

71st Annual Meeting June 10-13, 2017 TCU Place Convention Centre, SASKATOON, SK

"Transformational Care in Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery"

2017 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. 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 <u>either</u> the meeting's **REGISTRATION DESK** (by the end of the meeting) or the **SOCIETY'S OFFICE BEFORE July 30**TH. Your certificate will be sent according to the instructions below.

If you feel 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.

Max. Credits for 71st Annual Meeting: 19.25hrs

| DELEGATE NAME: | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|--|
| ☐ I wish to have my certificate of attenda | ance 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 NOB 1SO Tel: 800-655-9533 Fax: 519-846-9529 Email: cso.hns@sympatico.ca

| Sunday. 🤇 | June 1 | 1 @ | 08:0 | 0 - 9:50 |
|-----------|--------|-----|------|----------|
|-----------|--------|-----|------|----------|

Salon CD

CPD Credit Hours = 2.00

OPENING PLENARY SESSION

Guest of Honour Presentation – S. Kirby, St. John's, NL Lifetime Achievement Award Presentation – D. Ellis, Toronto, ON

Guest Speaker Presentation – "Paths to Leadership" - S. Chandrasekhar, New York, NY

Learning Objectives: N/A

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

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

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

Sunday, June 11 @ 10:30 - 11:45

Salon CD

CPD Credit Hours = 1.25

| Guest Speaker | Presentat | ion, G. Farwell, | Sacremento, | CA |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------------|-------------|----|
| 2016 Fellowshi _l | p Awards, | D. O'Connell, Ea | lmonton, AB | |

Learning Objectives: N/A.

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

| 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 |
| Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | | the allotted time? Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | | Completely |
| | | Not at all | at all Limited Degree | | Significant Degree | |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes | No | Explain: | | | | |

6. Identity 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:

| SUR- | TOTAL | CPD hrs. |
|-------|-------|----------|
| 3U D- | IVIAL | |

| Sunday, June 11 @ 13:15 – 14: |
|--------------------------------------|
|--------------------------------------|

Salon CD

CPD Credit Hours = 1.00

Great Debate: "Be It Resolved that Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery Does Not Steward the Canadian Public Healthcare System in a Sustainable Manner" –

Chair: - G. Osler, Winnipeg, MB / Moderator - L. Sowerby, London, ON

Learning Objectives: N/A

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | |
|--|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| 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 11 @ 14:20 – 15:05

Salon CD

CPD Credit Hours = 0.75

WS #1

Ask an Otologist – B. Blakley, Winnipeg, MB, J. Chau, Calgary, AB, J. Lea, Vancouver, BC, S. Chandrasekhar, New York, NY

Learning Objectives: After this workshop, participants will be better able to discuss the evidence for treatment of 1. Tinnitus, 2. Sudden sensorineural hearing loss, and 3. Acute vertigo.

☐ 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? Significant Degree Not at all Limited Degree Completely 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? Significant Degree Not at all Limited Degree Completely 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations 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:

| 71 ID | R-T∩T∆I | CPD hre |
|-------|----------------|---------|
| NI IH | (_ I () I Δ I | CPIInre |

| | | | | | _ |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|
| | | | | | 5 |
| Sunday, June 11 @ 15:30 – 17:00 | | | Salon | CD | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 | | | | | |
| Papers: Rhinology | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr. John Lee, Toronto, ON Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts f | or learning object | ives online at: http:/ | /otohns ca/s | chedule/ | |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | or learning object | ives offilite at. <u>intp./</u> | 70t011113.0a/3 | <u>criedule/</u> | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | |
| 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 | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No | Explain: | 1 | | | 1 |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change | ge your practice: | | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR sugg | estions for future | CME/CDD tonics: | | | |
| 7. Ove as suggestions on now to improve this session on sugg | estions for future | OME/OF D topics. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | _ | |
| Sunday, June 11 @ 14:20 – 15:05 CPD Credit Hours = 0.75 | | | Galle | ry A | |
| WS #2: Topical Management Developments for Swall Edmonton, AB | owing Dysfuncti | on in Children – H | . El-Hakim, | C. Jeffery, W. | Johannsen, |
| Demonstrate the process of development of a multidiscipli Present the management algorithm of SD and the complet Present the results of surgical interventions for Type I large | mentary interactions | s of SLP and otolaryn | gology | ŭ | |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | 1 | |
| 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 | Significan | t Degree | Completely |

| ☐ 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 | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No | Explain: | | | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will chang | ge your practice: | : | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR sugg | gestions for futur | re CME/CPD topics: | | | |
| | | SU | JB-TOT | AL | CPD hrs. |

