

34th Annual Tri-State Hand Conference 5/18/2018

This activity was created to address the professional practice gaps listed below:

- Recognizing the best way to take advantage of new communication technology in a HIPPA compliant manner.
- Assessing the controversy regarding the use of CTS-6 for diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome.
- Identifying that when surgically treating and evaluating patients for humeral prosthetics, alternative treatments should be considered.
- Identifying of current emerging therapeutics in neuromuscular disease.

1. Please respond regarding how much you agree or disagree that the gaps listed above were addressed.

	Disagree		Agree	
Participating in this educational activity changed your KNOWLEDGE in the professional practice gaps listed above. [35-3.60]	(0)	(0)	(14) 40.00%	(21) 60.00%
Participating in this educational activity changed your COMPETENCE in the professional practice gaps listed above. [35-3.60]	(0)	(0)	(14) 40.00%	(21) 60.00%
Do you feel participating in this educational activity will change your PERFORMANCE in the professional practice gaps listed above? [35-3.54]	(0)	(1) 2.86%	(14) 40.00%	(20) 57.14%

2. Please elaborate on your previous answers. (16)

Great conference.

very good

I work on a post op Hand/Ortho floor. It always helps me with knowledge to understand the surgeries they have

I feel that the new program used for HIPPA compliance in texting, etc should be implemented to include oncall nursing staff as well.

I feel that the new program used for HIPPA compliance in texting, etc should be implemented to include oncall nursing staff as well. I will bring this up.

Will be making sure no identifiers appear on screen

CTS help but sometime NCT needed

new knowledge always improves patient care

Very informative

informative

not ue

not sure what to elaborate on

I was particularly intrigued with the HIPPA lecture. I believe that the new program being used should be shared practice wide, including the on call nursing staff.

3. Please evaluate the effectiveness of the following speakers in improving your knowledge, competence and/or performance. (Poor = 1, Excellent = 4)

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Jorge Quintero, MD [34-3.68]	(0)	(1) 2.94%	(9) 26.47%	(24) 70.59%
Caroline Wolfe Wurtzel, MD [34-3.71]	(0)	(1) 2.94%	(8) 23.53%	(25) 73.53%
Alex Ferikes, MD [34-3.71]	(0)	(0)	(10) 29.41%	(24) 70.59%
Ajeesh Sankaran, MD [31-3.71]	(0)	(1) 3.23%	(7) 22.58%	(23) 74.19%
Wenjing Zeng, MD [34-3.71]	(0)	(0)	(10) 29.41%	(24) 70.59%
Laxminarayan Bhandari, MD [34-3.71]	(0)	(1) 2.94%	(8) 23.53%	(25) 73.53%
Justin Barrett, MD [32-3.69]	(0)	(0)	(10) 31.25%	(22) 68.75%
Will McClellan, MD [34-3.65]	(0)	(0)	(12) 35.29%	(22) 64.71%
Timothy Dooley, MD [33-3.70]	(0)	(0)	(10) 30.30%	(23) 69.70%
Tessa Smit, MD [34-3.76]	(0)	(0)	(8) 23.53%	(26) 76.47%
Ashley Nord, MD [34-3.74]	(0)	(1) 2.94%	(7) 20.59%	(26) 76.47%
Benjamin Rogozinski, MD [30-3.73]	(0)	(0)	(8) 26.67%	(22) 73.33%
Victor Fehrenbacher, MD [34-3.68]	(0)	(0)	(11) 32.35%	(23) 67.65%
Jake Weller, MD [33-3.76]	(0)	(0)	(8) 24.24%	(25) 75.76%
Christopher Matthews, MD [32-3.69]	(0)	(0)	(10) 31.25%	(22) 68.75%
John McMurtry, MD [34-3.76]	(0)	(0)	(8) 23.53%	(26) 76.47%
Tuna Ozyurekoglu, MD [34-3.65]	(0)	(1) 2.94%	(10) 29.41%	(23) 67.65%
Huey Tien, MD [34-3.74]	(0)	(0)	(9) 26.47%	(25) 73.53%
Scott Farner, MD [34-3.74]	(0)	(1) 2.94%	(7) 20.59%	(26) 76.47%
Suniel Thirkenad, MD [34-3.76]	(0)	(0)	(8) 23.53%	(26) 76.47%
Peter J Stern, MD [34-3.79]	(0)	(0)	(7) 20.59%	(27) 79.41%

