



# FRAME OF REFERENCE for the FACULTY RESEARCH FORUM ORGANISING COMMITTEE of the FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

## 1. NAME

Faculty and Student Research Forum of the Faculty of Health Sciences.

## 2. MISSION

To confirm the value of quality research and strengthen an academic and scientific approach, with the Forum as display for the research in the Faculty and to give exposure to the staff members and students.

## 3. POINTS OF DEPARTURE AND FUNCTIONS

- ❖ The committee has executive and implementation authority in respect of the Faculty Research Forum.
- ❖ The committee reports to Faculty Management.
- ❖ The committee organises the annual Faculty and Student Research Forum, which takes place in August each year.
- ❖ The Faculty Heads of Departments appoints the following internal evaluation committees:
  - Clinical
  - Laboratory
  - Education/Qualitative
- ❖ Appoints external evaluation committees for the above, with the choice of one evaluator per committee who attends the forum and contributes to the evaluation of the presentations during the Forum.
- ❖ Regarding the FP Retief speaker:
  - Collection of nominations.
  - Compilation of a shortlist, which the chairperson presents to the Dean for approval.
  - The chairperson contacts the person and invites him/her to present the lecture.
  - The administrative officer sends a letter to make all arrangements.
  - The liaison officer is responsible for the travel and accommodation arrangements.
  - The FP Retief speaker is also invited to the Dean's Dinner and the prize-giving of the Forum.

## 4. MAIN ROLES OF THE COMMITTEE

- ❖ Planning and organising of the Research Forum for the Faculty and student group.
- ❖ Facilitating the availability of financing for the Forum.
- ❖ Compiling the budget.
- ❖ Arranging exhibitors at the Forum.
- ❖ Election of internal evaluation committees.
- ❖ Appointment of external evaluators.
- ❖ Arranging the FP Retief speaker.
- ❖ Appointing session chairpersons.
- ❖ Compiling Forum programme.
- ❖ Evaluation of articles for medals, papers/abstracts and posters.
- ❖ The winners of the Forum are appointed by the internal evaluation committees.

- ❖ Arranging the prize-giving function.
- ❖ Research office advises and supports presentation participants to publication.

## 5. MODUS OPERANDI

### 5.1 Faculty Research Forum

The following persons are invited:

- ❖ The Rectorate.
- ❖ Deans of other UFS faculties.
- ❖ Directorate Research Development.
- ❖ Deans of other universities' Faculties of Health Sciences.
- ❖ Deans of Universities of Technology.
- ❖ The liaison officer places an advertisement in *Volksblad*.

#### 5.1.1 Internal Evaluation Committee

- *Term on committee:*  
The term extends over three years. In the third year, the person acts as chairperson of the relevant selection committee. The chairperson attends the Organising Committee's meetings.
- *Medals:*  
Articles for the medals are sent to the chairpersons of the evaluation committees in May/June. The chairperson arranges a meeting with the committee members in order to select the five best articles. The administrative officer sends the five articles to the three external evaluators of each selection committee, after which the Department of Biostatistics will statistically determine the winners of the medals.

Prerequisites for consideration:

- Journals must use peer evaluation.
- The participant must be the first author.
- The first author must be a staff member and/or student of the Faculty of Health Sciences, UFS.
- The article must have an affiliation with the University and give recognition to the University, regardless of where the research took place.
- Only articles that were published in the preceding year between January and December may be presented (electronic/online or in printed publications).
- John van der Riet medal: awarded to the clinical disciplines.
- Muller Potgieter medal: for the laboratory disciplines.
- Kerneels Nel medal: for the educational discipline.

Evaluation:

- The evaluation form for the assessment of Research Articles as well as Review Articles, sent to external evaluators is attached. Appendix A

Online articles:

- The author of an article has the choice to present the article as it appeared online, or the printed article for evaluation, but not both. In all cases it must be a full-length article that has been subject to peer review.
- Articles published in a reputable online publication will also be accepted for entry for the medals.

Appointment of runners-up:

- Runners-up are only appointed if the article's evaluation result is within 5% of the winner's result.

- *Abstracts:*  
Abstracts for papers and poster presentations for the three disciplines are sent to the members of the

three committees in July. The chairperson arranges a meeting with the other two members, in order that the abstracts may be selected. The chairperson reports back to the administrative officer which abstracts have been selected.

- \* It must have been approved by a head of department / programme director / other senior colleague.
- \* Ethics approval is essential. Foreign research studies must also be presented to the Ethics Committee and an Ethics Committee approval number (ETOVS/ECUFS number) must be awarded. No abstract without an ETOVS/ECUFS number will be accepted.
- \* A format has been created and a maximum of 300 words (from Introduction through to the end of Conclusion) is allowed. An abstract may be submitted in Afrikaans or English.
- \* The abstract must contain results and come to a clear conclusion on the basis of the results.
- \* The methodology of a qualitative research study should include and clearly describe the method as well as the type of study.
- \* The abstract must be structured as follows:
  - Title in bold;
  - Authors, and underline the author who will present;
  - Departments of all authors;
  - Leave one line open, then without lines in between:
  - Introduction and purpose;
  - Method;
  - Results;
  - Conclusion; and
  - Source references, acknowledgements, tables and graphic figures must be omitted.
- Guidelines for the judging of the abstracts are attached. Appendix B
- Two presentations on the same subject are not acceptable.
- Assessment of the qualitative papers. Appendix C
- Assessment of the quantitative papers. Appendix D
- Assessment of the posters and poster presentations. Appendix E
- *During the Forum:*

The committee members must attend all the sessions to appoint the winners and runners-up of the following:

  - Clinical / laboratory / educational papers and posters at senior (with doctoral degree/specialists) and junior (without doctoral degree) level.
  - Before, during and after the Forum, the chairpersons of the committees are the hosts of the external evaluators and are responsible for their transport in Bloemfontein at all times.
  - The chairpersons of the relevant internal evaluation committees are responsible for sending the files, together with the results of their relevant disciplines' presentations, to the administrative officer. The chairperson must also inform the officer of which abstracts are publishable.
- *After the Forum:*

The chairpersons of each internal evaluation committee must compile a report to be sent to the chairperson of the Organising Committee two weeks before the debriefing meeting. The administrative personnel must also send reports to the chairperson of the Organising Committee.