Sunday, June 11 @ 15:30 - 17:00 **Gallery A CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 Papers: Education** Chair: Dr. Lily HP Nguyen, 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 Poor 1. Subject content of the presentations 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 Significant Degree Limited 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 Explain: Nο 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

Sunday, June 11 @ 14:20 – 15:05

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

Gallery B

CPD Credit Hours = 0.75

WS #3

Thyroid Surgery and Technology – Do the Benefits Outweigh the Costs? – R. Payne, V-I Forest, Montreal, QC, D. O'Connell, Edmonton, AB, R. Hart, Halifax, NS, J. Harris, Edmonton, AB, G. Farwell, Sacramento, CA

Learning Objectives: At the completion of this workshop, physicians attending this session should understand the advantages and disadvantages of recurrent laryngeal nerve monitoring using the NIM, and the advantage and disadvantages of the harmonic scalpel. The physician will have the tools necessary to determine whether this equipment makes sense in their practice.

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

| 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 allotte | ed time? | 1 | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significar | nt Degree | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the to | opic(s)? | | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significar | nt Degree | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations | Yes | No | Explain . | | | | |

| <u> </u> | IR-TO | ~ T A I | 0.0 | D I |
|----------|-------|---------|-------|------------|
| ~I | 1K-1(|) I Δ I | (:12) | D hre |

| Sunday, June 11 @ 15:30 - | | | Galle | ry B | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|--|
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 | | | | | | | | |
| PAPERS: Otology / Neurot | tolog | у | | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr. Vincent Lin, Toronto | o, ON | | | | | | | |
| Learning Objectives: See individual presenta | ation ab | stracts | for learning obje | ectives online at: http:/ | /otohns.ca/s | schedule/ | | |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | | | | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rat | ing | | | | | | | |
| 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 to | pic(s)? | | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely | |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations | Yes | No | Explain: | | | | 1 | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD se | ssion w | ill chan | ge your practice: | : | | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | End o | of Sund | lay June | 11 Sessions | |

SUB-TOTAL ____CPD hrs.

| | | | | | 8 |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------|------------------|
| Monday, June 12 @ 08:00 – 09:00 CPD Credit Hours = 1.00 | | | | Salon CI | |
| Great Debate: "Be it resolved that the word " Chair: - G. Osler, Winnipeg, MB / Moderator - E. Wright, E Learning Objectives: N/A | | gy" should be rem | oved from | the name of | our specialty" – |
| ☐ 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 | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No | Explain: | • | | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will chang | ge your practice: | : | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR sugg | gestions for futur | re CME/CPD topics: | | | |
| Monday, June 12@ 09:05 – 09:55 CPD Credit Hours = 1.00 | | Salon C | D | | |
| Guest Speaker Presentation | | | | | |
| H. Gassner, Regensburg, Germany Learning Objectives: TBA | | | | | |
| ☐ 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 | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No | Explain: | l | 1 | | -1 |

