Menon 1

Reshma Menon

Mr.Speice

ISM

10 February 2017

Interview Assessment 6: Medical Technology

Name of Professional: Adam Alder

Profession: Pediatric Surgery

Date: 2/1/17

Place: Children's Medical Center Dallas

This interview was one of the most important interviews for me because this was the initiative in which I got my mentor. What made me even more happy to Dr. Alder as my mentor was the amount of effort Dr. Alder spent with me and taking personal initiative to teach me. My interview with him lasted almost an hour and a half, the longest of any other interview, and in it I truly learned a lot.

One of the biggest thing Dr. Alder and I discussed was medical technology. I asked questions on if he believes the da vinci model was truly helping the hospital. I had researched about the da vinci robot so I already knew what it was, but in my research I noticed that not everyone was for it. A lot of people were against such medical technology, leading to some medical debate. I believe that by showing this knowledge I was able to get Dr.Adler to take more of an interest in teaching me. He told me the reason so many people were against such

technology was that many doctors are afraid that it will replace humans completely, which obviously can have a lot of negative consequences. However, he told me that a human doctor is always going to be needed. No matter what, even with the rapid increase in technology, human touch to medicine is going to be the most important element.

This is relevant to me because obviously as time goes on I am going to have to learn to adapt to more technology in medical field. More and more aspects of not just medical professions, but any profession will become replaced by technology. But it is definitely a sense of job security knowing there really never will be a time when technology will completely strip me of a job. The information did change my perspective on medical technology because previously I had seen in as something that can be positive or negative but now I see it only as a positive. The drawbacks to it just are not even comparable to its benefits, benefits such as steadier movement that prevent patients from developing more problems that can prove fatal in the long run.

Dr.Alder described how many people are shifting to biomedical engineering because of this instead of just a medical field. This confused me because I though that when he said that there will always be doctors but there is not always a need for technology, there would be more doctor positions and therefore more desires to be doctors. But I quickly realized why this was the case. In many instances when I asked Dr.Alder what improvements doctors need to be making or what are the problems with medical field right now, he always gave me similar pics of advice: doctors need to use more medical technology. This made me understand that science has reached its maximum without technology. In other words, in order to improve doctors we need to improve technology. So in order to make more improvements, they need more people that are

capable of making these improvements such as biomedical engineers, as opposed to doctors who simply use these advancements to treat others. This made me wonder if I can use technology to treat cognitive birth defects, such as those in my original work. If there were medical technology to help students and kids interact better with the ways their mind thinks, those kids could receive just as good of education as a normal functioning child. With technology the possibilities are endless.

By interviewing Dr.Adler I learned so much roe about the integration of medicine and science. There is so much room for improvement in the technological aspect that provide it to be a great job center. For example, technology can constantly shrink itself so that cuts become more precise. But humans can only do so much. That being said, I do understand the value of humanity in medicine better at the same time. I know that technology will be on the rise, but that doesn't mean humanity is falling. Overall this entire interview helped me see the balance of technology and medicine and showed how my previous thoughts on the negative aspects of medical technology were wrong. It helped me see possible future integrations of temescal ter congy and pediatric surgery but still left me with more questions to ask my mentor. Will limits ever be drawn? How far should technology go in the first place? Why isn't technology advancing at a faster rate? All these will be answered in my next mentor visit, which I anxiously await.

JAN (FEB MAR APR MAY JUN JUL AUG SEP OCT NOV DEC 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 34 Dr. Alav 1. help lettle peepl, whelp hen
with one sychem o There
part, most pre wro you were
thing, pascinated with te try's spec
to du it o so intersorea and
ovan commers, meneris, wo, were, do. 20. Swang - hole nork, hipical try Kiving hornies all do propried why vore and this ise parent, are no chice melling. I amis BICK Whale, > Biggs out supice + brant/back iced. There such parkers movel, nere et is land more expreser, salue to au t tamanc, mjorg med and ga mare vom pour les de stemach, man neuer dere now, colo happer. huested in devel hours one place, - proben & us. wet

quet , niested in ig one to

you, singue descrute Te was

prun - researe = (civ.) fre

and + property. Various

query n ander neg - work

out pufarnere to proteens. cheleve. Reserve rises bithe all grup rose 4. Pediatric sursol- of want who called bioles is it tachers residency system of rought in aculture a, such seems

