



Grouping 1 Agenda

MINUTES ALL HIGHLIGHTED IN WHITE**

- Common projects brainstorm & working together
- Protocol for submissions & approval of projects
- Section Income
 - UEMS Expenditures & what it means to Sections
- Income stream – Exams / EACCME
- Specific Groups update – PGWG / CESMA
- EACCME update* IT investment / Fee changes
- Collaborations with European Scientific Societies
- Fellowships*

Grouping 1 Proposed New Policies

- **Common WEBSITE platform – Minutes ****
- Many sections already have websites , some good and some not so good
- Might be useful to have a central portal and then a link to differing websites
- Also useful to have portal in ESS
- But beware costs and scouting exercise needed
- 100 000 minimum cost for anything and that's ' bare bones IT before maintenance & upgrade

Grouping 1 Proposed New Policies

- PGWG *: Minutes**
 - Information gathering for strategic planning on training programs in all specialties across Europe
 - Internal medicine said this is a huge task for any member in any single country. Needs to be done thorough sections but unlikely to get much feedback and cost of logistically employing someone prohibitive and not cost efficient for our money
- CESMA suggestions
 - Investment for regular workshop training in Exam portfolios Agreed in principle. Cost efficient and as recurring cost can be easily managed . Wise investment
 - Investment in Appraisals process. Agreed too



Proposed New Policies

Minutes**

- **Specific awards for Research** Agreed
- **Mini 'Erasmus' program Clinician Scholarship (like Fulbright awards*)** Agreed

Other suggestions : Nephrology suggested

Invest money in uncovering why some specialties are not attracting any candidates into their training programs. Identify cause and change that . Also may be country to country variation and that needs clarification too. Low cost investment , as a recurring workshop and clearly serving UEMS specialties



Proposed New Policies

Minutes**

Other suggestions :

Invest money in Boards who want to set up exam but with clear costing , expected time of return of investment and once profit making that the 'investment' cost would be returned back into the 'policy fund pool'.

Cardiology suggested investment in a two day 'thinktank' to promote collaborative 'guidelines' and conjoint ETRs etc. between UEMS Boards and relevant societies. This harmonizes both but also contributes to harmonized documents that may be continually refreshed .



Protocol for Policies

Minutes** . Below – no objection

- An Application for grant support for any project must be submitted in writing to ALL UEMS Boards & sections , either independently or through the Chairs of each Grouping
- The application must state the project, estimated costs and purpose of the project as it serves the mission of UEMS
- Not unlike the ETRs, there should be an allotted time at the Council meeting for presentation of the request with an opportunity for Q& A.
- The approval of allotment of will be subject to a vote, either at the time of presentation or at a designated time for voting , or through an on line vote.



Protocol for Policies

Minutes : Below : No major objection except for Paragraph 3

- If the decision is taken **NOT** to support a project, there must be adequate feedback given and an opportunity for the request to be resubmitted in the amended format at a later date.
- There must be a minimum Quorum **PRESENT TO VOTE** ($2/3$ of ALL sections) **AND THE APPROVAL OF FUNDING** will be subject to a majority vote of $2/3$ to $1/3$
- No project can be funded without the majority approval by the **Boards and Sections** **BEFORE PRESENTATION TO THE NMAs** for **FINAL** ratification & approval



Protocol for Policies

Minutes

- The vote will be equally cast and decided upon by all sections and NOT according to Groupings or the majority of a Grouping vote
- There must be an update on expenditure and staging of project at each Council meeting. The release of funds should be staged and according to a proper update of successful utility of monies
- The UEMS Executive council or UEMS Extended executive council may neither overturn the majority decision or make a decision to dispense monies without the approval of the UEMS Boards & sections as outlined above. NMA insist this underlined statement be removed . Suggest presentation on Day 1 to Board & Sections 1st (not unlike ETR), but a requirement if supported by Boards that it be re-presented on day 2 to NMAs and THEY HAVE THE FINAL VOTE (not unlike ETRs). This was agreed .

Grouping 1 Section Income

- **Examinations. Minutes ****
 - Last Grouping 1 meeting and proposals were for cost neutrality and a 'not for profit' exam as the ultimate goal of exam
- Lots of discussion. Profit is not a dirty word. Huge financial investment in exams and that often necessitates engaging a commercial provider, who will not work if no profit. Suggestion however of using profits to upgrade exams, support those in 'lower income countries where exam cost prohibitive by providing a bursary. Nephrology suggestion (which also entices more people to participate in exam was to offer 50% rebate on cost to the PASSING candidate .

Grouping 1 Agenda Items

- Minutes **
- **Collaboration with ESS**
- Many boards & sections include delegates that are also participatory in ESS and suggestion is to use these people as point of contact between UEMS and ESS and harness that relationship to progress further integration and collaboration
- The scope of European exams demands some collaboration with ESS and indeed the imprimatur of the UEMS seal is essential in that exam recognition. The exam collaboration is another means of generating more 'cross talk' and engagement between both.
- **Collaboration with NSS**

Grouping 1 Agenda Items

- Minutes **
- **Collaboration with NSS**
- This is more challenging as we don't know who the representatives are. The division of day 1 for Boards and day 2 for NMAs further contributes to that separation and needs further reflection.
- But the option of European exams being potentially adopted independently as national exit exams in different specialties may be a crucial link in more of a working relationship between NMAs and Boards

Grouping 1 Agenda Items

- Fellowships *. Minutes**
- Many of the summative exit EUROPEAN exams already confer different titles such as Fellow of the European board of X, or Diplomate of European Board of X. One Suggestion is that Fellowships (going forward) be the nomenclature for those who have passed the European Board Exam AND ALSO have completed their specialty training in a recognized European Program.
- More discussion needed as we ran out of time