Brandon Smetana, MD [34-3.65]	(0)	(1) 2.94%	(10) 29.41%	(23) 67.65%
Reed Hoyer, MD [34-3.68]	(1) 2.94%	(0)	(8) 23.53%	(25) 73.53%
James Creighton, MD [33-3.67]	(1) 3.03%	(0)	(8) 24.24%	(24) 72.73%
Gregory Merrell, MD [34-3.74]	(0)	(0)	(9) 26.47%	(25) 73.53%
Elkin Galvis, MD [34-3.68]	(1) 2.94%	(0)	(8) 23.53%	(25) 73.53%
Thomas Kiefhaber, MD [33-3.64]	(1) 3.03%	(0)	(9) 27.27%	(23) 69.70%
Koji Takamoto, MD [34-3.74]	(0)	(0)	(9) 26.47%	(25) 73.53%
Rodrigo Moreno, MD [34-3.74]	(0)	(0)	(9) 26.47%	(25) 73.53%
Tsu-Min Tsai, MD [34-3.76]	(0)	(0)	(8) 23.53%	(26) 76.47%
Gregory Merrell, MD [34-3.76]	(0)	(0)	(8) 23.53%	(26) 76.47%
Jeffrey Greenberg, MD [31-3.77]	(0)	(0)	(7) 22.58%	(24) 77.42%
Thomas Kaplan, MD [34-3.76]	(0)	(0)	(8) 23.53%	(26) 76.47%
Christina Kaufman, PhD [33-3.73]	(0)	(0)	(9) 27.27%	(24) 72.73%

4. Please elaborate on your previous answers. (15)

Some of the ones rated poor did not attend this event

Speakers did a great job.

good presentatios

enjoyed the papers presented

Everyone did an amazing job!

Some individuals just speak well

All gave good presentations.

Very knowledgeable and informative for all speakers

informative and well prepared presentors

Will try

They all did an amazing job!

5. Please identify a change that you will implement into practice as a result of attending this educational activity (new protocols, different medications, etc.) (18)

Different surgical techniques

None

more attuned to pain prospective of my patients

I feel that the new program used for HIPPA compliance in texting, etc should be implemented to include oncall nursing staff as well. I will bring this up.

No change in my practice
confirmed limit use of nerve wraps
NCT requirement
learned something new about treatment of humeral patients
nothing
Will try
I will bring up using the HIPPA compliance app practice wide.
wont dissect UN distally for AIN xfer definite

6. How certain are you that you will implement this change?

(17)

Certain ⁽¹³⁻
76.47%)

Very Certain ⁽²⁻
11.76%)

N/A ⁽²⁻
11.76%)

7. What topics do you want to hear more about, and what issues(s) in your practice will they address? (17)

Nerve
reconstructive
I don't have a practice, I'm a nurse on a post op floor
HIPPA compliance
HIPPA
Nerve compressions
Improper splinting
Wrist
CRPS
none
business of medicine
I'd be interested in seeing a presentation on PRP injections.

8. Were the patient recommendations based on acceptable practices in medicine?

(24)

Yes ⁽²³⁻
95.83%)

No ⁽¹⁻
4.17%)

9. If you answered No on the question above, please explain which recommendation(s) were not based on acceptable practices in medicine? (1)
see above answer

10. Do you think the presentation was without commercial bias?

(27)

Yes (26-
96.30%)

No (1-
3.70%)

12. Please provide any additional comments you may have about this educational activity. (8)

Continue with education

na

Excellent course

none

do breakout sessions again

I was very pleased with this year's program.

As one of the participants of this educational activity, we want to encourage you to implement those ideas that were appropriate to your healthcare environment.

This evaluation is confidential and no individual will be identified by this office (Continuing Medical Education and Professional Development). It will only be used for quality improvement.

We look forward to seeing you at future University of Louisville events. Thank you very much.