### 5.1.2 External Evaluation Committee

- Suggestions of recognised researchers (clinical, laboratory and education/qualitative) are requested from the members of the three evaluation committees.
- The suggestions are presented to the Organising Committee for approval.
- The names of the persons who will attend the Forum must serve at the Faculty Heads of Departments meeting for final approval.
- The chairperson of the relevant evaluation committee must contact the persons and invite them to act as external evaluators.
- The external evaluator is requested to notify the Organising Committee immediately should he/she no

longer be able to act as external evaluator, in order for the Organising Committee to select another person to act as external evaluator.

- Two evaluators will evaluate the articles. The third person will evaluate the articles and attend the Forum to evaluate the abstracts and presentations. This person must also give a lecture at the Forum.
- The chairpersons of the evaluation committees must give the names and contact numbers to the administrative officer.
- The liaison officer is responsible for communication with the external evaluators regarding all administrative arrangements.
- The chairpersons of the evaluating committees will communicate with the external evaluators on matters regarding the evaluation of the articles.
- The liaison officer and relevant evaluation committee should be CC'ed on all communications with the external evaluators.

### 5.1.3 Session chairpersons

- Must take strict note of the time limit. A paper lasts 15 minutes and a poster presentation 4 minutes.
- Must initiate questions after delivery of the paper / poster presentation.
- Must introduce the guest speaker in their session.
- Must explain how the CPD marks system works.
- Must ask for cell phones to be switched off.

### 5.1.4 FP Retief speaker

- ❖ Nominations are received from the heads of departments, it is discussed at the Organising Committee meeting and a shortlist is compiled. The names are presented by the chairperson to the Dean for approval, after which the chairperson will contact the relevant person and invite him/her to present the lecture.
- ❖ The administrative officer sends a letter to make all necessary arrangements.
- ❖ The liaison officer is responsible for the travel and accommodation arrangements.
- ❖ The speaker is also invited to the Dean's Dinner and the prize-giving function.

### 5.1.5 Programme and arrangements

- *Compiling the programme*  
The programme is compiled according to the Forum template by the administrative officer, in conjunction with the chairperson. The internal committee members place abstracts in order / groupings, which will help make the programme more streamlined.
- *Language*  
The slides and abstracts may be presented in one language (Afrikaans or English), while the presentation may be in another language (Afrikaans or English). It is, however, unacceptable for a presentation / abstract / slideshow to be done in the two languages combined.
- *Theatre-, clinic- and lecture-free days*  
A letter is sent to all heads of departments of the three schools to make the two days of the Forum theatre-, clinic- and lecture-free days, and that only emergencies will be dealt with.
- *Manning of posters*  
Posters need not be manned during tea time. The presenter's name and telephone number must appear on the poster for enquiries.
- ❖ *Information letter*  
An information letter is distributed to all members of the Faculty via MEDmail in the beginning of each year.

Appendix F

### 5.1.6 Ethics Committee

- ❖ Approval by the Ethics Committee in respect of studies conducted in foreign countries and presented at the Forum (Ethics Committee 09/06/2009) is necessary.

- ❖ Faculty members who have conducted / are conducting research in foreign countries must present the research protocol to the Ethics Committee;
- ❖ An ETOVS/ECUFS number will be awarded to the study;
- ❖ Should the research study already have been conducted, the Ethics Committee will take cognisance of the study and cannot approve it;
- ❖ The awarding of the ETOVS/ECUFS number to a research project does *not* mean that the Ethics Committee approves the study, but is merely an administrative procedure that is done according to routine, namely to register all research projects handed in with the administration of the Ethics Committee;
- ❖ During an Ethics Committee meeting the research project is discussed and decisions made. After an Ethics Committee meeting the decisions regarding the research project will be given to the researcher in an official letter. This letter is the only indication of whether cognisance was taken of a research study and whether it has been approved or rejected.
- ❖ When a research project has been done in a foreign country and ethical approval had been obtained, please attach a copy of the specific document to your protocol, which you hand in with the Ethics Committee. When it is presented to the UFS Ethics Committee, an ETOVS/ECUFS number is awarded and the committee takes cognisance of the study. .
- ❖ Approval by the Ethics Committee is essential. No abstract without an Ethics ETOVS/ECUFS number will be accepted. Ethics Committee approval is applicable to case studies as well as clinical audit studies.

#### 5.1.7 Sponsors and exhibitors

- ❖ No advertising material (branding) will be allowed in any of the lecture halls where the presentations will be held.

#### 5.1.8 Session chairpersons

- ❖ Appointment of session chairpersons
  - The following persons are automatic session chairpersons:
    - First session: chairperson of Organising Committee;
    - Last session: Dean;
    - Heads of schools;
    - Chairpersons of Research Committees of the three schools; and
    - Chairperson of the Ethics Committee.
- ❖ Nominations for session chairpersons will be requested by the executive committees of each of the three Schools. These nominations are then communicated to the administrative officer.
- ❖ Session chairpersons are contacted telephonically by the administrative officer to determine if they are prepared to do this, and which session would suit them.
- ❖ The administrative officer sends written confirmation to the session chairpersons with the date, time and venue. The guidelines for session chairpersons are attached. Appendix G

#### 5.1.9 Information sessions and testing of computers

- ❖ Researchers should ensure on the Wednesday before the Forum that their presentations are stored correctly on the Kine computers. The Kines will be available.
- ❖ Information documents for young and less experienced researchers: On the Intranet \ General \ Faculty\_Forum there are various information documents that may be consulted.
- ❖ A session to ensure the presentations are correctly loaded on the computer is arranged for the Friday or Monday (depending on students' timetables) before the Student Research Forum between 13:00-14:00.

#### 5.1.10 Invitations to Faculty research forum

- ❖ The Directorate, Deans of other UFS faculties and Directorate Research Development;
- ❖ Deans of other Universities' medical faculties;
- ❖ Deans of universities of technology;
- ❖ The liaison officer places an advertisement in *Volksblad*; and
- ❖ List of involved persons can be obtained from liaison officer.

#### 5.1.11 Dean's Dinner, lunches and tea times

- All of the above are free.
- Guest list for Dean's Dinner:
  - \* Members of the Organising Committee, without partners
  - \* External evaluators attending the Forum
  - \* FP Retief speaker
  - \* Dean acts as host
- Guest list for lunches (40-50 persons):
  - \* Committee members
  - \* Exhibitors
  - \* Evaluators
- Guest list for tea times (250 persons):
  - \* Refreshments during the two mornings' tea.

