Call to Order

1. Digital Accessibility ................................................................. Mary Mauldin and Willette Burnham

2. New Business ........................................................................ E. Benjamin Clyburn, MD
   A. GME Per Trainee Expenses
   B. GME Strategic Manpower Committee Process
   C. HIPAA Privacy Rules
   D. Request for Temporary Increase (Interventional Radiology Independent)
   E. Request for Permanent Increase (Emergency Medicine)
   F. Request for International Rotation (Peds Emergency Medicine)

3. ACGME Correspondence ......................................................... Dr. Clyburn
   A. CLER findings
   B. Site Visits (Peds Hem Onc and Plastic Integrated)
   C. Participating Site Letters (OB/GYN and Maternal Fetal)

4. Resident Representatives’ Report .............................................. Drs. Ghanim, Hardy, Horton and Sealy

5. VA Update ................................................................................ Terrill Huggins, MD

6. PC Update ................................................................................. Melanie Pigott, C-TAGME

7. Program Information
   A. Annual Program Evaluations (APE) ..................................... Ann Ronayne, C-TAGME
      i. Pediatrics
      ii. Dermatopathology
   B. Remediations: 2 residents in 2 programs
   C. Duty Hours

8. Old Business
   A. October email voting
      i. Request for Complement Increase (Cardiology)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Please encourage any of your residents that may be interested in House Staff Council to attend the next meeting on Tuesday, November 13 at 6:00 p.m. in 419 CSB. Any resident/fellow is welcome to attend.

The Chief Resident/Resident Representative meeting for November is CANCELLED. We will meet again on December 19 at 6:00 a.m. in 419 CSB.

Next GMEC Meeting – Wednesday, December 12 at 12:00 noon in the Bioengineering Lobby for Lunch with Meeting immediately following. RSVP to your program coordinator, please.
Digital Accessibility Timeline
2018 - 2019

*Training includes basic and advanced sessions scheduled on a regular basis
**Messaging includes requirements, timelines, training schedules, accessibility website, tools and resources, and audit findings

SEPTEMBER
- Set institutional web standards
- Initiate audit of software applications and hardware
- Develop mandatory training for MyQuest
- Initiate training (general and individual colleges/units)*
- Initiate messaging**
- Begin applying standards

OCTOBER
- Approve mandatory module for MyQuest
- Identify and publicize process for bi-annual audits
- Consultant for training
- Continue training
- Continue messaging
- Apply standards

NOVEMBER
- Identify and publicize mechanisms to report access barriers
- Complete audit of software applications and hardware
- Reports from colleges regarding the proposed plan
- Resource issues identified
- Continue training
- Continue messaging
- Apply standards

DECEMBER
- Establish and communicate procurement process
- Continue training
- Continue messaging
- Apply standards

FEBRUARY/MARCH
- Finalize date for implementation
- Continue training
- Continue messaging
- Apply standards

JANUARY
- Begin monitoring web pages, videos, and electronic documents
- Implement procurement process
- Assign mandatory module in MyQuest
- Budgets due to Provost
- Continue training
- Continue messaging
- Apply standards
Request for Change in Resident/Fellow Program Complement

X TEMPORARY ☐ PERMANENT

Program Name: Interventional Radiology Independent

Program Director: Ricardo T. Yamada, MD

Program Coordinator: Claudia Richey

Department Chair: Philip Costello, MBBS

Specialty Program Director (if applicable):

# of positions requested: 2

FROM: 2 (# current complement) TO 4 (# requested complement):

Requested Effective Date: July 1, 2020

Effective End Date (if temporary): June 30, 2022

Program Director Signature/Date: ____________________________

Specialty Program Director Signature/Date: ____________________________

(if applicable)

Department Chair Signature/Date: ____________________________

Requests to change a program's resident/fellow complement need review and approval by:

1) Strategic Manpower Committee (only if hospital is to provide funding)
2) MUSC GMEC
3) ACGME/RRC

Requests to specific ACGME/RRC's must not be made until after approval by the MUSC GMEC. Requests should be made in the WebADS system no longer than six months following GMEC approval. No resident or fellow should be hired or promised a position until there has been approval by each group noted above.

Please address all the questions/requirements on the next page in your request. Send completed requests to E. Benjamin Clyburn, MD (c/o GME Office, room 202 MUH, MSC 333) at least two weeks prior to the GMEC meeting date where you would like this item considered.

FOR GME OFFICE USE ONLY:

Date Received: _______________

Approved by the GMEC: _______________

Date approved in WEBADS: _______________
Request for Change in Resident/Fellow Program Complement
Rationale, Impact and Financing for Complement Change

Please answer the following questions.

1. How will additional positions be financed? Please provide documentation.
   - If the department will be funding the position(s), please submit a letter from the Chair indicating willingness to fully fund the position(s).
   - If MUHA support is being requested, please complete the appropriate documentation to be submitted to and reviewed by the GME Strategic Manpower Committee.
     
   [http://academicdepartments.musc.edu/gme/pdls/manpower/GME%20New%20Request%20Instructions_Final.docx](http://academicdepartments.musc.edu/gme/pdls/manpower/GME%20New%20Request%20Instructions_Final.docx)

   Funding has already been requested and approved by the GME Strategic Manpower Committee.

2. Reason(s) for request to change the number of trainees in program:

   With the creation of the new Interventional Radiology Residency Program the first large-scale Match took place in March 2017. According to the curriculum, those residents will have an integrated training in Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology. They will only be full-time IR trainees during the last year of residency (PGY6 - July 2022). Meanwhile the traditional Interventional Radiology Fellowship Program will sunset in June 2020. This leaves a 2-year gap (2020-2021 and 2021-2022) in which no full-time IR trainees will be available. Right now MUSC has 4 IR fellowship positions.

   The traditional IR fellowship program will be substituted by the Independent IR Residency program, in which physicians can applied after finishing the Diagnostic Radiology Residency. Currently, MUSC has 2 ACGME-accredited positions for the Independent IR Residency. Therefore we are temporarily requesting 2 additional positions for a total of 4 Independent IR Residency spots per year during the gap years (2020-2021 and 2021-2022). It is important to mention that this will not increase the number of trainees, but maintain the current training positions after termination of the IR fellowship. Funding for those training positions has already been approved by the MUHA GME Strategic Manpower Committee.

3. What will be the impact of the change on the educational program? Please include both the positive and negative effects on the educational program in comparison to the current program size.

   As mentioned above this temporary increase will not affect the current education program since the Independent IR Residency will substitute the traditional IR Fellowship Program, which will sunset in June 2020. There will be a negative impact if those additional Independent IR residency positions are not available, since full-time IR trainees play a major role in the daily operations of the IR division.

4. What are the anticipated effects of your proposed program changes on other training programs at MUSC?
No major effects are anticipated since we will be substituting 4 fellowship positions to 4 Independent IR residency positions.

5. How will the change affect the number of cases seen by the trainee? 
   No major changes in the number of cases are anticipated since we will be substituting 4 fellowship positions to 4 Independent IR residency positions.

6. If your RRC or American Board have requirements for a certain number of rotations, clinical experience, number of producers, cases, etc., will there be adequate experiences to meet RRC and Board requirements?

   Yes. Currently there is an average of 1200 procedures per year for each fellow. We expect the same number if not more for each Independent IR resident. The currently ACGME recommendation is 1000 procedure by the end of training.

7. Assuming approval, what will the program look like for each year of training?
   a. What will be added, deleted or moved?

      The program can accept trainees who finished the DR residency or physicians who decided to pursue the IR career early during their DR residency. For the ones who finished DR residency, the Independent Program will be a 2-year program. During the first year they will be at IR division except for 1 ICU and 1 Vascular Surgery Rotation. During the second year residents will have all rotations in IR.

      Physicians who decided to pursue IR early during DR residency will have the option to enter the last year of the Independent Program provided some requirements are met during the first 4 years of DR residency. For those physicians the Independent Program will be 1 year post DR residency.

   b. Include a Block diagram by PGY year, for a model resident/fellow.

      Please see attached.

8. Will there be additional or new training sites needed to accommodate the change in trainee complement? If so:
   a. List the additional site(s).
   b. You will be required to provide completed Affiliation Agreement(s) before the start of the training.

   No additional sites will be needed.

9. Is there adequate space and resources (offices, desks, computers, labs, etc...) to accommodate the change? Please provide a summary of necessary resources.

   Yes. Currently space and resources are sufficient to accommodate the request.
### PGY6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotation Name</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>Vasc. Surgery</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>IVIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PGY7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotation Name</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 28, 2018

Ricardo Yamada, M.D.
Assistant Professor, Radiology

RE: GME Strategic Manpower Request: Independent Interventional Radiology Residency Program

Dear Dr. Yamada,

The GME Strategic Manpower Committee met Wednesday, June 22nd, 2018, to review your request. The request was then submitted to Strategic Manpower Committee for final approval. The following decision was made by the Committee:

- The Committee approved the request for the new Interventional Radiology Program with 4 new resident positions per year for 2 years, beginning in July, 2020 (FY21) and then a decrease to 2 residents per year beginning in July, 2022 (FY23).

- The residents will be expected to help grow procedure volume as described in the proposal request.

- Program Coordinator support of $12,542 for FY 21 and FY22 is approved.

- The committee understands that no additional support is needed for a Program Director.

