



Emergency Medicine Research Section Meeting

Monday, Oct. 1, 2018

9:00 – 10:00 am PST

Room: Upper 13

San Diego Convention Center

San Diego, CA

MINUTES

Participants: N. Garg (Chair); A. Liferidge (Board Liaison); S. Welsh; S. Gutovitz; J. Femling; J. d’Etienne; J. Belsky; M. Elie; C. Van Hise; G. Wilkerson; S. Venkatesan; A. Meltzer; L. Rives (Staff)

Others Participating: F. Bokhari; F. Bajam; P. Fu

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Old Business
 - a. Section Name Change
 - b. Update and discussion on Section Grant proposal
 - c. Councilor Report
 - d. Secretary Report concerning newsletters
3. New Business
 - a. Discussion on Investigator Pool – Collaborative Efforts
 - b. Other new business from members
 - c. Members interested in revamping Section webpage
 - d. Continue quarterly calls for the new year

Key Points Discussed

1. N. Garg announced that the new name of the Section, the Research, Scholarly Activity and Innovation (RSI) Section was approved by the Board of Directors. The Section materials will be updated to reflect the change.
2. The group provided introductions.
3. L. Rives shared that the ACGME was coming out with changes to core common program requirements for Section VI and that it would be open for public comment in the Fall. She noted that she would let the Section know when the comment period opened as there were elements that could impact protected faculty time as well as scholarly activity.

4. N. Garg shared that last year the group put forward a resolution to the Council on scholarly activity. She noted that the Section supported it but that it wasn't as well received by others because they felt it would put more burden on programs. She noted that it did not pass last year. She shared that the Section then decided to go after a Section Grant to conduct a survey on scholarly activity. She noted that the group discussed the potential for survey fatigue and had therefore decided that they would try to take a qualitative approach. She said that the plan was to get a booth at an exhibit hall during a conference to interview people on their thoughts about scholarly activity. The Section would then analyze the trends from responses. C. Camargo suggested that rather than conducting interviews, the group pull 5-10 definitions on what reasonable scholarly activity is and then field test them. Others at the meeting were in agreement. The group noted that scholarly activity covered a wide range from resident to faculty. The group felt that it would be of value to give program directors a resource on the types of scholarly activity that exists.
5. The guest surgeons in attendance shared what the value of scholarly activity meant to them. For surgeons in Taiwan, research is structured in a way to be rewarding however, it has very stringent requirements. Other Section members noted that at their institutions, they were still building the initial infrastructure to do research. This was particularly the case with new programs and community-based programs. The group discussed the continuum of research and scholarly activity. A suggestion was made to organize scholarly activity into levels (i.e. at Level I you should be doing X, at Level II you should be doing X and Y, etc.) The group noted that creating levels could end up inadvertently harming programs and were reminded of last year's resolution. The group discussed creating a broad definition of what scholarly activity was and then organizing into tiers with ranges.
6. Group members shared their experience with scholarly activity. G. Wilkerson shared that he was working on a project to re-write the guidelines on scholarly activity and noted that there are well defined definitions that currently exist. He shared that they went to every EM program website to look at each program's requirements for scholarly activity. He noted that the ranges went from very robust to "we support it." The group noted that it would be important to keep smaller programs and programs without a lot of resources in mind so as to be thoughtful and helpful and not create any overwhelming burdens.
7. The group discussed the value of organic and supportive growth for cultivating scholarly activity, rather than a top down approach of requirements to be enforced. The group discussed what they wanted their goal to be. They debated if their goal should be that more EPs do research, or more EPs understand research. The group felt that the goal should be to ensure that practicing physicians understand well designed and valid research.
8. The group noted that if the goal is to promote research, then they should help groups with fewer resources build them up or encourage them to get involved in a consortium. They also noted that even in places with fewer resources, there might be a QI project that would involve components of research. Others noted that contributions, such as a blog or podcast, could also be considered scholarly activity. Another member said that curriculum could be scholarly activity.

9. A suggestion was made to create a range of scholarly activity, not for residents, but for faculty. Another suggestion was to focus on QI projects and then encourage their growth into research projects.
10. Group discussed rather than having a range for residents – do one for faculty.
11. N. Garg suggested that the group write an information paper. The group suggested involving the Academic Affairs committee and noted the importance of having multiple organizations (i.e. CORD, EMRA) agree on what scholarly activity is. All were in agreement that alignment would be key.
12. A suggestion was made that the group look at current activities and start coordinating. They discussed making ACEP membership the target audience for their work. A suggestion was made to garner buy-in from the membership by calling it self-learning, or QI. They noted that when your job wasn't dependent on promotion or tenure, that scholarly activity could be defined broadly. It was also discussed that while in the past EM was consumer of research, they are now are driving more of it.
13. The group discussed the need to find balance between those with fewer resources/infrastructure and to find a way to provide them with a "menu" of ideas for scholarly activity that they can pick and choose from. These resources should include things that they would 't think of as traditional scholarly activity (i.e. the blog, etc.).
14. N. Garg said that she would create a draft of the paper and then the Section would work to collaborate with other societies. The paper will be more of an editorial/review with examples and citations of what currently occurs. The group agreed that taking the approach of "carrots not sticks" would be important.
15. As there were no nominees for the open offices during the electronic nomination process over the summer, the group conducted elections. There was a call for nominations from the floor for the following open offices: chair-elect, alternate councillor, and secretary/newsletter editor. The following individuals were nominated.
 - a. Chair-elect – James D'Etienne, MD, MBA
 - b. Alternate Councillor – Gentry Wilkerson, MD, FACEP
 - c. Secretary/Newsletter Editor – Carlos Camargo, MD, FACEP
16. There were no other nominees from the floor. The section members present voted for the candidates. All voted in favor of the nominees. The newly elected officers will join the current officers listed below:
 - a. Chair – Nidhi Garg, MD
 - b. Immediate Past-Chair – Wayne Bond Lau, MD
 - c. Councillor – James Miner, MD, FACEP
 - d. EMRA Rep – Alex Janke
17. In addition to the officers, C. Van Hise and S. Venkatesan will assist staff liaison L. Rives with the management of the Investigator Pool.

18. L. Rives provided an update on the investigator pool. She has been putting those in search of research collaborators in touch with other experts in the Section.
19. N. Garg shared that there is a draft newsletter article that explains the new EMRA appointment. She shared her goal in the past was to capture perspectives of researchers and do in-depth interviews. She asked for suggestions from the group.
20. N. Garg shared that the e-list is going away after ACEP18 and the group will communicate in EngagED. She encouraged the group to go in and access.
21. The surgeon guest suggested creating a subset of the Section on trauma and injury. He proposed creating a workgroup that would be focused on this.
22. Meeting was adjourned.