#### 5.1.12 Prize-giving function

- Master of ceremonies and person responsible for the toast on the Faculty:
  - \* This person must be appointed during the June meeting.
  - \* It must rotate annually between the three schools.
  - \* The administrative officer has a list.
- Should it be a function where a formal sit-down meal with grace is indicated, the same arrangements will apply as for the responsible person as mentioned above.
- Winners:
  - All winners are to attend the Prize Giving Ceremony after completion of the Forum.
  - \* The administrative officer contacts the prize-winners as soon as the winners of the medals are known.
  - \* The winners are announced and the medals handed over during the prize-giving function.
  - \* The winners of the papers and posters will be announced at the Prize Giving Ceremony.

#### 5.1.13 Who may participate

- ❖ The researcher must be a staff member of a department/division of the Faculty, and the work must be done by the staff member in the Faculty.
- ❖ Should work be done at another institution, e.g. abroad, it must have been done with the permission of the Faculty.
- ❖ Should a staff member be appointed in the Faculty after completion of the work and had done the work themselves, the staff member may participate.
- ❖ Postgraduate students of the Faculty may participate.
- ❖ Enrolled undergraduate students take part in the Student Research Forum.
- ❖ External persons with lecturer status.
- ❖ Individuals and institutions who have a formal and informal association with the Faculty may participate.
- ❖ Description: junior and senior  
*Junior category:* Participants WITHOUT a doctor's degree.  
*Senior category:* Participants WITH a doctor's degree and specialists.
- ❖ In all three disciplines, a winner and runner-up is announced for both the papers and posters in the junior and senior divisions.

#### 5.1.14 Promotion of publications amongst participants

- ❖ The Research office consults with each of the presenting participants to advise and support them to promote presentations to publications. With each committee meeting, feedback may be given with regard to the promotion of the presentations.

## 5.2 Student Research Forum

### 5.2.1 Chairperson

- The chairperson will be appointed on a rotating basis between the three schools, for a period of three

consecutive years.

- The exposition of the vice-chairmanship is as follows:
  - \* 2011: School of Allied Health Professions
  - \* 2014: School of Nursing
  - \* 2017: School of Medicine
  - \* 2020: School of Allied Health Professions

#### 5.2.2 Presentations per school

- The number of presentations per school is selected proportionally to the number of student research groups per school.
  - School of Allied Health Professions: 8 (2 presentations from each department: Occupational Therapy, Physiotherapy, Nutrition and Dietetics, and Optometry)
  - School of Medicine: Maximum of 10
  - School of Nursing: 2

#### 5.2.3 Judging panel

- One representative from each school, plus a representative from the Department of Biostatistics.
- The chairperson of the judging panel rotates between the three schools.
- The chairperson will be elected on a rotation basis from the three Schools:
  - 2014 – School of Medicine
  - 2015 – School of Allied Health Professions
  - 2016 – School of Nursing

#### 5.2.4 Session chairpersons

- One representative from each of the other two schools, depending on which school the chairperson of the Student forum represents.

#### 5.2.5 Programme

- Welcome: Chairperson of Student Research Forum.
- Opening: One of the medal winners of the previous year's Faculty Forum. Should none of the medal winners be available, the vice-chairperson of the Organising Committee will take over this function.
- Acknowledgement and announcing winners: Chairperson of Student Research Forum.

#### 5.2.6 Prize money

- The representatives of the three schools are responsible for the obtaining sponsors.
- The amounts sponsored by each of the Schools are determined each year in collaboration with the Executive Committee / Management Committee of the three schools.
- The representative of the three schools is responsible for obtaining the sponsors.
  - School of Medicine: R1 000
  - School of Allied Health professions: R1 200
  - School of Nursing: R300

#### 5.2.7 Student representatives

- Two student representatives must be chosen annually to serve on the committee. It is not necessary for students to attend all meetings, but they must be available during the Student Forum to assist as required by the chairperson.
- Student representatives are elected on rotation basis from the three Schools:
  - 2011 – School of Nursing
  - 2012 – School of Medicine
  - 2013 – School of Allied Health Professions

## 6. MEETINGS

### ❖ Regularity of meetings

- Meetings are scheduled to take place monthly, usually on a Thursday.
- In August, two meetings are held.
- In October, a debriefing meeting is held on the recently completed Forum.
- In September a financial meeting must be held to plan a presentation and budget for the next year's Forum, to ensure financing.

❖ **Language of meeting**

- Meetings will take place in English and Afrikaans according to Faculty policy.

❖ **Logistical arrangements**

- Meetings take place in the Boffie Strydom Committee Room.

❖ **Quorum**

- 50% of members plus 1 member = 7+1

❖ **Reporting**

- To the Faculty Management and Dean.

❖ **Procedures**

- Agendas
  - \* Matters for discussion must be submitted to the secretariat at least seven working days before the meeting.
  - \* The agendas will be sent to the members by e-mail four working days before the meeting.
- Minutes
  - \* Minutes will be kept, typed and sent electronically to each member.

## 7. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

❖ **Committee members**

- Chairperson
- Vice-chairperson
- Dean
- Head/Representative: School of Medicine
- Head/Representative: School of Allied Health Professions
- Head/Representative: School of Nursing
- Chairperson: Clinical Evaluation Committee
- Chairperson: Laboratory Evaluation Committee
- Chairperson: Education / Qualitative Evaluation Committee
- Chairperson: Student Research Forum
- Liaison officer
- Director/Representative: Faculty Administration
- Representative: Research Administration
- Student representative
- Secretariat
- Faculty Research Director

❖ **Vice-chairperson of Organising Committee (FMC 25/02/2003 par.11.1)**

- As the School of Medicine is substantially larger than the other two schools, the chairperson will be appointed alternately every second year between the Schools of Allied Health Professions and Nursing (see list below).
- The Schools of Allied Health Professions and Nursing will appoint the person themselves.
- The appointed person must be a professor or associate professor, or at least hold a PhD degree.