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 12@ 10:30 – 11:33 CPD Credit Hours = 1.00 | | Salon C | D | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| PAPERS: Pediatric Otolaryngology | V | | | | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr. Hamdy El-Hakim, Edmonto | • | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | Significan | t Degree | Completely | | | | |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely | | | | |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely | | | | |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No | Explain: | • | • | | | | | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will chan | ge your practice: | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR sugg | gestions for futur | re CME/CPD topics: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Monday, June 12@ 11:42 – 12:10 | | Salon Cl | D | | | | | | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 0.50 Papers: Laryngology | | | | | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr. Karen Kost, Montreal, QC | | | | | | | | | |
| Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives o | nline at: <u>http://ot</u> | tohns.ca/schedule/ | | | | | | | |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | | | | | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | Significan | t 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 | Significan | Significant Degree Complet | | | | | |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No | Explain: | - | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR sugg | gestions for futur | re CME/CPD topics: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | _ | | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------|------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Monday, June 12@ 13:30 – 15:00 Salon CD | | | | | | | | | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 | | | | | | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition | | | | | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, A | В | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | |
| 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: | | | | | | | | |
| Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will cha | nge your practice | : | | | | | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR su | agestions for futu | re CMF/CPD topics: | | | | | | | |
| The court of the c | , good on o tot tata | o omeror o topicor | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Monday, June 12@ 15:00 - 16:50 | | | Salon | CD | | | | | |
| Monday, June 12@ 15:00 – 16:50 CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 | | | Salon | CD | | | | | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 | ollowing coffee | e break) | Salon | CD | | | | | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 Poliquin Residents Competition (f | _ | e break) | Salon | CD | | | | | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, Advanced Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Chair: Dr. J | В | , | Salon | CD | | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, A Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives | В | , | Salon | CD | | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, A Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | В | , | Salon | CD | | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, A Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives | В | , | Salon | CD Very Good | Excellent | | | | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, As Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives □ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | online at: http://o | tohns.ca/schedule/ | | Very Good | Excellent Completely | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, As Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating 1. Subject content of the presentations | online at: http://o | tohns.ca/schedule/ | Good | Very Good | | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, And Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating 1. Subject content of the presentations 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | online at: http://o | tohns.ca/schedule/ Fair Limited Degree | Good | Very Good Degree | Completely | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, A Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating 1. Subject content of the presentations 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Poor Not at all | Fair Limited Degree Limited Degree | Good Significant | Very Good Degree | Completely Completely | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, And Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating 1. Subject content of the presentations 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | Poor Not at all Not at all Explain: | Fair Limited Degree Limited Degree Limited Degree | Good Significant | Very Good Degree | Completely Completely | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, And Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating 1. Subject content of the presentations 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No | Poor Not at all Not at all Explain: nge your practice | Fair Limited Degree Limited Degree Limited Degree | Good Significant | Very Good Degree | Completely Completely | | | | |
| Poliquin Residents Competition (for Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Harris, Edmonton, And Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts for learning objectives. □ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating. 1. Subject content of the presentations. 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No. 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will chain. | Poor Not at all Not at all Explain: nge your practice | Fair Limited Degree Limited Degree Limited Degree | Good Significant | Very Good Degree | Completely Completely | | | | |

| SUB-TOTAL | CPD | hrs. |
|-----------|---------|------|
| | | |

| Monday, June 12@ 10:30 – 11:54 Gallery A CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------|--|--|
| Papers: Head & Neck Sur | gery | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr. Jonathan Trites | • | | | | | | | | |
| 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 rati | ing | | | | | | | | |
| Subject content of the presentations | | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | | |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives a | as listed | l? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | Degree | Completely | | |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotte | d time? | ı | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | t Degree | Completely | | |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the to | pic(s)? | | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | t Degree | Completely | | |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations | Yes | No | Explain: | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD se | ssion w | ill chan | ge your practice: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this so | ession (| OR sugg | gestions for futur | e CME/CPD topics: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Monday, June 12@ 13:30 – CPD Credit Hours = 0.75 | 14: | 15 | | | Galle | ery A | | | |
| WS #6 Management of Cystic Cervical Masses – H. | Zhano | ı. J. de . | Almeida. E. Mo | nteiro. Toronto. ON. | V. Biron. D. | O'Connell. Ed | lmonton. AB | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Learning Objectives: 1) Discuss the etiology core biopsy, repeat FNA, neck ultrasound, and cancer or unknown primary carcinoma 5) Discu | PET/C | T in the | diagnostic work | up 4) Discuss the in | plications of | treatment if an | | | |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | | | omionogy minasimum. | , • • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rati | ing | | | | | | | | |
| Subject content of the presentations | | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | | |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives a | as listed | 1? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | Degree | Completely | | |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotte | d time? | | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | t Degree | Completely | | |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the to | pic(s)? | | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | t Degree | Completely | | |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations | Yes | No | Explain: | | | | | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD se | ssion w | ill chan | ge your practice: | | | | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this se | ession (| OR sugg | gestions for futur | e CME/CPD topics: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Monday, June 12@ 14:20 – 15:05

Gallery A

CPD Credit Hours = 0.75

WS #7

Office-Based Rhinologic Procedures – A Shifting Paradigm – L. Sowerby, London, ON, D. Micomonaco, Sault Ste Marie, ON, S. Kilty, Ottawa, ON, Y. Chan, Toronto, ON

Learning Objectives: 1) By the end of this workshop, participants will be more comfortable with setting up their clinic to perform office-based rhinologic procedures. 2) The breadth of procedures, and the nuances of technique to perform them, will be appreciated by audience members. 3) Patient satisfaction and ease of anesthesia will be demonstrated to participants.