****** JAN FEB MAR APR MAY JUN JUL AUG SEP OCT NOV 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 13 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 6 viant upper anedrora surjen Reds hernia the theelivers surgen Red

ale andre next cause pred

Stepe. Hert varing a spreather pred

Playroom or Sitt 300 d at ecces

Prayroom or Sitt 300 d at ecces

Rae Sare freeds dury, acceptive

the need a reedical need a redicties tecen an peterre as pect licies ; wark Boce Stran relative of beleating Medicine Bry School Test Borselling School Revers & created to cold to select the cold of the cold to the cold of accters. trocal is rsue med e a livenis vote 4 yrs med. End of biliships. Clinical 2 cless - 2 ch nto chem e tresur exprese Rey detale med: School ? praetice wave to & pren it seroces w/ test Loen

Understanding	describes and paraphrases the information. Thoroughly answers the		
Applying	question "What did you learn?" Thoroughly applies and illustrates the information. Thoroughly answers the following questions: "Why is this information relevant to you, your learning, your topic, and your ISM journey?		
Analyzing	Thoroughly analyzes, examines, and breaks down the information. Thoroughly answers the questions: What are the key parts of this information? How can it be classified? Thoroughly connects to prior knowledge and thoroughly explains whether or not the information changed or modified prior knowledge		
Synthesizing	Thoroughly synthesizes prior knowledge with new learning to demonstrate continuous growth of knowledge. Thoroughly answers the questions: How can I combine this new knowledge with my prior knowledge in order to facilitate continuous growth? How can I combine all of this information to create a plan to develop my original work?		
Evaluating	Thoroughly judges/appraises the information. Thoroughly answers the questions: Was this new knowledge effective in helping me achieve my goals? Was this new knowledge helpful, surprising, encouraging, discouraging, motivating, disagreeable, controversial?		
Creating	Demonstrates a clear, detailed, and well-thought-out plan describing what you will do with/as a result of this new learning. Thoroughly answers the questions: How can I blend this new knowledge with previous knowledge to create new ideas? What new		

	questions have arisen as a result of this new information.		
Evidence of Proofreading	No grammatical, spelling, or usage errors.		
Proper Heading/Format	All requirements met		
Professional Tone	Entirety of assessment is written in the appropriate professional tone.		
	Thoroughly annotated article		

Rubric rating submitted on: 2/24/2017, 10:42:27 PM by speicee@friscoisd.org

	10	8	5	0
Understanding Your score: 10	Throughly describes and paraphrases the information. Thoroughly answers the question "What did you learn?"	Adequately describes and paraphrases the information. Adequately answers the question "What did you learn?"	Somewhat describes and paraphrases the information. Somewhat answers the question "What did you learn?"	Does not describe paraphrase the information. Does not answer the question "What did you learn?"
Applying Your score: 10	Thoroughly applies and illustrates the information. Thoroughly answers the following questions: "Why is this information relevant to you, your learning, your topic, and your ISM journey?	Adequately applies and illustrates the information. Adequately answers the following questions: "Why is this information relevant to you, your learning, your topic, and your ISM journey?	Somewhat applies and illustrates the information. Somewhat answers the following questions: "Why is this information relevant to you, your learning, your topic, and your ISM journey?	Does not apply and/or illustrate the information. Does not answer the following questions: "Why is this information relevant to you, your learning, your topic, and your ISM journey?
Analyzing Your score: 10	Thoroughly analyzes, examines, and breaks down the information. Thoroughly answers the questions: What	Adequately analyzes, examines, and breaks down the information. Adequately answers the questions: What	Somewhat analyzes, examines, and breaks down the information. Somewhat answers the questions: What	Does not analyze, examine, and break down the information. Does not answer the questions: What are the key parts of this

