2011 AOCD Midyear Meeting Review

Marco Island, Florida
March 16-19, 2011
The attached information represents only a portion of the registered attendees at the recent 2011 Midyear Meeting held in Marco Island, Florida.

This information is only meant to be a general summary as evaluation forms will continue to trickle into the office in the coming weeks.

Contents include:

1. Summary of attendee responses on the various forms
2. AOA Document Survey summary
3. Attendee list
Membership Survey forms returned

Responses:

Newsletter Comments:
22 preferred electronic delivery of the Dermline
21 preferred paper delivery of the Dermline

Yearly updates on coding section
Potential needs of the college like evaluations
Updates on medicare
Guidelines for e-prescribing
PQRI reporting and EMR Penalties
Clinical pearls
Alumni updates
Results of trustee meetings
Feature each residency program throughout the year as originally planned.

Website Comments:
Update layout
On-line registration for meetings
Job listings
Needs modernized
On line CME Category 1-A
Needs updated always
It is hard to go right where I need to go
Good info but often hard to find.
Website should evolve over time.
Blog
Classifieds
Resources
Increase disease database for patient use.
BOT Fulfills needs of members and the college

We don’t know what the Board is doing.
Send email copies of meeting minutes
More communication
Improve co-herency of college breakdown
Abuse of slave labor in residencies
Email addresses direct to Board on AOCD website.
More communication of issues with membership.
More pharma support at meetings.
Better organization
Twice a year society meetings with reports from each area.
Not sure what the Board does.
Apply for more funds/grants to cover costs.
Listen to comments and make the changes.
Don’t allow program directors to run on board, bias.
Limit term
I feel like an uninformed member.
Encourage recent graduates to get involved.

Meeting schedules, locations, transportation.

The content, location and need for CME credits were all factors cited as a reason to attend.

23 responded distance from major airport was a problem
  5 responded it made no difference.

Arrange transportation/shuttles
Rental cars = headaches
Not more than 2 hrs from airport
Within 45-60 minutes from airport
Locations of midyear meetings are remote
Needs to be a reasonable drive
Less than 100 miles from airport
½ to 1 hour drive to major airport
Would not attend if travel were greater than one hour.
Location needs to be easily accessible

Do away with midyear meetings
Lack of notification and announcements of meeting
Start meeting earlier, end earlier
Need more D.O. attending lectures
Schedule over a weekend
Get better lectures
Do Like about Midyear Meetings
Different locations
Smaller meetings
Warm weather
Sunny locations

Don’t Like about Midyear Meetings
Travel
Lack of communication
Too many resident lectures
Too early start time
Cold weather locations
More mailings
Too far from airport
Need better quality of lectures
Lack of transportation
Marco Island was inconvenient
High price of items
Difficult to get to
Not enough content
Locations remote
Driving time to meetings
Expensive
Meetings held during the week – I have to work for a living
Too much lecture content crammed into a short period
Timing during the year
Quality of presenters
Lack of AOCD Attending faculty
Decreased lecture quality

Worst Experience of the meeting
Travel time
Cold room
Expense
No shuttle
Too far from airport
Expensive hotel
Lack of rooms at hotel
Lectures were not intriguing
Too many days of work were missed
The drive
Not suitable for a family practitioner
Some resident presentations were poor quality
Too many resident lectures
Needs to be closer to airport
Locations for future meetings:

- Aruba 1
- Ashville, NC 1
- Aspen 1
- Atlanta 3
- Austin 5
- Baltimore 2
- Bermuda 1
- Biloxi, MS 1
- Boca Raton 1
- Boston 5
- Canada 1
- Cancun 3
- Charleston 7
- Charlotte 2
- Chicago 1
- Colorado 2
- Columbus 1
- Cruise 1
- Dallas 2
- Denver 3
- Destin, FL 3
- Durango, CO 1
- Ft. Lauderdale 3
- Georgia 3
- Hawaii 4
- Hilton Head 3
- Jackson Hole 5
- Key West 5
- Lake Tahoe 4
- Los Angeles 3
- Maine 2
- Marco Island 6
- Maui 1
- Miami 5
- Miami Beach 1
- Minneapolis, MN 1
- Monterey Park 1
- Monterrey 2
- Naples 4
- Nashville 1
- New York, NY 12
- Northwest 1
- Orange County, CA 3
- Oregon 1
- Orlando 4
- Palm Beach 1
- Palm Springs 1
- Park City 4
- Puerto Rico 2
- Philadelphia 6
Phoenix  1
Portland  6
Reno  1
Salt Lake City, UT  1
San Antonio  3
San Bernadino  1
San Diego  9
San Francisco  1
San Luis Obispo, CA  1
Santa Barbara  3
Santa Monica  1
Sante Fe  2
Sarasota  1
Savannah, GA  3
Scottsdale  2
Seattle  5
Sedona  1
South Beach FL  1
Southeast  1
St. Lucia  1
St. Petersburg  1
Tampa  2
Telluride  1
Traverse City  3
Vail  2
Vegas  4
Washington, DC  1
West Palm Beach  1
Williamsburg, VA  2
Yellowstone  1
Yosemite  1