- The approval is contingent upon Interventional Radiology working closely with Perioperative Services to ensure improvement of Vascular Surgery access, to include one (1) room support on Wednesdays and Thursdays 8am to 5 pm.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Phillip D. Warr, MD
Interim Chief Medical Officer and Executive Medical Director
MUSC Medical Center

CC: Mike Dacus
Georgia Brogdon
Matt Waun
Beth Adams
Patrick Cawley, MD
John Cooper
Peter Zwerner, MD
Lisa Goodhet
Leonic Gordon, MD

"An equal opportunity employer, promoting workplace diversity."
Request for Change in Resident/Fellow Program Complement

☐ TEMPORARY  ☑ PERMANENT

Program Name: Emergency Medicine Residency

Program Director: Jeffrey S. Bush, MD

Program Coordinator: Melanie Pigott, C-TAGME

Department Chair: Gregory A. Hall, MD (Interim)

Specialty Program Director (if applicable): N/A

# of positions requested: 12

FROM: 18 (# current complement) TO 30 (# requested complement):

Requested Effective Date: 7/1/2019

Adding 4 residents, per year, over the course of 3 years.

Effective End Date (if temporary):

Program Director Signature/Date: [Signature]

Specialty Program Director Signature/Date: [Signature]

Department Chair Signature/Date: [Signature]

Requests to change a program's resident/fellow complement need review and approval by:

1) Strategic Manpower Committee (only if hospital is to provide funding)
2) MUSC GMEC
3) ACGME/RRC

Requests to specific ACGME/RRC's must not be made until after approval by the MUSC GMEC. Requests should be made in the WebADS system no longer than six months following GMEC approval. No resident or fellow should be hired or promised a position until there has been approval by each group noted above.

Please address all the questions/requirements on the next page in your request. Send completed requests to E. Benjamin Clyburn, MD (c/o GME Office, room 202 MUH, MSC 333) at least two weeks prior to the GMEC meeting date where you would like this item considered.

FOR GME OFFICE USE ONLY:

Date Received: __________________________

Approved by the GMEC: ______________________

Date approved in WEBADS: ___________________
Request for Change in Resident/Fellow Program Complement
Rationale, Impact and Financing for Complement Change Please answer the following questions.

1. How will additional positions be financed? Please provide documentation.
   - If the department will be funding the position(s), please submit a letter from the Chair indicating willingness to fully fund the position(s).
   - If MUHA support is being requested, please complete the appropriate documentation to be submitted to and reviewed by the GME Strategic Manpower Committee.

2. Reason(s) for request to change the number of trainees in program:
   Our residency is one of the smallest in the nation and we have had no complement increase since our formation over ten years ago. Emergency Medicine is a priority growth area for MUSC Health and we need synchronized growth of the residency program, as well. Patient volume and population complexity have continued to change and increase, while our complement has remained the same. A complement increase will allow us to better serve our community’s patients’ needs, while providing a solid educational foundation for our EM residents. Please see attached proposal for a more detailed, formal layout.

3. What will be the impact of the change on the educational program? Please include both the positive and negative effects on the educational program in comparison to the current program size.
   We anticipate positive impact on several levels, including our varying levels of residents to be able to work more closely together. No negative impact is expected. Please see attached proposal.

4. What are the anticipated effects of your proposed program changes on other training programs at MUSC?
   We anticipate no negative impact on other training programs.

5. How will the change affect the number of cases seen by the trainee?
   We expect to see a volume increase (including MUHA’s expansion plans), which would increase our residents’ procedure and patient numbers. Please see attached proposal.

6. If your RRC or American Board have requirements for a certain number of rotations, clinical experience, number of producers, cases, etc., will there be adequate experiences to meet RRC and Board requirements?
   Yes, our RRC necessitates specific requirements met which will be provided to the additional residents, both here at Main Campus and, eventually, at MUHA’s expansion & the VAMC.

7. Assuming approval, what will the program look like for each year of training?
   a. What will be added, deleted or moved?
      No rotations will be eliminated. Additions would be MUHA expansions, and hopefully the VAMC, which is indicated as an ED month on the attached block diagram. The new block diagram will also allow upper-level residents to work directly with lower-level residents. This has been a request by our residents, as well. Due to our current (lower) number of residents, varying training levels have had fewer occasions to work with one another.
   b. Include a Block diagram by PGY year, for a model resident/fellow. Please see attached block diagram.
8. Will there be additional or new training sites needed to accommodate the change in trainee complement? If so:
   a. List the additional site(s). We are able to accommodate current structure; however, we anticipate additional areas for our residents with the MUHA expansions and the VAMC.
   b. You will be required to provide completed Affiliation Agreement(s) before the start of the training. PLA with VA.

9. Is there adequate space and resources (offices, desks, computers, labs, etc...) to accommodate the change?
   Yes, we have sufficient workstations within our Department. We are able to expand within our current resident room.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abukheir</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodak</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emberton</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammi</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clendening</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagel</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soo</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushkar</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Cards</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>Neuro Float</td>
<td>OB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MSICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Neuro Float</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibert</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Cards</td>
<td>Neuro Float</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MSICU</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallebi</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Cards</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Neuro Float</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MSICU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verplanck</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Neuro Float</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Cards</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MSICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolford</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MSICU</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Neuro Float</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY1</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Cards</td>
<td>Neuro Float</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MSICU</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY1</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>PED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Cards</td>
<td>Neuro Float</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>MSICU</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 3, 2018

Greg Hall, M.D.
Interim Chairman, Emergency Medicine

RE: GME Strategic Manpower Request: Emergency Medicine Residency Increase

Dear Dr. Hall,

The GME Strategic Manpower Committee met Wednesday, September 26, 2018 to review your request. The request was then submitted to Strategic Manpower Committee for final approval. The following decision was made by the Committee:

- The Committee approved the request for the complement increase for Emergency Medicine. The increase will include 4 new residents per year, beginning in FY20 for 3 years for a total increase of 12 residents. The committee also approved the Program Director position and understands that no support will be needed for a Program Coordinator.

- The residents will be expected to help reduce the wait times in the Emergency Department and reduce the number of patients that leave without being seen to a more suitable 1% or less.

- The committee is requiring that an APP Best Practice Center consultation be completed within 3 months.

- Given the significant increase in residents, the annual Adult Emergency Medicine coverage FY20 contract will need to be re-evaluated within the next 2 months.

- The department should work with Charleston VAMC to expand the program.

Please let do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Phillip D. Warr, M.D.
Interim Chief Medical Officer and Executive Medical Director

Phillip D. Warr, M.D.
Interim Chief Medical Officer and Executive Medical Director

Tel 843.792.2383
Fax 843.792.0762
MUSCHealth.org

CC: Mike Dacus
    Georgia Brogdon
    Matt Wain
    Beth Adams
    Patrick Cawley, MD
    John Cooper
    Peter Zwemer, MD
    Lisa Goodlet
    Leonce Gordon, MD
    Lindley Pannkamp
    Jonathan Boone

"As an equal opportunity employer, promoting workplace diversity."
Request for International Rotation

Program Name: Pediatric Emergency Medicine
Program Director: Olivia Titus, MD
Program Coordinator: Ingrid Schneider
Department Chair: Andrew Alz, MD

Specialty Program Director (if applicable):
Requested Rotation Dates: 1/1/19 - 2/2/19

Program Director Signature/Date: Olivia Titus 1/26/19
Specialty Program Director Signature/Date: (if applicable)
Department Chair Signature/Date:

International Rotations will not be considered until the DIO has given approval and all paperwork has been processed. No resident or fellow should be hired or promised a position for international rotations until approval has been given by the DIO.

Please address all the requirements on the next page in your request. Send completed requests to Dr. Benjamin Clyburn, DIO (c/o GME Office, room 202 MUH, MSC 333) at least six months prior to the desired rotation.
Request for International Rotation
Rationale, Impact and Financing for International Rotation

1. Complete a Non-MUSC Rotation Funding Approval Form and submit to the GME Office. If the department (or other resource) is covering all expenses (salary, fringe benefits, etc.) for your resident, a letter is needed from your Chair stating so.

2. Provide goals and Objectives for this international rotation.

3. You will need to provide documentation that either: a.) there is no need for malpractice coverage or b.) malpractice coverage will be covered by the host facility or some other entity - The name of the provider would need to be stated. Both documents would need to have the appropriate signatures. Per the Insurance Reserve Fund of the State Fiscal Accountability Authority, “Policy Territory” means (1) The United States of America, its territories or possessions, or (2) anywhere in the world with respect to “Injury” arising out of the activities of any “Insured” permanently domiciled in the United States of America, though temporarily outside the United States of America, its territories and possessions or Canada, provided the original suit for damages because of any such injury or damage is brought within the United States of America, its territories or possessions. In terms of worker’s compensation, so long as the individual is receiving a paycheck from MUSC/MUHA then they are covered by Worker’s Compensation insurance.

4. If your residents are planning to receive credit for this international rotation, we will also need documentation from your RRC and/or Board to verify this rotation is approved as part of your residency requirements.
Resident Guidelines for Resident International Electives and Experiences

Each year a number of residents participate in activities outside the United States through electives and independently arranged experiences. In many cases, the countries where these activities take place present a variety of challenges and risks to residents for which they may not be prepared. These include unfamiliar cultures and languages, political instability, and infectious diseases and other health hazards that are uncommon in the United States.

To assist residents preparing for these eventualities, the GME Office requires that all residents enrolled in a credit-bearing elective with an international component perform the following prior to departure from the United States:

1. Gather information concerning any political problems or health hazards which may place them at risk by consulting the State Department (202/647-5225 or http://travel.state.gov and the Centers for Disease Control [404/639-3311 or www.cdc.gov/travel] for current information.