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | |
|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|----------|------------|
| Subject content of the presentations | Poor | Fair | Good Ve | ery 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 12@ 15:45 – 16:30

Gallery A

CPD Credit Hours = 0.75

WS #8

Non-Cosmetic Indications of Botulinum Toxin in Otolaryngology - R. Jaggi, Saskatoon, SK

Learning Objectives: Participants will learn: 1) What is Botulinum toxin 2) What are the FDA approved indications 3) What are some of the non-cosmetic indications in Otolaryngology 4) Who is a good candidate 5) What are the potential complications 6) How I perform these injections

☐ 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? Significant Degree Not at all Limited 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:

- ${\bf 6.}\ \ {\bf Identify\ at\ least\ one\ way\ in\ which\ this\ CPD\ session\ will\ change\ your\ practice:}$
- 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions for future CME/CPD topics

| OII | ъ | $\Gamma \cap$ | T A 1 | | 7 L | • |
|-----|-------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| JU | JD- I | ıu | TA | L GPI | D hrទ | Š. |

| | | | | | 13 |
|---|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Monday, June 12@ 10:30 – 11:30 | | | Galle | ry B | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.00 | | | | | |
| WS #4 | | | | | |
| The Best Articles of the Last Year in Otolaryngology for Obaseki, Ottawa, ON | or the General | Otolaryngologist – S. K | ilty, JP. V | accani, D. Schi | ramm, S. Johnson- |
| Learning Objectives : By the end of the session, the audition been published during the last year in the subspecialty don't these published articles can impact their clinical practice. | | | | | |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | |
| 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 | Significa | nt Degree | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significa | nt 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 | o Explain: | 1 | | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will ch | nange your prac | tice: | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR s | uggestions for | future CME/CPD topics: | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Monday, June 12 @ 11:35 - 12:20 | \ | | Galle | rv R | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 0.75 | | | Gaile | iy D | |
| WS #5 | | | | | |
| Novel Therapies in Cutaneous Malignancies: A Review | w of New Deve | lonments – H. Zhana T | oronto ON | M Gunta Han | ailton ON |
| Learning Objectives: 1) Discuss current epidemiology of skin-cancer chemoprevention 3) Discuss use of hedgehog monoclonal antibody BRAF mutation inhibitors in the treatr | common cutar g-pathway inhib | neous malignancies 2) Dis nitors for the treatment of I | scuss utiliza | tion of nicotinan | nide for nonmelanoma |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | |

| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------|------------|
| 1. Subject content of the presentations | Poor | Fair | Good Ve | ery 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 Deg | gree | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No | Explain: | | | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change | e your practice: | | | • | |

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

End of Monday June 12 Sessions SUB-TOTAL ____CPD hrs.

SUB-TOTAL: ____CPD hrs.

| Celebrating Our Own Session Recipients: Dr. Erin Wright, Edmonton, AB, T. W. Matthews, Calgary, 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 | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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 | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | |
| 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 13@ 09:35 – 10:20 Salon CD CPD Credit Hours = 0.75 | | | | | | |
| WS #9 | | | | | | |
| Pediatric Sensorineural Hearing Loss and the General Otolaryngologist – R. Rahmanian, F. Kozak, Vancouver, BC | | | | | | |
| Learning Objectives: 1. Early Newborn Screening practices in Canada. 2. How to investigate Pediatric SNHL in an evidence based medicine m 3.recognize 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: | | | | | | |

Tuesday, June 13@ 10:35 – 11:35

Salon CD

CPD Credit Hours = 1.00

WS #12

Demystifying Maintenance of Certification: Attend and Earn Section 2 Credits – Y. Chan, Toronto, ON, G. Osler, Winnipeg, MB, M. Desrosiers, Montreal, QC, J. Jones, Winnipeg, MB

Learning Objectives: After attendance of this workshop, the participate will be able to: 1) differentiate accredited and unaccredited learning activities in Section 1. 2) plan learning activities independently or in collaboration with peers. 3) implement knowledge and performance assessment activities.

