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**Out with the old**

- Too radiologists attending 2 meetings a year as per RCR guidelines
- Too many errors
- Too many discussions
- Too many blame
- Too many individual issues
- Too many poor attendance
- Too many poor feedback

---

**In with the new**

- Focus on mistakes
- Cases anonymised and used as a basis for learning points, not for blame
- Focus on education and patient safety
- Individuals felt singled out

---

**Background**

- The Royal College of Radiology (RCR) first published guidance on running a discrepancy meeting in 2008: Meetings throughout the UK have traditionally been of variable quality. Historically in Leeds attendance, contribution and morale were poor. Since 2012 we have tried to improve the meetings and here we share our experience.
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**First we rebranded it**

In order to emphasise the change in culture the “cases meeting was renamed “The Educational Cases Meeting”. A regular more suitable venue was found and the timetable published in advance. A chairman organised the program and collected cases from the entire consultant body. This was a popular change, in 2014 the RCR updated their guidance suggesting renaming the errors meeting “Learning from discrepancy meeting”.
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**Then we set standards**

Colleagues were reminded of their responsibility to follow Royal College guidelines for minimum attendance of 3 meetings per year. In addition they were encouraged to contribute a minimum of one case per year via the standard template to the chairman, present audits and organise targeted teaching on behalf of their sub-specialty.

**Education, Education, Education**

- We wanted to emphasise the importance of education rather than individual existing. We did this by:
  1. Summarising the educational points after discussing each discrepancy case.
  2. Linking the case with targeted teaching.
  3. Linking the educational cases meeting with a rolling targeted teaching season run by each sub-specialty in turn.
  4. Integration of the educational cases meeting into the Trust PACS system after each meeting.

**We used L.T. to make the meeting interesting and interactive**

Interactive voting (e.g. grey) or difficult cases was very successful in keeping the audience engaged (Fig. 8).

**We gave feedback**

Every consultant who contributed a case, whose case was discussed, or who contributed an audit presentation or targeted teaching session, was sent a standard feedback letter following the meeting.

**We ended up with a better meeting**

Prior to 2012 only a minority of the workforce attended the meeting regularly. Now 75% of consultants attend 3 or more meetings per year. During the last 2 years feedback has been good and engagement has increased with more consultants contributing cases (Fig. 10).
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