2. At least four weeks prior to departure, obtain medical travel advice and immunizations appropriate for the country to which travel is planned. We encourage you to make an appointment with the MUSC travel clinic (792-4542) or a private travel clinic or health department, particularly if you are traveling to developing countries. Please note that the Charleston County Health Department no longer provides travel medicine services.

3. Register your travel itinerary and emergency contact information with International SOS before your departure date per the MUSC International Travel policy requirements. Registration provides information that will enable MUSC to activate intervention services on your behalf in the event of a health emergency, natural disaster, or a crisis of civil or political unrest in a foreign location that requires assistance or evacuation. Review benefits and services provided through the MUSC/International SOS partnership, which includes accidental medical and sickness insurance, emergency medical and security evacuation and international travel assistance. Obtain the membership card from CGH website or the International SOS portal.

4. Designate persons both in the foreign country and in the United States who may be contacted in the event of an emergency.

5. In addition, competency or training in the local language is strongly encouraged.

6. MUSC International Travel Policy: https://globalhealth.musc.edu/musc-policy

Completion of these steps is the responsibility of the individual residents and not the GME Office. The GME Office, which grants approval of credit-bearing internation electives, is available to assist residents who are preparing for overseas travel.

I have read and understand the above guidelines. I further understand that the decision whether to undertake study abroad is mine alone, and that the MUSC GME Office or Department of Pediatrics bears no responsibility for any health or safety risks presented by such electives.

Form approved by GME 1/2/68
Intended Travel Location (including organization/clinic name): Partners in Health, Haiti

Dates of Travel: 1/1/19 - 2/2/19

Signature of Resident

10/19/18 Date
GLOBAL EMERGENCY MEDICINE VISITING PROFESSORSHIP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Patient Care:
1. Supervise emergency medicine residents’ performance of efficient complaint directed history and physicals on patients presenting to the ED, particularly of pediatric patients.
2. Have prompt recognition and appropriate emergency stabilization of the unstable patient, with a focus on pediatric patients.
3. Formulate comprehensive differential diagnosis to include tropical medicine disease states not common in the United States.
4. Teach residents technical proficiency in procedural skills.
5. Manage multiple patients simultaneously.

Medical Knowledge:
1. Demonstrate a more advanced fund of medical knowledge within emergency medicine.
2. Learn emergency care of common tropical medicine diseases.

Interpersonal and Communication Skills:
1. Communicate pertinent case information effectively across language barriers to colleagues, patients, family, and staff.
2. Provide resident feedback regarding performance of emergency care relative to skill/training level.
3. Demonstrate appropriate conflict resolution skills across language barriers.

Professionalism:
1. Demonstrate the ability to act as patient advocate at all times.
2. Demonstrate respect, compassion, and integrity with patients, family, and all staff.
3. Demonstrate respect of patient’s privacy and confidentiality.

Practice-Based Learning and Improvement:
1. Demonstrate ability to provide evidence-based medicine to patient care decisions.
2. Apply variations of evidence-based medicine in resource limited settings.

Systems-Based Practice:
1. Utilize the consultation process appropriately.
2. Utilize scarce resources (ventilators, pumps, etc) appropriately.
3. Use experiences and observations while working in health care system outside of the US to inform and develop a focused research topic for further literature review and investigation.
October 8, 2018

Dear Office of Graduate Medical Education,

Attached you will find supporting documents providing information as to why malpractice insurance is not necessary during a Global Emergency Medicine Elective as a Visiting Professor with Partners in Health – Zanmi Lasante in Haiti. The Emergency Medicine Residency Program Director, Keegan Checkett, has verified a previously existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Haitian Ministry of Health. I have also provided a brief summary below about Hôpital Universitaire de Mirebalais explaining the care and services provided for free by the facility to an extremely poor and uninsured population.

Haiti is a country of 10.9 million people, of which 59% live at or below the poverty line. Average life expectancy there is 63 years and the Under-5 mortality rate is 67 per 1,000.\(^1\) The University Hospital, Hopital Universitaire de Mirebalais (HUM) is a public Ministry of Health facility, built in partnership with Partners In Health/Zanmi Lasante (PIH/ZL).\(^2\) In addition to delivering comprehensive, high-quality healthcare in some of the poorest, most remote regions of Haiti, PIH/ZL and HUM are also helping to develop the next generation of doctors and nurses for the country. The 300-bed teaching hospital is home to residency programs in emergency medicine, surgery, pediatrics, obstetrics and gynecology, internal medicine, and nurse anesthesiology.\(^3\)

If there is any additional information I can provide for you, please don’t hesitate to ask.

Sincerely,

Alexandra Monroe, MD
Pediatric Emergency Medicine Fellow, PGY-4
Medical University of South Carolina
monroaal@musc.edu
404-245-4216

---

\(^1\) [https://www.pih.org/country/haiti](https://www.pih.org/country/haiti)

\(^2\) [https://www.pih.org/press/from-vision-to-reality-hopital-universitaire-de-mirebalais](https://www.pih.org/press/from-vision-to-reality-hopital-universitaire-de-mirebalais)

\(^3\) [https://www.pih.org/pages/mirebalais](https://www.pih.org/pages/mirebalais)
August 15, 2018

Ernest B. Clyburn, MD
Designated Institutional Official
Medical University of South Carolina
169 Ashley Avenue, Room 202 Main Hospital
Charleston, SC 29425

Dear Dr. Clyburn:

On behalf of the CLER team, thank you for your efforts in coordinating your institution’s most recent site visit. Attached is the written report reflecting the team’s findings across the six focus areas.

We offer you the option of submitting a response to be shared with the CLER Evaluation Committee. While the Committee members are open to receiving all manner of feedback, they would especially appreciate any information that would help them to understand how you and the executive leadership of the site visited intend to use the information to improve resident and fellow physician engagement in one or more areas that you have determined to be a priority.

If you would like to respond, please complete the attached form and submit it through ADS on or before 10/05/2018. Once logged into ADS as the DIO, please select the CLER tab, and then under Upload CLER Site Visit Response, select Choose File, then Upload. Please use 11 point font or larger, limit the number of pages to no more than 3 in total, and upload the file as a PDF.

Thank you again for participating in this ongoing process to improve the clinical learning environment. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Best regards,

Robin Wagner, RN, MHSA
Vice President, CLER
Medical University of South Carolina Medical Center
Clinical Learning Environment Review (CLER)
Site Visit Report

Dates: June 19 - 21, 2018

Sponsoring Institution: Medical University of South Carolina College of Medicine

Participating Site: Medical University of South Carolina Medical Center

Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Host: Patrick Cawley, MD

Designated Institutional Official (DIO) Host: Ernest B. Clyburn, MD

Site Visitors: Robin Dibner, MD (lead site visitor)
Marian Damewood, MD
Jill Moormeier, MD (volunteer site visitor)

Overview

The Medical University of South Carolina Medical Center (MUSC) is an acute care academic medical center that sponsors 60 active ACGME-accredited residency and fellowship training programs with just over 700 residents and fellows. The majority of the institution’s residency and fellowship training occurs at MUSC Medical Center in Charleston, South Carolina. Their website features their designated cancer center, level I trauma center, and children’s hospital. According to their website, MUSC is a key component of the larger integrated health system, MUSC Health, the clinical enterprise of the Medical University of South Carolina including a physicians’ group, more than 100 outreach locations, clinical affiliations with numerous health care partners, and a telehealth network.

Methodology

The visit began with a meeting with the CLER team and the institution’s senior leadership, including Patrick Cawley, MD, CEO; Philip Warr, MD, Interim CMO; Tim Brendle, DNP, RN, Associate CNO; Chris Stern, MD, PGY-3 pediatrics, the resident Graduate Medical Education Committee (GMEC) representative; and Ernest (Ben) Clyburn, MD, the DIO and Chair of the GMEC. Additional activities included group meetings with the senior management of patient safety and health care quality, peer-selected residents and fellows, faculty members, program directors, and a series of one-on-one discussions with individual residents and fellows and other staff (eg, nurses, pharmacists, social workers, technicians) that occurred during the walking rounds of multiple clinical sites within the medical center. As a new part of the site visit, the CLER team met with a group of individuals identified by senior leadership as working to address the well-being of the clinical care team at MUSC.
At the end of the visit, the site visitors met with Dr. Cawley, Dr. Clyburn and other members of the senior leadership team to provide initial feedback on the findings from the visit.

Group meetings with the residents and fellows, faculty members, and program directors included a combination of closed- and open-ended questions on topics in the CLER focus areas. An electronic audience response system was used to collect anonymous responses to multiple-choice questions.

The walking rounds helped to expand or clarify information on some of the topics raised during the group meetings. The CLER team visited more than 25 clinical locations, including medical and medical specialty, surgical and surgical specialty, pediatric, obstetric, psychiatric, perioperative, procedural, and intensive care units; the radiology department; the pathology department; the pharmacy department; the emergency department; and ambulatory care sites. The team observed 6 resident and fellow change-of-shift hand-offs.

This report presents the results from the audience response system as percentages. In the group meetings, the CLER team interviewed 56 residents and fellows, 45 faculty members, and 47 program directors from the residency and fellowship programs at MUSC. Although, overall, the response rate was high (>95%) for all questions, the number of respondents for any single question may have varied. Of the resident and fellow cohort, none were postgraduate year (PGY)-1, 25% were PGY-2, 25% were PGY-3, and the rest were PGY-4 or higher. Sixty-two percent of the faculty members and 77% of the program directors interviewed indicated that they had been at MUSC for 6 or more years.

