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1. Introductions
As this was the first time in 2-3 years that the group has been together in person, we began the meeting with introductions.
2. Sub-Tracks
Dr. Parks introduced the sub-tracks that are being developed in the ACS Committee and asked for feedback from the PD Committee. There are four sub-tracks currently – Burns, Austere Environment, Strategy & Deployment and Pediatrics. The committee suggested Vascular might be another option to investigate.

	1. Burns

Vanderbilt has a Burns program but found when they did it in two years it was too much and they have better success by adding a year to the training.

UT SW sprinkles Burns education and experience throughout the two years.

ABA wants the training to be very specialized, but there are no specific requirements. Can we balance it over 3 years instead of 2? It’s not as solid of an education if it’s not a full year – Burn “lite” isn’t worth it. Surgeons may get pigeonholed into Burns if there is a certificate. What do the fellows want and how can we accomplish it? How many people specialize in Burns; how many are needed; how many are classically trained?

* 1. Pediatrics

Mary Fallat has been focusing on this aspect. She is developing a curriculum to help in areas where there is no children’s hospital.

 None of these tracks would be required but offered as an optional, additional training.
 We could look into doing the subtracks as visiting rotations. Find out which program

has a specialty they could offer to Fellows from other programs. Need to determine the

right amount of exposure to make it worthwhile.

1. Didactic Curriculum

This subgroup is working with some members of the Education Committee. They will determine what fellows need to know – a list of topics that should be covered during their time in the fellowship – and where the gaps are. Then they will pull together all the resources currently available in one place and build up areas where we don’t have as many resources.

The committee discussed creating an online journal club. Programs could be grouped by time zone and PDs would take turn hosting. They also considered incorporating guest lectures and have the second years help with the prep

If anyone has a fellow interested in spearheading this, please contact Bridget Lindbloom.

1. Bootcamp
The bootcamp idea is still in development but would bring all incoming second year fellows together for a three day education seminar to prepare them for the ACS year of their fellowship. The original idea was to hold the course in July/August, but the PD committee suggested considering the Spring, perhaps in conjunction with the April Board of Managers meeting.

Program Directors also suggested seeing what programs are doing and see what gaps can be filled with this course. The brainstormed on a the areas where second year fellows struggle: billing and coding, they have never been an attending before, how to teach and still learn (faculty onboarding), How to look for a job, networking exercises, leadership seminar, involvement with AAST Committees.

The committee also discussed creating a Fellow Council that could meet periodically. This could build comradery and perhaps would encourage all fellows to attend the AAST annual meeting; especially if we had pre-courses for the fellows (first years – EGS; second years – advanced endoscopy)
2. Recruitment Match Summary
The committee discussed their desire to have an algorithm that would help applicants determine which programs they would really be interested in instead of applying at all programs. Programs could fill out a survey to give an idea of what their program is about and could provide an apples-to-apples comparison (location, city size, specialties offered, etc.). Current fellows could provide input on what criteria they considered when choosing a program to help develop the survey. In addition, we could pull information from the graduated fellow survey. We could also post each programs intro slides or a brief sales pitch/elevator speech videos on the website.

The program directors expressed their frustration with interviewing fellows who were not serious about the program or a two year fellowship. They would like fellows to indicate their top programs in some way because currently, they are checking every program in SAFAS. The committee discussed splitting the application period into two year program applicants followed by one year program applicants.

We will need a liaison to the SCCPDS Board to help. If anyone is interested, please contact Nancy Parks and Bridget Lindbloom.