Our goal was to engage experts who would care enough to immerse themselves in the project and help us create the best scenarios and assessment tools possible. The group used the following criteria to identify ‘Subject Matter Experts’ (SMEs):

1. Clinical experience and expertise as determined by:
   1. Peers
   2. Clinical career and reputation
   3. Academic experience (publications and studies)
   4. Education and certification
   5. Experience evaluating in-training and practicing physicians (Board Examiner/Board Exam Developer)
   6. American Board of Anesthesiology (ABA) or equivalent certification
   7. Enrollment in Maintenance Of Certification, or equivalent
2. Some simulation experience would be desirable – “familiar with simulation methods and use” (from our SME-solicitation letter)
3. Experience with the study subject matter (i.e., crisis management and medical knowledge of anesthesiology)

Many distinguished candidates were nominated, thus the group further refined their selection process:

1. Preference was given to stakeholders (members of the ABA, Anesthesia Patient Safety Foundation, American Society of Anesthesiologists, Foundation for Anesthesia Education and Research, International Anesthesia Research Society, etc.)
2. Personality characteristics were considered:
   1. People who would consider the project carefully
   2. Be willing to question and challenge the research team
   3. Be willing to devote the considerable time that was expected to be required
3. Those skeptical that simulation could be used to measure performance were specifically sought out

The SMEs created the CPE checklists for the first 2 scenarios. The grant team commented on those, and then sent the CPEs back to the SMEs for approval. The grant team created the CPE list for the third scenario, to save time. The 4th scenario was adapted from one frequently used at a site, and thus a CPE list already existed for it. For those scenarios, the SME team commented and edited the lists and sent them back to the grant team.

Ultimately, the SMEs had authority to agree/accept CPEs and scenarios. They were specifically queried about the appropriateness of each scenario before final approval/deployment and could have vetoed any of them.

The table summarizes the qualifications of the 10 SMEs for this project.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SME #** | **LOCATION** | **Board Certified *and* enrolled in MOC or equivalent** | **National Board Examiner or Question writer** | **Simulation Education Expertise** | **Published more than 50 journal articles** | **Subspecialty training or expertise** | **Leadership position in own department or in National academic society/foundation** |
| 1 | Mountain states | X | X |  |  | OB | X |
| 2 | Midwest | X | X |  | X | OB | X |
| 3 | Mid-south | X | X | X | X | Neuro | X |
| 4 | New England | X | X | Only as a participant | X | Neuro |  |
| 5 | Mid-south | X | X | X |  | Pediatrics | X |
| 6 | Canada | X | X | Only as a participant | X |  | X |
| 7 | Midwest | X | X | Only as a participant |  | Pediatrics | X |
| 8 | Midwest | X | X |  |  | Thoracic | X |
| 9 | Midwest | X |  |  |  | Pediatrics | X |
| 10 | Midwest | X | X | Only as a participant | X | Critical Care | X |