

2015 ASPHO Review Course Follow Up Survey

1. What was your primary reason for attending the 2015 Review Course?

Value	Count	Percent
Preparation for initial certification in pediatric hematology/oncology (March 24, 2015 ABP Sub-board Examination)	67	88.2%
Preparation for Part 3 of the ABP's Program for Maintenance of Certification in Pediatric Subspecialties Examination in 2015	2	2.6%
Preparation for Part 3 of the ABP's Program for Maintenance of Certification in Pediatric Subspecialties Examination (recertification) in 2016	3	4.0%
Other (Specify)	4	5.3%
Just for general update	1	
Preparation for Site Exam	1	
to get updated	1	
update MY INFORMATION	1	

2. What is your level of agreement with the following statement: The ASPHO Review Course provided effective preparation for the ABP Sub-board Examination in Hematology-Oncology / OR / the ABP Maintenance of Certification in Pediatric Subspecialties Examination (Hematology-Oncology).

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly agree	35	45.5%
Agree	32	41.6%
Neutral	5	6.5%
Disagree	1	1.3%
Strongly disagree	1	1.3%
Not Applicable	3	3.9%

3. Red blood cells:

Value	Count	Percent
Extremely valuable (4)	38	50.7%
Valuable (3)	34	45.3%
Somewhat valuable (2)	2	2.7%
Not valuable (1)	1	1.3%

4. You rated "red blood cells" a 1 or 2, please explain:

The hemoglobinopathy lecture was not helpful and reflective in the exam questions.

The questions on the exam that I remember on RBCs involved basic physiology of sickle cells and the difference between neonatal RBCs and adult RBCs. There were specific questions about solubility, i antigen expression, co-inheritance with Hb A or alpha thalassemia... I don't remember these topics from the board review course.

5. White blood cells:

Value	Count	Percent
Extremely valuable (4)	35	46.7%
Valuable (3)	35	46.7%
Somewhat valuable (2)	4	5.3%
Not valuable (1)	1	1.3%

6. You rated "white blood cells" a 1 or 2, please explain:

more genetics molecular biology than was covered

the lecture on leukocytes was not well organized and had lots of extraneous information

I think that this was a lot of information that was not tested and the information tested was not as emphasized.

7. Hemostasis

Value	Count	Percent
Extremely valuable (4)	51	68.0%
Valuable (3)	22	29.3%
Somewhat valuable (2)	2	2.7%
Not valuable (1)	0	0.0%

8. You rated "hemostasis" a 1 or 2, please explain:

I was comfortable with hemostasis prior to the review course

9. Cancer

Value	Count	Percent
Extremely valuable (4)	43	57.3%
Valuable (3)	23	30.7%
Somewhat valuable (2)	9	12.0%
Not valuable (1)	0	0.0%

10. You rated "cancer" a 1 or 2, please explain:

There is not a good coverage for minor cancer.

there were so many esoteric oncologic questions on the test that were not and probably could not be covered by the course
 Not all speakers understood the level of material that would be tested on and tried to give a master class not a master review for the exam

Certain lectures focused on too much unnecessary details like one on "Neuroblastoma and Renal Tumors"

There was alot of emphasis on staging and grouping of disease and no questions asked on the subject. There was alot of emphasis on chemotherapy, and modes of resistance, which I think should get more emphasis in the future.

There was a lot of obscure knowledge of oncology on the exam that I am unsure could be addressed in the course.

11. Stem cell transplantation

Value	Count	Percent
Extremely valuable (4)	35	47.3%
Valuable (3)	28	37.8%
Somewhat valuable (2)	9	12.2%
Not valuable (1)	2	2.7%

12. You rated "stem cell transplantation" a 1 or 2, please explain:

Although the talk itself was good, too many things were not covered in the talk.

Limited board questions

Presentation did not help focus the exam point.

Too much discussion of controversial topics.

There was very little of what was taught on the SCT lecture reflected on the actual exam. The content specifications were not adequately covered during this talk

There were surprisingly few SCT questions on exam. Content in review course was excellent though.

several questions in the exam were fairly ambiguous and needed indepth understanding of SCT, which was not provided in the lecture.