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

| 4 Cubinet content of the nuceautotions | D | F . · · | 0 | V O I | E |
|--|------------|----------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| 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: | | | | |

- b. 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 13@ 11:40 – 12:40

Salon CD

CPD Credit Hours = 1.00

WS #15

Medical Therapies for CRS: What is New and What Really Works – S. Kilty, Ottawa, ON, A. Janjua, Vancouver, BC, J. Lee, Toronto, ON, M. Desrosiers, Montreal, QC

Learning Objectives: By the end of the session, the audience member will be able to 1) identify important new therapies for the management of patients with chronic rhinosinusitis and understand how these treatments target the pathophysiology of the disease. 2) understand how to better utilize some of the existing medical therapies for patients with chronic rhinosinusitis.

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

| 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: | | | |

| SUB-TOTAL: | CPD hrs |
|------------|---------|
|------------|---------|

| | | | | | 16 | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------------|--|
| Tuesday, June 13 @ 13:10 – 14:10 CPD Credit Hours = 1.00 | | | Salon | CD | | |
| WS #18: | | | | | | |
| A How-to-Guide for Residents on Successfully Applying | | | earls from F | Residents Who | Have Been Through | |
| the Process – T. Phillips, E. Graham, Halifax, NS, K. Smith Learning Objectives: 1) To become familiar with the fellows | | | larvngology | residents 2) T | o hecome familiar with | |
| the process of applying to fellowships 3) To gain insight into a opportunity for open discussion on fellowship opportunities for | the difficulties of | | | | | |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | | |
| 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 | Significan | t Degree | Completely | |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t 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 chan | ge your practice | : | | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions on how to improve this session OR suggestions. | gestions for futu | re CME/CPD topics: | | | | |
| Tuesday, June 13 @ 14:15 – 15:45 CPD Credit Hours = 1.50 | | | Salon | CD | | |
| PAPERS: General Otolaryngology | | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr. Peter Spafford, Saskatoon, SK | | | | | | |
| Learning Objectives: See individual presentation abstracts | for learning obje | ctives online at: http:// | otohns.ca/s | chedule/ | | |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | | |
| 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 | Significan | t Degree | Completely | |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely | |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely | |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes No | Explain: | | • | | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will chan | ge your practice | | | | | |

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

| SUB-TOTAL: CF | ט־ | hrs. |
|---------------|----|------|
|---------------|----|------|

| Tuesday, June 13 @ 09:35 – 10:20 | |
|--|------|
| CPD Credit Hours = 0.75 | |
| WS #10: | |
| The Geriatric Voice: Accept It or Treat It? - K. Kost, Month | eal, |

Gallery A

The Geriatric Voice: Accept It or Treat It? – K. Kost, Montreal, QC, A. Darnbrough, Winnipeg, MB, T. Brown, Halifax, NS, M. Brake, Kelowna, BC, M. Allegretto, Edmonton, AB

Learning Objectives: At the end of the session, participants will: 1. Understand what makes a voice sound 'old' 2. Appreciate the physiologic/anatomic changes which occur in the aging larynx 3. Be aware of the management options in treating the geriatric voice

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| 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 N | 10 | Explain: | | | | • |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will c | hange | your practice: | | | | |

Tuesday, June 13@ 10:35 – 11:35

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

Gallery A

CPD Credit Hours = 1.00

WS #13

Efficient Evaluation and Treatment of Dysphagia for the Otolaryngologist – A. Darnbrough, Winnipeg, MB, D. Eibling, Pittsburgh, PA, D. Randall, Calgary, AB

Learning Objectives: Participants attending this workshop will be able to: 1) list the most common causes of dysphagia 2) be able to describe an approach to the evaluation of dysphagia 3) be able to evaluate and choose an appropriate method to manage dysphagia in various conditions.

 \square 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: | | | | | |

in tuesting at loads one may in minor and or 2 decelor min change your practice

| Q١ | IR-T | ΩΤΔΙ · | CPD hrs |
|----|------|--------|---------|
| זכ | 10-1 | ., | GEDINS |

| Tuesday, June 13 @ 11:35 - 12:20 | Tuesday, | June 13 @ | 11:35 - | 12:20 |
|---|----------|------------------|---------|-------|
|---|----------|------------------|---------|-------|

Gallery A

CPD Credit Hours = 0.75

WS #16

Asymptomatic Primary Hyperparathyroidism: An Update on Surgical Indications and Surgical Advances – D. MacNeil, J. Yoo, London, ON Learning Objectives: At the end of this workshop attendees will:1) Understand the indications for surgical intervention in patients with asymptomatic primary hyperparathyroidism. 2) Describe the end-organ manifestations of primary hyperparathyroidism 3) Be aware of the indications, strengths and limitations of intraoperative PTH testing and pre-operative localization testing 4) Understand the pros and cons of minimally invasive techniques