- The person from the School of Medicine will be appointed at a meeting of the School of Medicine Heads of Departments (Academic).
- From 2010 it will be as follows (FMC 13/05/2010 Par 1.8.4.3)
  - \* 2010: School of Nursing
  - \* 2011: School of Medicine
  - \* 2012: School of Medicine
  - \* 2013: School of Allied Health Professions
  - \* 2014: School of Medicine
  - \* 2015: School of Medicine
  - \* 2016: School of Nursing
  - \* 2017: School of Medicine
  - \* 2018: School of Medicine
  - \* 2019: School of Allied Health Professions
  - \* 2020: School of Medicine
  - \* 2021: School of Medicine

❖ **Sub-Financial Committee**

- The committee comprises the chairperson, Dean, liaison officer and deputy director. The chairperson must convene the meeting.
- Meetings will be held on predetermined dates, where the budget, quotations and all other financial implications will be discussed.
- A concept budget must be presented to the Organising Committee during the meeting in May.

❖ **Office of the Research Director, Faculty of Health Sciences**

- The office of the Research Director will assist and advise paper participants until publication of their work.

❖ **Internal Evaluation Committees**

- Clinical Evaluation Committee
  - \* Three clinically grounded members who have knowledge of clinical research.
- Laboratory Evaluation Committee
  - \* Three members from laboratory-oriented disciplines OR
  - \* Three laboratory-grounded members who have knowledge of laboratory research.
- Education/Qualitative Evaluation Committee
  - \* Three educationally grounded members:
    - One member from the School of Allied Health Professions
    - One member from the School of Medicine
    - One member from the School of Nursing
- ❖ The choice of co-opting on the evaluation committees may be executed in order that an expert may be involved as needed.
- ❖ An internal committee member involved as co-author in an abstract, should also evaluate their own work according to the provided rubric. These rubrics will be made available in the event that any questions are raised with regards to the results.
- ❖ Guidelines for internal evaluators: Appendix H

## 8. LINE FUNCTION

The chairperson of the Research Forum reports to the Dean and the Faculty Management.

Compiled by: Dr A Sherriff  
April 2012



**ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH ARTICLES**

**Article:**

You are requested to assess the following articles by means of the included criteria.  
A **Likert scale** will be used for assessment. The interpretation of the scale is as follows:

0	1	2	3	4	Not applicable
---	---	---	---	---	----------------

- 0 – Not done at all
- 1 – Poor
- 2 – Average
- 3 – Good
- 4 – Excellent

Evaluation scale							
Article		0	1	2	3	4	Not applicable
		Not done	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
1. Abstract	1.1 Represents the article in its entirety						
2. Introduction and problem statement	2.1 Literature grounded						
	2.2 Clearly formulated						
	2.3 Scientific						
3. Goal	3.1 Goal is clearly stipulated (qualitative research requires no goal)						
4. Method	4.1 Design is applicable						
	<b>AND</b>						
	Clearly set out and described						
	4.2 Research technique clearly described						
	4.3 Population suitable and clearly discussed						
	4.4 Test sample size is sufficient (in qualitative research saturation is usually the norm and not the numbers)						
	4.5 Data collection is in conjunction with the method						

	4.6 Credibility is discussed according to qualitative research norms						
	<b>OR</b>						
	Validity and dependability is discussed according to quantitative norms						
	4.7 Method of analysis clearly set out						
5. Results	5.1 Data is accurately presented						
6. Findings / Discussion	6.1 Findings are supported by data						
	6.2 Refers to the research problem						
	6.3 Meaningful recommendations are made						
	6.4 Limitations of the study are clearly set out						

General impression on the scientific character and completeness of the article	1	2	3	4
Value of study within the subject area	1	2	3	4

<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>For office use</b>
--------------	--	-----------------------

23 March 2004



### ASSESSMENT OF REVIEW ARTICLES

#### Article:

You are requested to assess the following articles by means of the included criteria.  
A **Likert scale** will be used for assessment. The interpretation of the scale is as follows:

0	1	2	3	4	Not applicable
---	---	---	---	---	----------------

- 0 – Not done at all
- 1 – Poor
- 2 – Average
- 3 – Good
- 4 – Excellent

		Evaluation scale					Not applicable
Article		0	1	2	3	4	
		Not done	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
1. Abstract	1.1 Represents article as a whole						
2. Introduction and statement of purpose	2.1 Introduction clearly formulated						
	2.2 Introduction scientific						
	2.3 Introduction provides suitable background to the aim of the review						
	2.4 Introduction includes clear statement of purpose of review						
3. Content of review article	3.1 Description of criteria used to select articles						
	3.2 Information sources adequately described						
	3.3 Literature reviewed comprehensive						
	3.4 Literature review unbiased						
4. Results	4.1 Facts/data accurately and clearly presented						
5. Conclusion	5.1 Review addresses statement of purpose						
	5.2 Meaningful recommendations made						

	5.3 Limitations of the study clearly stated						
	5.4 Areas for further research identified						
6. Overall	6.1 Review novel and topical						
	6.2 Structure of review appropriate and clearly written						

General impression on the scientific character and completeness of the article	1	2	3	4
Value of study within the subject area	1	2	3	4

<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>For office use</b>
--------------	--	-----------------------



FACULTY RESEARCH FORUM

**GUIDELINES FOR THE JUDGING OF ABSTRACTS**

**1. LENGTH OF ABSTRACTS**

The maximum number of words (from Introduction through to the end of Conclusion) is 300. The total number of words must be indicated on the abstract form.

**2. LANGUAGE OF ABSTRACTS**

An abstract may be submitted in Afrikaans or English.

**3. STRUCTURE OF ABSTRACTS**

The abstract must contain results and come to a clear conclusion based on the results.

The abstract must be structured as follows:

- Title
- Authors (presenters' name underlined)
- Departments of all authors
- Name of person who will do presentation
- Introduction and goal
  - Method
  - Result
  - Conclusion

Source references, acknowledgements, tables or graphic figures must be omitted.  
There is a template for the abstract.

Example:

**THE INFLUENCE OF FINASTERIDE ON THE URINARY STEROID PROFILE OF HEALTHY MALE VOLUNTEERS**

E Grobbelaar, PJ van der Merwe, L Potgieter

South African Doping Control Laboratory, Department of Pharmacology, UFS.

