**Overall Evaluation Form**

Pre-Meeting Course: Complications and Risk Stratification in Deformity Surgery – An Evidence Based Approach

September 21, 2016 in Prague, Czech Republic

SRS respects and appreciate your opinions. To assist us in evaluating the effectiveness of this activity and to make recommendations for future educational offerings, please take a few minutes to complete this evaluation form.

**Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate rating:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 = Outstanding | 4 = Good | 3 = Satisfactory | 2 = Fair | 1 = Poor |

# Extent to Which Program Activities Met the Identified Objectives

*After completing this activity, participants should be able to:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Describe what risk stratification is and how it can impact patient care | 4.27 |
| * Identify predictors of outcomes and implement them in their care plans | 4.08 |
| * Utilize information about cost in developing strategies to optimize cost effective care | 3.96 |

# Effectiveness of the CME content

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Objectives were related to overall purpose/goal(s) of activity. | 3.92 |
| * Enhanced my current knowledge base. | 4 |
| * Will help me improve patient care. | 3.77 |
| * Provided new ideas or information I expect to use. | 3.88 |
| * Was timely and will influence my practice of medicine. | 3.96 |
| * Addressed my most pressing questions. | 3.69 |
| * Was free from commercial bias or influence | 4.19 |

**If the content of this course was NOT free from commercial bias, please explain why:**

No comments

**How could the effectiveness of this CME activity be improved?:**

* When discussed the several regional differences, from US, Europe and South America, I would like to hear also from Asia and Oceania
* Great presentations, made for a very full day.
* Presentation on cost per HRQOLY for treatment options and methods of assessing risk vs benefits
* This was entirely irrelevant to my practice and in future would prefer to limit such sessions to half a day at most

**Please indicate any changes you plan to make in your practice of medicine as a result of information you received from this activity:**

* Use more of the predictive tools for informed consent.
* Take more attention to a pre-op plan with multidisciplinary work-up team stablished to each case
* Multi-disciplinary conferences, increased communication with anesthesia and ancillary staff. Team building.
* Get psych profile on patients preop
* Nil

**In what time frame do you anticipate making these changes?** Out of 26

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Immediately | 1-2 Months | 3-6 Months | At Some Point in the Future |
| 15.38% (4) | 19.23% (5) | 11.54% (3) | 30.77% (8) |

**Based on my participation in this CME activity, I will now incorporate the following new clinical strategies (check all that apply):** out of 26

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 53.85%  14 | Consistently select surgical and non-surgical interventions based on a thoughtful review of current indications and contraindications for various spinal pathologies. |
| 57.69%  15 | Carefully consider documented benefits versus known potential complications in the treatment of various pathologies. |
| 42.31%  11 | Develop consistent treatment plans for particular problems to achieve more predictable results |
| 42.31%  11 | I already do all these things |

**If you do not plan to incorporate the above clinical strategies, please list the factors acting as barriers:**

* I believe that I already do these things, but I will re-evaluate my practice to confirm.
* "Hospital allowing use of HRQOL standardized forms without IRB and research process

Needs to be accepted by administration as QA and standardized medical care questionnaire instead of research

Assistance from societies at national level would be helpful"

* Our group have limitations/barries that most public teams back in Brazil suffer: difficult chatting/ time spent on others specialties evaluation, anaesthesiology, ICU, department ward beds available, and limited resources to solve critical and elective pacients.
* yes

**Would more information on the following subjects help to improve your care of patients?:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Absolutely** | **To Some Extent** | **Not At All** |
| **Emerging Technology** | 10 | 15 | 1 |
| **Pre-operative Planning** | 16 | 9 | 1 |
| **Outcomes** | 14 | 10 | 2 |
| **Complications** | 16 | 8 | 1 |
| **Instrumentation** | 10 | 16 | 0 |
| **Surgical Approaches** | 11 | 14 | 1 |
| **Non-Operative Management** | 7 | 16 | 3 |
| **Biologic Options** | 8 | 5 | 13 |

**Other:**

* Performing live surgeries during the event by several centres all connected around the world would be quite an interesting challenge!!

