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Objectives

Understand the LSL Medical Education Call for Submissions

Hear tips for writing a successful submission

Learn about the peer review process
No Financial Disclosures
Submissions

We will be discussing:

Medical Education Call for Submissions

Research in Medical Education (RIME) Call for Research Papers
Timeline for Submissions

Annually

September  Calls for submissions are announced
October   Call for reviewers is announced
December Calls for submissions close and submissions sent for review

January  Peer review period
February Committees meet
March     Decisions sent out
Reviewers

• All reviewers are volunteers

• The Call for Reviewers is announced in October

• Reviewers self-identify their own areas of expertise

• We always need new peer reviewers!
Submission Types

Sessions in Medical Education

• Broad topics engendering discussion among diverse voices
• May consist of multiple presentations on a single theme or a single facilitated activity
• Submissions **MUST** include:
  Description of the session
  Learning objectives
  Facilitator and speakers
Highlights – Research In Medical Education

• Abstract
• Completed empirical investigation
• Presented orally or via poster
• Welcomes:
  • Small-scale pilots
  • Exploratory studies
  • Components of larger projects
Highlights – Innovation in Medical Education

• Abstract
• Program, project or other unique educational experience
• Report with valuable insight worth sharing and some data
• Presented orally or via poster
• Welcomes:
  • New and timely work
  • Generalizable to many institutions
  • Components of larger projects
Submission Types

RIME Research Papers

• Research papers should report completed investigations that contribute to medical education research and practice.
• The submitted paper must not have been accepted or be under consideration for publication elsewhere.
• Submissions MUST include:
  - Purpose
  - Methods
  - Results
  - Conclusions
Submission Types

RIME Review Papers

• Review papers should synthesize existing research and should provide direction for future research and practice.
• The submitted paper must not have been accepted or be under consideration for publication elsewhere.
• Submissions **MUST** include:
  - Objective(s)
  - Method
  - Results/Key Findings
  - Conclusions/Implications
Submission and Acceptance Rates by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Innovations</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Sessions*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Called *Emerging Solutions* in 2016
Submission and Acceptance Rates by Type: RIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Stats Innovations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovations</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral (%)</td>
<td>24 (12)</td>
<td>22 (10)</td>
<td>60 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster (%)</td>
<td>36 (18)</td>
<td>54 (25)</td>
<td>96 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected (%)</td>
<td>140 (70)</td>
<td>134 (65)</td>
<td>122 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (n)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral (%)</td>
<td>39 (25)</td>
<td>28 (19)</td>
<td>42 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster (%)</td>
<td>67 (44)</td>
<td>40 (28)</td>
<td>120 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected (%)</td>
<td>48 (31)</td>
<td>77 (53)</td>
<td>58 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Stats \textbf{Sessions}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral (%)</td>
<td>11 (6.5)</td>
<td>17 (9)</td>
<td>19 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster (%)</td>
<td>1 (.5)</td>
<td>6 (3.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected (%)</td>
<td>156 (93)</td>
<td>166 (87.8)</td>
<td>98 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Stats - RIME Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIME Submissions</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research (%)</td>
<td>9 (18)</td>
<td>14 (34)</td>
<td>7 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review (%)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected %</td>
<td>40 (78)</td>
<td>27 (66)</td>
<td>56 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Stats Overall Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate-Innovations</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate-Research</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate-Sessions</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review Form

Review Score Card

Follow instructions on the form to complete your evaluation.

Save Review

Review Question 1
Topic of importance: Is this topic relevant and timely for a national/international audience? Why or why not?

Review Question 2
Learning objectives: Are the learning objectives of the session both achievable and desirable?

Review Question 3
Plan to promote discussion: Is the session plan clearly described and have a high probability of generating a rich discussion of the issues presented?