Presented by E Grobbelaar

*Introduction and aim:* Testosterone is mainly metabolized in the human body by the enzymes 5 $\alpha$ - and 5 $\beta$ -reductase. The metabolites of testosterone are 5 $\alpha$ -androstenediol and androsterone ( $\alpha$ -pathway) and 5 $\beta$ -androstenediol and etiocholanolone ( $\beta$ -pathway). The urinary steroid profile is obtained by measuring the concentration of testosterone and these metabolites. Other anabolic steroids like 19-nortestosterone follow the same metabolic pathway with the  $\alpha$ -pathway metabolites predominant. Finasteride is a drug that inhibits the enzyme 5 $\alpha$ -reductase and therefore can potentially reduce the excretion of the  $\alpha$ -pathway metabolites. The aim of this study was to determine the influence of finasteride on the urinary steroid profile of healthy male volunteers.

*Methodology:* Six healthy male volunteers participated in the study. Fractional urine samples were collected for 24 hours prior to administration of finasteride to obtain a baseline. A single dose of 5mg finasteride was administered and urine samples were collected for 7 days. The concentrations of testosterone (T), 5 $\alpha$ -androstenediol (5 $\alpha$ -diol), 5 $\beta$ -androstenediol (5 $\beta$ -diol), androsterone (A) and etiocholanolone (E) were measured by GC/MSD. These concentrations were used to determine the ratios A/E, and 5 $\alpha$ -diol/5 $\beta$ -diol.

*Results:* There is a significant decrease in the concentration of the  $\alpha$ -pathway metabolites with an increase in the  $\beta$ -pathway metabolites. This resulted in a significant decrease in the ratios of A/E (87%) and 5 $\alpha$ -diol/5 $\beta$ -diol (87%) within 24 hours post administration of finasteride.

*Conclusion:* The use of finasteride may reduce the concentration of metabolites formed by the  $\alpha$ -pathway to below the limit of detection leading to a false negative result. Finasteride may therefore be used as a masking agent for anabolic steroids and this justifies the inclusion of finasteride on the WADA list of prohibited substances.

**QUALITATIVE RESEARCH  
FACULTY RESEARCH FORUM EVALUATION OF PRESENTATIONS**

<b>Assessment criteria</b>	<b>No performance</b>	<b>Minimal performance</b>	<b>Adequate performance</b>	<b>Excellent performance</b>
<b>1. APPEARANCE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-7</b>	<b>8-11</b>	<b>12-15</b>
Clear and controlled voice Logical flow of information, well-paced Relaxed and enthusiastic style Eye contact and interest of audience held	No compliance	Minimal compliance	Adequate compliance	Excellent compliance
<b>2.1. INTRO. AND PROBLEM STATEMENT</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Clear discussion depicting the context Clear statement of problem/question/scientific gap filled Persuasive / convincing motivation	None attempted	Minimal discussion Inadequate context Inadequate problem statement Inadequate motivation	Adequate discussion Adequate context Adequate problem statement Persuasive motivation	In-depth discussion Clear context Clear problem statement Convincing motivation
<b>2.2. PURPOSE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4-5</b>
Clearly states the specific purpose of study	None attempted	Inadequate statement of the purpose of study	Adequate statement of the purpose of study	Clear statement of the purpose of study
<b>2.3. METHODS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-9</b>	<b>10-15</b>	<b>16-20</b>
Logically ordered Study design is indicated and appropriate Clear description of population Clear description of sampling (unit of analysis) techniques Clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria Explorative interview was done and described Trustworthiness and ethical issues discussed Meticulous description of study techniques / procedures Analysis used is clearly identified	None attempted	Minimal attempt at fulfilling the assessment criteria	Adequate attempt at fulfilling the assessment criteria	Good attempt at fulfilling the assessment criteria
<b>2.4. RESULTS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Clearly reports analysed data relating to aim/objectives Results correctly interpreted Logically ordered	None attempted	Minimal	Adequate	Excellent
<b>2.5 CONCLUSION</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Concise summary of meaning of findings in context	None attempted	Inadequate	Adequate	Excellent
<b>3. SCIENTIFIC VALUE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Study is novel and has relevance and value	None	Minimal compliance	Adequate compliance	Excellent compliance
<b>4. VISUAL AIDS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Clear, readable, attractive, informative, relevant	No compliance	Minimal compliance	Adequate compliance	Excellent compliance
<b>5. ABSTRACT</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Compact, readable, stand-alone summary of project	No compliance	Minimal compliance	Adequate compliance	Excellent compliance



**QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH  
FACULTY RESEARCH FORUM EVALUATION OF PRESENTATIONS**

<b>Assessment criteria</b>	<b>No performance</b>	<b>Minimal performance</b>	<b>Adequate performance</b>	<b>Excellent performance</b>
<b>1. APPEARANCE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-7</b>	<b>8-11</b>	<b>12-15</b>
Clear and controlled voice Logical flow of information, well-paced Relaxed and enthusiastic style Eye contact and interest of audience held	No compliance	Minimal compliance	Adequate compliance	Excellent compliance
<b>2.1. INTRO. AND PROBLEM STATEMENT</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Clear discussion depicting the context Clear statement of problem/question/scientific gap filled Persuasive / convincing motivation	None attempted	Minimal discussion Inadequate context/motivation Inadequate problem statement	Adequate context/discussion Adequate problem statement Persuasive motivation	In-depth discussion Clear context / motivation Clear problem statement
<b>2.2. PURPOSE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4-5</b>
Clearly states the specific purpose of study	None attempted	Inadequate statement of the purpose of study	Adequate statement of the purpose of study	Clear statement of the purpose of study
<b>2.3. METHODS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-9</b>	<b>10-15</b>	<b>16-20</b>
Logically ordered Study design is indicated and appropriate Clear description of population and inclusion exclusion criteria Clear description of sampling (unit of analysis) techniques Pilot study was done and described Validity and reliability is discussed Meticulous description of study techniques/procedures used Statistical analysis used is clearly identified Meticulous description of study techniques / procedures Analysis used is clearly identified Ethical issues discussed	None attempted	Minimal attempt at fulfilling the assessment criteria	Adequate attempt at fulfilling the assessment criteria	Good attempt at fulfilling the assessment criteria
<b>2.4. RESULTS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Clearly reports analysed data relating to aim/objectives Results logically ordered and correctly interpreted	None attempted	Minimal	Adequate	Excellent
<b>2.5 CONCLUSION</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Concise summary of meaning of findings in context	None attempted	Inadequate	Adequate	Excellent
<b>3. SCIENTIFIC VALUE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Study is novel and has relevance and value	None	Minimal compliance	Adequate compliance	Excellent compliance
<b>4. VISUAL AIDS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Clear, readable, attractive, informative, relevant	No compliance	Minimal compliance	Adequate compliance	Excellent compliance
<b>5. ABSTRACT</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>8-10</b>
Compact, readable, stand-alone summary of project	No compliance	Minimal compliance	Adequate compliance	Excellent compliance