**Please rate the effectiveness of the following presentation formats:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very Effective** | **Somewhat Effective** | **Not At All Effective** |
| **Expert Lecture** | 17 | 9 | 0 |
| **Panel Discussion** | 17 | 9 | 0 |

**What other presentation formats should SRS consider utilizing for the Pre-Meeting Course?**

* Current format is very effective
* Participants / panel review of cases submitted prior to meeting from attendees
* Very interesting for me, it exceeded my expectations

**Please provide general comments regarding this activity and suggest how it might be improved:**

* Very interesting for me, it exceeded my expectations! So important to have prominent presenters, making spine significant for every attendee

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * This activity was designed to help the participant master the ABMS/ACGME core competency of patient care and medical knowledge. How well did this activity address this competency? | 4.12 |

**SESSION EVALUATION FORM**

*Pre-Meeting Course*

September 21, 2016 Prague, Czech Republic

**Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate rating:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 = Outstanding | 4 = Good | 3 = Satisfactory | 2 = Fair | 1 = Poor |

**Overall Session Evaluation**

This session: Session 1. Basic Concepts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Enhanced my current knowledge base. | 4.29 |
| * Will help me improve patient care. | 4 |
| * Provided new ideas or information I expect to use. | 4.21 |
| * Was timely and will influence my practice of medicine. | 4.14 |
| * Addressed my most pressing questions. | 4.07 |
| * Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence | 4.43 |

**Session Faculty Evaluation**

Effectiveness of the Individual Faculty Members

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speakers** | **Knowledge of Subject Matter** | **Effective in Presenting Material** | **Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence** |
| Dahl | 4.38 | 4.42 | 4.25 |
| Sethi | 4.62 | 4.33 | 4.33 |
| C. Crawford | 4.62 | 4.17 | 4.33 |
| Berven | 4.31 | 4.17 | 4.08 |
| Sørensen | 4.25 | 4 | 4.18 |
| Ondra | 4.08 | 4.36 | 3.91 |
| Munhoz Da Rocha | 4.25 | 4.09 | 4.27 |
| Shah | 4.5 | 4.36 | 4.36 |
| Daubs | 4.58 | 4.45 | 4.36 |
| Wagner | 4.75 | 4.64 | 4.27 |
| (Panel) Berven | 4.42 | 4.27 | 4.18 |
| (Panel) Daubs | 4.36 | 4.33 | 4.11 |
| (Panel) Sethi | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.18 |
| (Panel) Song | 4.33 | 4.36 | 4.18 |
| (Panel) Wagner | 4.5 | 4.45 | 4.18 |

**Overall Session Evaluation**

This session: Session 2. The Current Status of Risk Stratification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Enhanced my current knowledge base. | 4.33 |
| * Will help me improve patient care. | 4 |
| * Provided new ideas or information I expect to use. | 4 |
| * Was timely and will influence my practice of medicine. | 4.08 |
| * Addressed my most pressing questions. | 4 |
| * Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence | 4.45 |

**Session Faculty Evaluation**

Effectiveness of the Individual Faculty Members

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speakers** | **Knowledge of Subject Matter** | **Effective in Presenting Material** | **Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence** |
| Koski | 4.42 | 4.33 | 4.08 |
| Sethi | 4.58 | 4.67 | 4.25 |
| Ames | 4.45 | 4.45 | 4.33 |
| Burton | 4.5 | 4.58 | 4.42 |
| Hey | 4.42 | 4.17 | 4 |
| J. Sanders | 4.27 | 4.5 | 4.17 |

**Overall Session Evaluation**

This session: Session 3. Pediatrics and Risk Stratification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Enhanced my current knowledge base. | 4.45 |
| * Will help me improve patient care. | 4.1 |
| * Provided new ideas or information I expect to use. | 4.09 |
| * Was timely and will influence my practice of medicine. | 4.09 |
| * Addressed my most pressing questions. | 4.09 |
| * Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence | 4.36 |