The results from the audience response system are included for the purposes of providing general feedback. Those interviewed did not comprise a random sample. This report includes point estimates only and not estimates of variance (eg, confidence intervals). In addition, this report uses the following summary terms to summarize the results from the audience response system: few (<10%), some (10%-49%), most (50%-90%), and nearly all (>90%).

The site visit explored 6 areas of focus: patient safety, health care quality (with a special focus on health care disparities), supervision, care transitions, well-being, and professionalism. The site visit is structured to assess the focus areas as they relate to (1) institutional infrastructure and resources, (2) graduate medical education (GME) leadership and faculty members' engagement, (3) resident and fellow engagement, (4) the medical center's perspective on their measures of success in integrating GME into their infrastructure to address patient safety and quality, and (5) the medical center's plans for improving the clinical learning environment in these 6 focus areas.
Initiatives in the Clinical Learning Environment

At the meetings with senior leadership, the patient safety and quality leaders, and the program directors, the CLER team explored the medical center's efforts to integrate GME in supporting the organization's strategic goals to improve patient care, changes made since the last CLER visit, and challenges in the focus areas.

When asked how GME has been integrated into MUSC's key strategic initiatives, Dr. Cawley noted that, last year, residents and fellows provided input into the development of the strategic plan. He also noted the prominent role of residents and fellows in many patient safety and quality initiatives and on medical center committees.

The patient safety and quality leadership team noted a number of special efforts to educate the residents and fellows on the medical center's strategic plan and priorities in patient safety and quality improvement (QI). These include presenting at orientation, monthly meetings with the chief residents, individual program presentations and reviews of reported patient safety events, and the efforts of the GME Medical Director of Quality who presents at the GMEC.

When asked how residents and fellows are involved in developing MUSC's patient safety and QI strategy, the patient safety and quality leadership team indicated residents and fellows are not involved in strategic planning for QI. They noted that residents and fellows serve an important role in implementing medical center-wide initiatives and that resident and fellow feedback from the culture of safety survey helps to determine the goals and objectives of the strategic plan.

The senior leadership team indicated that since the last CLER visit of the CLER focus areas, the medical center has made the most progress in addressing well-being. Senior leadership identified transitions of care as posing the greatest challenge. In explaining the challenges, the senior leadership team mentioned the challenges of transitioning patients to follow up in their home communities, especially in smaller towns and rural areas.

Program directors described efforts to improve the clinical learning environment since the last CLER visit, such as a revision of the funding process for GME program leadership, increased resident and fellow involvement in QI projects, increased awareness of fatigue and burnout by residents and faculty members, and increased patient safety event reporting. They also described program-specific goals in the CLER focus areas and progress in accomplishing these goals, including responding to the risk of burnout by providing education and adding ancillary clinical help; developing departmental quality and patient safety committees; joining the national I-PASS initiative; and starting a resident wellness committee which is being expanded to faculty members.

The residents and fellows interviewed were positive when speaking about the clinical and educational culture at the medical center. Many of the nurses interviewed indicated that working with residents and fellows is a rewarding experience.
Patient Safety

The CLER team explored several areas of patient safety, including use of the patient safety event reporting system, feedback on patient safety event reports, inclusion in patient safety event investigations, and the clinical learning environment's role in monitoring patient safety.

**Use of the Patient Safety Event Reporting System**

The patient safety and quality leaders noted that MUSC uses an online system for reporting patient safety events and indicated that the system allows for anonymous reporting. They noted that MUSC has expanded requirements for resident and fellow reporting to include reviews and suggest improvements on the events they report. The patient safety and quality leaders mentioned that residents, fellows, and faculty members can also submit patient safety event reports by calling a hotline, using the chain of command, or reporting directly to the patient safety office. They noted that their staff subsequently enter any reports received through these mechanisms into the online system.

The patient safety leadership team indicated although they do not have specific goals for resident and fellow recognition and reporting of adverse events, near misses, and unsafe conditions, they are monitoring for an annual increase in the absolute number and proportion of the total reports submitted by residents and fellows compared with the prior year, and noted they have observed this increase since instituting a resident incentive program.

The patient safety and quality leaders reported that in calendar year 2017, MUSC received 16,086 patient safety event reports. Of these, 161 were submitted anonymously, residents and fellows submitted 1,540 reports and medical staff physicians submitted 402 reports.

In the group meetings, 49% of the faculty members and 89% of the program directors indicated that, in the past 12 months, they had personally reported a patient safety event at MUSC using the medical center's patient safety event reporting system.

In the group interviews, 98% of the residents and fellows indicated that they believe the medical center provides a supportive, nonpunitive environment for reporting patient safety events. The high proportion of resident and fellow reports into the medical center's patient safety event reporting system supports their view of a nonpunitive system.

In the group interviews, 88% of the residents and fellows reported that they had experienced an adverse event, near miss, or unsafe condition while at MUSC. Of these, 82% (72% of the total) indicated that they had personally entered the patient safety event into the medical center's patient safety event reporting system, 4% indicated that they relied on a nurse to report the patient safety event, 8% indicated that they relied on a supervisor to report the patient safety event, and 6% indicated that they chose not to report the patient safety event. In a separate query, 55% of the residents and fellows indicated that they have reported a near miss at MUSC in the past year.
When the faculty members and program directors in the group sessions were asked what process they believe their residents and fellows follow when reporting a patient safety event, 93% of the faculty members and 85% of the program directors responded that they believe their residents and fellows report the patient safety event using the medical center’s patient safety event reporting system.

All residents and fellows interviewed on walking rounds stated that they had entered a patient safety event into the medical center’s patient safety event reporting system. Many residents and fellows appeared to have an understanding of the range of reportable patient safety events, including near misses, unsafe conditions, and events without harm; fewer appeared to recognize unexpected deteriorations and known complications of procedures as reportable patient safety events. They appeared to understand their responsibility to report patient safety events into the medical center’s central patient safety event reporting system and appeared to understand how reporting of patient safety events can provide opportunities to identify potential causes of harm and promote improvements to prevent future patient safety events.

The CLER team also asked nurses about their use of the patient safety event reporting system. The nurses interviewed on the walking rounds appeared to be familiar with the medical center’s patient safety event reporting system. A small proportion had not submitted a patient safety event report in 6 months or longer.

Many nurses interviewed appeared to recognize near misses, unsafe conditions, events without harm as reportable. Fewer recognized unexpected deteriorations or known complications of procedures as reportable patient safety events. Some noted that known complications of procedures are tracked within their units for discussion or at M&M conferences and may not be entered into the patient safety event reporting system. Nurses in some clinical areas noted the amount of time needed to enter a patient safety event report, competing clinical responsibilities, and lack of feedback limited their reporting of near misses or less serious patient safety events.

Several residents, fellows, and nurses interviewed across multiple service areas on walking rounds indicated that the medical center’s patient safety event reporting system was occasionally used to report on the behaviors of others. They patient safety leadership indicated that they have encouraged the use of the system to report behaviors and professionalism issues that may undermine the culture of safety.

**Feedback on Patient Safety Event Reports**

Of the residents and fellows in the group interviews who indicated that they had reported a patient safety event by any means (themselves or through a nurse or physician supervisor), 61% indicated that they had received feedback on the outcome of the report. When asked to describe, residents and fellows noted they received an email indicating that a case has been closed and instructions on how they may follow up to obtain more information. Others noted participation in RCAs and departmental conferences that provide feedback regarding major events, or phone calls from risk management or an attending physician. Faculty members and
program directors indicated that residents and fellows also learn about the outcome of their reports by participating in departmental morbidity and mortality (M&M) conferences or other case-based discussions, the children's hospital event review meetings, and through feedback from the risk management department to the departmental patient safety liaisons.

**Inclusion in Patient Safety Event Investigations**

The patient safety leadership team reported that they conducted 49 patient safety event investigations called serious safety solutions (S3s) in calendar year 2017. They indicated that 35 residents and fellows had participated in one or more of these investigations. They also noted that the medical center conducted 321 other types of investigations for low harm events or those that did not reach the patients, and noted they do not track resident and fellow participation in these investigations.

During the group sessions, the CLER team asked residents, fellows, and program directors about their participation in patient safety event investigations such as root cause analyses (RCAs) that included the following five components:

- Review by an interprofessional team
- Detailed analysis of patient safety event-related systems and processes
- Identification of potential systems changes
- Implementation of an action plan
- Follow-up evaluation of the actions

Of the residents and fellows in the group who were PGY-3 and above, 65% indicated that they had participated in an interprofessional investigation of a patient safety event (eg, RCA). When asked to describe their experience, several noted participating in a process that included the steps of a formal investigation that would allow them to understand a systems approach to addressing factors associated with adverse events, near misses, and unsafe conditions.

Fifty-eight percent of the program directors interviewed indicated that they had participated in a patient safety event investigation led by the medical center.

When asked about the ways that residents and fellows experience interprofessional patient safety event investigations, program directors provided the following examples: RCAs, mock RCAs, departmental M&M conferences, patient safety event reviews, and quality conferences. Based on their descriptions of these conferences, programs and departments appeared to vary in their approaches to teaching how to conduct these types of investigations.

In the interviews on walking rounds, residents and fellows appeared to vary in their understanding of patient safety principles, methods, and tools (eg, Swiss cheese model of system failure, fishbone diagrams) associated with a systems approach to investigating adverse events, near misses/close calls, or unsafe conditions. Several residents and fellows appeared to
be conversant with these concepts. The level of understanding appeared to vary across programs.

