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About EACIC

- Leonardo project Eur/99/2091/11.1.1.b/FBC
  - Developing Cross National CME for Mental Disorders in Europe
- Objectives: to assess the different CME in CNS (or equivalent) systems available in European countries.
- Set up a common European system of quality control for CME in CNS.
Objectives

- EACIC can be considered as one of the achievement of this Leonardo project.
- Initial objectives
  - To develop the guidelines and processes which should be adhered to in providing CME, and to ensure that the required standards are being met by any organisation providing CME in CNS.
  - Development of evaluation and monitoring tools
EACIC and ECNP

- **EACIC:**
  - International events
  - CNS, mainly psychiatry and psychopharmacology

- **ECNP annual congress:**
  - Major event in Neuropsychopharmacology
  - 5000 to 7000 participants

- **EACIC involved in the accreditation of the ECNP congresses: 2002-2007**
The CME procedure

- Program or material submission to EACIC
- Review process: External referees
  - Prof. M. Bourin (France)
  - Prof. E. Griez (The Netherlands)
  - Prof. S. Kasper (Austria)
  - Prof. Y. Lecrubier (France)
  - Prof. D. Marazziti (Italy)
  - Prof. H.J. Möller (Germany)
  - Prof. S. Ögren (Sweden)
  - Prof. M. Pandolfo (Belgium)
  - Prof. S. Stahl (USA)
  - Prof. M. Trimble (UK)
  - Dr. Isabelle Massat (Belgium)
  - Dr. Luc Staner (France)
  - Prof. Stephan Claes (Belgium).
The CME procedure

- The monitoring
  - CME Evaluation forms to be completed by participants
  - General statements about the program
  - Satisfaction scores for each session/lecture
  - Evaluation forms
    - Online evaluation forms
    - EACIC staff at ECNP congresses
  - CME certificates
  - The Feedback report
The feedback report

1. Description of the procedure
2. Feedback report
   - Number of feedback forms received
   - Distributions of feedback forms per country
   - General statements about the scientific programme
   - Satisfaction scores for each lecture
   - Ranking of lectures according mean satisfaction score
3. EACIC comments
4. Accreditation statistics
Fig 2: Nb of feedback forms in the last 6 years

- 15th ECNP: 250
- 16th ECNP: 635
- 17th ECNP: 579
- 18th ECNP: 1135
- 19th ECNP: 1425
- 20th ECNP: 1360
**Ranking of sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lectures with satisfaction score equal or higher to 4</th>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. 17:</strong> Antipsychotic polypharmacy for the treatment of schizophrenia</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. 05:</strong> Bipolar depression: report on consensus meeting 2007</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. 09:</strong> Bipolar affective disorders: therapeutic options beyond current guidelines</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pl. 03:</strong> Molecular mechanisms of learning and memory</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. 11:</strong> Stress related anxiety disorders</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General statements about the program

1. Was the information relevant to your clinical practice?
2. What was the educational standard of the lectures?
3. The program provided well-balanced presentations supported by scientific information and fair description of all therapeutic options?
4. The lectures provided enough opportunity for questions and discussion?
5. How did CME and accreditation influence your decision to attend this event?
6. Would you attend a similar congress in the future?
7. Did the faculty provide adequate disclosure information?
8. Overall how would you rate the congress?
Means scores for Q1 to Q8
The monitoring procedure and feedback report

- The real meaning of CME
  - To report to the organizers on the feedback from participants to the activities.
  - Contributing to improving the scientific and educational standard
  - More than simple certificate delivery
Conclusions and discussion

- EACIC: CME procedure fully operational
- Collaboration with ECNP
- “Internal” validity
  - The evaluation process
- Benefit for the organizers: monitoring and feedback from participants
  - Fundamental aspect of CME, lacking and neglected in Psychiatry
Conclusions and discussion

- Future of CME in Psychiatry
- Linking the gap between “internal” and “external” validity of CME and accreditation procedures
- “External” validity
  - Need for collaboration with national bodies, UEMS,…