**Session Faculty Evaluation**

Effectiveness of the Individual Faculty Members

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speakers** | **Knowledge of Subject Matter** | **Effective in Presenting Material** | **Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence** |
| Vitale | 4.36 | 4.18 | 4.27 |
| J. Sanders | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.27 |
| Vitale | 4.36 | 4.18 | 4.09 |
| Newton | 4.36 | 4.45 | 4.18 |
| Hasler | 4.27 | 4.18 | 4.27 |
| McLeod | 4.27 | 4.09 | 4.1 |
| Brighton | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.2 |

**Overall Session Evaluation**

This session: Session 4. ASD and Risk Stratification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Enhanced my current knowledge base. | 4.4 |
| * Will help me improve patient care. | 4.2 |
| * Provided new ideas or information I expect to use. | 4.56 |
| * Was timely and will influence my practice of medicine. | 4.4 |
| * Addressed my most pressing questions. | 4.3 |
| * Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence | 4.5 |

**Session Faculty Evaluation**

Effectiveness of the Individual Faculty Members

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speakers** | **Knowledge of Subject Matter** | **Effective in Presenting Material** | **Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence** |
| Lenke | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.2 |
| Dahl | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4 |
| Matsumoto | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4 |
| Jayaswal | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.33 |
| De Kleuver | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.2 |
| Choma | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.1 |

**Overall Session Evaluation**

This session: Lunchtime Symposium. The Most Significant Spinal Deformity Papers Published in the Past Three Years

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Enhanced my current knowledge base. | 4.5 |
| * Will help me improve patient care. | 4 |
| * Provided new ideas or information I expect to use. | 4 |
| * Was timely and will influence my practice of medicine. | 4 |
| * Addressed my most pressing questions. | 4 |
| * Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence | 4.67 |

**Session Faculty Evaluation**

Effectiveness of the Individual Faculty Members

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speakers** | **Knowledge of Subject Matter** | **Effective in Presenting Material** | **Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence** |
| J. Sanders | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.33 |
| Hu | 4.57 | 4.29 | 4.29 |
| Rubery | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.29 |

**Overall Session Evaluation**

This session: Lunchtime Symposium. Physiotherapeutic Scoliosis Specific Exercises: Update for Therapeutic Exercises in the Treatment of Scoliosis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Enhanced my current knowledge base. | 4 |
| * Will help me improve patient care. | 3.75 |
| * Provided new ideas or information I expect to use. | 3.75 |
| * Was timely and will influence my practice of medicine. | 3.75 |
| * Addressed my most pressing questions. | 4.25 |
| * Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence | 4.25 |

**Session Faculty Evaluation**

Effectiveness of the Individual Faculty Members

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speakers** | **Knowledge of Subject Matter** | **Effective in Presenting Material** | **Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence** |
| Richards | 4.25 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Negrini | 4 | 3.75 | 3.5 |
| E. Parent | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Kwan | 3.75 | 4 | 4 |
| Muccio | 4 | 3.75 | 4 |
| Price | 4 | 3.75 | 4 |
| Vitale | 7.47 | 4.5 | 4.25 |
| Skaggs | 5 | 4.5 | 4 |

**Overall Session Evaluation**

This session: Lunchtime Symposium. Biology and Mechanics of Junctional Failures

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Enhanced my current knowledge base. | 4.17 |
| * Will help me improve patient care. | 4.33 |
| * Provided new ideas or information I expect to use. | 4.5 |
| * Was timely and will influence my practice of medicine. | 4.67 |
| * Addressed my most pressing questions. | 4.33 |
| * Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence | 3.8 |

**Session Faculty Evaluation**

Effectiveness of the Individual Faculty Members

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speakers** | **Knowledge of Subject Matter** | **Effective in Presenting Material** | **Avoided Commercial Bias or Influence** |
| Lenke | 4.83 | 4.83 | 4 |
| Kebaish | 4.67 | 4.5 | 4 |
| S. Parent | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.4 |
| Schwab | 4.5 | 4.17 | 4 |
| Mehta | 4.67 | 4.33 | 3.83 |