Fellowship Directors
Meeting

POSNA Annual Meeting
Indianapolis, IN
April 27, 2016
Agenda

- Recap of the 2016 Match
- Jack Flynn, Fellowship Match Grievance Committee
- Fellowship Applicant Survey 4/2016
- AAOS Fellowship Match Oversight Committee
- Fellowship committee activities
  - POSNA accreditation
Recap/Review of 2016 Match

• Fellowship year 2017-2018
• SFMP website went “live” September 1st, 2016
• Interview process:
  – November 16th, 2015 through March 31st, 2016
  – One issue reported to POSNA
    • Applicant interview canceled due to weather→ skype, asked for “second visit”
  – Post-interview contact with applicants:
    • Applicants can contact fellowship: encourage communication with administrative staff, current fellows and past fellows. Not with attendings.
    • Fellowship programs cannot initiate contact w/ applicants
Recap/Review of 2016 Match

• Rank lists submitted
  – 45 programs (2 more than last year) with 73 fellowship positions (2 more than last year)
  – Match results were manually reviewed on April 4th
  – Applicant rank list
  – Fellowship rank list
Recap/Review of 2016 Match

- Match date: April 8th, 2016
  - Programs sent an email that morning
- Applicants had access to Match results on April 8th by logging onto the SFMP website
- 55 full applicants in match* (decrease of 14)
  - 2015: 69
  - 2014: 76
  - 2013: 67
- 44 North American (decrease by 3)
- 11 IMG (decrease by 11)
Recap/Review of 2016 Match

• Mean number of application/applicant: 17.0
  – (2015 17.5  2014 18)

• Mean number of Programs the applicant ranked: 8.2 (2015 7.8   2014 7.4)
  – Average number of offers to applicants: 5.4

• Mean number of applicants the Program ranked: 10.8 (2015 11.8   2014 11.8)
Recap/Review of 2016 Match

• Match results
  – 50 applicants “matched”
    • 2013: 50
    • 2014: 60
    • 2015: 53
  – 5 applicants “un-matched”
    • 2013: 17
    • 2014: 16
    • 2015: 16
• 0 North American (2012: 1, 2013: 1; 2014: 3; 2015:0)
Recap/Review of 2016 Match

• Withdrawals
  – IMGs difficult to track
  – North American
    • 4 withdrawals prior to match
    • 1 matched in spine
# 2016 Applicant Rank List
(Matched 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2016 (n=50)</th>
<th>2015 (n=53)</th>
<th>2014 (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 (46%)</td>
<td>24 (45%)</td>
<td>30 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 5 choices:**
- **2016:** 100%
- **2015:** 96%
- **2014:** 78%
- **2013:** 96%
Recap/Review of 2015 Match

• Programs: 73 fellowship positions
  – 50 filled positions
    • 27 programs
  – 23 un-filled positions
    • 18 programs
2016 Fellowship Program Match List

- Top 5
  - 2016: 54%
  - 2015: 47%
  - 2014: 60%
  - 2013: 66%

- Top 10
  - 2016: 90%
  - 2015: 85%
  - 2014: 95%
  - 2013: 88%
Recap/Review of 2016 Match

- April 8th unfilled programs were listed (voluntary) onto the SFMP website
  - 23 fellowship positions
- Problems with Interview process, applicant or fellowship conduct: None
Fellowship Match Grievance
Issues: Past

• 2012: 1 applicant reneged on match agreement
• 2014: 2 applicants reneged on match agreement
• 2015: 1 applicant reneged on match agreement
  – fellowship director left the pediatric fellowship, applicant did not want to do fellowship
Fellowship Match Grievance
Issue: 2016

- Jack Flynn (Chairman of Fellowship Match Grievance Committee)
Fellowship Applicant Survey

• Data collected: April 2016
• 38 of 50 applicants in match responded so far…..
• Average number of applications: 17 (2015: 16; 2014: 16)
• Average number of interviews: 9.8 (2 to 17)
  – 2015: 7.6 (3 to 16)
  – 2014: 8.5 (1 to 17)
  – 2013: 8.2 (2 to 14)
Fellowship Applicant Survey

