2002 CAG NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Executive Summary

The Canadian Association Of Gastroenterology (CAG), in conjunction with the Canadian Journal Of Gastroenterology (CJG) and industry partner Pulsus, sent out 522 surveys during the week of April 1st, 2002. All members of CAG received the survey. Members of the CAG were asked to return the survey to Communique Consultants, an independent consulting firm, for evaluation prior to April 15th, 2002. Communique Consultants received 105 forms prior to the deadline and an additional 45 forms after the deadline passed. The return rate of 150 forms represents an almost 29% response rate.

The intent of the survey was to determine the educational requirements of the CAG members and also determine how they felt about the material published in the CJG. In addition, industry sponsors wanted to know what methods would effectively entice delegates at a symposium or conference to also visit the industry room. The results of the survey are presented visually in chart format. There is also explanation for some areas which require further clarification. Recommendations to the CAG, the CJG and industry sponsors follow the Executive Summary.

It should be noted that because of the way the survey was constructed, respondents could, for most questions, provide more than one choice as a response. As a result, the information gathered does not reflect a strict total of 150. Where appropriate, a discussion utilizing percentages based on mode is presented. A brief summary of each area is provided. In addition, it should be noted that although the response rate was positive enough to make the statistics gathered herein both valid and reliable, the information still represents approximately 30% of CAG’s population. Hence, the discussion points included represent the views of those participants and are not necessarily reflective of the entire organization.

Recommendations:

- Provide training in negotiation skills for gastroenterologists at both the CDDW and regional symposiums. Define, specifically, the kinds of negotiation skills required by gastroenterologists so the training is specific and meets their needs.
- Provide information in IBD, GI Bleeding, and Gut Immunology at the CDDW. Supporting information for each of these topics can also be provided at regional symposiums, reading materials on websites provided through the CAG website, referral to journal articles and through the CJG.
- Expand the focus of the Canadian Journal Of Gastroenterology to include more review articles for clinicians which provided them with more information on the kinds of issues they deal with in their practice.
- Industry sponsors should focus on providing delegates with educational material rather than “gimmicky” things which provide little value to gastroenterologists. Overwhelmingly, delegates are looking for information which is helpful to them in their day to day work.
Areas Of Interest For Gastroenterologists

The charts below reflect the information received in the survey. The first chart utilizes raw numbers to indicate the actual numbers of respondents. The second chart provides the raw numbers converted to percentages. Areas of comment, discussion or recommendation, should there be any required, follow the two charts.

The survey broke down areas of interest for gastroenterologists into two main sections: Administrative Topics and GI Related Topics.

Administrative Topics included:

- Administration for doctors
- Practice management
- Health policy
- Negotiation techniques
- Effective teaching
- Computer skills / internet
- Personal financial management
- Ethics

GI Related Topics included:

- Pancreatic disorders
- Biliary disease
- Non-viral liver disease
- Viral liver disease
- Transplantation for GI
- Diseases of the esophagus
- Gastric disorders
- Lower GI tract
- IBD
- IBS
- GI Malignancy
- Nutrition
- Pregnancy and GI
- GI Pharmacology
- Pediatric GI
- Endoscopy
- Genetics
- Diarrhea
- Constipation
- Gut Immunology
- GI Bleeding
Demographic Information Summary:

- 77% of the respondents were male gastroenterologists.
- 36% of the respondents were from Ontario.
- Nearly half the respondents, 44%, serve communities in Canada with populations of more than 500,000 people.
- The largest group of respondents, 31%, have been in practice or research for 16 – 25 years.
- 57% of the respondents practice academic gastroenterology.
Administrative Topics Summary:

- 8% of respondents indicated a desire to become an expert in the topic of *Administration For Doctors*.

- 37% of respondents indicated a desire to become proficient in *Practice Management*. An additional 13% expressed a desire to become experts in this same area.

- 27% of respondents indicated a desire to become proficient in *Health Policy*.

- 61% of the respondents felt their negotiation skills were currently minimal. 41% of the respondents wanted to improve their negotiation skills to either *proficient* or *expert* within 1 – 3 years.

