



**70<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting**

**June 12-14, 2016**

**The Delta Hotel / PEI Convention Centre, CHARLOTTETOWN, PE**

**“Patient First Collaborative Care – The Role of the  
General Otolaryngologist-Head and Neck Surgeon”**

## **2016 SESSION-SPECIFIC EVALUATION FORMS**

### **Overall Learning Objectives**

---

This meeting provides learners in the specialty of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery (including general and subspecialty otolaryngologists as well as resident and medical student trainees) a significant opportunity to attend sessions of interest and acquire further understanding and knowledge in areas of perceived / unperceived weakness in the specialty. All branches of the specialty, including head & neck oncology, laryngology, rhinology, otology, neurotology, pediatric otolaryngology, facial plastic and reconstructive surgery, general otolaryngology, sleep disorders, and medical education, are part of the program.

Building on the success of last year, we will run three concurrent sessions of workshops and podium presentations. New this year is the addition of an extra day of general, subspecialty and resident sessions, as well as a series of debates. This provides delegates with a great variety of learning opportunities. As always, there will be ample time allotted for enhanced dialogue, discussion and interaction with the various presenters. In keeping with the theme of this year’s meeting, guest speakers will present their areas of expertise through plenary talks and workshops. Increased numbers of workshops will give each learner practical and adoptable knowledge to use immediately in practice when they return home. We will also have a series of pre-convention courses designed to give impactful hands-on experience to attendees. Also addressed in this year’s program will be workshops and presentations for the community-based practitioners, continued information on technological advancements in education, and popular updates in a variety of topics.

**This meeting is an Accredited Group Learning Activity (Section 1)  
as defined by the Maintenance of Certification Program of the Royal College of  
Physicians and Surgeons of Canada.**

## INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO RECEIVE YOUR OFFICIAL CERTIFICATE OF ATTENDANCE:

In this booklet you will find **ALL** the session-specific evaluation forms for the meeting. Please complete the appropriate sections and return the booklet to either the meeting's **REGISTRATION DESK** (by the end of the meeting) or the **SOCIETY'S OFFICE BEFORE July 30<sup>TH</sup>**. Your certificate will be sent according to the instructions below.

If **CONFIDENTIALITY** is an issue, **DETACH** this sheet and send it to us **SEPARATELY**.

Your opinion and feedback is **ESSENTIAL**. It will be used to help plan future CPD/CME events.

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Max. Credits for 70<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting: 22.25 hrs.</b></p> |
|---|

**DELEGATE NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_

I wish to have my certificate of attendance **EMAILED** to: \_\_\_\_\_

I wish to have my certificate **MAILED** to:

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ Prov: \_\_\_\_\_ Postal Code: \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL CREDIT HOURS CLAIMED:**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

**Society's mailing address:**

Canadian Society of Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery

68 Gilkison Street, ELORA, ON N0B 1S0 Tel: 800-655-9533 Fax: 519-846-9529 Email: [csso.hns@sympatico.ca](mailto:csso.hns@sympatico.ca)

**Sunday, June 12 @ 07:30 – 10:00**

**Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom**

**CPD Credit Hours = 2.50**

**OPENING PLENARY SESSION**

Guest of Honour Presentation– R. Gore-Hickman, Saskatoon, SK / Lifetime Achievement Award Presentation – P. Gullane, Toronto, ON / Guest Speaker Presentation – The Evolving Significance of Metastatic Lymph Nodes in Papillary Thyroid Cancer. Do Changes in the ATA Clinical Practice Guidelines Make Sense? - M. Urken, New York, NY / Celebrating Our Own Presentations: E. Massoud, Halifax, NS and A. Chiodo, Toronto, ON

Learning Objectives: N/A

Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |           |            |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good | Excellent  |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |           |            |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |           |            |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |           |            |

**Sunday, June 12 @ 10:30 – 11:15**

**Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom**

**CPD Credit Hours = 0.75**

**Guest Speaker Presentation**

Diagnosis and Management of Eustachian Tube Dilatory Dysfunction – D. Poe, Boston, MA

Learning Objectives: N/A.

Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |           |            |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good | Excellent  |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |           |            |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |           |            |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |           |            |

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Sunday, June 12 @ 11:15 – 12:15****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****Great Debate: “Be It Resolved that Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery in Canada is Overly Sub-specialized” –****Chair: – G. Osler, Winnipeg, MB / Moderator – B. Westerberg, Vancouver, BC**

**Learning Objectives:** *At the end of this session, participants will be able to:* 1. Recognize the positive and negative consequences of increased subspecialisation of the Canadian Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery workforce. 2. Become familiar with varying perspectives on the issue from both generalists and subspecialists. 3. Discuss the expectations of the public and physicians of the Canadian Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery workforce.

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.****Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Sunday, June 12 @ 13:30 – 14:30****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #1****Diagnosis and Treatment of Semicircular Canal Dehiscence Syndrome (SCDS) – L. Parnes, London, ON, D. Poe, Boston, MA, I. Saliba, Montreal, QC**

**Learning Objectives:** *At the end of this workshop, participants should be able to:* 1. Identify potential SCDS patients based on history and physical exam 2. Know which diagnostic tests to order and understand how to interpret them. 3. Be aware of the various surgical treatment options

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.****Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Sunday, June 12 @ 14:30 – 15:15****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****Papers: Otology 1****Chair: Dr. Jane Lea, Vancouver, BC & Dr. Dennis Poe, Boston, MA**Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/> Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Sunday, June 12 @ 15:45 – 17:00****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.25****Papers: General Otolaryngology****Chair: Dr. Albino Chiodo, Toronto, ON**Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/> Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Sunday, June 12 @ 13:30 – 14:30****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #2: Patient-centred Treatment Selection for Laryngeal Cancer in the Era of IMRT and Transoral Surgery – A. Christopoulos, T. Ayad, L. Guertin, E. Bissada, Montreal, QC**

**Learning Objectives:** *By the end of this session the otolaryngologist will be able to:* 1. describe the steps for comprehensive diagnostic evaluation of a newly diagnosed laryngeal cancer. 2. understand the indications and surgical techniques of transoral resections for glottic and supraglottic cancers as well as open supracricoid laryngectomy. 3. implement a patient centered algorithm for treatment selection for laryngeal cancer thus optimizing function and quality of life.

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**
**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|  |            |                |                    |            |           |
|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations                    | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?    | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?     | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations              | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |

6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics:

**Sunday, June 12 @ 14:30 – 15:15****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****Papers: Head and Neck Surgery 1****Chair: Dr. Donna Sutherland, Winnipeg, MB**

**Learning Objectives:** See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/>

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**
**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|  |            |                |                    |            |           |
|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations                    | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?    | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?     | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations              | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |

6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics:

SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.

**Sunday, June 12 @ 15:45 – 17:00****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.25****PAPERS: Head & Neck Surgery 2****Chairs: Dr. John de Almeida, Toronto, ON, Dr. Claudio Vicini, Forli, Italy**Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/> Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Sunday, June 12 @ 13:30 – 14:15****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #3***Periorbital Rejuvenation Part I: Upper Lid Blepharoplasty- M. Samaha, Montreal, QC*Learning Objectives: *By the end of the workshop, the participant will be able to:* 1- Demonstrate an approach to pre-operative facial analysis, with particular attention to the periorbital region. 2- Provide an overview of the relevant surgical anatomy of the periorbital region. 3- Share a personal approach to upper blepharoplasty, including technique and tips and pearls. Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.

**Sunday, June 12 @ 14:15 – 15:00****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #4***Periorbital Rejuvenation Part II: Lower Blepharoplasty- M. Samaha, Montreal, QC*

**Learning Objectives:** *By the end of the workshop, the participant will be able to:* 1- Demonstrate an approach to pre-operative facial analysis, with particular attention to the periorbital region. 2- Provide an overview of the relevant surgical anatomy of the periorbital region. 3- Share a personal approach to lower lid blepharoplasty, including technique and tips and pearls.