5) Be able assess the safety of outpatient parathyroidectomy

| _ | | | | |
|----|-----------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| ΙI | Attended | hut do | not wish | to evaluate. |

| 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 Com | | 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:

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

Tuesday, June 13@ 13:10 – 14:10

Gallery A

CPD Credit Hours = 1.00

WS #19

Management of Low-Risk Thyroid Cancer; Shifts in Treatment Paradigms – H. Zhang, Toronto, ON, J. Harris, Edmonton, AB, R. Payne, Montreal, QC, D. Goldstein, Toronto, ON

Learning Objectives: 1) To discuss the changing epidemiology of PTC 2) To discuss potential implications of new subtypes of low risk thyroid cancer 3) To discuss the new non-invasive follicular thyroid neoplasm with papillary-like nuclear features diagnosis 4) To discuss the utilization of differing treatment paradigms for low-risk thyroid cancer: active surveillance versus surgery 5) To discuss the future of low-risk thyroid cancer treatment. Objectives for the session will be delivered through a combination of didactic lecture with case presentations. Audience participation will be facilitated through interactive case presentations along with questions.

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating 1. Subject content of the presentations Poor Very Good Fair 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 Nο Explain: 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session will change your practice:

| CI | ID 7 | $\Gamma \cap T$ | ' A I . | CDD bro | |
|----|------|-----------------|---------|---------|----|
| วเ | JD- | IUI | AL: | CPD hrs | i. |

| Tuesday, June 13@ 14:15 – 14:43 CPD Credit Hours = 0.50 | | | | | Gal | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--|---|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Papers: Facial Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery | | | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr. Michael Brandt, Toronto, ON | | | | | | | |
| Learning Objectives: See individual presen | tation a | bstrac | ts for learning | objectives online at: | http://otohn | s.ca/schedule/ | |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | | | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rat | ing | | | | | | |
| 1. Subject content of the presentations | | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives a | as listed | ? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significar | t Degree | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotte | d time? | | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significar | t Degree | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the to | pic(s)? | | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significar | t Degree | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations | Yes | No | Explain: | | | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD se | ssion w | ill chanç | je your practice | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Tuesday, June 13@ 14:43 | - 16 : | 00 | | | Gal | lery A | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.25 | | | | | | | |
| Papers: Head & Neck Surg | | _ | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr Paul Kerr Winnings | | 2 | | | | | |
| Chair: Dr. Paul Kerr, Winnipeg, Learning Objectives: See individual present | MB | | for learning obj | ectives online at: http:/ | //otohns.ca/s | schedule/ | |
| Chair: Dr. Paul Kerr, Winnipeg, Learning Objectives: See individual present Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | MB | | for learning obj | ectives online at: http:// | //otohns.ca/s | schedule/ | |
| Learning Objectives: See individual present | MB ation ab | | for learning obj | ectives online at: <u>http:/</u> | //otohns.ca/s | schedule/ | |
| Learning Objectives: See individual present ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | MB ation ab | | for learning obj | ectives online at: <u>http:/</u> Fair | //otohns.ca/s | schedule/ Very Good | Excellent |
| Learning Objectives: See individual present ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate ration | MB ation ab | stracts | | | | Very Good | Excellent Completely |
| Learning Objectives: See individual present Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate ration. Subject content of the presentations | MB ation ab | estracts | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | |
| Learning Objectives: See individual present Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate ration. 1. Subject content of the presentations. 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives and the session meet the session meet the learning objectives and the session meet the learning objectives and the session meet the se | MB ation ab ing as listed ad time? | estracts | Poor Not at all | Fair Limited Degree | Good | Very Good Degree Degree | Completely |
| Learning Objectives: See individual present Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate ration. 1. Subject content of the presentations. 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives and all others. 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotter. | MB ation ab ing as listed ad time? | estracts | Poor Not at all | Fair Limited Degree Limited Degree | Good Significant | Very Good Degree Degree | Completely |
| Learning Objectives: See individual present Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate ration. Subject content of the presentations. Did the session meet the learning objectives and all the session well-paced within the allotter. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the total | MB ation ab ation ab as listed at time? ppic(s)? | estracts ? | Poor Not at all Not at all Not at all Explain: | Fair Limited Degree Limited Degree Limited Degree | Good Significant | Very Good Degree Degree | Completely |
| Learning Objectives: See individual present Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate rati 1. Subject content of the presentations 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives at a series of the presentation of the presentations. 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotter of the presenter of the presentation of the presenter of the presentations. 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations. 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD seep the present of the presentation of | ation about the state of time? Yes Session with the state of the sta | estracts ? No | Poor Not at all Not at all Not at all Explain: | Fair Limited Degree Limited Degree Limited Degree | Good Significant | Very Good Degree Degree | Completely |
| Learning Objectives: See individual present Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. Please CIRCLE the appropriate rations 1. Subject content of the presentations 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives and all other session well-paced within the allotter. 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the total session between the content of the presentations. | ation about the state of time? Yes Session with the state of the sta | estracts ? No | Poor Not at all Not at all Not at all Explain: | Fair Limited Degree Limited Degree Limited Degree | Good Significant | Very Good Degree Degree | Completely |