- 39% of respondents indicated a desire to become experts in *Effective Teaching*. This demonstrates the importance of this area to individuals who are in the GI field.

- 8% of respondents indicated they currently posses expert level abilities in computer / internet skills. 34% of respondents indicated their desire to attain this level of knowledge.

- A combined 70% of respondents indicated a desire to become either proficient or expert at *Personal Financial Management*. This is an important area to consider when planning future training for individuals in the GI field.

- 49% of respondents indicated a desire to have a proficient knowledge of *Ethics*. This represents a 15% increase over those who currently possess this level of knowledge and those who wish to acquire it.
Administrative Topics

Administration For Doctors

- Administration For Doctors - 1
  - Current Knowledge: 40%
  - Desired Knowledge: 23%
  - 1=minimal
  - 2=working
  - 3=proficient
  - 4=expert

- Administration For Doctors - 2
  - Current Knowledge: 41%
  - Desired Knowledge: 31%
  - 1=minimal
  - 2=working
  - 3=proficient
  - 4=expert

- Administration For Doctors - 3
  - Current Knowledge: 15%
  - Desired Knowledge: 28%
  - 1=minimal
  - 2=working
  - 3=proficient
  - 4=expert

- Administration For Doctors - 4
  - Current Knowledge: 1%
  - Desired Knowledge: 8%
  - 1=minimal
  - 2=working
  - 3=proficient
  - 4=expert

Practice Management

- Practice management - 1
  - Current Knowledge: 29%
  - Desired Knowledge: 18%
  - 1=minimal
  - 2=working
  - 3=proficient
  - 4=expert

- Practice management - 2
  - Current Knowledge: 44%
  - Desired Knowledge: 20%
  - 1=minimal
  - 2=working
  - 3=proficient
  - 4=expert

- Practice management - 3
  - Current Knowledge: 37%
  - Desired Knowledge: 23%
  - 1=minimal
  - 2=working
  - 3=proficient
  - 4=expert

- Practice management - 4
  - Current Knowledge: 2%
  - Desired Knowledge: 13%
  - 1=minimal
  - 2=working
  - 3=proficient
  - 4=expert
Health Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health policy - 1</th>
<th>Health policy - 2</th>
<th>Health policy - 3</th>
<th>Health policy - 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Knowledge</td>
<td>Desired Knowledge</td>
<td>Current Knowledge</td>
<td>Desired Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Minimal  2=Working  3=Proficient  4=Expert

Negotiation Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiation techniques - 1</th>
<th>Negotiation techniques - 2</th>
<th>Negotiation techniques - 3</th>
<th>Negotiation techniques - 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Knowledge</td>
<td>Desired Knowledge</td>
<td>Current Knowledge</td>
<td>Desired Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%  23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Minimal  2=Working  3=Proficient  4=Expert
### Personal Financial Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Area</th>
<th>Current Knowledge</th>
<th>Desired Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics-1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics-2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics-3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics-4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=minimal, 2=working, 3=proficient, 4=expert

### Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics Level</th>
<th>Current Knowledge</th>
<th>Desired Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics-1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics-2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics-3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics-4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=minimal, 2=working, 3=proficient, 4=expert
GI Related Topics Summary:

- 27% of respondents indicated a desire to increase their knowledge of Viral Liver Disease to expert level.

- 36% of respondents indicated a desire to increase their knowledge of Transplantation For GI to a proficient level. This represented a change of 21%. 15% of respondents felt their knowledge in this topic was currently proficient.

- 58% of respondents felt their current knowledge of IBD was proficient. This same number of respondents wanted their knowledge level to be expert. This represents a jump in this section of over 50% of individuals who wish to increase their knowledge in this particular area.

- 21% of respondents indicated a desire to increase their knowledge of GI Malignancy to the expert level. This represents an 11% increase of individuals who currently possess expert knowledge levels of this topic.

- 47% of respondents expressed a desire to increase their knowledge of Nutrition to a proficient level. An additional 21% indicated a desire to increase their knowledge level to that of an expert in this same field.

- 46% of respondents indicated a desire to acquire proficient knowledge in Pregnancy And GI. This represents a 16% increase of individuals who currently possess expert knowledge levels of this topic.

