MINUTES: Academic Section Executive Teleconference

Time: Monday, September 15 @ 11h00 – 12h30 (Eastern)

Attendees: Ian Stiell, Brian Chung, Eddy Lang, Jeff Perry, Jill McEwen, Jim Christenson, Garth Meckler, Jonathan Sherbino, Kirk Magee, Laurie Morrison, Mark Mensour, Rodrick Lim, Martin Kuuskne, Jennifer Artz

Regrets: Claude Topping Jim Ducharme, John Foote, Rob Woods, Simon Field, Rob Green, Vera Klein

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION: Laurie will send the Leadership Program curriculum to Jim Christenson and Howard Ovens.

ACTION: Jim Christenson/Jenn to review the agendas to best use the expertise of the Working Group and panelists.

ACTION: (All) Promote inaugural GMeS and FEI releases at your medical school.

ACTION: Ian/Jenn to write CAEP Board asking for $250 annual prize for best Educational Innovation Abstract at annual meeting.

ACTION: Ian/Jenn can modify the Tables to produce a draft publication for the upper level. This can then be verified with individual sites.

ACTION: Ian/Jenn will draft a description of an Academic Consultation Process for the Academic Section Executive, which upon endorsement could proceed to the CAEP Board.

ACTION: (All) Provide names of experts available to participate in 10-12 minute videos on topics from Rosen’s text to Mark Mensour.

The minutes from July 2014 were reviewed.

2015 Academic Symposium Updates – J. Christenson

The title of the 2015 Academic Leadership Symposium has been finalized: "How to improve emergency medicine academic leadership, governance, and funding at your university".

The terms of reference will be similar to the previous symposia. The leads and titles for the three panels falling under the symposium title are as follows:

Howard Ovens – Leadership: How to build Leadership within the EM academic community and beyond

Dave Petrie – Best models: What are the best models for University EM governance and administration?
Eddy Lang - Funding: What is an appropriate amount of funding and how to achieve it

The panel leads, Ian Stiell, and Jim Christenson are meeting next week to review what is expected and timelines. The panelists for each topic are not finalized, but they will include a current leader and support from Ian Stiell and Jim Christenson. Poignant vignettes from across Canada from exceptional leaders with a background in emergency medicine will be gathered.

Laurie has indicated that the Leadership Programs at the University of Toronto are fully subscribed, and she has offered to provide some interim results and the curriculum to the panels.

**ACTION:** Laurie will send the Leadership Program curriculum to Jim Christenson and Howard Ovens.

It may be a challenge to engage all 17 academic leaders. It is hoped that each will be on a panel. Each will be encouraged to attend the symposium and invite up-and-coming leaders in their department to join. Efforts will be made to engage all emergency medicine leaders, not only academic heads, but also hospital chiefs and the pediatric leaders. Engagement will be a priority.

**Update from Working Groups**

**Leadership/Administration – J. Christenson**

With the focus on the Academic Leadership Symposium, it will be necessary to review the interests of the core Leadership Working Group and the three panels of the Academic Symposium. Although Jeff Perry kept the Research Working Group separate from the Academic Research Symposium, it may be advantageous to integrate the two or have Working Group members participate on the panels.

**ACTION:** Jim Christenson/Jenn to review the agendas to best use the expertise of the Working Group and panelists.

The panelists will be invited to Working Group calls.

**Education Scholarship – J. Sherbino**

GEMeS (similar to CMAJ info POEMS) and Feature Education Innovation (FEI) are being published monthly from each medical school. Ken Milne produced a CAEP cast (audio podcast) for first FEI. It is scheduled to be released on September 19, 2014.

**ACTION:** (All) Promote inaugural GEMeS and FEI releases at your medical school.

**CAEP Cast**

CAEP Cast is a digital abstract or audio podcast. A CAEP Cast was produced for the FEI. It was hosted by Ken Milne, as he interviewed Teresa Chan and Alim Pardhan on their education innovation. It will be released on September 19, 2014.

**Education Innovation Abstracts**

The Research Committee and Education Working Group have updated the ScholarOne website so that Education Innovation Abstracts are fully integrated into the Abstract Submission system for CAEP 2015.
The Education Working Group has also requested of the Research Committee that a $250 award be given for the highest ranking education innovation abstract. This is the same award and criteria as for the other research awards, including Top Investigator, Top Medical Student, and Top Pediatric Awards. There is also the Grant Innes Award ($500) for top overall abstract, one for top resident abstract ($500) plus seven awards for Resident Research Abstracts ($250).

Some Academic Section Executive Members are concerned about whether requests concerning the education innovation should be funneled through the Academic Section (instead of the Research Committee). The Research Committee manages the entire abstract process and the research awards, so this request went to the Research Committee.

The Academic Section questioned whether all education abstracts (research and innovation) should be handled by the Academic Section. There was reluctance, because research abstracts might be better served if kept as a single group, whether education or pediatrics or EMS research.