**Sharing Lessons From Patient Safety Event Reports and Investigations**

The patient safety and quality leadership team stated that they share the numbers of patient safety event reports submitted by residents, fellows, and medical staff physicians at the GMEC monthly meeting as a standing agenda item presented by the GME medical director of quality. They also indicated that they report the numbers of residents and fellows who have participated in patient safety event investigations to the GMEC. They indicated they do not report the number of resident and fellow patient safety event reports or participation in patient safety investigations to the medical center's governing body. They noted that MUSC is a state institution and that the meetings are open to the public.

The patient safety and quality leadership team stated that efforts to disseminate lessons learned from patient safety event investigations to the residents and fellows include a weekly update dedicated to lessons learned which is included in a daily safety email sent to residents, fellows, faculty members and other members of the clinical care teams.

The CLER team also explored issues around disclosure of patient safety events. During the group interviews, 84% of the residents and fellows reported that they have received training on how to disclose medical errors to patients and families; 5% responded that the question was “not applicable” to their specialty. Of those who indicated they had received training, 25% indicated that the training was principally provided by lecture; 37%, online; 4%, via simulation; and 31%, informally while providing care.

When given a scenario of being involved in a major patient safety event resulting in a patient death, 80% of the residents and fellows in the group interviews indicated that they know of medical center resources to assist them in coping with the event. Of the residents and fellows familiar with the resources, 78% indicated that they would be somewhat or very comfortable using these resources.

**Procedure Management**

The CLER team also explored resident and fellow management of bedside and ambulatory procedures. The nurses, residents, and fellows interviewed on walking rounds indicated that the residents and fellows, faculty members, attending physicians, and consultants are actively engaged in the process of performing a time-out before bedside and ambulatory procedures. Nurses reported that if a physician does not perform a standardized time-out, they feel comfortable to speak up and the procedure is stopped. A few nurses noted that they are not routinely involved in bedside procedures performed on their unit.
Suggestions for Improving Resident and Fellow Training in Patient Safety

When asked for suggestions to improve resident and fellow training in patient safety, faculty members and program directors recommended interdisciplinary or system-wide M&Ms.

Health Care Quality

Priorities in Health Care Quality

The members of the senior leadership team stated that the medical center’s top priorities for improving health care quality are to promote patient safety event reporting and further develop the system of interprofessional quality and performance improvement plans (QAPIs) in each of the integrated clinical centers of excellence (ICCEs, previously service lines) to decentralize the management of quality.

In the group meetings, 80% of the residents and fellows, 80% of the faculty members, and 77% of the program directors reported knowing MUSC’s QI priorities. Overall, residents, fellows, faculty members, and program directors described priorities that did not specifically align with those mentioned by senior leadership. They principally mentioned clinical quality metrics such as hospital acquired conditions.

Engagement in Quality Improvement Activities

The patient safety and quality leaders indicated the medical center uses IMPROVE (Identify the problem, Measure the impact, Problem analysis, Remedy selection, Operationalize the remedies, Validate the improvements, Evaluate over time) in designing and implementing QI activities.

In the group discussion and on walking rounds, a limited number of the residents and fellows appeared to be familiar with QI terminology and processes. In general, the residents and fellows were able to describe how QI processes would be used to improve patient care.

When the program directors were asked about their experience with QI processes and methods in place at MUSC, 23% indicated that they had extensive experience in using these QI processes and methods, 65% indicated that they had moderate experience, and 12% indicated they had minimal or no experience.

The patient safety and quality leadership stated that their department does not have a mechanism to centrally monitor resident- and fellow-led QI projects.

Of the residents and fellows in the group interviews who were PGY-2 and above, 88% indicated that they have participated in a QI project of their own design or one designed by their program or department. Of those, 71% indicated that the project directly linked to one or more of the
medical center's goals, 6% indicated that the project did not link to the medical center's goals, and 23% responded that they did not know if the project linked to the medical center's goals.

When asked to describe their involvement in QI projects, residents and fellows in the group interviews and on walking rounds described planning and/or implementing an activity, developing order sets or clinical process changes, program-level educational activities, or compliance with clinical guidelines. Several described projects that included the steps of evaluating the efforts; a limited number described projects with follow-up actions to support ongoing improvement or projects with more than one cycle of improvement.

A limited number of the nurses interviewed on walking rounds indicated that they were working on interprofessional QI projects that included residents or fellows.

The patient safety and quality leadership team indicated that residents and fellows share the lessons learned from their QI projects with other professions across the organization by displaying their QI projects as posters during patient safety week.

**Access to Data**

Eighty-one percent of the program directors in the group interviews reported that their residents and fellows have ready access to organized systems for collecting and analyzing data for the purposes of QI. When asked to provide some examples of these resources, program directors mentioned the electronic health record, departmental databases, and local, regional, and national registries.

The patient safety and quality leaders indicated that residents and fellows may obtain quality performance data specific to their patients by using specific functions in the EHR. They noted that a few departments are able to provide individual data from specialty-specific data bases. Program directors in some programs confirmed that they have recently been able to provide individual resident or fellow level data from the EHR.

In response to a question about access to data directly related to their patients, 5% of the residents and fellows in the group interviews indicated that they periodically receive QI data on their own patients, and 25% indicated that they periodically receive both data on their own patients and data related to patients in their department or service area. Thirty-nine percent reported that they only receive aggregated or benchmarked QI data related to patients in their department or service area, and 30% indicated that they do not receive any aggregated or benchmarked QI data related to patient care.

**Suggestions for Improving Resident and Fellow Engagement in Quality Improvement**

Residents, fellows, faculty members, and program directors offered several recommendations to improve resident and fellow engagement in MUSC's QI initiatives. Residents and fellows recommended, for example, consolidating multiple related QI efforts into one large project in
some departments, and providing protected time for QI projects. Faculty members and program directors suggested increasing support for data collection, analysis, publication, and presentation of resident and fellow QI projects; making quality data available at the individual resident or fellow level; including outpatient areas in QI work; and developing a QI track within training programs.

Health Care Disparities

**Patient Populations at Risk for Health Care Disparities**

When asked to describe the patients receiving care at MUSC at risk for health care disparities, residents and fellows mentioned patients who are non-English speaking, patients who are LGBT, those who are uninsured, patients of different cultural backgrounds, and those of low socio-economic status. Faculty members and program directors added patients who are hearing impaired, patients with low health literacy, and patients with HIV. They also mentioned pediatric patients transitioning to adult medicine, transgender youth, and patients who live in rural areas as populations at risk for health care disparities.

In the group meetings, 34% of the residents and fellows and 55% of the faculty members indicated that, while at MUSC, they have participated in cultural competency training specific to the patients receiving care at the medical center. During the interviews on walking rounds, the majority of residents, fellows, and nurses described cultural competency training that appeared to be largely generic.

**Resident and Fellow Engagement in Efforts to Eliminate Health Care Disparities**

Four percent of the residents and fellows in the group interviews indicated that they had participated in a QI project focused on eliminating health care disparities at MUSC.

Faculty members and program directors noted that resident and fellow engagement in advancing efforts to eliminate health care disparities at MUSC includes the following examples: providing hands-on clinical care in undeserved and/or rural areas, telemedicine care, facilitating enrollment of rural and minority patients in clinical trials, and involvement in research projects.

**Clinical Site Efforts to Eliminate Health Care Disparities**

The senior leadership team indicated that MUSC's efforts to eliminate disparities in health care among the patients receiving care at the medical center include a strategic focus on diversity, inclusion, and health and healthcare disparities. They noted that they are in the early phases of building awareness of healthcare disparities and have instituted implicit bias training. They described that they are currently analyzing internal data to identify where care disparities may exist, and then assigning performance improvement teams to areas of concern.
When asked about measures that focus on health care disparities as part of the medical center’s performance measurement tools for tracking quality and patient safety, the senior leadership team indicated that the medical center does not currently have measures that focus on health care disparities. They noted their use of Vizient data as a source of information which has resulted in efforts to improve in a few identified areas of disparities in care. (eg racial differences in ED length of stay prior to admission).

The CLER team asked the patient safety and quality leadership team if they report quality metrics to the medical center’s governing body by subgroups of vulnerable populations. They indicated that they do not currently report by subgroups.

In the group meetings, 22% of the residents and fellows, 42% of the faculty members, and 35% of the program directors reported that they were aware of QI performance measures that the medical center uses to assess its efforts to eliminate health care disparities. Examples included tracking utilization of translation services, patient satisfaction scores, the children's hospital's participation in a national collaborative addressing healthcare disparities, and annual program evaluation reports to GME leadership.

MUSC appears to be in the early stages of developing a systematic approach to identifying variability in the care provided to or the clinical outcomes of their known vulnerable patient populations that includes the steps of periodic review of performance measures to identify disparities in patient care or outcomes, targeted QI efforts to address these disparities, and ongoing analyses to assess these efforts.

Senior leadership also noted that some departments and service lines are conducting population-specific studies or research projects related to health care disparities.

---

**Care Transitions**

**Education on Care Transitions**

Sixty percent of the residents and fellows in the group interviews indicated that, while at MUSC, they have participated in formal interprofessional educational activities focused on patient care transitions. When asked for examples, residents and fellows described departmental educational activities for physicians aimed at improving hand-off skills; a limited number described interprofessional educational activities aimed at improving hand-off skills when communicating with all members of the care team.