	are the key parts of this information? How can it be classified? Thoroughly connects to prior knowledge and thoroughly explains whether or not the information changed or modified prior knowledge	are the key parts of this information? How can it be classified? Adequately connects to prior knowledge and thoroughly explains whether or not the information changed or modified prior knowledge	are the key parts of this information? How can it be classified? Somewhat connects to prior knowledge and thoroughly explains whether or not the information changed or modified prior knowledge	information? How can it be classified? Does not connect to prior knowledge and does not explain whether or not the information changed or modified prior knowledge
Synthesizing Your score: 8	Thoroughly synthesizes prior knowledge with new learning to demonstrate continuous growth of knowlege. Thoroughly answers the questions: How can I combine this new knowledge with my prior knowledge in order to facilitate continuous growth? How can I combine all of this information to create a plan to develop my original work?	Adequately synthesizes prior knowledge with new learning to demonstrate continuous growth of knowlege. Adequately answers the questions: How can I combine this new knowledge with my prior knowledge in order to facilitate continuous growth? How can I combine all of this information to create a plan to develop my original work?	Somewhat synthesizes prior knowledge with new learning to demonstrate continuous growth of knowlege. Somewhat answers the questions: How can I combine this new knowledge with my prior knowledge in order to facilitate continuous growth? How can I combine all of this information to create a plan to develop my original work?	Does not synthesize prior knowledge with new learning to demonstrate continuous growth of knowlege. Does not answer the questions: How can I combine this new knowledge with my prior knowledge in order to facilitate continuous growth? How can I combine all of this information to create a plan to develop my original work?
Evaluating Your score: 10	Thoroughly judges/appraises the information. Thoroughly nswers the questions: Was this new knowledge	Adequately judges/appraises the information. Adequately answers the questions: Was this new knowledge	Somewhat judges/appraises the information. Somewhat answers the questions: Was this new knowledge	Does not judge/appraise the information. Does not answers the questions: Was this new knowledge effective in

	effective in helping me achieve my goals? Was this new knowledge hepful, surprising, encouraging, discouraging, motivating, disagreeable, controversial?	effective in helping me achieve my goals? Was this new knowledge hepful, surprising, encouraging, discouraging, motivating, disagreeable, controversial?	effective in helping me achieve my goals? Was this new knowledge hepful, surprising, encouraging, discouraging, motivating, disagreeable, controversial?	helping me achieve my goals? Was this new knowledge hepful, surprising, encouraging, discouraging, motivating, disagreeable, controversial?
Creating Your score: 10	Demonstrates a clear, detailed, and well-thought-out plan describing what you will do with/as a result of this new learning. Thoroughly answers the questions: How can I blend this new knowledge with previous knowledge to create new ideas? What new questions have arisen as a result of this new information.	Demonstrates a clear and well-thought-out plan describing what you will do with/as a result of this new learning. Adequately answers the questions: How can I blend this new knowledge with previous knowledge to create new ideas? What new questions have arisen as a result of this new information.	Demonstrates a somewhat clear and well-thought-out plan describing what you will do with/as a result of this new learning. Somewhat answers the questions: How can I blend this new knowledge with previous knowledge to create new ideas? What new questions have arisen as a result of this new information.	Does not demonstrate an acceptable plan describing what you will do with/as a result of this new learning. Does not adequately answer the questions: How can I blend this new knowledge with previous knowledge to create new ideas? What new questions have arisen as a result of this new information.
Evidence of Proofrading Your score: 5	No grammatical, spelling, or usage errors.	Very few grammatical, spelling, or usage errors.	Too many grammatical, spelling, or usage errors.	Enough grammatical, spelling, or usage errors that the assessment is borderline incomprehensible.
Proper Heading/Format Your score: 10	All requirements met	Most requirements met	Some requirements met	Few or none of the requirements met.
Professional Tone	Entirety of	Most of	Some of	None of

Your score: 10	assessment is written in the appropriate professional tone.	assessment is written in the appropriate professional tone.	assessment is written in the appropriate professional tone.	assessment is written in the appropriate professional tone.
Annotated Article Your score: 10	Thoroughly annotated article submitted with assignment	Adequately annotated article submitted with assignment	Somewhat annotated article submitted with assignment	No annotated article submitted with assignment

Comments: