggage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Dr A Al-Nafussi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Dr ARW Williams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Renal Pathology Mini- Symposium: New Insights into the Pathogenesis of Glomerular Diseases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof P Brenchley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Prof VD D'Agati</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Prof J Feehally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the transplant eqa should have just been excluded due to the IT problems

The symposium was mainly on molecular studies, though interesting not relevant for DGH pathologists who are not involved in research. If this had been clarified earlier on, I would have probably not attended the meeting

The other two talks (by EP Dinneen and DT Kipgen) were both very well done

Very interesting and informative - a very worthwhile day

Very useful annual meeting to stay in touch

I attended renal pathology day on Wednesday. Previously I have attended Oxford renal pathology course and found that very useful. But I didn’t find Wednesdays talks much useful to me as a reporting pathologist. It is good to have an insight into the new developments. However I felt that majority of talks

Symposium: Pancreatobiliary Pathology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Respons Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (LOW) 2 3 4 5 (HIGH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof AK Foulis &amp; Dr SJ 1 1 5 17 40</td>
<td>4.47 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Prof I Esposito 1 4 11 25 23</td>
<td>4.02 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Prof G Kloppel 0 3 11 30 21</td>
<td>4.06 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Prof F Campbell 1 0 7 28 24</td>
<td>4.23 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Dr T Hagemann 1 0 9 27 17</td>
<td>4.09 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Respons Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (LOW) 2 3 4 5 (HIGH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Interesting, particularly Prof Foulis.

Many speakers simply presented a series of illustrations together with some refs; nothing that could not be found in the literature; personal approaches / contributions often lacking. The diabetes talk should await collection of further data.

Excellent coverage of current areas

Pathological Society Oakley Lecture: Post-Genomic and Post-Transcriptional Mechanisms in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Respons Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (LOW) 2 3 4 5 (HIGH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Dr JPC Le Quesne 0 1 12 26 25</td>
<td>4.17 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Respons Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (LOW) 2 3 4 5 (HIGH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

inspiring

Too research orientated for myself

Of some interest, but it would be better if an established authority (preferably not a pathologist) had addressed the shift from transcriptional to translational research.

Good content; not great delivery

very impressive! the future of pathology is in good hands
### CPD/Delegate Evaluation Form Edinburgh Pathology 2013, 18-21 June

**Symposium - Investigative Imaging**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Dr VG Brunton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Dr SIK Semple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Dr MR Dweck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Prof ISD Roberts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Dr JM Lucocq</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Miss K Cox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

- Really excellent symposium
- Best session of the conference. Dr Brunton gave the best talk of the session
- Some very good presentations.
- Extremely interesting symposium, good idea
- Did not attend
- Only attended half this session, but the lectures were excellent
- This was a really excellent symposium

**Symposium - Bone and Soft Tissue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof C Fisher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Prof NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Dr OME Albagha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Prof AM Flanagan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Prof JVM Bovee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

- Dr Albagha's lecture was dire - please remember a lot of your audience are trainees and if you are presenting hard molecular science of Paget's disease, then at least make it clear why you are doing this research and what the clinical implications are! To me (Post FRCPath trainee), this lecture was purely to show off hard science that is not grounded
- Flanagan needs to be reminded of her limitations. Fisher's talk was of interest, but the technology applied is not within the grasp of all laboratories (including university ones). One wonders why Athanasou's HEs are of a poor quality. Bovee presented her own research, but the value of this needs to tested against time.

**Trainees Session - Meet the Experts: Medical Renal Pathology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof ISD Roberts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Dr JM Lucocq</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Miss K Cox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

- Answered question 38
- Answered question 45
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof ISD Roberts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>great session and really appreciated him giving extra time to go through more cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please consider repeating this session in future years and focusing on other areas it is getting increasingly difficult to experience during training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent session with interesting cases presented in a logical way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Lecture: Clearance of Dying Cells in Control of Inflammation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof Sir John</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too short and not enough depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An interesting lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CPD/Delegate Evaluation Form Edinburgh Pathology 2013, 18-21 June
Slide Seminar Discussion Session: Inflammatory Skin Pathology

Answer Options 1 (LOW) 2 3 4 5 (HIGH) Rating Average Respons e Count

a) Dr A Biswas 0 0 0 5 9 4.64 14
b) Dr M Mathers 0 0 5 14 8 4.11 27

Comments
Good cases and well discussed. I would like to mark 4 for Dr Mathers, but the survey is not accepting this score!!
Excellent cases

Symposium - Update Lectures in Dermatopathology

Answer Options 1 (LOW) 2 3 4 5 (HIGH) Rating Average Respons e Count

a) Prof WJ Mooi 0 1 6 17 17 4.22 41
b) Dr E Calonje 0 1 6 13 19 4.28 39
c) Dr P Jansen 1 2 10 16 9 3.79 38
d) Dr T Brenn 1 0 6 17 16 4.18 40
e) Dr LA Jamieson 2 2 6 19 10 3.85 39

Comments
Highly unconvincing performance by Jamieson. Jansen was a bad choice of speaker. It would be best for everybody if Brenn gets off his self-constructed pedestal a.s.a.p. One gets tired of Calonje's presentations that only serve as advertisements of personal publications the scientific value of which is a matter of dispute. Mooi could have performed better if not wrapped in a cocoon of self importance.

Symposium - Testicular Pathology

Answer Options 1 (LOW) 2 3 4 5 (HIGH) Rating Average Respons e Count

a) Dr VE Reuter 0 0 2 4 17 4.65 23
b) Dr JM Theaker 0 0 2 8 13 4.48 23
c) Dr C Verrill 0 0 2 12 10 4.33 24
d) Prof DM Berney 0 0 2 8 13 4.48 23
e) Dr VE Reuter 0 0 2 8 14 4.50 24
That whole symposium was my favourite one!!! Very, very usable for my daily practise!

did not attend

Fantastic presentations

It is lamentable that the best lectures of the meeting have been delivered by Americans.

The BDIAP Kristin Henry Lecture: Bowel Cancer Screening: Extraordinary Conundra for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prof NA Shepherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

excellent - can be modified for public lecture at another occasion

Superb.

It would be interesting to compare Florey's and Shepherd's achievements!
### Programme Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The title of the meeting interested me</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The meeting was relevant to my CPD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The meeting contained new ideas and</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Adequate time was given for discussion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) The meeting met my expectations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) The facilities, catering arrangements met</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) The AV facilities were of high quality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question** 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) London</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) N. England</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Scotland</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Wales</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) N. Ireland</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question** 23

### Comments

- central England
- Midlands
- any University or Hospital in UK
- Europe
- South of England
- Birmingham

### How did you hear about this Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Membership communication</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Newsletter</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Website</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Colleagues(s)</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question** 29

### Comments

- Other (please specify)

### Are you a member of the Pathological Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Yes</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) No</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question** 30

### If you are NOT a member of the Pathological Society - would you like to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Yes</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) No</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question** 17
### CPD/Delegate Evaluation Form (RCPaht) ACEM Satellite Meeting Thursday 20 June

**Association of Clinical Electron Microscopists - 16th Annual Scientific Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1 (LOW)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (HIGH)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Glenn Anderson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Wolfgang Muss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Bart Wagner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) John Lucoq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Catherine Horsfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Ray Griffin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(answered question)*