**FACULTY RESEARCH FORUM  
ASSESSMENT FORM: POSTER AND POSTER PRESENTATION**

<b>SESSION 4</b>		
<b>KPV-#</b>	<b>TIME</b>	<b>NAME OF POSTER</b>
		<u>Authors</u>
		Department of
<b>Level:</b>	<b>Senior/Junior</b>	<b>Male/Female</b>

Use these criteria to assess the poster presentation on a scale from 1- 5

1 = set criteria has not been mastered;

2 = partially mastered;

3 = mastered;

4 = mastered above set criteria; and

5 = excellent

SECTION	MAXIMUM SCORE	ADJUDICATORS SCORE
<b>Poster and content</b>	<b>25</b>	
<b>Scientific design</b> Is the information of value to the understanding of the topic? Is the problem well defined? Does the title reflect the contents of the study? Is the methodology scientifically sound?	<b>5</b>	
<b>Data, analysis and interpretation</b> Is the presentation of the data scientific (use of decimal etc.) Is the analysis of the data appropriate? Does the data substantiate the conclusions?	<b>5</b>	
<b>Layout and design of the poster</b> Is the poster easy to follow in terms of organization and layout? Are the different sections clearly defined? Is the poster free of unnecessary detail or duplication?	<b>5</b>	
<b>Visuals: Text, graphs and tables</b> Is the font size appropriate? Are there spelling or grammatical errors? Are there typographical errors on the poster? Are graphs and tables self-explanatory?	<b>5</b>	
<b>Overall Impression</b> Overall use of colour and design?	<b>5</b>	
<b>Poster presentation</b>	<b>25</b>	
<b>Communication</b> Did the presenter effectively communicate the poster contents?	<b>5</b>	
<b>Demeanour</b> Was the presenter professional and neat?	<b>5</b>	
<b>Coherency</b> Were the arguments presented in a logical manner?	<b>5</b>	

<b>Response to questions</b> Were answers appropriate and demonstrate an understanding of the topic?	<b>5</b>	
<b>Enthusiasm</b> Was the presentation enthusiastic?	<b>5</b>	
<b>FINAL MARK</b>	<b>50</b>	
<b>Penalties</b>		
Poster and poster presentation drastically diverges from the abstract	<b>-10</b>	
Allocated time is exceeded	<b>-10</b>	
<b>FINAL PERCENTAGE</b>	<b>100</b>	

**General Comments:**

---



---



---

Division: Research Administration  
Faculty of Health Sciences  
University of the Free State  
Enquiries: Ms L De Reuck  
Room D104, Francois Retief Building  
E-mail: [dereuckl@ufs.ac.za](mailto:dereuckl@ufs.ac.za)  
Tel: 051 401 2848 / Fax: 051 401 9061

**TO: ALL HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS, SENIOR LECTURERS, LECTURERS, MEDICAL SCIENTISTS, ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONALS, TECHNOLOGISTS AND POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS**

**Re: FACULTY RESEARCH FORUM: 28 AND 29 AUGUST 2014**

Herewith a friendly reminder of our Faculty Research Forum that will be held on **Thursday 28 and Friday 29 August 2014**.

One of the most important yardsticks used to evaluate academic institutions is the quality of the research conducted at such an institution. At the Faculty of Health Sciences we place a high premium on the quality of research, and quality research is conducted on an on-going basis. The pursuit of improvement, a scientific approach and academic enrichment remains one of the objectives of the Faculty. The aim of the Faculty Research Forum is to serve as a showcase for all the research conducted in the Faculty and also as exposure for junior personnel members.

Personnel members involved in research are therefore invited to use this opportunity for presenting the results of their research.

The following persons may participate:

- i) The researcher must be a staff member of a department/division of the Faculty, and the work must be done by the staff member in the Faculty.
- ii) Should work be done at another institution, e.g. abroad, it must have been done with the permission of the Faculty.
- iii) Should a staff member be appointed in the Faculty after completion of the work and had done the work themselves, the staff member may participate.
- iv) Postgraduate students of the Faculty may participate.
- v) Enrolled undergraduate students take part in the Student Research Forum.
- vi) External persons with lecturer status.
- vii) Individuals and institutions who have a formal and informal association with the Faculty may participate.

In order to facilitate the arrangement of the Forum, kindly note the following:

## **1. ABSTRACTS**

- 1.1 Papers will be the main theme at the Faculty Research Forum.
- 1.2 Only **three papers** that relate to a group research project will be accepted.
- 1.3 The closing date for the submission of abstracts of papers and poster presentations is **Wednesday, 16 July 2014**.
- 1.4 You are requested to click on the link that will be sent to you via MEDmail or e-mail, and complete your details on the webpage (this will replace Form A).

- 1.5 Approval by the Ethics Committee is essential. **No abstract will be accepted without an Ethics Committee registration number.** An Ethics Committee registration number must be obtained for case studies as well as clinical audit studies.
- 1.6 Your application will be submitted electronically and will only be eligible for submission once abstracts are uploaded.
- 1.7 Please note that selection as well as assessment will be based on the content of abstracts.
- 1.8 The abstract will be included in the programme in its original format. It will not be possible to do language and technical editing beforehand. You must therefore ensure that your submission is sub-edited for publication. Photocopies will not serve this purpose.
- 1.9 A maximum of three (3) abstracts with the same Ethics Committee registration number will be accepted.
- 1.10 Abstracts that fail to meet the requirements will not be accepted. It will be returned to the author and requested that the necessary changes within 24 hours be made within 24 hours. Neglect to do so will lead to the non-acceptance of the abstract.

