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Background
• 1999: Research Directors’ Interest Group (RDIG) of the Society of Academic Emergency Medicine (SAEM) developed consensus statement on EM resident scholarly project requirement.

ACGME Program Requirements on the EM Resident Scholarly Activity
Must advance residents’ knowledge of the basic principles of research, including how research is conducted, evaluated, explained to patients, and applied to patient care.

Sponsoring institution and program should allocate adequate educational resources to facilitate resident involvement.

• Initial intent focused on emphasizing unique specialty-specific literature.
• Variety of interpretation among programs.
• Single accreditation system for graduate medical education in place for July 2020.
• Need for revised consensus document on best practices, processes, and outcomes for the emergency medicine scholarly activity.

Problem Statement
After the initial steps towards creating an up-to-date consensus amongst the major governing bodies of EM on the ‘scholarly project’ requirement for EM residents, what qualitative agreement is there amongst attendees at the following consensus conference?

Methods
Consensus methodology: techniques or processes used to achieve a nonbiased, valid agreement among a group of individuals with diverse opinions and expertise.

First Round
1. Selection of stakeholders and participants
   Association of Academic Chairs in EM
   Residency Review Committee/ACGME Program Directors
   Emergency Medicine Resident’s Association
   1. Creation and distribution of survey
   2. Analyzing results (360 responses) to determine initial areas of concordance and discordance
   3. Dissemination of results from initial survey

Second Round
5. Consensus Meeting
   1. Stakeholder representatives share viewpoints
   2. Group discussion (>50 participants)
   3. Re-rank outcomes using anonymous polling
   6. Qualitative Analysis
   1. Data: Transcript from consensus meeting
   2. Primary themes, or parent nodes, identified using deductive approach through content analysis via coding of transcript
   3. Further deductive analysis used to identify subthemes, or child nodes.

Discussion
• Attitudes toward the EM resident scholarly activity have evolved with time.
• Primary goal: instruct residents on the process of scientific inquiry.
• Ideas for outcome metrics varied greatly among participants.
  – Traditional methods, such as authorship on peer-reviewed original research publications will always be one of a number of ways to evaluate faculty productivity.
  – It is critical to address how to evaluate contributions via non-traditional formats and work products, such as blogs, contributions to FOAMed websites, tweets, etc.
  – It will be incumbent upon stakeholders to address how to measure and recognize these new traditional scholarly activities and academic accomplishments and how to create an academic currency from them that can be recognized institutionally.

• Limitations
  – Potential for bias
  – Possibility that individuals who participated do not represent range of opinions
  – Survey limits

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Example theme statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals of the Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>The scholarly project should teach residents to ask questions, digest scientific information, develop methods, and use critical appraisal skills, so that upon entering a career, they have the tools to continue life-long learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of scientific method and evidence-based medicine</td>
<td>A measurable result</td>
<td>Outcomes are best when interests are aligned and residents collaborate with faculty at their respective institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of EM as a Profession</td>
<td>A &quot;point&quot; system</td>
<td>Resident output from the project should demonstrate validity, competence, and publishable quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving the growth of EM</td>
<td>A &quot;piecewise&quot; approach</td>
<td>The way the resident scholarly project is interpreted may be a feature that helps distinguish programs, so that residents may choose one to best meet their long-term goals and interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity of research</td>
<td>A lack of standardization as distinction, room for niche among programs</td>
<td>The amount of literature generated by residency programs ultimately directs how Emergency Medicine is going to progress in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived resident attitudes and interests</td>
<td>Development of EM</td>
<td>Broadening the desired outcomes of the scholarly project in order to accommodate resident interests would also allow faculty to concentrate on developing and mentoring residents who are truly interested in research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program resources and limitations</td>
<td>Expert non-physician involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions
• The consensus document may serve as a best practices guideline for EM residency programs by delineating the goals, definitions, and endpoints for the EM resident SA.
• Each program must evaluate the resources available and individually implement requirements by balancing the residency review committee requirements with their own circumstances.
• Themes emerged during the consensus process highlight this integral connection between healthcare systems, leadership, and the ultimate goals and outcomes of resident scholarly activity.
• Springboard for discussion of possibilities for future change in the system.
• Exploring leadership in medicine, and the process of building consensus.
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