Review Question 4
Overall Evaluation and General Comments: Please provide general comments or reflections you have on the overall quality of this session. Are there any areas that the authors should strengthen to improve this proposal?
## Review Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Innovation/Research Abstracts</th>
<th>RIME Research Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic of importance</td>
<td>Topic of importance</td>
<td>Title and Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Objectives</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Intro and Conceptual Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to Promote</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion and Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity of Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most feedback from reviewers is in narrative format.
# Review Criteria

Global rating for each submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctable Faults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Faults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH/INNOVATIONS/SESSIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediocre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Process

• Submissions receive up to 3 peer reviews

• Abstracts are assigned to reviewers by area of expertise

• Each reviewer is typically assigned 5 – 10 reviews

• Reviewers have about 1 month to complete reviews
The Process- RIME

• Submissions receive up to 3 peer reviews

• Papers are assigned to reviewers by area of expertise

• Each reviewer is typically assigned up to 3 reviews

• Reviewers have about 1 month to complete reviews
Reviewer Ratings Sessions

Based on 432 Reviews

- Excellent: 43%
- Good: 33%
- Mediocre: 18%
- Weak: 4%
- Very Poor: 2%
Reviewer Ratings: Research

- Excellent: 16%
- Good: 40%
- Mediocre: 28%
- Weak: 3%
- Very Poor: 13%

Based on 379 Reviews
Reviewer Ratings Innovations

Based on 432 Reviews

- Excellent: 33%
- Good: 43%
- Mediocre: 18%
- Weak: 4%
- Very Poor: 2%
Reviewer Ratings RIME

- **Excellent**: 30%
- **Correctable Faults**: 31%
- **Major Faults**: 4%
- **Very Poor**: 35%

Based on 109 Reviews
Submission Reviews

Things that don’t help the review process

• Reviews are late or not done

• Reviews with no comments or with just one or two words of comment

• Making up your own rating scale
Next steps – the Med Ed Planning Committee

• Results are aggregated and sent to the Medical Education Planning Committee

• Every submission and its reviews are read by one member of the committee
Next steps – the RIME Planning Committee

• Results are aggregated and sent to the RIME Planning Committee

• Every submission and its reviews are read by two members of the committee
The RIME and Med Ed Planning Committee

• Medical educators who are active in AAMC communities

• Read abstracts in preparation for their meeting

• Make program decisions over 2 1/2 days at the AAMC
## Making Sense of Reviewer Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Reviewer 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>mediocre</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>mediocre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>mediocre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>mediocre</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Making Sense of Reviewer Ratings

### Sorting the Reviewer Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Mediocre</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP RATED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHLY RATED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sessions Breakdown by Rater Review

Based on 233 Reviews

- **TOP Rated**
  - Excellent x 3
  - Or
  - Excellent x 2
  - Good x 1

- **HIGHERLY RATED**
  - Excellent x 2
  - Mediocre x 1
  - Or
  - Good x 2 or more

- **AVERAGE Rated**
  - Good
  - And
  - Mediocre

- **LOW Rated**
  - Mediocre
  - And
  - Weak

22% of reviews are Top Rated,
33% are Highly Rated,
30% are Average Rated,
15% are Low Rated.
The Program Planning Process

• **Space** on the program determines # of accepted abstracts

• 3 committee members assigned a submission category
• Each committee group discusses acceptance or rejection
• Preliminary accepts are grouped by themes
• Preliminary rejects are re-read
The Program Planning Process

- Abstracts and submissions continue to be winnowed

- Once a preliminary program is created, facilitators and moderators are suggested

- The process ends with suggestions for improved process and lessons learned
Breakdown by learner group

Top 18 rated sessions submissions

[Diagram showing breakdown by learner group: 12 medical students, 1 physician, 1 resident, 0 residents, 1 medical student, 1 physician, 1 resident]
Institutional representation for top 18 sessions
Important tips

• Get on the GEA listserv
  • Email  Chris McKnight  cmcknight@aamc.org
  • Email  Sarah Brown  sarbrown@aamc.org

• Volunteer!

• Introduce yourself!
Questions??

Brian Mavis  
Nagaraj Gabbur  
Clara Schroedl  
Reena Karani  
Kate McOwen  
Nesha Brown

brian.mavis@hc.msu.edu  
ngabbur@northwell.edu  
c-schroedl@northwestern.edu  
reena.karani@mssm.edu  
kmcowen@aamc.org  
nbrown@aamc.org

Thank you!!