## 2. **FORMATTING:**

- 2.1 The format of the abstract has already been created.
- 2.2 The template will be available on the intranet as well as on the webpage where one can apply for submission.
- 2.3 Please take the following into account when preparing the abstracts:
  - i) The maximum number of words (from Introduction to the end of the Conclusion) is 300. The number of words must be indicated on the abstract form. An abstract may be submitted in Afrikaans or English.
  - ii) The abstract must contain results and come to a decisive conclusion based on the results.
  - iii) The abstract must be structured as follows:
    - Title in bold
    - Authors (presenter must be underlined)
    - Departments of authors
    - Person presenting the abstract
    - Introduction and aim
    - Methodology
    - Results
    - Conclusion
- 2.4 References, acknowledgements, tables or graphics must be omitted.



## 2.5 Example:

### THE INFLUENCE OF FINASTERIDE ON THE URINARY STEROID PROFILE OF HEALTHY MALE VOLUNTEERS

E Grobbelaar, PJ van der Merwe, L Potgieter

South African Doping Control Laboratory, Department of Pharmacology, UFS.

Presented by E Grobbelaar

*Introduction and aim:* Testosterone is mainly metabolized in the human body by the enzymes 5 $\alpha$ - and 5 $\beta$ -reductase. The metabolites of testosterone are 5 $\alpha$ -androstenediol and androsterone ( $\alpha$ -pathway) and 5 $\beta$ -androstenediol and etiocholanolone ( $\beta$ -pathway). The urinary steroid profile is obtained by measuring the concentration of testosterone and these metabolites. Other anabolic steroids like 19-nortestosterone follow the same metabolic pathway with the  $\alpha$ -pathway metabolites predominant. Finasteride is a drug that inhibits the enzyme 5 $\alpha$ -reductase and therefore can potentially reduce the excretion of the  $\alpha$ -pathway metabolites. The aim of this study was to determine the influence of finasteride on the urinary steroid profile of healthy male volunteers.

*Methodology:* Six healthy male volunteers participated in the study. Fractional urine samples were collected for 24 hours prior to administration of finasteride to obtain a baseline. A single dose of 5mg finasteride was administered and urine samples were collected for 7 days. The concentrations of testosterone (T), 5 $\alpha$ -androstenediol (5 $\alpha$ -diol), 5 $\beta$ -androstenediol (5 $\beta$ -diol), androsterone (A) and etiocholanolone (E) were measured by GC/MSD. These concentrations were used to determine the ratios A/E, and 5 $\alpha$ -diol/5 $\beta$ -diol.

*Results:* There is a significant decrease in the concentration of the  $\alpha$ -pathway metabolites with an increase in the  $\beta$ -pathway metabolites. This resulted in a significant decrease in the ratios of A/E (87%) and 5 $\alpha$ -diol/5 $\beta$ -diol (87%) within 24 hours post administration of finasteride.

*Conclusion:* The use of finasteride may reduce the concentration of metabolites formed by the  $\alpha$ -pathway to below the limit of detection leading to a false negative result. Finasteride may therefore be used as a masking agent for anabolic steroids and this justifies the inclusion of finasteride on the WADA list of prohibited substances.

### 3. CATEGORIES OF PARTICIPATION AND EXPLANATION OF TERMS (Only three abstracts per person per category will be accepted, but not on the same subject.)

#### 3.1. Papers (Category A)

- i) Clinically-orientated
- ii) Laboratory-orientated
- iii) Educational research

#### 3.2. Poster presentations (Category B)

- i) Clinically-orientated
- ii) Laboratory-orientated
- iii) Educational research

#### 3.3. Junior personnel member

Staff members WITHOUT a doctor's degree or MMed

#### 3.4. Senior personnel member

- i) Personnel members WITH a doctor's degree
- ii) Specialists (MMed)

#### 3.5. Laboratory-orientated

Include results in which the patients are not directly involved. It might therefore comprise new analytical methods or the development of new antibodies for possible clinical application, or even new surgical procedures on animals before clinical application.

#### 3.6. Clinically-orientated

Papers/presentations in the clinical group will include results affecting the treatment of patients.

#### 3.7. Education and/or qualitative research

All qualitative research and/or research investigating undergraduate or postgraduate student training. This could include the development of learning programmes, curricula, educational techniques, learning methods or any other student-related matter. It may also include qualitative research that would advance patient treatment.

### 4. PRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 15 minutes (5 minutes discussion and question time included) will be allowed for the reading of a paper. The duration will be strictly adhered to. Presentations will take place in the Kines.
- 4.2 4 minutes (2 minutes for presentation and 2 minutes discussion and question time included) will be allowed for a poster presentation. The duration will be strictly adhered to. Poster presentations will be presented in the foyer of the Faculty's Building.
- 4.3 The paper/poster must be presented in such a manner that any person in the audience would be able to understand it.
- 4.4 Selection will be based on submitted abstracts.
- 4.5 Personnel members submitting papers or posters must in each case indicate the category in which they wish to be evaluated, if they wish to be evaluated at all.
- 4.6 The impression the presentation makes on the audience, the scientific content and value; as well as visual aids used during the presentation will play a role in the evaluation of a presentation.
- 4.7 Facilities for colour slides and computer presentations will be available only for presentations
- 4.8 Persons delivering presentations are politely requested to load their presentations onto the folder marked Kine 1, Kine 2 or Kine 3. Further particulars will be forwarded in due course.
- 4.9 Corporative format is compulsory. Information in this regard is available on the UFS Home Page, Staff Intranet, UFS Corporate Identity. If using PowerPoint, take note that the first and last slide must comply with the Corporate Identity.

## 5. POSTERS

### 5.1 **Poster size: maximum 1.37 X 1.80 m ( $\pm$ 10 cm deviation will not be penalised)**

5.2 4 minutes (2 minutes for presentation and 2 minutes *discussion and question time included*) will be allowed for a poster presentation. The duration will be strictly adhered to. Poster presentations will be presented in the Foyer of the Faculty's Building.

5.3 Since it will not be possible to supervise the posters at all times, the *name and telephone number* of the presenter must appear on the poster in order that he/she may be contacted should there be enquiries.

5.4 Posters must be set up on **Wednesday, 27 August**.

5.5 Posters must not be taken down before 14:00 on Friday afternoon.

5.6 Personnel members that are submitting posters must indicate whether they want their poster to be evaluated.

5.7 The care that went into the preparation of the poster and the aesthetic impression it creates, its scientific content and value, the methodology, results and conclusion will play a role in the judging of a poster.