| | | | | | | 20 |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Tuesday, June 13 @ 09:35 – 10 CPD Credit Hours = 0.75 | 0:20 | | | Gallery | В | |
| WS #11 | | | | | | |
| Management of Hereditary Hemorrhagic Telange Montreal, QC, B. Rotenberg, London, ON, I. Witter | | | Epistaxis in Canad | a – D. Côté, | Edmonton, AB | , M. Desrosiers, |
| Learning Objectives: To explore HHT as a clinical To explore the various treatment options available to To identify gaps in provision of care for HHT patients | entity rele OHNS p | vant to Otolaryng ractitioners in ma | | | s (OHNS) in Ca | anada. |
| ☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | | • | | | | |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | | |
| Subject content of the presentations | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as list | ed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted tim | e? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s |)? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 5. Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes | No | Explain: | | | | l |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session | will chang | ge your practice: | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 7. Give us suggestions on how to improve this sessio | n OR sugg | gestions for future | CME/CPD topics: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Tuesday, June 13@ 10:35 – 1 | 1:35 | | | Gallery | В | |
| CPD Credit Hours = 1.00 | | | | | | |
| WS #14 | | | | | | |
| Facial Reconstruction Complications, Problems, Taylor, Halifax, NS, K. Ansari, Edmonton, AB, J. Ti | | | | | ON, C. Moore , | London, ON, S. M. |
| Learning Objectives: Participants will appreciate the | | | | | arise in the loca | al flap reconstruction of |
| the head and neck. Participants will appreciate the | | | | | | |
| prepared to anticipate common pitfalls, and manage Attended, but do not wish to evaluate. | the challe | enges inal can pr | esent in their own O | lolaryrigolog | <u>y - неаа апа м</u> | eck Surgery practice. |
| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | | |
| Subject content of the presentations | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as list | ed? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| Was the program well-paced within the allotted tim | e? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s |)? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significan | t Degree | Completely |
| Perceived commercial bias in presentations Yes | No | Explain: | | <u> </u> | | |
| 6. Identify at least one way in which this CPD session | will chang | ge your practice: | | | | |

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

Tuesday, June 13@ 11:40 - 12:40

Gallery B

CPD Credit Hours = 1.00 *Observation of this workshop is worth Section 1 credits.

WS #17 - Please contact Dr. Adrian Gooi for Section 3 credits if you took part in the simulation: adriangooi@gmail.com

Acute Airway Management: An Interactive Session for Airway and Crisis Resource Management Using Video-assisted Simulation – A. Gooi, Coquitlam, BC, K. Fung, London, ON, L. Nguyen, Montreal, QC, N. Viallet, Winnipeg, MB

Learning Objectives: By the end of the session, participants will: 1) have discussed airway management strategies that can be applied to future patient care. 2) have further developed crisis resource management skills that can be applied to clinical teams. 3) experience how simulation, teambased learning, and audience response systems can be applied to medical education.