• Did you apply for fellowships in any other subspecialty?
  – Yes: 1 (2.6%)
  – No: 37 (97%)

2015

  – Yes: 1 (3%)
  – No: 33 (97%)
Fellowship Applicant Survey

• Late cancellations: 58%  
  (2015: 50%; 2014: 28%; 2013: 60%;)
  – Applicant: 57%  
    (2015: 55%; 2014: 98%; 2013: 68%)
• “too expensive” 65%  
  (2015: 54%; 2014: 65%; 2013: 53%)
• “not enough time” 59%  
  (2015: 44%; 2014: 65%; 2013: 65%)
  – Program: 10%  
    (2015: 3%; 2014: 2%; 2013: 14%)
Fellowship Applicant Survey

- Estimated cost to applicants
  - Per interview: $390
    - 2015: $566
    - 2014: $372
    - 2013: $515
  - Total cost (38 respondents): $146,960
  - Project this to all 50 matched applicants: $193,369

- Difficult to arrange interview without work hours violation?
  - Yes 43% (2015: 43%; 2014: 37%; 2013: 30%)
  - No 61% (2015: 61%; 2014: 63%; 2013: 70%)
Fellowship Applicant Survey

- Pressured to make commitment prior to match day?
  - Yes: 1 applicant (2.6%)
    - 2015: 4 applicants (12%)
    - 2014: 1 applicant (2.3%)
    - 2013: 4 applicants (10%)
  - No 97%

- Pressured directly to applicant?
  - Yes: 1 applicant (2.6%)
    - 2015: 3 applicants (14%)
    - 2014: 1 applicant (2.3%)
    - 2013: 3 applicants (7.5%)
  - No 97%

- Pressured indirectly through residency program?
  - Yes: 0%
    - 2015: 2 applicants (9%)
    - 2014: 1 applicant (2.3%)
    - 2013: 1 applicant (3.3%)
  - No 100%
Fellowship Applicant Survey

Did any fellowship director encourage you to contact them, after your interview, if you were interested in their fellowship and were going to rank their program highly?

2013: 37.5%
2014: 21%
2015: 32%
2016: 16%
Fellowship Applicant Survey

Were you encouraged, or was it recommended to you by the fellowship program, to have an “extended” interview or “try-out” which was longer than the normal interview day?

2015: 1 applicant (3%)
2016: 0%

POSNA forbids this activity
Fellowship Applicant Survey

Where did you get your information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFMP</th>
<th>2013: 74.3%</th>
<th>2014: 71%</th>
<th>2015: 66%</th>
<th>2016: 85%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSNA website</td>
<td>2013: 82.9%</td>
<td>2014: 88%</td>
<td>2015: 88%</td>
<td>2016: 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAOS book</td>
<td>2013: 8.6%</td>
<td>2014: 15%</td>
<td>2015: 9%</td>
<td>2016: 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fellowship Applicant Survey

Did you have any fellowship interviews at the 2015 IPOS meeting?

2012: 29.7%
2013: 25%
2014: 21%
2015: 16%
2016: 42%

1-2 programs
Fellowship Applicant Survey

Did you have any fellowship interviews at the 2016 AAOS annual meeting?

- 2013: 7.7%
- 2014: 7%
- 2015: 2%
- 2016: 2.6%

IPOS and AAOS meetings are opportunities for cost/time savings for applicants.
Fellowship Applicant Survey

What additional information do you feel would have been helpful to know about a fellowship, during the planning and scheduling phases, to make more informed/educated decisions?

• Number of people in match
• Interview dates ahead of time
• Money (pay, insurance etc)

• Applicants wanted “more information” on each fellowship’s websites
Fellowship Applicant Survey

- AAOS Webinar on Fellowships (Fall 2015)
  - Webinar was seen live by 4 applicants (10.5%)
    - 2014: 24% of applicants (n=8)
  - Webinar was reviewed later on AAOS website by 8 applicants (22%)
    - 22% of applicants (n=97)
Fellowship Applicant Survey

Was your rank list influenced by whether or not a program was ACGME accredited?

