

10 The Radiology Grand Rounds planning committee discussed gaps in our staff's knowledge and competence in 2 specific areas to be addressed during the 2009-2010 grand rounds series:

1. The absence of NIH funding for radiology research at UVM/The University of Vermont Medical Center Department of Radiology-Source Acad of Rad Research data (attached)

2. The increased importance of molecular imaging in radiology departments. UVM/ The University of Vermont Medical Center does have such a department, but growth in volume and research in molecular imaging lag behind other departments of similar size- National survey from Academic Radiology 2007; 14(2): 125-136. This survey showed that 68% of responders to a national survey had a molecular imaging program.

11. Two educational needs were identified that underlie the gaps identified above:

1. Radiologists at UVM need to learn more about the process of securing outside funding for imaging research.

2. Radiologists in our department need to learn about novel molecular imaging techniques so they can develop competence in these imaging procedures and offer them to our patients.

12. The grand rounds for 2009-2010 will attempt to:

1. Improve radiologists' understanding of issues relating to funding of radiology research to allow them to successfully secure such funding.

2. Improve the performance and interpretation of newer molecular imaging studies at The University of Vermont Medical Center Department of Radiology.

13. The audience of the grand rounds series includes academic radiologists who are involved in research related activities in the imaging sciences, and who perform and interpret molecular imaging studies here at The University of Vermont Medical Center. The presentations will be primarily didactic presentations, with an opportunity for discussion.

14. The series will address several ACGME competencies:

1. Patient care. Research related findings can be applied to improve patient care. The performance of newer molecular imaging studies will lead to more accurate and timely diagnosis.

2. Medical Knowledge-Improved knowledge of evolving molecular imaging tests should their to application to patient care

3. PBLI. The conduction of research in a particular area allows deficiencies in scientific evidence in specific disease states to be identified and for a process of improving the state of the art to be developed.

4. Interpersonal and communication skills. Successfully obtaining funding for research efforts requires good interpersonal skills that are involved in the process of developing the research group necessary for successful research.

5. Professionalism. Good research requires a respect for patients needs and for conducting oneself in a professional and ethical manner.

6. System based practice. Successful research requires the physician to work effectively within the health care system.

15. The success of our activity will be assessed in two methods:

1. The amount of external grant support secured by the department of Radiology will be assessed in 2010 and compared to prior amounts.

2. We will measure the number of newer molecular imaging studies performed in our department as a result of several interventions, including this activity and the availability of a dedicated inpatient PET-CT scanner, by determining the number of rubidium cardiac PET examinations performed for the assessment of cardiac ischemia.

Academy of
Radiology

Academy of Radiology Research

Raising the Profile of Imaging Research through Education and Advocacy

Industry News & Info

Ranking of NIH Research Grants Radiology Departments - FY 2008

Rank	Medical School	Total Awards 2008
1	Massachusetts General Hospital	\$41,950,570.65
2	University of California San Francisco School of Medicine	\$29,396,545.00
3	University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine	\$24,601,717.00
4	Washington University School of Medicine	\$22,656,075.00
5	Stanford University School of Medicine	\$18,258,573.00
6	Brigham and Women's Hospital	\$16,637,774.00
7	Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine	\$15,177,718.00
8	Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center	\$11,183,607.00
9	University of Michigan Medical School	\$11,167,723.00
10	Yale University School of Medicine	\$9,908,996.00
11	University of Minnesota Medical School	\$9,679,685.00
12	Vanderbilt University School of Medicine	\$8,784,347.00
13	University of Washington School of Medicine	\$8,131,261.00
14	University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine	\$8,123,097.00
15	New York University School of Medicine	\$6,931,845.00
16	University of California San Diego School of Medicine	\$6,877,267.00
17	University of North Carolina School of Medicine	\$6,229,051.00
18	Duke University School of Medicine	\$5,824,055.00
19	Mayo Foundation	\$5,580,710.00
20	Northwestern University Medical School	\$5,175,278.00
21	Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center	\$4,812,024.00
22	MD Anderson Cancer Center	\$4,735,525.00
23	University of Iowa College of Medicine	\$4,306,948.00
24	Emory University School of Medicine	\$4,017,041.00
25	University of Virginia School of Medicine	\$3,772,713.00
26	University of Texas Health Science Center San Antonio Medical School	\$3,751,907.00
27	University of Chicago Pritzker School of Medicine	\$3,665,709.00
28	University of Arizona College of Medicine	\$3,477,473.00
29	University of Utah School of Medicine	\$3,402,354.00
30	University of Massachusetts Medical School	\$2,815,426.00
31	Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine	\$2,579,619.00
32	University of Wisconsin Medical School	\$2,455,815.00
33	Wake Forest University School of Medicine	\$2,130,522.00
34	David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles	\$2,036,773.00
35	University of Miami School of Medicine	\$1,736,922.00
36	Weill Medical College of Cornell University	\$1,692,694.00
37	University of Texas Health Science Center Houston Medical School	\$1,660,415.00
38	Harvard Medical School	\$1,553,573.00
39	Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine	\$1,537,640.00
40	Indiana University School of Medicine	\$1,496,983.00
41	University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center/Dallas	\$1,487,552.00
42	Jefferson Medical College of Thomas Jefferson University	\$1,479,123.00
43	Columbia University College of Physicians & Surgeons	\$1,446,085.00
44	Georgetown University School of Medicine	\$1,341,362.00
45	University of Rochester School of Medicine & Dentistry	\$1,221,256.00
46	Ohio State University College of Medicine	\$1,207,763.00
47	University of California Davis College of Medicine	\$1,093,701.00
48	University of New Mexico School of Medicine	\$938,397.00