- 20% of respondents indicated a desire to increase their level of knowledge in GI Pharmacology to the level of an expert. This represents a 15% increase over those who indicated they currently possess this level of knowledge.

- 35% of respondents indicated a desire to increase their level of knowledge in Genetics to a proficient level. This represents a 22% increase over those who indicated they currently possess this level of knowledge.

- 51% of respondents felt their current knowledge of Gut Immunology was at a working knowledge level. 53% wanted to raise their knowledge level to either proficient or expert within 1 – 3 years.
GI Related Topics

Pancreatic Disorders

% Of Respondents

1=minimal 2=working 3=proficient 4=expert

Current Knowledge Desired Knowledge

Biliary Disease

% Of Respondents

1=minimal 2=working 3=proficient 4=expert

Current Knowledge Desired Knowledge
Transplantation For GI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current Knowledge</th>
<th>Desired Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transplantation for GI - 1</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transplantation for GI - 2</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transplantation for GI - 3</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transplantation for GI - 4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=minimal   2=working   3=proficient   4=expert

Diseases Of The Esophagus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current Knowledge</th>
<th>Desired Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diseases of the esophagus - 1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases of the esophagus - 2</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases of the esophagus - 3</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases of the esophagus - 4</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=minimal   2=working   3=proficient   4=expert
Constipation

1=minimal  2=working  3=proficient  4=expert

Gut Immunology

1=minimal  2=working  3=proficient  4=expert
GI Bleeding

% Of Respondents

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50%

GI Bleeding - 1 GI Bleeding - 2 GI Bleeding - 3 GI Bleeding - 4

1=minimal 2=working 3=proficient 4=expert

Current Knowledge Desired Knowledge
Administrative Topics – Learning Time Frames

- 28% of respondents indicated a desire to learn computer/internet skills within 6 months.
- For all other topics, respondents indicated their willingness to acquire the knowledge they desired within a 1 – 3 year time period.
GI Related Topics – Learning Time Frame

- 35% of respondents for the topics of: Non-viral Liver Disease, GI Pharmacology, Genetics and Gut Immunology indicated a desire to acquire information regarding these topics within a 1 year period.
- 38% of respondents indicated a desire to increase their knowledge in IBS within 1 year.
- 37% of respondents indicated a desire to increase their knowledge of Nutrition within 1 year.
Canadian Journal Of Gastroenterology Summary:

- 47% of respondents felt the primary mission of the CJG should be that of a journal which promotes continuing medical education through review articles.
- It appears the CJG is well read amongst those members of the CAG who responded to this survey. 96% of the respondents indicated they spent time reading the CJG each month.
- 66% of the respondents indicated they wanted more review articles to appear in the CJG. This information is consistent with the written comments provided by respondents.
CJG - Content Analysis

% Of Respondents

Brief communication
CAG News Page
Industry News

More Of This Content
Less Of This Content
Same Amount Of This Content

CJG - Content Analysis

% Of Respondents

Advertisers' Index
Classified Advertising
Calendar Of Events

More Of This Content
Less Of This Content
Same Amount Of This Content
Time Spent Reading Various Journals

- Clinical Perspectives in Gastroenterology: 53.33%
- Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology: 10%
- Infection & Immunity: 2.66%

% Of Respondents

- < 1 hour: 3.33%
- 2 hours: 2.66%
- 3 hours: 1.33%

CAG Survey May 1, 2002
Should The CJG Introduce A CME Quiz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industry Information Summary:

- 76% of the respondents felt the most important way to have symposium or conference delegates visit the industry booths, was to present educational materials.
- Providing abstracts, videos, personal learning projects, and product information all were within 5 percentage points of enticing delegates into industry booths.
- The least important factor in drawing delegates into industry booths was a draw or competition.
Sponsor Feedback Section Comments

- We should have to visit a minimum number of sponsors and have them sign off a “passport”. The passports can be entered into a draw. This increases the exposure of the sponsors.
- Would like patient handouts in common conditions or symptoms or drug information at patient level – re: mechanism of actions/ side effects / drug interactions
- Would like easy access to scientific studies on products