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

| | _ | <u> </u> | | | _ |
|--|----------|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
| 2. Did the session meet the learning objectives as listed? | | | Significant Degree Completely | | Completely |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | | Limited Degree | Significant Degree | | Completely |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | | Limited Degree | Significant | Degree | Completely |
| No | Explain: | • | | | 1 |
| | | Not at all Not at all | Not at all Limited Degree Not at all Limited Degree Not at all Limited Degree | Not at all Limited Degree Significant Not at all Limited Degree Significant Not at all Limited Degree Significant | Not at all Limited Degree Significant Degree Not at all Limited Degree Significant Degree Not at all Limited Degree Significant Degree |

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

Tuesday, June 13@ 13:10 – 13:55

Gallery B

CPD Credit Hours = 0.75

WS #20

Nasal Reconstruction: A Specialists Panel on Reconstruction of the Nose – M. Brandt, Toronto, ON, C. Moore, London, ON, K. Ansari, Edmonton, AB, S. M. Taylor, J. Trites, Halifax, NS, H. Gassner, Regensburg, Germany

Learning Objectives: Participants will appreciate the functional and aesthetic considerations required to achieve a successful nasal reconstruction. Participants will appreciate the array of techniques possible in repairing cutaneous and soft-tissue defects of the nose. Participants will be prepared to evaluate the benefits, limitations, and complications of different nasal reconstructive options. At the completion of this workshop, participants will be better equipped to reconstruct complex nasal 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 | d 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:

| ~ • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | R-TOT | - A I | CPD hrs |
|--|-------|-------|-----------|
| | _ | Λ I | I'DII NEC |
| | | | |

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

| | _ , | <mark>6</mark> @ 14:0 | :00 |
|-------|-----|-----------------------|-----|
| WS #2 | 1 | | |

Gallery B

Intraoperative Margin Assessment in Head and Neck Cancer Surgery – M. Rigby, M. Bullock, S. M. Taylor, R. Hart, J. Trites, P. Horwich, Halifax. NS

Learning Objectives: At the end of the workshop participants will be able to demonstrate proficiency in the following: 1) Describe positive margins, adequate margins and consider the limitations of these definitions in head and neck cancer surgery.2) Describe and interpret current evidence for the impact of positive margins in head and neck cancer surgery.3) Describe different techniques in intraoperative margin analysis, and to evaluate the benefits, limitations and potential pitfalls of associated with these techniques. 4) Describe and interpret recent evidence regarding intraoperative margin analysis for head and neck cancers and consider how it relates to their current practice. 5) Describe and consider an intraoperative protocol designed to meet best evidence practices, within the limitations of existing resources in a Canadian health care setting.

| Attended | but do | not wish | to evaluate. |
|------------|----------|----------|--------------|
| l Attended | . but do | not wish | to evaluate |

| Please CIRCLE the appropriate rating | | | | | | |
|--|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|------------|--|
| 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 | t Degree | Completely | |
| | | | | | | |
| 3. Was the program well-paced within the allotted time? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | t Degree | Completely | |
| | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the presenter(s) knowledgeable on the topic(s)? | Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | t 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 13@ 15:05 – 15:50

Gallery B

CPD Credit Hours = 0.75

WS #22

How to Produce High Quality Clinical Research Using Canadian Health Administrative Databases – D. MacNeil, London, ON, K. MacDonald, Ottawa, ON, J. Beyea, Kingston, ON, A. Eskander, Columbus, OH, S. Hall, Kingston, ON

Learning Objectives: At the end of this workshop attendees will: 1) Be aware of the administrative databases available for high quality clinical research 2) Consider the ethical implications of administrative database research 3) Understand the strengths and limitations of using administrative data for research in Otolaryngology – Head & Neck Surgery 4) Appreciate the barriers and solutions of using administrative data for their own research

☐ Attended, but do not wish to evaluate.

| Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | |
| Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | Degree | Completely |
| | | | | |
| Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | Degree | Completely |
| | | | | |
| Not at all | Limited Degree | Significant | Degree | Completely |
| | | | | |
| Explain: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Not at all Not at all Not at all | Not at all Limited Degree Not at all Limited Degree Not at all Limited Degree | Not at all Limited Degree Significant Not at all Limited Degree Significant Not at all Limited Degree Significant | Not at all Limited Degree Significant Degree Not at all Limited Degree Significant Degree Not at all Limited Degree Significant Degree |

- 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 13 Sessions

| SUB-TOTAL | CPD hrs |
|-----------|---------|
| | |

| | TOTAL number of your CPD credits for the meeting: | hrs. |
|---------------|--|------|
| r general com | nments about the meeting and recommendations for future topics: | |
| | intents about the meeting and recommendations for future topics. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Thank-you for your comments!