2010-06-07

Educational Trajectory WG, 7 Jun 2010

Attending: Kim Hoffman, Chair; Valerie Smothers, Staff; Elaine Dannefer, Bob Galbraith, Simon Grant, Linda Lewin, Amber Montañano, Pat O'Sullivan
Kim relayed that there is a joint session of the AAMC Group on Educational Affairs and Group on Student Affairs July 14. Bob will be there to discuss efolios. She, Pat, and Lindsey will work to prepare a report. Pat commented that she is leaving for Tanzania June 17. Bob agreed to participate in their discussion. He added that the other topic at the meeting is assessment of competencies, which is loosely related.

1 Review minutes of last call
The minutes were accepted.

2 Review publication categories
Kim summarized that we would like to reach consensus on how to approach the publication categories and author role. Valerie did some research in this area and in author role.

Valerie commented that her research shows there is no consensus as to how publications should be categorized. She looked at categories used by three institutions, and there was little agreement. The simpler we can make the categories, the better.

Elaine commented that their cv builder is very simple: article, book, or book chapter. There are scientific presentations, which is broken down into abstract, poster, oral presentation, and other. There are also patents and innovation disclosures.

Valerie commented that there were no categories specific to electronic publications.

Linda ask what purpose the data will serve: is it for a cv or for other purposes?

Kim commented the primary purpose was to acknowledge scholarly products. But our purpose has morphed into supporting initial academic cvs. She asked if the group still views the academic cv as part of the product.

Linda commented that for cv's, big categories make sense. Patents could go under other. Valerie recommended trying the categorization scheme out with real data to see if it works.

Simon commented it may be easier to have students classify in their own way according to guidance of their own schools. Kim asked what impact would that have on interoperability. Valerie replied that it would depend on how you expect computers to handle that data. From her view, it would not harm interoperability. But if those people viewing the data have trouble navigating it without categories, that would be problem.

Linda commented that from the perspective of someone who reads residency intern applications, she would not recommend categories. People peruse publication lists to see if there is anything there or any recognized journal. Some fields require a lot of research.

Bob commented that he supported Simon's comment. You can tell from the entry if it is peer reviewed, whether it's a chapter in a book, etc. If we force classification prematurely, we may have to change.

Elaine added that their cv builder indicates whether a publication is required for an NIH cv.

Bob commented that wouldn't work in other countries. He encouraged waiting until there was more agreement.

Kim asked Bob to clarify whether he supported purely open text format or large categories. He replied that he supported very large categories.

The group continued the discussion of peer review. Bob commented that not all peer reviewed journals are equal – some have high acceptance rates, others have low acceptance rates. The reader must look at the journal to know that kind of data.

Kim commented that providing the acceptance rate would be onerous for those entering the data.

The group agreed to the following classification: publications and presentations. Publications will allow for further categorization: peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed.

The group recommended providing examples of presentations to help users classifying their work: abstracts, poster, oral presentations, case reports, and workshops.

Pat and Elaine agreed to apply the categorization to a handful of cvs. The group will discuss on the next call.

3 Discuss publication roles
Kim asked the group if we want students to indicate their role in publication. The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) provides definitions of author and contributor. Is it appropriate to identify the learner's role in authorship of scholarly works?

Pat commented it was an important piece of information. She recommended a standard nomenclature. She added that the definition from ICMJE are recently published and other journals may not have those requirements of authorship. Kim agreed the criteria were used in top tier journals, but not the middle tier.
Pat suggested that role in research may be a better proxy. Linda asked if that data would be located elsewhere in the trajectory, perhaps under extracurricular activities.

Kim commented that the JAMA authorship form uses the following language.
" I have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for: part of the content or the whole content. "
Part D asks what contributions were: conception and design, drafting manuscript, etc, from a list of 25 things. That's a lot of data to collect.

Simon recommended adding a text box for learners to describe their role in addition to having the author/contributor distinction.

Kim agreed it was important to identify the role of the learner. She summarized the three scenarios: 1) an author/contributor distinction, 2) whether the learner is willing to take responsibility for part of or whole of the content, 3) a text box of exactly what has been done.

Linda commented a text box might be best.

4 Review of publication structure

5 Pilot update
On the next call we will review Pat and Neil's efforts to apply the publication categories, review the mock up, and revisit issues we set to the side and make decisions as to whether we want to do further work.

Decisions

- The group agreed to the following classification: publications and presentations. Publications will allow for further categorization: peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed.
- The group recommended providing examples of presentations to help users classifying their work: abstracts, poster, oral presentations, case reports, and workshops.
- The group agreed there should be a text box for defining the learner role in a publication. Author and contributor fields are not necessary as the learner will either be listed as an author or not.

Action items

- Valerie will update the specification and the publication mock up.
- Pat and Elaine agreed to apply the categorization to a handful of cvs.