There were alot of stem cell questions on the boards. As a BMT physician I didn't mind, but I know some of my colleagues were surprised by the amount and depth needed. More emphasis on the timeline of infections would be helpful in the future.

13. Transfusion medicine

Value	Count	Percent
Extremely valuable (4)	27	37.0%
Valuable (3)	32	43.8%
Somewhat valuable (2)	13	17.8%
Not valuable (1)	1	1.4%

14. You rated "transfusion medicine" a 1 or 2, please explain:

A big topic with only one lecture that wasn't comprehensively covered during the talk

I was comfortable with transfusion medicine prior to the review course

Reviewed material did not represent test questions

Somehow, I did not like the lecture. Slides are not well organized.

The lecture was not reflective of the questions.

The transfusion medicine lecture was in too much depth for too few questions.

Too much time spent on non-FDA approved products that we were not being tested on as above

This lecture was very rushed, and while the slides had more info for us to review later, things that were on the test were not included in either her speaking or the slides, and it was hard to learn the material in how it was presented.

She spent too much time on octoplas rather than discussing things that were actually on the test, such as directed donation or febrile nonhemolytic transfusion reaction.

I felt that much of the lecture was a discussion of a specific pharmaceutical agent, and such topics do not really arise on the exam. The lecture could have been better geared toward key concepts that we have to understand as hematologists, ie TRALI, Coombs, etc (these subjects were covered but had to be rushed/abbreviated because of the time spent discussing the pharmaceutical agent).

I originally rated this lecture as free of commercial bias, but on re-review before the exam I noted that the speaker spent an inordinate amount of time on Octaplas, a commercial product that was not covered at all in the exam. More time in that lecture should have been spent on antibodies and transfusion reactions.

15. Research methods

Value	Count	Percent
Extremely valuable (4)	27	37.0%
Valuable (3)	39	53.4%
Somewhat valuable (2)	7	9.6%
Not valuable (1)	0	0.0%

16. You rated "research methods" a 1 or 2, please explain:

I was comfortable with research methods prior to the review course

Not a lot of questions

There could have been more covered on research methods during the course

There were several questions about IRB decision making that we did not discuss in the review course. Wording such as "more than minimal risk" and "benefit to patient" and testing a new drug and the IRB procedure for that. I had to guess on these. That being said, the statistics lecture was incredible and high yield and very well explained.

There were many questions regarding IRBs on the examination and this was not addressed during the review course.

there were a number of questions on IRB approval which were a little bit hard to interpret--the research methods review was very heavily weighted to statistics rather than regulatory process

17. How valuable was the Online Review Course as you prepared for your exam?

Value	Count	Percent
Extremely valuable	42	55.3%
Valuable	20	26.3%
Somewhat valuable	5	6.6%
Not valuable	0	0.0%
Did not use	9	11.8%

18. What specific suggestions do you have for either the Review Course or the Online Review Course?

Availability of more questions, with newer questions year to year.

Fantastic job! And good location.

Lots of immunology on the exam

Make it more affordable

More IRB, more information on biochemical disorders (i.e. Hurler's, Hunter's etc)

More emphasis on immunology and immunodeficiency

More questions. Bigger image bank.

More questions. I also used PREP in order to have more questions.

The content covered was very well matched to the content tested on the exam.

extremely useful and recommended course

offer annually?

Various questions on storage disease (hurler, gaucher) that were very specific (what enzyme, and in which cell is this enzyme located). Various questions on rare RBC enzyme problems (things we will likely not encounter in real life). If possible, would be helpful to have a high yield session (or at least come up with some tables/packet) of random/very specific things one must memorize (this could include mutations, immunohistochem, stains, keywords).