Program Evaluation Summary:
Were you interested in a specific speaker?
27 Yes  26 No

Have you previously attended an AOCD CME program?
51 Yes   3 No

What is the population of the city you practice in?
2 = under 10,000  
8 = 10,000-30,000  
11 = 30,000-50,000  
10 = 50,000-100,000  
21 = over 100,000  

What type of practice are you currently engaged in?
22 solo  29 group  _ hospital  _ military  _ retired

2011 Midyear Meeting Summary for Marco Island, Fl
Future Topics Requested:
What topics would you like to see addressed at future AOCD CME programs?

Accutane
Alopecia
AOA & AOCD Updates
Clinical Pearls
Coding
Contact Dermatitis
Cosmetic
Derm Surgery
Dermatology in 3rd World Countries
Dermoscopy
Dermpath 101
Difficult Diagnosis
E.H.R.
E.M.R.
Experiences in the Field
Genodermatoses
Health Reform
Hippa
Inpatient Dermatology
Medical Liabilities
Medical Malpractice
Melanoma
MOHS
MTX
New Laser Technology
Osha
Pediatric Dermatology
Pigmentary Disorders
Round Table Discussions
Therapeutic Updates
Therapy
Warts
Speaker/Content Evaluations by day: Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Presentation met your needs. Excellent to Good to Average
Presentation provided usable ideas and/or techniques. Excellent to Good to Average
Program will improve professional effectiveness. Excellent to Good to Average
Time for questions & answers was sufficient. Average – Fair – Poor
Handouts were useful. Average – Fair – Poor
Seminar met your expectations. Excellent to Good to Average
Format and organization were effective. Excellent to Good to Average

Did these lectures meet the objectives of this CME program? YES= 36  NO= 1
Would you attend a similar conference next year? YES= 37  NO= 4
Was the activity commercially biased? YES= 7  NO= 31

Some topics were not at Dermatology Resident level, especially for second and third year residents. Areas of weakness noted on Resident lectures was Delivery.

Speaker/Content Evaluations by day: Thursday, March 17, 2011

Presentation met your needs. Excellent to Good to Average
Presentation provided usable ideas and/or techniques. Excellent to Good
Program will improve professional effectiveness. Excellent to Good
Time for questions & answers was sufficient. Average – Fair – Poor
Handouts were useful. Average – Fair – Poor
Seminar met your expectations. Excellent to Good
Format and organization were effective. Excellent to Good

Did these lectures meet the objectives of this CME program? YES= 52  NO= 0
Would you attend a similar conference next year? YES= 49  NO= 2
Was the activity commercially biased? YES= 12  NO= 41
**Speaker/Content Evaluations by day: Friday, March 18, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation met your needs.</td>
<td>Good – Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation provided usable ideas and/or techniques.</td>
<td>Good – Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program will improve professional effectiveness.</td>
<td>Good – Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for questions &amp; answers was sufficient.</td>
<td>Good – Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts were useful.</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar met your expectations.</td>
<td>Good – Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format and organization were effective.</td>
<td>Good – Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did these lectures meet the objectives of this CME program?</td>
<td><strong>YES= 46</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO= 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you attend a similar conference next year?</td>
<td><strong>YES= 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO= 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the activity commercially biased?</td>
<td><strong>YES= 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO= 38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speaker/Content Evaluations by day: Saturday, March 19, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation met your needs.</td>
<td>Excellent – Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation provided usable ideas and/or techniques.</td>
<td>Excellent – Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program will improve professional effectiveness.</td>
<td>Excellent – Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for questions &amp; answers was sufficient.</td>
<td>Good – Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts were useful.</td>
<td>Good – Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar met your expectations.</td>
<td>Excellent – Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format and organization were effective.</td>
<td>Excellent – Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did these lectures meet the objectives of this CME program?</td>
<td><strong>YES= 37</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO= 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you attend a similar conference next year?</td>
<td><strong>YES= 34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO= 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the activity commercially biased?</td>
<td><strong>YES= 9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO= 27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>