The CLER team also asked the program directors about resident and fellow participation in interprofessional training on transitions in care. Fifty percent of the program directors reported that their residents and fellows participated in team training that involved nurses and other health care professionals.
Engagement in and Assessing Care Transitions

When asked about transitions at discharge, 23% of the residents and fellows in the group interviews reported that they follow a standardized process for handling transitions from inpatient to outpatient care. Thirty-eight percent responded that the question did not apply to their specialty.

Sixty-four percent of the residents and fellows in the group interviews indicated that they follow a standardized process for handling transitions of care during hand-offs between shifts. Fourteen percent indicated this does apply to their specialty. Of those who indicated they followed a standardized process, 75% indicated that they use a standardized written template for communication to facilitate the hand-off process. When asked how frequently attending physicians supervise their shift-to-shift hand-off process, 18% of the residents and fellows responded that attending physicians supervise daily, 7% responded at least once per week, 9% responded at least once per month, and 45% responded rarely. Twenty-one percent of the residents and fellows responded that the question did not apply to their specialty.

Seventy-five percent of the faculty members in the group interviews indicated that they assess resident and fellow readiness to move from direct to indirect supervision in conducting change-of-shift hand-offs. Fifty-four percent of the program directors indicated that their program assesses resident and fellow readiness to move from direct to indirect faculty supervision in conducting change-of-shift hand-offs. Of these, 7% indicated that their programs directly observe using a standardized assessment tool to monitor resident and fellow change-of-shift hand-offs.

During the walking rounds, the CLER team observed change-of-shift hand-offs for 6 clinical services. Across services, these hand-offs were consistent with regard to being held in quiet, nonpatient areas with minimal interruptions. The majority of the observed hand-offs were supervised by engaged senior residents; used standardized written templates, contingency planning (if/then scenarios), and synthesis by the receiver that included asking questions and confirming the plan of care.

Perceived Vulnerabilities in Care Transitions

In group discussion and on walking rounds, residents, fellows, and nurses interviewed expressed their belief that the transitions at MUSC posing the greatest risk for patient safety due to incomplete or inaccurate communication include transfers from the intensive care units to the floors, transfers from the floors or ORs to ICUs, and transfers from inpatient to outpatient care. They also mentioned patient transfers from other facilities that arrive unannounced or with incomplete or inaccurate information including imaging studies that cannot be opened; delays in patient care when beds are unavailable for emergency department patients admitted to inpatient care; hand-offs after extended shifts; ED to ED transfers; and the transition from pediatric to adult medicine care.
The patient safety and quality leadership team noted efforts to improve transitions in care at MUSC, including developing embedded hand-off tools and an interprofessional discharge planning document in the EHR. The patient safety and quality leadership team indicated that they monitor resident and fellow transitions of care for issues regarding patient safety by auditing medication reconciliation documentation on admission and at discharge.

**Supervision**

*Perceived Vulnerabilities Related to Supervision*

When asked about patient safety vulnerabilities related to resident and fellow supervision at MUSC, the senior leadership team did not express specific concerns.

The CLER team also asked faculty members and program directors about perceived patient safety vulnerabilities related to resident and fellow supervision. They identified that for some inpatient services, no in-house attending physician is present on nights or weekends. They also noted that residents and fellows vary in their comfort level and/or decision processes in determining when to ask for assistance; a faculty member may be placed in a situation where they are expected to supervise residents in two distant parts of the hospital, and productivity pressures may impact faculty members’ availability to supervise. Some expressed the concern that residents and fellows are oversupervised, leaving them potentially unprepared for independent practice.

To address some of these supervision concerns, program directors noted that the medical center has implemented a GME funding model which takes teaching time into account.

*Perceptions of Supervision*

When the CLER team asked the residents and fellows in the group interviews to characterize their experience with supervision at MUSC, 2% responded that they are generally undersupervised, 7% responded that they are occasionally undersupervised, 68% responded that they are adequately supervised, 20% responded that they are occasionally oversupervised, and 4% responded that they are generally oversupervised.

When the program directors were asked the same question, 15% indicated that the residents and fellows are generally oversupervised, 23% indicated that the residents and fellows are occasionally oversupervised, 58% indicated that the residents and fellows are adequately supervised, and 4% indicated that the residents and fellows are occasionally undersupervised.

During the group interviews with residents and fellows, 29% indicated that while training at MUSC, they have been placed in a situation or witnessed one of their peers in a situation where they believed supervision was inadequate. Residents and fellows explained that the general situations in which this occurred involved difficulties in locating the attending, contacting on call
physicians at night, and attending physicians that were not be immediately proximate when an emergency situation occurred.

When asked to describe their experience with contacting attending physicians and consultants for help at MUSC, 34% of the residents and fellows in the group interviews reported that they have occasionally encountered a physician who has made them feel uncomfortable about asking for assistance; 7% indicated that they have frequently encountered a physician who has made them feel uncomfortable about asking for assistance.

The CLER team also asked the program directors about their opinions on the experience of residents and fellows with requesting assistance. Forty-two percent of the program directors expressed the belief that residents and fellows have occasionally encountered a physician who has made them feel uncomfortable about asking for assistance. None expressed the belief that residents and fellows have frequently encountered a physician who has made them feel uncomfortable about asking for assistance.

**Clinical Learning Environment Monitoring of Resident and Fellow Procedural Supervision**

Eighty-six percent of the residents and fellows in the group interviews indicated that they know what they are allowed to do without direct supervision. When asked about residents and fellows from other services performing clinical procedures on their patients, 29% of the residents and fellows responded that they have an objective way to verify what procedures their peers are allowed to do without direct supervision.

In the group interviews with the faculty members, 80% indicated that they have an objective way to know which procedures a particular resident or fellow is allowed to perform without direct supervision. Faculty members noted that the GME office has an online system that allows them access to information about procedural supervision requirements for all residents and fellows in all programs. Faculty members and program directors noted that the online system is also available to nurses.

The patient safety and quality leadership team indicated that they do not monitor whether the database/system is being used by the physician staff and other members of the health care team in the course of patient care.

In the interviews on walking rounds, the majority of nurses were aware of the online system for accessing information regarding which procedures a resident or fellow is allowed to do without direct supervision. A small proportion of the nurses indicated that they had accessed the system in the past year. When asked to demonstrate use of the system, the majority of nurses could reach the site; a limited number were able to log on and access the procedural supervision requirements. The majority of nurses interviewed indicated that, in the absence of an attending physician, they principally rely on familiarity, trust, year of training, or assume or confirm the attending physician has given permission for the resident or fellow to perform the bedside patient procedure.
Nineteen percent of the program directors interviewed reported that, in the past year, they have had to manage an issue of resident or fellow supervision that resulted in a patient safety event. The patient safety and quality leadership did not recall any patient safety event reports involving issues of resident or fellow supervision.

Well-Being

As part of this round of visits, the CLER team explored a selected set of interrelated topics in well-being: work/life balance, fatigue, burnout, and support of those at risk of or demonstrating self-harm. This focus area replaces what was formerly called “duty hours, fatigue management, and mitigation.”

Promoting the Well-Being of the Clinical Care Team

Based on conversations with the senior leadership team, it appears that MUSC has a strategy that supports the well-being of the clinical care team. They noted that is a specific goal in their strategic plan. They described that the most recent quarterly leadership institute, attended by more than 500 leaders and managers, was devoted to well-being and burnout, and focused on identification and interventions. Members of the senior leadership team mentioned that the top priority in this area is developing awareness of well-being issues in the medical center, emphasizing the need for identification of burnout, and publicizing available resources.

The well-being representatives stated that MUSC maintains several activities and programs to promote the physical and emotional well-being of residents and fellows, such as group social activities, free wellness center/gym memberships for residents and fellows, women’s support groups, and other residency and fellowship program based activities.

Eighty percent of the faculty members in the group interviews reported that they knew of programs that MUSC maintains to support their well-being. They mentioned, for example, GME and university sponsored programs on stress and burnout, a wellness center, and online and live didactics that address wellness topics.

Workload and Work/Life Balance

In the section that follows, workload refers to volume and complexity of patient care, as well as hours worked, including documentation, research, and educational activities.

Based on conversations with the senior leadership team and the well-being representatives, it does not appear that MUSC sets specific expectations for faculty workload to promote safe and high-quality patient care. When asked how the medical center monitors whether faculty members exceed expected workload, the well-being representatives mentioned that chairs evaluate RVU productivity status and would be alerted by evidence of excessive clinical productivity.
In the group meetings, 65% of the faculty members and 23% of the program directors agreed or
strongly agreed that the medical center creates an environment that promotes balance between
faculty workload and their well-being.

When asked how MUSC monitors whether faculty's clinical workload adversely affects teaching
responsibilities, the senior leadership team noted use of the resident ACGME surveys.

In the group meetings, 36% of the faculty members and 81% of the program directors agreed or
strongly agreed that the volume and intensity of faculty member's clinical workload adversely
impacts their ability to teach residents and fellows.

Fifteen percent of the program directors reported that the medical center's leadership
collaborates to a moderate or great extent with GME leadership to set expectations for resident
and fellow workload to optimize patient care while supporting their well-being. When asked to
describe how these expectations are set, they mentioned DIO discussions with the CEO and
Dean, and hiring of hospitalists and advanced practice providers (APPs) to reduce resident and
fellow clinical workload.

The patient safety and quality leadership indicated that they assess for risks to patient safety
due to resident and fellow workload and use this information to reduce risks to patients through
review of patient safety event reports and issues raised during patient safety investigations.