The chapters with the content specs were the most useful. Also, some talks were not given enough time- it felt rushed while others felt like they were given too much time

Overall, the course was excellent. For the oncology topics, the time devoted to each disease did not always correlate with the number of questions on the exam. For example, it seemed like a lot of time was spent on RB, but there were only 2 questions on the whole exam. Same for the histiocytoses. There were a ton of sarcoma questions on the test, and maybe not enough time devoted to sarcomas (especially RMS and EWS). The content for the lectures on chemo, BMT, AML, transfusion, hemoglobinopathies, hemolytic anemias, marrow failure and platelets was absolutely spot on for the questions. The anemia lecture might need some more on RBC basics. There were a bunch of questions on metabolic diseases that were not really covered in the course at all (Hurlers). The education methodology was minimally tested (and pretty common sense) so that lecture may not be needed. The lecture on statistics was probably more comprehensive than necessary. Generally, I felt well prepared.

I am unable to comment currently about how valuable the course sessions were to meet my exam preparations since I will take the exam next year- but I believe it will be very valuable in my preparations

There are some errors in the course material that have not been corrected since the last course was offered.

Wished the review course would have been slightly earlier so that I could review the online material longer and have the packet of powerpoints for a longer period of time (maybe if the course had been in Dec or Jan? Overall I loved the course and found it to be invaluable!

I thought the course was great and very much worth the time, effort. I obviously don't have my score yet, but I feel the material provided me an organized way to study and I know the course helped my overall performance. Also, the course was a solid review prior to starting my first attending job.

- BMT - should spend more time on infections and times they occur - Some of the speakers spent too much time reviewing the disease entities in their entirety vs. reviewing what we need for the boards purposes. - Hurler's syndrome and mucopolysaccharidases - like 4 questions on the test --- and need review of them and the mechanisms
Needs more comprehensive SCT lectures. Would add second lecture for SCT geared toward conditioning regimens and side effects. Transfusion lecture could have been structured better.

Overall the course was extremely valuable. At the very least it provided a framework to study from. Unfortunately the test did not feel like the focus was the same as from the review course. There were a few % questions that were nowhere in the course, and honestly shouldn't have been taught or on the exam. I would still recommend the course to trainees but with the emphasis points mentioned above.

There was one question out of 230 on the exam on education and teaching. While Dr. Kesselheim's lecture on this topic was well done, I am not sure that this material merits a full lecture in the review course given its lack of emphasis on the actual exam. Please make sure that presenters will make slides readable on paper. Some colors on letters were nice at presentation but horrible on book.

There were no questions this year on education methodology however there were quite a few on research ethics--maybe this could be reflected in the curriculum.

As I did the review questions, I kept making excuses like, "there's no way this will be on the actual test", or "this is way harder than the test will be". But it turns out the test was actually very hard! and some of the review questions were actually almost identical to certain test questions.

I was not anticipating so many questions regarding relapsed patients which was not covered in the review course. The test also surprised me in not having any questions on ITP, VWD, hemophilia management (for the most part), or radiation. I would try to include more coverage of rare anemias including sideroblastic, congenital dyserythropoietic, hemochromatosis, and RBC enzyme deficiencies since this seemed to be favorite topics.

there were some really specific questions about outcomes that I didn't get from the board review.

It should be held earlier so there is more time to study course materials between the review course and the exam.

This year there were many questions on enzyme disorders, not PK def. many questions on inborn errors of metabolism. Many % questions-I had not seen these in review questions or PREP questions

Overall I thought it was a great course but the initial certification exam was fixated predominantly on an esoteric knowledge base that is very difficult to comprehensively cover. More diligent and rigorous coverage of the content specifications is the only thing that may help.

there were many questions on ethics of research/IRB approval that were not covered at all by the course. overall I thought the course was excellent, both as a general review of the field and as prep for the test. We'll see how we all do on the results!!

There were more management/treatment questions on various cancers on the exam than I was expecting, as I feel this is constantly changing, and thus it would be hard to test this. A number that I can recall revolve around radiation (up front and in relapse), so if perhaps speakers could specifically comment on when it would be used in relapse? I'm glad I attended the course--thanks!

I would have liked the questions to be "mixed up" in terms of subject area. So that you can take a "practice test" of questions from different topics all combined. it is a little false to do 15 questions on Lymphoma all together at one time, as opposed to having that same question mixed in with transplant, immunodeficiency, histiocytosis topics.