5.8 The graphics division of CHESD can be service to you regarding the layout and printing of posters.

5.9 Corporative format is compulsory and portrait outlay is preferred. Information in this regard is available on the UFS Home Page, Staff Intranet, UFS Corporate Identity.

## 6. SUBMISSION OF ARTICLES WITH A VIEW TO THE AWARDING OF THE MULLER POTGIETER, JOHN VAN DER RIET AND KERNEELS NEL MEDALS

During the Faculty Research Forum, three medals are awarded to the authors of the best scientific articles published in a scientific journal. The requirements are as follows:

6.1 Journals must have made use of peer review

6.2 The participant must be one of the authors

6.3 The first author must be a personnel member and/or student of the Faculty

6.4 The article that is submitted must have an affiliation with the University. Acknowledgement must also be given to the University, regardless of where the research had been conducted.

6.5 Articles published between January and December of the previous year may be submitted for evaluation.

6.6 Articles published in a reputable online publication will also be accepted for entry for the medals.

The John van der Riet medal is awarded in the clinical disciplines, the Muller Potgieter medal in the laboratory disciplines and the Kerneels Nel medal in the educational research. The closing date for submission of articles is **Friday, 25 April 2014**.

## 7. FLOATING TROPHIES

Floating trophies will be awarded to the three best papers in each of the three categories.

## 8. ANNOUNCEMENT OF WINNERS

The winners will be announced directly after the Forum during a cocktail reception. All participants must be present. No winner will be contacted. Please keep the entire afternoon until 18:00 free.

I wish to thank you in advance for the attention you will once again devote to the Faculty Research Forum this year and for your expected participation, which will contribute towards the success of this important event.

Yours sincerely



**M. Oberholzer**

**CHAIR: ORGANISING COMMITTEE 2014**



**FACULTY RESEARCH FORUM  
GUIDELINES TO SESSION CHAIRPERSONS**

1. A paper lasts 15 minutes (including 5 minutes discussion and question time).
2. A poster presentation lasts 4 minutes (including 2 minutes discussion and question time).
3. The author's name underlined in the summary will do the presentation.
4. **In each case you must be very alert to the time duration.** As the programme is very full, no session may go over the time.
5. Facilities are available for computer projection in the Kines for the presentation of papers.
6. The exhibition and presentation of posters are in the foyer of the Faculty building.
7. Please ensure after tea and lunch times that all the judges are present before starting the session.
8. After the presentation of the paper/poster the chairperson must initiate questions.
9. Should a guest speaker talk during your session, you must introduce the speaker. A CV of the person will be sent to you prior to the event.
10. Explain how the CPD marking system works (CPD forms will be handed out before a session).
  - i) For each hour one point is awarded.
  - ii) Points are only awarded for the attendance of a whole session.
  - iii) A person who wants to score points must ensure that he fills out the correct colour form and hand this in after the session. Should an incorrect colour form be handed in, or be incomplete, he/she will not score points.
11. Please ask that cell phones be switched off, to not disturb the speakers.



**FACULTY RESEARCH FORUM**  
**GUIDELINES FOR THE INTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**1. TERM ON COMMITTEE**

- The term runs over three years. In the third year you will serve as chairperson of the specific selection committee (Clinical / Laboratory / Education / Qualitative / Discipline).
- The chairperson attends the Organising Committee meetings, which are usually scheduled for a Thursday.

**2. JOHN VAN DER RIET, MULLER POTGIETER AND KERNEELS NEL MEDALS**

- Articles for the medals are sent to the chairpersons of the evaluation committees in May/June. The chairperson organises a meeting with their committee members in order that the best five articles may be selected.
- Before the May meeting the members must identify three external evaluators (the third evaluator is the external evaluator who will judge abstracts during the Forum). The names of the external evaluators must serve at the Organising Committee for approval. As soon as the external evaluators have been approved, it is the task of the respective disciplines' chairperson to contact the external evaluators and confirm whether they are available to act as evaluators. Thereafter the names of the persons who will attend the Forum must serve at the Faculty Heads of Departments Meeting for final approval.
- The chairperson then sends the names and contact details to the administrative officer. The administrative officer sends the five articles to the three external evaluators, after which the Department of Biostatistics statistically determines the winners of the medals.

**3. ABSTRACTS**

- Abstracts for clinical / laboratory / education papers and poster presentation are sent to the members in June. The chairperson organises a meeting with the other two members in order that they abstracts may be selected. The chairperson reports to the administrative officer which abstracts have been selected or not.

**4. DURING THE FORUM**

- During the Forum the committee members must attend all the sessions to appoint the winners and runners-up of the following:
  - Senior winner: clinical / laboratory / education paper;
  - Senior runner-up: clinical / laboratory / education paper;
  - Senior winner: clinical / laboratory / education poster presentation;
  - Senior runner-up: clinical / laboratory / education poster presentation;
  - Junior winner: clinical / laboratory / education paper;
  - Junior runner-up: clinical / laboratory / education paper;
  - Junior winner: clinical / laboratory / education poster presentation; and
  - Junior runner-up: clinical / laboratory / education poster presentation.
- During, before and after the Forum the chairpersons of the evaluation committees are the hosts of the external evaluators and are at all times responsible for their transport in Bloemfontein.
- An internal committee member must withdraw from the evaluation when an abstract is being presented by a family member or if you are involved as co-author in a specific abstract.

Additional evaluators would be used in such cases.

- It is the responsibility of the chairpersons of the various internal evaluation committees to send all files, together with the results of their particular disciplines' presentations, to the administrative officer. Similarly you must also notify the administrative officer which abstracts are publishable. You will receive the necessary documentation in this regard, which must be completed.

## **5. AFTER THE FORUM**

- A meeting is held after the Forum to discuss any problems and bring suggestions to the table. The chairpersons of each internal Evaluation Committee must compile a report, which they must send to the chairperson of the Organising Committee two weeks before the Debriefing Meeting.
- The chairpersons of the committees must send their debriefing reports to the chairperson of the Organising Committee two weeks before the debriefing meeting. Your input will be discussed at this meeting.
- The administrative personnel (administrative and liaison officer) must also submit reports to the chairperson of the Organising Committee.