Yes: 26%
No: 74%

New Question
Fellowship Applicant Survey

• What changes would you (applicant) recommend to the match process for future years?
  – Interview dates listed as early as possible
  – Group interviews regionally
  – Saturday interviews
  – Know size of applicant pool
Take home points

• Websites
  • Improve fellowship websites—link to POSNA
• “Extended interviews” or “tryouts” not permitted
• Offer applicants the option of interviews at IPOS and AAOS
• Early notification about interviews
• Post-interview contact discouraged
AAOS Fellowship Match Oversight Committee

- Sanctions for Fellowship Match violations
- No society has any effective sanctions for applicants that leave their subspecialty area.
  - POSNA
    - Applicant: restriction of membership in POSNA
    - Fellowship: academic participation in annual meeting
- Many Fellowship subspecialties have experienced applicant misconduct
AAOS Fellowship Match
Oversight Committee

• Non-compete clauses/Restrictive covenants
  – If these exist for a fellowship they will be listed on the SFMP website and/or the POSNA website
  – Approved by the POSNA BOD
• “Extended interviews”, “tryouts” and scrubbing into surgical cases are not acceptable.
• Webinar for the fellows starting this summer: “Tips for the Orthopaedic Fellowship Year”. May 17, 2016
ACGME decision: D.O.s
Unified Accreditation System

- AOA (American Osteopathic Association)
  - Accredits programs and osteopathic medical schools
  - Certifies osteopathic physicians
- AACOM (Association of American Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine)
- AOA and AACOM will become ACGME member organization (phased in to ACGME Board and Review Committees)
- DO and MD graduates will have access to all GME programs
- AOA-accredited programs may apply for ACGME-accreditation 7/1/2015 to 6/30/2020
ACGME decision: Fellowship Eligibility

• New requirement effective 7/1/2016….
• Requires completion of either ACGME-accredited or RCPSC-accredited orthopaedic surgery residency.
• AOA-accredited programs may apply for ACGME-accreditation 7/1/2015
• So how can D.O.s participate in ACGME-accredited fellowships in 2017 (and thereafter)?
ACGME decision: D.O.s Fellowship Eligibility

• If an AOA-accredited medical school has applied for ACGME-accreditation by 8/1/2016 then their graduates will have current rules apply for all fellowships, then no problem…

• However, if an AOA-accredited medical school has NOT applied for ACGME-accreditation by 8/1/2016, then the AOA graduate could potentially enter orthopaedic fellowship programs as permitted under the “Exception”.

• RRCs may or may not allow “Exceptions”, however the Orthopaedic Surgery RRC WILL allow the “Exception”.
ACGME decision: D.O.s Fellowship Eligibility

• What is the “Exception” for eligibility?
  – Completion of non-ACGME-accredited core residency
  – Demonstrated clinical excellence compared to peers throughout training
  – Satisfactory completion of USMLE Steps 1, 2 and if eligible, 3
  – Additional: e.g. additional clinical or research training; demonstrated scholarship; demonstrated leadership; completion of ACGME-I residency
ACGME decision: D.O.s Fellowship Eligibility

• What is the “Exception” for eligibility?
  – Must be reviewed and approved by the GMEC or GMEC subcommittee
  – ECFMG verification if international
  – Evaluation by CCC using fellowship milestones within 6 weeks of matriculation

• Word on the street…..a program which has a history of using the “Exception” eligibility requirements for their fellowship will be scrutinized by the ACGME.
Fellowship Committee 2015-2016

- Improved/updated information for applicants on the new POSNA website
  - Listing/Links for every program (map)
  - Program information updated
  - Recommend that each program link to their own websites
  - SFMP match timeline posted (links to SFMP)
  - Links to previous match data (these presentations)
Fellowship Committee 2015-2016

• POSNA accreditation Project
Background

• Accreditation ensures minimal standards in training
• Provides for “uniform” product
• Minimizes outliers
Background

ACGME

- Only current accreditation body for Peds Ortho fellowships
- Primarily concerned with large training programs (medicine, surgery etc.)
- Relevance to smaller subspecialities is questionable
Background

ACGME

- Processes are onerous
- Expensive ($6200/$4300)
- Many within our subspecialty forego accreditation completely
  - 25 programs
  - 43 in match in 2015
Pros

POSNA accreditation

• We gain control
  – We are Peds Ortho authorities—we can decide minimal standards

• Bring all programs under one umbrella
  – Not a referendum on ideal training program

• Make accreditation relevant

• Make accreditation responsive
  – Competency based
Cons

POSNA accreditation

• Onus of initial implementation
• Ongoing work to maintain
• Hard to go back
• Financial risk
• Legal risk?
Precedent

- OTA accreditation
  - Successful
  - Financially neutral
- ASES, others considering
- AAOS Fellowship accreditation project team
  - Support alternative accreditation pathways
  - AAOS will explore
POSNA accreditation

• 2014-2015: Discussions begun by Scott Luhmann
• Summer 2015: OTA plan used as starting point
• Worked through fellowship committee
• Surveyed all program directors
• Draft presented to POSNA BOD 9/15
POSNA accreditation

• Refined based on BOD input
• Drafted proposed timeline
• Vetted by task force of fellowship program directors
  – Canada, Shrine, large, small, non-ACGME etc.
• Drafted language for oversight and penalties
• Discussed by BOD 12/15
POSNA accreditation

- Reviewed by Carl Stanitski and Dick Haynes (previous ACGME reviewers)
- Language for oversight/sanctions were reviewed (and approved) by legal
- Plan approved by BOD 3/16
- Details emailed to all program directors
Q1 As POSNA considers the development of a POSNA accreditation for pediatric orthopaedic fellowships, would your program be interested in this?

Answered: 32  Skipped: 0

- Yes, in lieu of our current...
- Yes, in addition to...
- Yes, and we are not...
- No
Q2 Understanding that the ACGME currently charges $5000 a year for accreditation, how much would your program be willing to pay for POSNA accreditation?

Answered: 31   Skipped: 1
Proposal

- Pediatric trauma experience
- Malpractice coverage
- Cost = $2000; $1000 for ACGME
- Faculty requirements
  - 2:1 ratio
  - POSNA members
  - Total # trainees must not exceed faculty
- Educational program
  - Fellow conferences, journal club etc
Proposal

• Non-surgical responsibilities
  – Harder to quantify
  – Minimum 1 outpatient day/week
  – Trauma call ideally

• Research encouraged
  – Minimum requirements (e.g. IRB)
Proposal

• Surgical responsibilities
  – 250 cases***
  – 45% of program directors (55% thought ≥ 300)
  – 10th percentile ACGME = 391 codes ~ 260 cases
  – Not broken down by subspecialty
Q13 What do you feel is a reasonable number of MINIMUM surgical cases (not CPT codes) for a pediatric orthopaedic fellowship (as primary surgeon or first assist)?

Answered: 31   Skipped: 1
Q14 As part of a proposed accreditation system, do you favor MINIMUM surgical case volume requirements for each subspecialty (e.g. hip, spine, foot & ankle etc.)?

Answered: 32  Skipped: 0
Proposal

- **Evaluations**
  - Can be institutional
  - Samples drafted
  - Fellow eval of faculty
  - Faculty eval of fellow
  - Program eval by faculty
  - Program eval by fellow***
    - Submitted online to POSNA

- **Program director attestation**
Implementation

• Accreditation required to participate in 2017-2018 match cycle (i.e. match day April 2018, for fellows starting Aug 1, 2020)
• Deadline for applications Jan 1, 2017
• All completed applications (with $$) will be granted provisional accreditation
• ACGME accreditation = POSNA accreditation
• All programs reviewed by fellowship committee over 2 year period to confer full accreditation
• Renewals reviewed on yearly basis
Thoughts

• Not a referendum on optimal training program
  – Each program will continue to have its own personality and educational priorities
• Goal is to provide minimum and uniform standards for fellowship training
• We want (need) everyone on board