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**
**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Sunday, June 12 @ 15:45 – 17:00****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 1.25****PAPERS: Endocrine Surgery****Chairs: Dr. R. Payne, Montreal, QC, Dr. M. Urken, New York, NY**

**Learning Objectives:** See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/>

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**
**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**End of Sunday June 12 Sessions****SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**



**Monday, June 13 @ 08:00 – 09:45****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.75****Plenary Session**

*Guest Speaker Presentation: The Role of the ENT Surgeon in Sleep Apnea – C. Vicini, Forli, Italy / Celebrating our Own – W. Matthews, Calgary, AB / Guest Speaker Presentation: Cutting Corners by Cutting Less in Rhinoplasty – A-J. Tasman, St. Gallen, Switzerland*

Learning Objectives: N/A

 Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |           |            |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good | Excellent  |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |           |            |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |           |            |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |           |            |

**Monday, June 13 @ 10:20 – 11:20****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #5**

*How to Avoid Complications in ESS, and How to Deal With Them When They Occur – L. Sowerby, London, ON, Y. Chan, J. Lee, Toronto, ON, D. Sommer, Hamilton, ON*

**Learning Objectives:** *By the end of the session, attendees will:* 1. have a greater appreciation for the consent process for sinus surgery, and how to mitigate medico-legal risk when complications occur. 2. feel more comfortable with techniques for minimizing the risk of orbital complications, and for managing complications when they occur. 3. be able to integrate techniques for avoiding skull base injury into sinus surgery, and feel more comfortable in managing skull base complications when they occur. 4. understand how to minimize risk of epistaxis after sinus surgery, and perioperative bleeding during surgery.

 Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |           |            |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good | Excellent  |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree |           | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |           |            |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |           |            |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |           |            |

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Monday, June 13@ 11:20 – 12:05****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #8**

*Surgical Management of Chronic Rhinosinusitis: How Much is Enough? – E. Wright, Edmonton, AB, R. Gall, Winnipeg, MB, L. Sowerby, London, ON, D. Sommer, Hamilton, ON, M. Tewfik, Montreal, QC*

**Learning Objectives:** At the conclusion of this workshop participants: 1. Will be able to clearly define the extent of surgical options available for the treatment of CRS. 2 Will have reflected on the options best suited for their own clinical practice setting. 3. Will have taken home at least one surgical pearl to enhance their surgical acumen.

Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Monday, June 13@ 13:30 – 16:00****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 2.50****2016 POLIQUIN RESIDENT COMPETITION****Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, AB**

**Learning Objectives** See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/>

Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Monday, June 13@ 16:15 – 17:00****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #13**

*Know Before You Go: What You Need to Know Before, During, and After a Global Surgery Trip – F. Osler, Winnipeg, MB, B. Westerberg, Vancouver, BC, L. Sowerby, J. Strychowsky, London, ON*

**Learning Objectives:** *By the end of the workshop, the learner will be able to:* 1. Recognize the unmet need for surgical care in low and middle-income countries (LMIC). 2. Identify potential ethical and moral dilemmas in provision of surgical services in LMIC. 3. Analyze the impact of the Global Surgery trip on the individual, the individual's institution/community, and the host institution/community. 4. Have an approach for personal involvement in a global surgical initiative.

**Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Monday, June 13@ 10:20 – 11:20****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #6**

*Laryngeal Surgery 101 - How To Do More with Less – K. Fung, London, ON, T. Brown, Halifax, NS, M. Allegretto, Edmonton, AB, M. Brake, Kelowna, BC*

**Learning Objectives:** At the end of the session, participants will: 1. Understand how to be an effective laryngeal surgeon in the context of a general community practice. 2. Appreciate the importance of appropriate patient selection with respect to performing endoscopic and open laryngeal surgery in the community. 3. Be aware of a variety of creative technical pearls in the performance of selected endoscopic and open laryngeal surgical procedures within the constraints of a resource-deplete operating room environment (e.g. endoscopic phonosurgery, vocal fold injection, external framework surgery). 4. Appreciate the importance of developing a collaborative working relationship with our anesthesiology colleagues regarding intraoperating airway management and the appropriate use of inexpensive readily-available technology in the shared-airway experience. 5. Understand when it is appropriate to refer a patient with a surgical laryngeal problem to a tertiary care centre.

**Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.

**Monday, June 13@ 11:20 – 12:05****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #9**

*Postoperative Calcium Management in Thyroid Surgery – V.I. Forest, R. Payne, Montreal, QC J. Harris, Edmonton, AB, R. Hart, Halifax, NS, M. Urken, New York, NY*

**Learning Objectives:** 1 Review the literature on hypocalcemia and calcium management protocols. 2 Inform about the various approaches used in different high volume centers: standardized PTH and calcium blood test protocol established in the hospital, systematic calcium supplementation protocol for all patients, and individualized, case by case approach. 3. Develop the framework for national guidelines in postoperative calcium management.

Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|  |            |                |                    |            |           |
|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations                    | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?    | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?     | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations              | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |

6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics:

**Monday, June 13@ 13:30 – 14:15****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #11**

*Practice (and time) Management in Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery – M. Samaha, Montreal, QC*

**Learning Objectives:** 1. Share some insights for residents and new practitioners on developing and grow a practice. 2 Practice management tools for any practitioner to optimize service, efficiency, work environment, and personal satisfaction. 3 Share some crucial time-management strategies which enhance efficiency, productivity, and personal and professional satisfaction.

Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|  |            |                |                    |            |           |
|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations                    | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?    | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?     | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations              | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |

6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics:

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Monday, June 13@ 15:15 – 16:00****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #12*****Ear to Stay: How to Easily Introduce Endoscopic Ear Surgery into Your Practice – N. Jufas, Halifax, NS***

**Learning Objectives:** *By the end of this workshop on Endoscopic Ear Surgery, the practising or training otolaryngologist will be able to:* 1. Understand how to affordably, easily and practically introduce endoscopic ear surgery into otological procedures they perform, whether they are otologists or not. 2. Appreciate the new and relevant middle ear anatomical landmarks that can be seen with endoscope and the relevant variations of these. 3. Realise the advantages of endoscopic endoscopic ear surgery and more importantly have an understanding of its present limitations. 4. Recognize the indications and current applications of endoscopic ear surgery.

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.****Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|  |            |                |                    |            |           |
|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations                    | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?    | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?     | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations              | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |

6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics:

**Monday, June 13@ 16:15 – 17:00****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #14*****Pediatric Sensorineuroal Hearing Loss and the General Otolaryngologist – F. Kozak, R. Rahmanian, Vancouver, BC***

**Learning Objectives:** At the end of this workshop the attendee will be familiar with: 1. Early Newborn Screening practices in Canada. 2. How to investigate Pediatric SNHL in an evidence based medicine manner. 3. Recognizing the importance of congenital CMV and genetics as the 2 main causes. 4. Be knowledgeable about the progressive nature of Pediatric SNHL.

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.****Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|  |            |                |                    |            |           |
|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations                    | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?    | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?     | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations              | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |

6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics:

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Monday, June 13@ 10:20 – 11:20****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #7***Drug Induced Sleep Endoscopy - Modernizing Sleep Apnea Surgical Planning – C. Vicini, Forli, Italy, H. El-Hakim, Edmonton, AB, B. Rotenberg, London, ON***Learning Objectives:** 1. To review anatomy and physiology of snoring. 2. To teach regarding how patients with primary snoring can be diagnosed and managed in the office setting. 3. To educate regarding optimal methods of snoring surgery in the clinic setting. **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.****Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Monday, June 13 @ 11:20 – 12:05****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #10***Utility of In-office Ultrasound-guided FNAB in Surgical Practice – K. Roth, S. Van Uum, London, ON***Learning Objectives:** *By the end of this session, the participant will be able to:* 1. List the ultrasound technical requirements for thyroid examination and the procedure for performing thyroid FNAB 2. List the indications for thyroid FNAB 3. Recognize normal anatomical structures surrounding the thyroid on ultrasound 4. Recognize the sonographic features of concern (dimensions, echogenicity, peripheral vascularity, micro-calcifications) in a thyroid nodule. 5. Describe the role of ultrasound in the determination of extent of surgery, abscess drainage, oncologic surveillance. 6. Understand the role of ultrasound in the new 2015 American Thyroid Association (ATA) guidelines **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.****Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Monday, June 13 @ 16:15 – 17:00**