When asked how the medical center addresses concerns about patient safety related to staff
workload, residents, fellows, nurses interviewed in the group meeting and on walking rounds
mentioned surge coverage in some residency programs and clinical units.

**Fatigue**

Eighty-six percent of the residents and fellows in the group interviews agreed or strongly agreed
that the medical center has successful systems in place to ensure patient safety from the risks
of resident and fellow fatigue.

In the interviews on walking rounds, residents, fellows, nurses indicated that they were aware of
medical center efforts at their program or unit level to proactively recognize and address fatigue
among the clinical care team.

The residents and fellows in the group interviews were presented with a scenario in which they
are maximally fatigued, yet have 2 hours remaining until the end of their shift. When asked what
they would do in this circumstance, 55% of the residents and fellows indicated that they would
power through to hand-off; 14% indicated that they would approach another resident or fellow
and hope he/she would take over their responsibilities; 16% indicated that they would notify a
supervisor and expect to be taken off duty immediately; 14% responded “other” with some
suggesting that they would ask to share the workload with a peer or ask the resident scheduled
for the next shift to come in earlier.
When the faculty members and program directors were given the same scenario, 21% of the faculty members and 12% of the program directors expressed the belief that the resident or fellow would power through to hand-off, whereas 60% of the faculty members and 62% of the program directors expressed the belief that the resident or fellow would notify a supervisor and expect to be taken off duty immediately.

The well-being representatives noted that MUSC assesses the effectiveness of its efforts to manage fatigue among the clinical care team by faculty surveys and measuring staff turnover. They noted current pilot studies that include assessments of effectiveness of programs that promote healthy lifestyles.

During the group interviews, program directors offered several suggestions on how the medical center could further help residents and fellows minimize fatigue while on call, including reducing the burden of non-physician tasks, developing policies to address times of surge capacity at the hospital, hiring more APPs, and developing attending-only services. They also emphasized the importance of access to healthy food options 24/7 for residents, fellows, and faculty members and noted that long wait times in the cafeteria discourage eating when a short break is available.

**Burnout**

Based on conversations with the senior leadership team, MUSC appears to have systems in place to identify the level of burnout among faculty members that includes surveys administered in most departments. They noted that the data are shared with chairs and division directors.

The well-being representatives described the following efforts to build awareness of burnout at MUSC: the recent leadership development institute program, a new interprofessional task force to address clinician burnout and methods to build resilience, a faculty round table presentation on burnout, and EAP presentations at the department level for residents, fellows and faculty members to address recognition of burnout and available resources.

In the group sessions, 57% of the residents and fellows and 75% of the faculty members reported that they are moderately or very prepared to recognize and respond to burnout among the members of the clinical care team.

When the CLER team asked the residents and fellows how frequently they see signs of burnout among the faculty members at MUSC, 38% responded sometimes and 25% responded often. When asked the same question, 52% of the faculty members reported they sometimes see signs of burnout among their faculty colleagues; 20% reported often.

In the group discussion and interviews on walking rounds, the CLER team asked residents, fellows, nurses, about their observations of signs of burnout among members of the clinical care team. Those who indicated that they had witnessed signs described faculty members arriving late; expressing frustration with ancillary and support staff, as well as with clinical inefficiencies
and the EHR; showing decreased interest in clinical teaching and engagement in clinical care; having an increased focus on RVUs and productivity; losing empathy toward patients; and attrition.

**Support of Those at Risk of or Demonstrating Self-Harm**

When asked about the medical center’s process to identify residents, fellows, and faculty members at risk of or demonstrating self-harm, the well-being representatives did not describe a consistent process to identify these individuals. They indicated that once an at-risk individual is identified there are a number of referral options immediately available: EAP, forensic psychiatry consultation, and/or referral to the impaired physician program. The well-being representatives noted that the medical center assesses the effectiveness of its efforts to facilitate care for those at risk of or demonstrating self-harm through on-going monitoring after their return to the medical center and ultimate success in their career as tracked by resident and fellow graduate surveys.

In the group sessions, 48% of the residents and fellows, 68% of the faculty members, and 85% of the program directors reported that they are moderately or very prepared to recognize members of the clinical care team at risk of or demonstrating self-harm.

In a follow-up question, the CLER team asked the groups of residents and fellows, and program directors what they would do if they identified a member of the clinical care team at risk of or demonstrating self-harm. Residents and fellows indicated that for a colleague they would speak directly with the individual first, and then the chief resident or program director. If a faculty member, they would bring this to the attention of the program director or chair. For a nurse they would approach the charge nurse or the nursing supervisor. Program directors noted similar approaches and added that for residents and fellows, they would remove the individual from clinical duties and facilitate an emergency safety assessment. For a peer or a nurse they would refer to EAP.

The CLER team asked the residents, fellows, and faculty members if they knew of resources offered by the medical center to support their well-being if they needed personal or professional support after one of their colleagues harmed him/herself. Eighty-two percent of the residents and fellows and 84% of the faculty members reported that they knew of these resources.

**Future Well-Being Efforts**

The CLER team asked the well-being representatives about their vision of the future of well-being efforts at MUSC. They expressed a vision to integrate the well-being strategy and associated activities across the three entities that make up MUSC (medical center, physician’s group, and the College of Medicine). They also noted the importance of effectively communicating the availability and accessibility of the many well-being resources and support services to all constituents at MUSC.
Professionalism

During the visit, the CLER team touched on a selected set of topics related to professionalism, including honesty in reporting, integrity, and mistreatment.

Current Challenges Regarding Professionalism

The senior leadership team noted that the major challenges regarding unprofessional behavior at MUSC are episodes of unprofessional behavior that are not addressed immediately or repeated behaviors that are not escalated quickly. They indicated that MUSC is addressing these challenges by promoting a just culture and exhibiting a low tolerance for unprofessional behavior in all settings.

Honesty in Reporting

In the group meetings, 34% of the residents and fellows and 16% of the faculty members indicated that they have documented a history or physical finding in a patient medical record that they did not personally elicit without documenting the original source (such as copying and pasting from another note without attribution).

To explore the medical center's culture around reporting of duty hours, the CLER team presented a scenario to the residents and fellows in the group interviews in which a colleague stays 30 minutes beyond his/her duty hours limit to address a nonurgent clinical task. When asked whether the colleague would report the time, 82% responded that it was somewhat or very unlikely that the colleague would do so. The CLER team also presented the same scenario to the program directors and 12% reported that it was somewhat or very unlikely that the resident or fellow would report the time.

Integrity

The CLER team asked the residents and fellows in the group interviews how often faculty members disclose whether or not they have potential conflicts of interest at the beginning of all medical education conferences. Sixty-three percent indicated that faculty members always report such potential conflicts.

When asked how often faculty members disclose whether or not they have potential conflicts of interest during each resident and fellow clinical rotation, 11% of the residents and fellows reported that faculty members always disclose this information.

To further explore issues of integrity, the residents and fellows in the group interviews responded to a scenario in which one of their colleagues has written a manuscript and the department chair, although not involved in the project, asks to be included as an author. When asked what they would advise the colleague to do, residents and fellows responded as follows: 36%, include the chair's name on the manuscript; 45%, discuss the request with the CMO, DIO,
or a faculty member; none, register a concern with the ACGME; and 20%, "other." Of those who responded "other," some indicated they would advise speaking with the chair directly, submitting the paper without putting the chair's name on the manuscript, or publishing the paper after graduation.

In the group interviews, 13% of the residents and fellows reported that there had been at least one occasion where they felt pressured to compromise their integrity to satisfy an authority figure while at MUSC.

Respectful Treatment of Others

Overall, the majority of the residents, fellows, nurses, and other health care professionals interviewed indicated that they work in a respectful environment. However, individuals across several areas of the medical center described the behavior of a few attending physicians, residents, fellows, and nurses as dismissive or disrespectful. Individuals noted that, in most cases when reported, these behaviors appeared to improve.

In the group interviews with the program directors, 92% expressed the belief that MUSC is usually or always effective in managing reports of unprofessional behavior.

The group discussions concluded by exploring attitudes and beliefs regarding options for dealing with potential mistreatment. The CLER team presented the residents and fellows with a scenario describing an attending physician's mistreatment of a resident colleague. In the scenario, the issues of mistreatment continue to persist although reported to the chief resident, program director, department chair, and head of GME. When presented with several options for what they would advise the colleague to do next, residents and fellows responded as follows: 55%, contact the human resources (HR) department or the medical center's hotline; 14%, contact the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC); 18%, register a concern with the ACGME; and 11%, "other." Of those who responded "other," some indicated that they would advise repeating the process through GME, or approaching the university ombudsman or going to the diversity office.

When presented with the same scenario, 52% of the program directors and 40% of the faculty members in the group interviews expressed the belief that the resident would contact the HR department or the medical center's hotline; 18% of the faculty members and 28% of the program directors selected "other." Of these, some expressed the belief that the resident would return to the program director, approach a faculty mentor, speak to an attorney, or report the behavior though the patient safety event reporting system.
Conclusion

In closing, the CLER Program would like to thank the Medical University of South Carolina Medical Center for its hospitality in facilitating the visit. We recognize that a great deal of effort went into making the arrangements. We hope that the observations made during this visit are helpful to you in identifying opportunities for improving patient care and education of residents and fellows. We invite you to share your comments about the site visit process and/or your plans to use this information on the optional response form included with this report. We look forward to visiting you again in the future.