49	Keck School of Medicine of the University of Southern California	\$856,601.00
50	SUNY Stony Brook Health Science School of Medicine	\$825,634.00
51	Temple University School of Medicine	\$777,192.00
52	University of Missouri-Columbia School of Medicine	\$725,694.00
53	SUNY at Buffalo School of Medicine	\$657,164.00
54	University of California Irvine California College of Medicine	\$653,990.00
55	Virginia Commonwealth University School of Medicine	\$649,395.00
56	University of Arkansas For Medical Sciences	\$613,820.00
57	Medical College of Georgia School of Medicine	\$613,664.00
58	New Jersey Medical School	\$583,535.00
59	Mount Sinai School of Medicine of New York University	\$568,042.00
60	Baylor College of Medicine	\$503,413.00
61	University of Colorado Health Science Center School of Medicine	\$439,972.00
62	Medical College of Wisconsin	\$435,190.00
63	Dartmouth Medical School	\$356,564.00
64	West Virginia University School of Medicine	\$325,412.00
65	University of Illinois College of Medicine	\$317,175.00
66	University of Nebraska College of Medicine	\$198,450.00
67	Wayne State University School of Medicine	\$150,500.00
68	University of Kentucky College of Medicine	\$71,126.00
69	University of Tennessee College of Medicine	\$10,000.00
	Total	\$350,461,742.65
	•As in previous reports, the total dollars listed (direct + indirect) do not include the NIH Contracts awarded to Pis in Diagnostic Radiology Departments. Traditionally, these are about 2% of total dollars awarded. These numbers will not be available fr	

<< Return to previous page

© 1999-2009 Academy of Radiology Research



OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE
Association of University
Radiologists

Register or Login: _____ Password: _____ | Auto-Login [Reminc

Search in This Periodical for _____

Advanced Search - MEDLINE - ~~My Recent Searches~~ - My Saved Searches -

JOURNAL HOME

CURRENT ISSUE

ARTICLES IN PRESS

BROWSE ALL ISSUES

SEARCH THIS JOURNAL

TOP 10 CITED

JOURNAL INFORMATION

- Aims and Scope
- Editorial Board
- Submit Manuscript
- Author Information
- Permissions
- Abstracting/Indexing
- Related Sites
- Contact Information
- Society Information
- Pricing Information

SUBSCRIBE TO JOURNAL

ADVERTISING INFORMATION

fil)RSS

Volume 14, Issue 2, Pages 125-136 (February 2007)

results list

Molecular Imaging Programs in the United States: Results of a National Survey

Hansel J. Otero, **MB**, Sukru Mehmet Erturk, MD!!.,
Silvia Ondategui-Parra, MD, MPH, MSc2, Stephen T Wong, PhD
Pablo R. Ros, MD, MPH!!.

Received 23 August 2006; accepted 6 November 2006.

Rationale and Objectives

We sought to identify and describe the characteristics of molecular imaging (MI) programs in the United States and to determine the factors considered critical for their future.

Materials and Methods

In a cross-sectional study, a validated survey was sent to members of the Society of Chairmen in Academic Radiology Departments (SCARD) in the United States, and 26 variables were studied.

Results

The response rate was 40.3%; 67.9% of the departments surveyed have an MI program. The main focus of 47.4% of departments is oncology. The number of radiologists working for the department was the only variable found to be significantly positively correlated with (1) number of researchers in the MI program, (2) number of MI modalities available, (3) total number of grants, and (4) having ongoing MI clinical trials. These four variables plus the number of federal grants and the space used by MI programs were independent of the geographical region, hospital size (number of beds), and department size (number of radiological examinations per year). All the MI programs received grants during 2005. Only 16.1% have no alliances with industry. Among all the departments, 82% identified staff training and recruitment as the keys for success; 78.57% considered oncology the most important future application of MI and cancer management the hospital service most affected by MI.

Conclusion

MI programs are starting to be more widespread throughout the United States, and the trend is for more academic radiology departments to become engaged in MI activities; their development is independent of department characteristics.

ABSTRACT

FULL TEXT

FULL-TEXT PDF (2133 KB)

CITATIONALERT

CITED BY

RELATED ARTICLES

EXPORT CITATION

EMAIL TO A COLLEAGUE

REPRINTS/PERMISSIONS

BOOKMARK ARTICLE

FULL TEXT ELSEWHERE

Related Information:

Lili! G _ ...

SCTt1J 11:

The Online Source
for Radiology Information

More periodicals:

FIND A PERIODICAL

FIND A PORTAL

GO TO PRODUCT CATALOG

... components for success of MI initiatives and the areas that will be most affected by MI applications.

Key Words: Molecular imaging, molecular imaging programs, molecular imaging development

Department of Radiology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, 75 Francis Street, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts

² Administration, Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts

⁰⁷ Address correspondence to: H.J.O.

PII: S1076-B332(06)00665-9

doi:10.1016.acra.2006.11.002

© 2007 AUR. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Copyright © 2009 Elsevier, Inc. All rights reserved | Privacy Policy | Terms & Conditions | Feedback | About Us | Help | Contact Us |
The content on this site is intended for health professionals.