**ACTION**: Ian/Jenn to write CAEP Board asking for $250 annual prize for best Educational Innovation Abstract at annual meeting.

---

**Research Scholarship – J. Perry**

The main focus is to complete the manuscripts from the Academic Symposium. Resident research manuscript is drafted. All three manuscripts are expected to be complete by the first week of November, when they will proceed to the Academic Section for approval, then to CJEM.

How can we as an Academic Section facilitate the manuscript process? Jeff will send the Academic Section Executive all the manuscripts in one batch (three). The Academic Section Executive will circulate and give X days to respond. At this point, the Academic Section Executive is charged with looking for big concerns, i.e., no re-writing. Everyone can respond to the e-mail exchange. If anything major appears, it can be added to the agenda for the November meeting.

The next big priority will be to create mentorship networking groups and a network to facilitate multicenter studies, like PERC for adults.

---

**Review Environmental Scan (Escan) – I. Stiell**

A 12-page PDF (including six large tables), which includes the data summarized at the CAEP 2014 Conference and all of the (blinded) individual site data, was distributed.

This format will allow the data to be shared with each medical school, excluding Table 6 (funding), which can only be shared in aggregate form. It should only include the mean, median, and range.

There were concerns over the accuracy of the data (especially funding questions that could be interpreted multiple ways), but it is intended that each site be contacted to review the results by phone and validate the responses.

---

**Publishing the Escan**
A number of formats were proposed for publishing this data (but including the individual site date in a publication was not endorsed).

1) An executive summary followed by three detailed reports with recommendations under the headings of Leadership/Administration, Research, and Education.

2) A single overview paper, with an in depth appendix with all the tables (minus individual data).

There were concerns about redundancy among potential manuscripts and the lack of punch, if a main paper takes away from the focused topic papers.

The tone of all the publications will be important and must be consistent, because it should talk about the “haves” and how to get there by addressing the “have-nots”. The messaging needs to focus on achieving excellence in an area and not just funding goals. There is an amazing amount of variation and opportunities within Canadian medical schools.

In order to do this, the current status must be known and insight into the challenges must be given by experts. It will be necessary to interpret, explain, and make a recommendation.

With the Academic Symposia on Education Scholarship and Research complete, drafting Education and Research sub-papers is ideal. The Administration may require additional background work that will be done during the Leadership Academic Symposium.

**ACTION**: Ian/Jenn can modify the Tables to produce a draft publication for the upper level. This can then be verified with individual sites.

**Authorship**

Everyone on the executive can be an author on the manuscript, as this will give it profile and will be a tight writing group.

**Consultation to academic departments**

SAEM offers this service, but Ian’s discussion with them revealed that it is designed to help new residency programs get started or to help established sites prepare for a review. This is not what the Academic Section is interested in doing.

Previously (last Academic Section Executive meeting), a site visit and report were discussed as the mechanism. Although the Academic Section would need to charge, the Academic Section could do this at cost. Expenses and time would be covered.

There was a positive reception for the idea, but it was unclear if there was a demand or need. Jim Christenson will have a better vantage point on this with respect to administration/leadership after the 2015 Academic Symposium, but Jonathan Sherbino and Jeff Perry are well-positioned to assess sites.

Although this service should be described and publicized, the Academic Section should proceed with caution as the costs may be too much for struggling programs. Also, struggling programs may be reluctant to ask for help, and the intent is not to act dictatorial, but rather provide the best options.

If the department wants an external review, there may be ways for it to be funded internally.

In order to provide a consulting service, we must be able to identify the “haves” and “have-nots”. All of the best models must be understood, so that the “have-nots” can achieve excellence. Again, the messaging cannot be about funding, but rather about models that work.
ACTION: Ian/Jenn will draft a description of an Academic Consultation Process for the Academic Section Executive, which upon endorsement could proceed to the CAEP Board.

Escan for pediatrics

Garth Meckler has agreed to provide some support for the next Escan directed at the pediatric academic departments.

Other New Business

Proposal for Resident Rep/Instead of Martin

The Resident Ex-officio member, Martin Kuuskne, is interested increasing resident participation on the Academic Section. The Resident Section would like to create a description of the resident role on the Academic Section to identify what they could do. They would like to propose that a second resident representative be added.

There was reluctance to add another position to the Academic Section Executive, as it is already a large group. Those present suggested that it does not need to be the Resident Chair who participates on the Academic Section Executive, nor does participation in the Academic Section need to be via the Executive. Jim Christenson and Jonathan Sherbino would welcome a resident representative on their Working Groups.

Mark Mensour request

CME group is developing an EM review course and is looking for experts to create 10-12 minutes video’s on Rosen’s text (210 subjects). They are asking the Academic Section Executive to provide the names of experts to contribute.

ACTION: (All) Provide names of experts available to participate in 10-12 minutes videos on topics from Rosen’s text to Mark Mensour.

Next meeting

The next Academic Section Executive meeting will be mid-November.