Meeting Minutes: Academic Section Executive Teleconference
Time: Friday, July 11, 2014 @ 10h30 – 12h00 (Eastern)

Attendees: Ian Stiell, Garth Meckler, Jim Christenson, Martin Kuuskne, Jonathan Sherbino, Jill McEwen, Jim Ducharme, Claude Topping, Jeff Perry, Rob Primavesi, Kirk Magee, Jennifer Artz

Regrets: Bruce McLeod, Claude Topping, Eddy Lang, John Foote, Laurie Morrison, Rob Woods, Rodrick Lim, Simon Field, Brian Chung, Rob Green, Vera Klein

Note: The new CME Chair Mark Mensour will be invited to future meetings.

Welcome
The two new members: Garth Meckler and Martin Kuuskne were welcomed to the CAEP Academic Section Executive. (The new CME Chair Mark Mensour will be invited to future meetings.)

Previous minutes from April 2014 were quickly reviewed, and no outstanding items were identified.

The website has been updated with pictures of all the new executive and WG members.

New pictures from the Academic Symposium 2014 are coming.

Debrief on Academic Symposium CAEP 2014

Overall
The Academic Symposium was extremely well received with great discussions surrounding the panel data and recommendations. Although more than 240 were registered, 60-80 were present for the duration (J. Perry).

Because it is so easy to check a box to register, in the future it should be assumed that the maximum number of attendees will be 100. This is significant because of the costs associated with food and the room size.

The timing of the Academic Symposium is a challenge since there are conflicting meetings. The topics of the 2015 Leadership/Administration Academic Symposium should be considered when concurrent meetings are scheduled.

The lively discussion surrounding each of the panel presentations requires that future Academic Symposia keep tight time control on their presentations to accommodate the valuable feedback from the attendees. These comments will be important to consider in the further development of the recommendations (J. Christenson).

Achieving Excellence in Resident Research Panel
Lisa Calder’s group led a strong discussion surrounding the important components of a resident research program. Her panel has written the first draft of a manuscript for CJEM publication. They also had a debriefing meeting in late June.

Training and Developing Career Researchers Panel
Jeff Perry’s panel led a lively discussion on a Canadian EM fellowship ideally endorsed by CAEP/Academic Section and modelled on the SAEM Fellowship. Their follow-up meeting is scheduled for the end of July, and they anticipate the first draft of their manuscript at the end of September.
Research Funding
The Research Funding Panel (Christian Vaillancourt) presented their findings on the funding of salaries and operations for research. They characterized the unequal national landscape especially with respect to internal departmental funding and the need for advocacy. They are in the process of drafting a manuscript.

CJEM Publication of Academic Symposium Papers
Although the manuscripts took some time last year, Jim Ducharme indicated confidentially that a change in publishers is in the future and that the journal will be online only (and bimonthly). It is expected the CJEM Abstract Supplement will still appear in print for conference attendees. It is expected that online manuscript versions could appear within 2-4 weeks of CJEM acceptance.

The submission process was reviewed. All manuscripts should be submitted to CJEM for EIC editing prior to CAEP Board approval. After approval, no further changes can be made, and the final manuscripts can be uploaded to ScholarOne for the final publication steps. It is recommended that prior to EIC editing, the manuscripts be reviewed by the Academic Section.

2015 Academic Leadership Symposium
Jim Christenson provided a draft of potential topics for the 2015 Academic Leadership Symposium. He drafted the Terms of Reference based on copy provided by Ian Stiell from previous years.

The draft provided by Jim has been edited herein according to discussions during the call (page 4).

Three tentative panel lead candidates (Brian Holroyd, Eddy Lang, and Dave Petrie) have been contacted, but there are possible time conflicts. Panel leads will be first author on any manuscript, while Jim Christenson will be last author. Ian Stiell is recommending Jim Christenson as a potential panel lead.

ACTION:
(All) Contact Jim Christenson with your interest in leading a panel.