More tables, specially for genetic alterations and inheritance patterns of diseases. Compilation of such tables that can be revised the last day or hour before exam.

I thought the course was really well organized, and the preparation materials were succinct and easy to study from. What I felt was somewhat difficult was the variability in approach of different speakers. Some speakers highlighted which ABP content specifications they would cover, others described them in detail, and others did not list them at all. I appreciated having the content specs in the lecture outline because it helped me ensure I was covering good ground. One thing that the review course did not cover in great detail was storage disorders, and for some reason, my exam had at least 4-5 questions about cytopenias related to storage disorders. There were also many questions about the O₂ affinities of rare and unusual hemoglobins. For the latter topic, obviously, we do not have the ability to review every last hemoglobin in existence, but perhaps it would help to review a general approach to questions like that. With regard to the research methods lecture, I thought this was a great overview. What we did not cover was IRB/research ethics, and I had at least 2-3 questions on this that were somewhat tricky. I had only 1 question on education/teaching, so that last lecture on education could have probably been abbreviated.

I don't know if it is possible, but a short review on radiation oncology - mostly specific side effects. I know that each section provided some information, but there were a couple of questions on somnolence syndrome, acute versus chronic toxicities (i.e. acute vs chronic cardiac toxicities). Not sure where you would fit it.

There should be some emphasis on the ethics portion of the specs. Also, the morphology review can be more informative instead of just question and answer.

I believe there needs to be more emphasis on the normal physiology and pathophysiology of disease. I think the review course is excellent and certainly makes for a better physician in day to day practice. However, I felt that there was too much emphasis on all of the memorization of the rare disorders for the exam and not enough on normal physiology and pathophysiology.

I suggest that all lecturers should put the content specifications relevant to the slide they are giving directly after and not at the end of the slides like the AML lecture. Otherwise this course is exactly what you need before the initial certifications and the lectures prodded recorded were very very helpful since I just listened to them 3 or 4 times after the real course and that is very practical since we are working all the time. I was kind of skeptical at the beginning regarding the cost of the course but honestly it is worth every dollar spent for the next exam takers absolutely without any hesitations.

I think this was a great course. The test seemed to have some very random stuff on it that is impossible to cover in a 4 day course. However, I would have been even more lost without the course. The stuff covered in the course I knew (after taking the course) and it helped me prepare the best I could. I recommend it to anyone needing to take the examination. Having access to the online lectures and handouts is also added benefit. I hope to not need them in two years, but it was great preparation.

antiemetics were not covered in pharm lecture, but were on the exam. There were quite a few questions on infants with anemia. There were some questions on SLE associated cytopenias and reasons for them (ie, why causes lupus-associated thrombocytopenia)

In general the information was very helpful and a majority of what was discussed in the review course was on the exam. I just have a few logistical suggestions that would make studying the syllabus easier. - In general I think it would be helpful if all the lectures had the format that some of them do when they list all the content specs and the pages that discussed them. It is useful when the actual wording of the spec is laid out (vs just putting the number/letter and then we have to go search for it like in the pharm lecture). Also then, it would be helpful to actually have the slides printed out with the numbering already on it b/c then we have to go and number each slide when it connects a spec to a slide number. -the ALL/AML lectures have some boxes that were darkened in and is hard to read, maybe make the shading a lighter color since the printed book is in black and white. -the BMT lecture have these very small charts and pictures that have pertinent info on them. would be helpful at the end to have a blown up one or something b/c I had to pause the lecture and write all of the small print in that I couldn't read. thanks!

There was a lot of pharmacology questions on the test. I felt the presentation was difficult to learn from the course was good--i would highly recommend it; there were some questions on the exam that seemed to be topics that weren't covered in the review, but more than likely I just wasn't understanding the question very well

The board review course was very helpful in preparing for the test. There were some very specific questions they asked that I thought I did not learn about in the board review or maybe just did not remember. 1. enzyme required to reduce iron 2. inheritance pattern for FXIII deficiency 3. mutation for X-linked versus female with HLH There were definitely a lot of questions about Red cell processes. Those rare hemolytic anemias were mentioned a few times. Overall I was very satisfied with the board review so thank you for that.