

Emergency Medicine (EM) Program Director’s (PD) view of a “lower 1/3rd” SLOE and ways an applicant can overcome such an evaluation.

Methods: A 15-question survey validated through a modified Delphi technique was constructed and distributed to EM PDs across the country. Each PDs response was assessed and any recurring themes between the responses were noted and analyzed further. Descriptive statistics were obtained to summarize PDs’ attitude.

Results: The survey was sent out to 280 program directors, 18.9% (53) responded. Of the 47.0% of PDs who matched a student with a “lower 1/3rd” SLOE in the 2023 Match, 96.0% indicated having a student rotate at their institution was key to overcoming a “lower 1/3rd” SLOE. 64.2% of respondents viewed a “lower 1/3rd” SLOE from a home institution as worse than a “lower 1/3rd” SLOE from an away institution. 96.2% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that an improved SLOE from an away institution is positively perceived in the case of a student with a “lower 1/3rd” SLOE from their home institution. 52.0% of respondents reported life experiences, 48.0% reported a personal connection to the region, and 36.0% reported a competitive STEP score as other factors that help them overlook a “lower 1/3rd” SLOE.

Conclusion: A student rotating at their program, and other factors such as an improved SLOE, will help PDs overlook a “lower 1/3” SLOE when creating their rank lists.

25 A Descriptive Analysis of Emergency Medicine Residency Scholarly Tracks Faculty Workforce

Amy Mariorenzi, Allison Beaulieu, Angela Regina, Seth Lotterman, Vytas Karalius, Evelyn Porter, Emad Awad, Arlene Chung, Jaime Jordan

Background: Scholarly tracks typically consist of longitudinal sub-specialty-specific curriculum and resident mentorship. Roughly one in five emergency medicine (EM) residency programs offer scholarly tracks, allowing residents to explore a niche and develop skills to prepare them for their future careers. There is limited information on the faculty workforce that leads scholarly tracks.

Objectives: We sought to understand the workforce characteristics of EM track leaders.

Methods: We performed a cross-sectional survey study of EM faculty track leaders. We identified track leaders through a review of program websites and direct contact of program coordinators. Participants completed an electronic survey consisting of multiple-choice and completion items. We calculated descriptive statistics.

Results: 112 of 276 (40%) track leaders completed the survey, including 63 (57.3%) males and 47 (42.7%) females. The mean age was 42 years. 62.5% had completed fellowship. Participants supervise a mean of 2.6 residents per year and spend a median of 7.6 (4-10.7) hours per month on track activities. 57.1% of participants receive no compensation for their role. Non-monetary benefits included career satisfaction (87.6%), intellectual stimulation (76.4%), departmental recognition (41.6%), and increased scholarly productivity (33.7%). Overall, 71.7% of faculty track leaders would recommend the role to a colleague.

Conclusion: Our study sheds light on the current track leader workforce and highlights that the majority of track leaders are uncompensated for their time and effort, which could be an area for targeted advocacy.

Table 1. Demographics and characteristics of faculty scholarly track leaders.

	Total responses	Min-Max	(Mean +/- SD) or Median (IQR)
Age per year	105	33-65	42.6 +/- 7.5
No of years in role	104	0-20	4.3 (2-6.1)
		Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender	110		
Male		63	57.3%
Female		47	42.7%
Fellowship completed	108		
Yes		70	63.5%
No		38	33.5%
Academic rank	110		
Assistant Professor		53	46.4%
Associate Professor		46	41.1%
Professor		9	8.0%
Others		5	4.5%
Region of residency prog.	100		
Midwest		19	17.8%
Northeast		38	33.9%
South		34	30.4%
West		19	17.8%

Table 2. Faculty scholarly track leaders effort and compensation.

	Total responses	Min-Max	(Mean +/- SD) or Median (IQR)
No of residents supervised per year	109	1-5	2.6 +/- 1.9
No of hours/month spend on track activities	93	0-63	7.6 (4-10.7)
% of time spent on administrative	94	1-65	12.5 (10-25)
% of time spent on mentorship	94	0-90	29.3 (15-49)
% of time spent on scholarly work	94	0-55	20.0 (10-30)
% of time spent on teaching	94	3-98	35 (15-49)
		Frequency	Percent (%)
Compensation	84		
None		64	57.1%
Time buy-down		13	11.8%
Salary support/stipend		3	3.6%
Other*		4	4.7%

*Specific types of “other” compensation listed include FTEs and core faculty position.