Specific updates to Academic Leadership Symposium Draft
Based on the interests of the broad CAEP audience, Jeff recommended that the original topic 3 be switched to topic 1.

As for the Best Models Topic (topic 2 [page 4]), it was suggested to expand the goals and also include: to recommend strategies to support the development of academic units (i.e., achieve status or even greater development). It was noted that there are multiple diverse strategies to create a strong department. Consideration must be given to the different needs and requirements across the country.

As for topics 2 and 3 [below], these are opportunities for department heads to invite future leaders.

Academic Leadership Symposium Panels and Audience
Overall, these topics might not have the broad appeal that the past two symposia did, so different strategies may be required to recruit attendees. The potential audience should be considered broadly and include ED chiefs, because the
topics are also applicable to leaders of clinical and operational components of EM departments. A dichotomy was noted between providing practical advice to current heads and attracting a broader audience.

It was mentioned that there is a need to start early in the promotion of the Academic Leadership Symposium. Participants can be identified early and non-responders can be encouraged. Each academic department could identify key people to attend.
CAEP 2015 Academic Leadership Symposium:
How to improve emergency medicine academic leadership, governance, and funding at your university

Terms of Reference
There will be three panels as described below, each comprised of approximately six members. The members will be selected primarily from the Heads or Past-heads of Academic Emergency Medicine Units at Canadian universities. Each panel will be responsible to:

a) **Describe** the current state in Canada and potentially examples of US models
b) **Create recommendations or describe most effect models** for Canadian Academic EM units
c) **Present** the recommendations at the CAEP 2014 Academic Symposium
d) **Publish** the recommendations in CJEM

1. How to build Leadership within the EM academic community and beyond?
   **Leader:**
   **Goals:**
   - To define the key elements of leadership and leadership models (potentially to present short video vignettes of high level leaders from emergency medicine)
   - To recommend specific steps to build and strengthen leadership within the Academic Emergency medicine community in Canada (mentorship, succession planning, courses, resources)
   **Potential Members:**

2. What are the best models for University EM governance and administration?
   **Leader:**
   **Goals:**
   - To define effectiveness as an outcome of an emergency medicine academic program
   - To describe current governance and administration models and relate them to the overall effectiveness of the academic unit
   - To point out variability and gaps across Canada and determine best models to develop, sustain, and grow strong academic programs
   - To recommend strategies to support the development of academic units
   **Potential Members:**

3. What is an appropriate amount of funding and how to achieve it
   **Leader:**
   **Goals:**
   - To report on funding for academic EM programs across Canada
   - To benchmark academic unit support against expectations in the areas of administration, undergraduate education, postgraduate education, and research
   - To determine best strategies to grow and establish sustainable funding across Canadian university EM departments/divisions
   **Potential Members:**
Update from Working Groups: Leadership/Administration – J. Christenson

Leadership Forum

At CAEP 2014, the CAEP EM Leadership Forum was coupled with the meeting of the Leadership WG. In the future, heads attending the CAEP EM Leadership Forum should be encouraged to invite a guest for succession planning. It was noted that the meeting should be kept small, so not more than a single guest per head. The Leadership Forum was viewed as a great start to the sharing of practices and the discussion of current issues on an ongoing basis.

The timing of EM Leadership Forum/WG Meeting is important. In CAEP 2014, the meeting started late, because of the plenary and the group was not able to address all of the real issues (e.g., combined training program). Unfortunately, discussions around the Escan results were also cut short.

Jim’s WG has also used their time to thoroughly review the objectives set in the Academic Section Terms of Reference. Part of this challenge was to engage the leaders.

EM Leaders

Because of the different administrative structures, it can be difficult to know who the leader is at some universities. It may require the engagement of clinical heads, who should be included regardless of their title.

At the symposium level, include all – operational leaders, clinical leaders, and academic leaders. It must be considered that identifying the EM leaders (from all areas) is necessary to promote the symposium. They must be contacted early, and non-responders should be “pushed” for attendance. Representatives should be encouraged from each university to identify key people to attend.