Note: The CLER Program is designed to broadly inform the ACGME Accreditation System. CLER visits do not result in citations or directly lead to programmatic or institutional accreditation decisions. CLER staff/volunteers may share CLER-derived data/information with the Institutional Review Committee, the ACGME Residency Review Committees, or the public only in de-identified or aggregate form, unless written permission is obtained from the DIO of the Sponsoring Institution.
11/1/2018

Jennifer J Jarosck, ND
Program Director
Medical University of South Carolina
MSC 561
135 Rutledge Avenue, Room 489
Charleston, SC 29425

Dear Dr. Jarosck,

The Review Committee for Pediatrics, functioning in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME), has reviewed the information available regarding the following program:

Pediatric hematology/oncology

Medical University of South Carolina Program
Medical University of South Carolina College of Medicine
Charleston, SC

Program: 3274521063

Approximate Next Site Visit: 12/01/2018

The Review Committee determined that a full site visit of the program must be conducted before an accreditation decision can be made. Details regarding the site visit schedule will be provided by the Department of Field Activities.

The Review Committee is concerned with the results of the 2017-2018 Fellow Survey and the faculty supervision and teaching section of the Faculty Survey. The Fellow Survey results have declined significantly in most categories. Of particular concern is the fellows’ overall evaluation of the program.

The RC is also concerned that only one out of four graduates has passed the certifying examination from 2015-2017.

The program should be prepared to outline the steps it has taken to address the fellows concerns and the steps it is taking to ensure that the graduates are prepared to sit for the certifying examination.

The ACGME must be notified of any major changes in the organization of the program. When corresponding with the ACGME, please identify the program by name and number as indicated above. Changes in participating sites and changes in leadership must be reported to the Review Committee using the ACGME Accreditation Data System (ADS).
10/11/2018

Ashlyn H Savage, MD, MCR
Associate Professor
Medical University of South Carolina
96 Jonathan Lucas St
Suite 634, PO Box 250619
Charleston, SC 29425

Dear Dr. Savage,

The Review Committee for Obstetrics and Gynecology, functioning in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME), has reviewed the information submitted regarding the following program:

Obstetrics and gynecology

Medical University of South Carolina Program
Medical University of South Carolina College of Medicine
Charleston, SC

Program 2204521270

OTHER COMMENTS

The Review Committee acknowledges the addition of Planned Parenthood South Atlantic as a program participating site. Please ensure the program’s block diagram is updated to reflect this change. To update the block diagram: ADS > Participating Site tab > Block Diagram Upload.

This office must be notified of any major changes in the organization of the program. When corresponding with this office, please identify the program by name and number as indicated above. Changes in participating sites and changes in leadership must be reported to the Review Committee using the ACGME Accreditation Data System.
10/11/2018

Eugene Y Chang, MD
Program Director
96 Jonathan Lucas St
Suite 634
Charleston, SC 29425

Dear Dr. Chang,

The Review Committee for Obstetrics and Gynecology, functioning in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME), has reviewed the information submitted regarding the following program:

  Maternal-fetal medicine

  Medical University of South Carolina Program
  Medical University of South Carolina College of Medicine
  Charleston, SC

  Program 2304522001

OTHER COMMENTS

The Review Committee acknowledges the addition of MUSC Specialty Care North as a program participating site. Please ensure the program’s block diagram is updated to reflect this change. To update the block diagram: ADS > Participating Site tab > Block Diagram Upload.

This office must be notified of any major changes in the organization of the program. When corresponding with this office, please identify the program by name and number as indicated above. Changes in participating sites and changes in leadership must be reported to the Review Committee using the ACGME Accreditation Data System.
We understand the Action Plan is now done in the form to align with the program’s AIMS, however, it still needs to be presented and reviewed by the faculty. In addition, none of the items below a 4.0 on the surveys are listed in the Action Plan, although the APE form identifies them. Good Action Plan for the upcoming year. From last year, you indicate that only 9/13 required procedures reached the 75% minimum? What about the other 5 procedures? Some of the issues from last year are still issues.

Very good Board Pass Rate
Very engaged in PSI reporting system
100% of the core faculty need to be involved with professional development opportunities. Also, it looks like you’ve listed every faculty member in the program - you don’t have to list everyone

very good initiative to foster resident scholarly activity including academic half days
very good initiative to promote wellness

Why does the ACGME list you as having 56 positions? You indicate you have 50 (51 with temp increase)
Good use of Emily Brennan as non-physician faculty
Q22 - how are you promoting resiliency in trainees? You’ve addressed all the other areas

Resident input only identified bad balance between primary care and ICU training. The amount of ICU time during second year is challenging, according to some residents. All other resident input was positive.
Excellent Board Pass and Take Rate

Excellent Faculty scholarly activity - good for the fellows
Need to fix the participation in local, national...section on Dr. Metcalf's CV

Low participation on faculty survey - but addressed in APE

Good updates on Action Plan - new Action Plan is only one item. You may consider expanding to include wellness or other relevant ACGME topics

Excellent program performance relative to national norms and trends
Medical University of South Carolina - 10-30-18  
Duty Hours Violations report: 80 Hours Per Week - Averaged Over A Four-Week Period  
Reporting Period: 07/01/2018 through 06/30/2019 (365 days)  

Maximum hours: 320 hours in 28 days (4 week)

### Hematology-Oncology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Rotation Start</th>
<th>Rotation End</th>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Max Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>9/23/2018</td>
<td>10/20/2018</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Obstetrics and Gynecology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Rotation Start</th>
<th>Rotation End</th>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Max Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/29/2018</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>325.5</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/1/2018</td>
<td>7/28/2018</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>8/26/2018</td>
<td>9/22/2018</td>
<td>324.25</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surgery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Rotation Start</th>
<th>Rotation End</th>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Max Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/1/2018</td>
<td>7/28/2018</td>
<td>324.5</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/1/2018</td>
<td>7/28/2018</td>
<td>333.5</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/1/2018</td>
<td>7/28/2018</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>9/23/2018</td>
<td>10/20/2018</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/29/2018</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>322.5</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>8/26/2018</td>
<td>9/22/2018</td>
<td>327.25</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>9/23/2018</td>
<td>10/20/2018</td>
<td>320.75</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internal Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Rotation Start</th>
<th>Rotation End</th>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Max Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/1/2018</td>
<td>7/28/2018</td>
<td>323.75</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>9/23/2018</td>
<td>10/20/2018</td>
<td>320.75</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>9/23/2018</td>
<td>10/20/2018</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/1/2018</td>
<td>7/28/2018</td>
<td>338.5</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Orthopaedics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Rotation Start</th>
<th>Rotation End</th>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Max Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/29/2018</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anesthesiology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Rotation Start</th>
<th>Rotation End</th>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Max Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/1/2018</td>
<td>7/28/2018</td>
<td>332.75</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoracic Surgery - Integrated</td>
<td>Rotation Start</td>
<td>Rotation End</td>
<td>Hours Worked</td>
<td>Max Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>9/23/2018</td>
<td>10/20/2018</td>
<td>321.5</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vascular Surgery - Integrated</th>
<th>Rotation Start</th>
<th>Rotation End</th>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Max Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Name Suppressed]</td>
<td>7/29/2018</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/23/2018</td>
<td>10/20/2018</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 30, 2018

E. Benjamin Clyburn, M.D., FACP
ACGME Designated Institutional Official for Graduate Medical Education
Medical University of South Carolina

Re: Complement Increase for Adult Cardiovascular Disease Fellowship

Dear Dr. Clyburn,

I write to request an increase in the total complement of clinical residents/fellows in the ACGME-approved Adult Cardiovascular Disease program from 18 to 19. This increase will help to expand the educational opportunities for subspecialty training, to increase our outpatient educational exposure, and to increase the involvement by our fellows in research. To meet these educational goals, MUSC has hired 11 new clinical cardiologists over the past 3 years. Our current clinical faculty ratio to fellows is 36:18 (2:1) and the increase will not change this ratio substantially.

The Ralph H Johnson VA Medical Center notified me yesterday that they would fund this new permanent position. I should clarify that this is an increase from 18 to 19, not 1 per year for this 3-year fellowship. The funding is available for July 2019, and I hope to be able to fill this position through the NRMP. The deadline for changing the quota in the match is tomorrow, and I apologize for the short notice.

Thank you for considering this request. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Daniel P Judge, MD
11/1/2018

Jennifer J Jarosck, MD
Program Director
Medical University of South Carolina
MSC 561
135 Rutledge Avenue, Room 489
Charleston, SC 29425

Dear Dr. Jarosck,

The Review Committee for Pediatrics, functioning in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME), has reviewed the information available regarding the following program:

Pediatric hematology/oncology

Medical University of South Carolina Program
   Medical University of South Carolina College of Medicine
   Charleston, SC

Program: 3274521068

Approximate Next Site Visit: 12/01/2018

The Review Committee determined that a full site visit of the program must be conducted before an accreditation decision can be made. Details regarding the site visit schedule will be provided by the Department of Field Activities.

The Review Committee is concerned with the results of the 2017-2018 Fellow Survey and the faculty supervision and teaching section of the Faculty Survey. The Fellow Survey results have declined significantly in most categories. Of particular concern is the fellows' overall evaluation of the program.

The RC is also concerned that only one out of four graduates has passed the certifying examination from 2015-2017.

The program should be prepared to outline the steps it has taken to address the fellows concerns and the steps it is taking to ensure that the graduates are prepared to sit for the certifying examination.

The ACGME must be notified of any major changes in the organization of the program. When corresponding with the ACGME, please identify the program by name and number as indicated above. Changes in participating sites and changes in leadership must be reported to the Review Committee using the ACGME Accreditation Data System (ADS).