**Henry Johnson Room**

**CPD Credit Hours = 0.75**

**WS #15**

*Nasal Valve Reconstruction: Thinking Beyond Septoplasty and Turbinate Reduction to Optimize the Nasal Airway – M. Brace, Kelowna, BC, S. Smith Jr., Columbus, OH*

**Learning Objectives:** *By the end of this session otolaryngology residents and practicing otolaryngologists will be able to:* 1. describe the anatomy and physiology of the nasal valve. 2. clinically evaluate a patient with, or at risk for, nasal valve collapse. 3. describe nasal valve reconstruction options. 4. describe and design spreader grafts, batten grafts, strut grafts, and butterfly grafts. 5. describe the role of nasal valve suture suspension systems.

**Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| <b>1. Subject content of the presentations</b>                    | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| <b>2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?</b> | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| <b>3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?</b>    | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| <b>4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?</b>     | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| <b>5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations</b>              | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |

**6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:**

**7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics:**

**End of Monday June 13 Sessions**

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Tuesday, June 14 @ 07:00 – 08:00****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.0****Special Session***“Is There a Doctor on Board?”- Responding to In-flight Medical Emergencies – F. Osler, Winnipeg, MB, J. Chung, Air Canada, T. Watkins, CMPA***Learning Objectives:** *By the end of the session, the participant will be able to:* 1. Describe the ethical and medico-legal responsibilities in responding to in-flight medical emergencies. 2. List the medical supplies and equipment available on airplanes for domestic and transcontinental flights. 3. Respond to in-flight medical emergencies with assistance from flight attendants and ground-based medical support consultants. **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.****Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14 @ 08:00 – 09:00****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****Great Debate***“Be it resolved that too many residents are being trained in OtoHNS in Canada” – Chair: B. Rotenberg, London, ON Moderator: R. Ballagh, Barrie, ON***Learning Objectives:** *At the end of this session, participants will be able to:* 1. Discuss the current state of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery training in Canada. 2. Recognize differing views of the Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery workforce in Canada. 3. Consider strategies to balance the competing demands of residency training numbers and the Canadian Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery job market **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.****Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**



**Tuesday, June 14@ 09:00 – 09:15****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.25****2016 Canadian Fellowship Recipients – Introduction and Presentations***Dr. D. O'Connell, Edmonton, AB*

Learning Objectives: N/A

 Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14@ 09:15 – 10:00****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #16***Physician Assisted Death: A Primer for the Canadian Otolaryngologist – S. Kohlert, Ottawa, ON*

**Learning Objectives:** *Over the course of this presentation, attendees will:* 1. Understand the current legal landscape surrounding physician assisted death in Canada. 2. Become aware of the series of events that led up to the most recent Supreme Court decision. 3. Contrast and compare palliative sedation, physician assisted death, medical aid in dying and euthanasia. 4. Gain an appreciation for the different approaches to Physician Assisted Death worldwide. 5. Learn about the viewpoints and review the draft guidelines set forward by important Canadian stakeholders including the CMA, CPSO and federal political parties. 6. Appreciate the nuanced ethical dilemmas surrounding Physician Assisted Death. 7. Participate in discussion with their colleagues regarding several controversial unsolved issues surrounding Physician Assisted Death.

 Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                        | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?                           | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?                            | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations                                     | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Tuesday, June 14@ 10:15 – 11:15****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #19:**

*Where to Draw the Line: Advanced Endonasal Approaches to Sino-Nasal Tumours, Skull Base Lesions and Orbital Pathologies – D. Sommer, Hamilton, ON, B. Rotenberg, London, ON, M. Tewfik, Montreal, QC, S. Kilty, Ottawa, ON, J. De Almeida, Toronto, ON*

**Learning Objectives:** After attendance of this workshop, participants will: 1. Understand the appropriate utilization of endoscopic approaches to advanced nasal and para-nasal pathologies. 2. Understand the limitations of these endoscopic approaches, including when they should be avoided in favour of an open approach. 3. Obtain practical surgical pearls from experienced surgeons about maximizing success in these novel approaches. 4. Engage in fruitful discussion with colleagues and peers about appropriately advancing our specialty, including our limitations.

Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|  |            |                |                    |            |           |
|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations                    | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?    | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?     | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations              | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |

6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics:

**Tuesday, June 14@ 11:15 – 12:00****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****PAPERS: Rhinology****Chair: Dr. M. Tewfik, Montreal, QC**

**Learning Objectives:** See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/>

Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|  |            |                |                    |            |           |
|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations                    | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?    | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?     | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations              | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |

6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics:

**SUB-TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Tuesday, June 14@ 12:45 – 13:45****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #22***Statistics 101 for Busy Clinicians –M. Bance, Halifax, NS, D. Schramm, Ottawa, ON, M. Rigby, Halifax, NS, K. MacDonald, Ottawa, ON*

**Learning Objectives:** 1. To understand basic concepts in statistical analysis (parametric versus non-parametric, sample size, power, what statistical analysis is and isn't). 2. To focus on uses and indications of 6 commonly used tests: (Students t-test, Chi-squared analysis, Correlation coefficient-spearman and pearson, Fischer's exact test, Wilcoxin test for non-parametric data, Anova) 3. To review practical methods to do this in excel and other commonly used software.

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**
Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14@ 13:45 – 14:45****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #25***Facial Reconstruction: A Specialist Panel on the Contemporary Reconstruction of the Face - M. Brandt, Toronto, ON, C. Moore, London, ON, S.M. Taylor, J. Trites, Halifax, NS, K. Ansari, Edmonton, AB, A.J. Tasman, St. Gallen, Switzerland*

**Learning Objectives:** Participants will appreciate the functional and aesthetic considerations required to achieve a successful facial reconstruction. Participants will appreciate the array of techniques possible in repairing cutaneous and soft-tissue defects of the face. Participants will be prepared to evaluate the benefits, limitations, and complications of different facial reconstructive options. At the completion of this workshop, participants will be better equipped to reconstruct cutaneous and soft-tissue defects presenting to their Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery practice.

 **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**
Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Tuesday, June 14@ 15:00 – 15:45****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****PAPERS: Facial Plastic Reconstruction****Chairs: Dr. S. Mark Taylor, Halifax, NS Dr. A-J. Tasman, St. Gallen Switzerland**Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/> Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14@ 15:45 – 16:30****Sir John A. MacDonald Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****PAPERS: Otology 2****Chair: Dr. Vincent Lin, Toronto, ON**Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/> Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Tuesday, June 14@ 09:15 – 10:00****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #17***Versatile Regional Flaps for Every Surgeon - T. Ayad, E. Bissada, A. Rahal, Montreal, QC***Learning Objectives:** 1. Understand the principles underlying the use of the pedicled flaps presented in this course. 2. Implement appropriately these pedicled flaps in their practice. **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14@ 10:15 – 11:15****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #20***Not Quite Cancer: What to do with Vocal Fold Dysplasia and Keratosis – T. Brown, Halifax, NS, D. Bosch, Calgary, AB, K. Kost, Montreal, QC, M. Allegretto, Edmonton, AB, K. Fung, London, ON***Learning Objectives:** *At the end of this session, the participants will:* 1. Have a better understanding about management options available for the keratotic and/or dysplastic vocal fold. 2. Gain a better understanding of the natural history of vocal fold dysplasia and appreciating when observation alone is sufficient versus surgical intervention. 3. Appreciate the importance of striking an appropriate balance between adequate treatment of vocal cord dysplasia/keratosis and maintenance of vocal pliability and quality. 4. Review the available surgical options for the management of vocal fold dysplasia and keratosis, from cold steel phonosurgical techniques to the use of newer laser technologies. **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                        | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?                           | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?                            | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations                                     | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Tuesday, June 14@ 11:15 – 12:00****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****Papers: Laryngology****Chair: Dr. Liane Johnson, Halifax, NS**Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/> Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14@ 12:45 – 13:45****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #23***Airway and Esophageal Foreign Bodies: A Basic and Safe Approach - J. Strychowsky, M. Husein, London, ON, J. Maclean, Hamilton, ON, L. HP Nguyen, Montreal, QC, E. Propst, Toronto, ON, J. P. Vaccani, Ottawa, ON*

Learning Objectives: 1. To develop a basic and safe approach to the management of pediatric aerodigestive foreign bodies. 2 To learn about endoscopic instrumentation and retrieval techniques. 3. To discuss challenging cases with input from a panel of experts.

 Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Tuesday, June 14@ 13:45 – 14:45****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #26***Pediatric Obstructive Sleep Apnea: Advances in Evaluation and Management- J. Strychowsky, J. Paradis, London, ON, E. Propst, I. Narang, Toronto, ON***Learning Objectives:** 1. Review the clinically relevant outcomes in children with OSA. 2. Critically appraise recent literature including the Childhood Adenotonsillectomy Trial (CHAT). 3. Understand advances in the evaluation and management of OSA in pediatric patients, including patients with persistent OSA after adenotonsillectomy. 4. Formulate a surgical plan according to the identified level of obstruction. Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14@ 15:00 – 16:00****Coles Ballroom****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****Papers: Pediatric OHNS****Chair: Dr. Evan Propst, Toronto, ON****Learning Objectives:** See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/> Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating**

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**Tuesday, June 14@ 09:15 – 10:00****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 0.75****WS #18***Surgeons and Social Media: How Surgeons Can Utilise Social Media to Enhance Patient Care- E. Levi, S.M. Taylor, Halifax, NS*

**Learning Objectives:** 1. The learner will consider the purposes, benefits and limitations of social media. 2. The learner will examine the various cases of effective and non-effective social media use in health care. 3. The learner will analyze the legal restrictions of social media. 4. The learner will evaluate various techniques of social media use to enhance patient care.

**Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**

Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14@ 10:15 – 11:15****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #21***The Unknown Primary Carcinoma: Past, Present and the Future - A. Mlynarek, M. Black, M. Hier, K. Richardson, K. Sultanem, R. Shuckrun, Montreal, QC*

**Learning Objectives:** *At the end of the workshop the participant will:* 1. Understand how management of unknown primary has changed throughout the years. 2. Understand the current work up techniques and protocols. 3. Discover the controversies in the management of the unknown primary. 4. Learn the role of TORS (Trans oral robotic surgery).

**Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**

Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.



**Tuesday, June 14@ 11:15 – 12:15****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****Papers: Head and Neck Surgery 3****Chair: Dr. Rob Hart, Halifax, NS**Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/> Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14@ 12:45 – 13:45****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #24***Tools to Enhance Your Teaching Toolbox – J. Paradis, London, ON*

Learning Objectives: 1. To introduce the educational framework created by the Clinical Teaching Program, Stanford Faculty Development Centre. 2. To provide participants with a conceptual understanding of the educational framework including its seven educational categories. 3. To provide participants with a model of analyzing their own teaching behaviors, with a particular focus on teaching behaviours related to learning climate.

 Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.

**Tuesday, June 14@ 13:45 – 14:45****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****WS #27***Mobile Health Technology for the Practicing Otolaryngologist: An Update – S. Kohlert, L. McLean, M. Bromwich, Ottawa, ON***Learning Objectives:** *Over the course of this session attendees will:* 1. Discover the most recent advancements in mHealth technologies. **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**Tuesday, June 14@ 15:00 – 16:00****Henry Johnson Room****CPD Credit Hours = 1.00****Papers: Education****Chair: Dr. Laurie McLean, Ottawa, ON****Learning Objectives:** See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives online at: <http://otohns.ca/schedule/> **Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.**Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate rating

|   |            |                |                    |            |           |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations   | Poor       | Fair           | Good               | Very Good  | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed?                                      | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time?   | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)?  | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | Completely |           |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations   | Yes        | No             | Explain:           |            |           |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:               |            |                |                    |            |           |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: |            |                |                    |            |           |

**End of Tuesday June 14 Sessions****SUB-TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_ CPD hrs.**

**TOTAL number of your CPD credits for the meeting: \_\_\_\_\_hrs.**

Your general comments about the meeting and recommendations for future topics:

**Thank-you for your comments!**