Update from Working Groups: Education Scholarship – J. Sherbino

Jonathan indicated that the three education symposium papers were published in CJEM and encouraged all of the executive to put them in the hands of educators.

The Education WG has established an EM Education Network through the identification of Education Champions at each institution to facilitate bidirectional communication between each university and the Education WG.

CAEP is incorporating the Education Innovation Abstracts into the same process as research abstracts, but with independent submission and review processes, which will include separate reviewers.

GEMes (similar to infoPOEMS) with Julian Poitras and Teresa Chan as editors will be distributed monthly starting in September. They will review materials applicable to the frontline teacher.

Similarly, profiles of education innovations by institution will be distributed monthly. These will avoid the duplication of education ideas.

The Education WG is also looking through the Escan for data to write a specific sister piece to global Escan publication.

ACTION:

(WG Chairs/Ian/Jenn) Inform Ian and Jenn about any sub-analysis.
Distribution of Escan results

Slides were distributed to the WG chairs, and Ian and the Escan team are meeting shortly to identify the items to appear in the main Escan manuscript. There are concerns about confidentiality. Only financial information was gathered under the premise of confidentiality.

**ACTION:**

Ian/Jenn will consult and send out a version of the data to the executive.

**Update from Working Groups: Research Scholarship – J. Perry**

Jeff’s WG on Research Scholarship discussed the creation of a new national EM WG (like PERC or Critical Care) for the purposes of collaboration and networking. This national EM Research Forum has been discussed with Rob Green and the CAEP Research Committee. It is anticipated that a concrete strategy will be in place for CAEP 2015.

The challenge is the current system of research silos. Networking must occur. Facilitation of multi-centre sites and support of junior researchers will be encouraged through collaboration and mentorships.

**Academic Section Consultations on Request (Ian, Jeff, Jim C.)**

Expert consultations on Research and Education (pending for Leadership) for have-not EM units were discussed.

The Escan identified areas of strength and weakness, so this group could offer a consultation for a given site, on request. The service could be retained by domain (i.e., research, education, leadership/administration). If the Academic Section Executive could agree on a process, then the service could be advertised to those have-nots, who could benefit from a consultant. It may take the form of a one-day site visit followed by a report. Perhaps, the site would pay for travel, and CAEP funding for an honorarium for the consultant time.

**Challenges of an Academic Section Consultation Process**

Jonathan agreed that it is a strong idea, but operationally, it may be challenging. It needs to revenue neutral. A single site visit may not be effective, but instead it should involve significant preparatory work and e-dialogue to have everything started. The consultant would need to see the current state (e.g., staff, productivity). It could be a single site-visit consultant, but two consultants for the whole process.

There are other challenges. The have-nots may not consider themselves have-nots. The consultations are not intended to be condescending, but may be perceived this way. Broad advertising for the service and sensitive packaging of the consultation are essential.

As this may also be sensitive at the intuitional level, both the university and medical faculty should be engaged. The EM unit must be considered as part of the whole institution.

Further concerns were raised by Jim Ducharme, as this process is not only politically sensitive, but also there is no single solution for all departments. The background of the entire university must be understood, as well there must be buy-in at the university/faculty level. There is definitely not a one size fits all, and this must be promoted as a tool to help.

**Overall (Academic Section Consultations)**
It is expected that the information provided at the Academic Leadership Symposium (as it did with education scholarship and research) will provide a description of the current state across the country (supplementing the Escan results), and the have-nots might be more anxious for this once they see the symposium.

The discussion was summed: considering that the EM unit politics are related to the university structure, the academic section consultants (especially WRT leadership) must make the diagnosis before providing a cure.

Recall that mandates of the CAEP Academic Section—to improve academic activities. Publishing the Academic Symposium results is one way to this, but it could be supplemented through this process.

As a starting point, the Academic Section can provide feedback to sites (regarding the Escan). Reviewing the results from each site in light of overall scan, may initiate sites to follow-up further.

**Next meeting**

September 2014 will be the next meeting, and subsequent meetings will be every two months.