Updates

Career Development Survey - The council reviewed the proposed revised DOM K-Award Survey handout and made further suggestions/comments:

- Change name of survey to reflect all Career Development awards
- The department should play a role in tracking CDAs, assuring that there are meetings of Awardees with mentors and with the mentoring committee, the latter at least once a year.
- Add a text box that allows the individual to describe their vision for their career path in an attempt to determine the trainee’s awareness of how they are doing in terms of career potential. There ought to be an understanding as to whether there will be a job at UCSF for trainees.
- In the section “What Do You Do In Your Current Position” – Add: “What Type of Leadership Responsibilities Do You Have in Your Current Position?”

Update of Council’s RMS recommendation to Talmadge: Bill has not yet met with Talmadge to discuss. He will debrief the council after the meeting.

Support for Fellows After ACGME-Required Training Ends

Support for fellows after their ACGME training has ended has been traditionally been managed by the divisions. Some divisions have specific research tracks allowing advanced planning for those fellows who will stay on after ACGME training years in terms of salary and other support for their research years. There are differences between divisions regarding resources to support research by fellows, and there are differing opinions about how much such support should be the responsibility of the lab PI.

Bill led a Council discussion exploring whether there should be a departmental policy or guidance regarding support to fellows following their ACGME training. What is the obligation for fellows who are in the division beyond their ACGME training? Are there different expectations depending on the individual? Currently, there is no department policy regarding salary support after their ACGME years.

Should this be considered a divisional responsibility?

- Investigators/mentors who only have NIH funding and no other discretionary funding may not be able to provide supplemental salary support for fellows.
- Is there an obligation from the division to support fellows who want to stay after their ACGME years?
- Medicine at VA – the decision to support happens earlier in the trainee’s training. The selection committee decides who may apply for career development awards.
- Should we be supporting people with the most promise or let everyone apply for fellowships post ACGME?

Should we be encouraging mentors/divisions/department to support fellows?

- Team approach to financial support. Should division partner with the mentors to meet the salary requirement of the individual?
- It can be awkward when there are large disparities in salaries for fellows from different programs working in the same lab
- Different sub-specialties have varying pay scales; different career development awards offer varying levels of support.
- Should there be a minimum salary established for fellows? Career development trainees?
- When fellows have finished their ACGME training, should there be a minimum level of appointment and salary?
Some recommendations from the Council

- Programmatic as well as individual plans for trainees should remain within divisions, with certain guidelines, as discussed below.
- Regardless of the plans for fellows regarding post-ACGME training, the most important issue is clarity about the plans, beginning at time of offering a position and on a regular basis thereafter, preferably in writing as well as verbally.
- Important information that should be explained includes whether a position after ACGME will be considered or promised, requirements for continuing training after ACGME (such as obtaining outside support), the expected appointment and salary range. It is expected that in many situations financial or other considerations may make it impossible to say at the start of fellowship whether support after ACGME training will be possible, and when this is the case it is important to say just that.
- With increasing financial pressure on divisions, the opinion was expressed that it is better support those with the greatest promise, rather than give the same support to all. That said, there may be individuals where additional time in training is needed to assess the potential for future research.
- Issue of PIs supporting people in their labs – This will usually require support from several sources, but this should include the lab PI.
- Decisions about sustained training in research should be made at the level of the division, not simply the PI – at least if any divisional resources are expected.
- The Council did not address in full the issue of whether there should be constraints on the number of people who can apply for K Awards and other CDAs, but there is already the constraint of funding, and the plan for funding should be in place before application is allowed. K awards require a mentor’s letter and an institutional letter indicating institutional support.
- There is a template appointment letter, which is a legal binding agreement to employment on an annual basis. The template can be tailored to the individual. Division Chiefs should review the fellowship appointment letter and add language necessary to clarify the appointment, financial support and future commitment. Appointments are, regardless, made only for one year at a time, and the language cannot negate this.

Future Meeting: Tuesday, May 13, 2014, 8:00 - 9:00 am, Parnassus Room S-226