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Commercial Exhibits Associated with CME Events: Sampling of Practices across Academia
Areas of Inquiry

01 — Pricing Models
02 — Policies/Forms
03 — Logistics
04 — Virtual Environments
Introduction

The Commercial Exhibits Associated with Continuing Medical Education (CME) Events Data Report is a collection and comparison of July 2021 data about CME exhibits and associated income among peers in an academic setting.

The report summarizes findings from four general areas of inquiry: 1. pricing models; 2. policies/forms with exhibitors; 3. logistics; 4. virtual environments. For example, pricing models explores methods used for determining levels of exhibit support. Policies/forms considers procedures and/or agreements related to exhibitors. Logistics explores the scope of activity, as well as roles and specific functions associated with the provision of the exhibits in the CME context. Virtual environments aims to collect lessons learned from any experiences with virtual exhibits.

Eleven representative academic CME or Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programs were surveyed. These included: Cleveland Clinic, University of Chicago, Penn State, Boston University, University of California San Francisco, Thomas Jefferson University, University of Rochester, Oregon Health and Science University, SUNY Downstate Health Sciences University, and University of Wisconsin - Madison.
01 - Pricing Models

01. All market-driven

All 11 programs use at least a somewhat, if not entirely, market-driven pricing model. Same fee is charged for same space (usually 6-foot table top); yet, exhibit levels vary across events. At least one program has set a minimum fee of $750.

02. Varied narratives about support levels

Methods to determine amount of exhibit support include: consult with course directors and coordinators, course historical data, specialty and target audience, geographical reach, program length, and square footage of each booth. For some, revenue from exhibits is significant and can be higher than income received from grants and other sources.

03. CME does not share in profit or loss

Fee-for-service charged to departments/course budget (7 out of 11). One program receives 4% and another 10% of all revenue from exhibits beyond fees for service. If doing an event for a department, for the majority (10 out of 11) CME does not share in financial profit or loss. One provider is splitting exhibit revenue for non-managed programs - 40% for CPD office and 60% for sponsoring department.
# 02 - Policies / Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Major Finding(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner Data Sharing</td>
<td>No data sharing allowed for 9 of 11 versus opt-in for 1; opt-out for 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Guidelines</td>
<td>Yes for all 11 - and some aligned with ACCME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Logos</td>
<td>For all, no logos allowed except in exhibit hall space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor Agreement</td>
<td>10 out of 11 have a standardized agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Event Survey</td>
<td>Most informally request exhibitor feedback versus for virtual exhibits surveys conveniently emailed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
03 - Logistics

Number of exhibits per year pre-COVID

- Ranged from 10% to 85% of all live events

CME role beyond compliance

- Planning to follow-up
- Funds and budget
- Exhibit hall management

Can individual departments manage logistics?

- Yes for 10 of 11
- For 3, CME then audits
- Rare use of 3rd party

Other who's and how's for exhibit management

- Grant person manages for 5
- Separate role/function for 6
- For all, exhibitors can attend (2 for free)
04 - Virtual Environments

01. Nine of 11 do virtual meetings

Compared with live, virtual exhibit income was less for all. Most state that it is much more work for less financial return; building virtual halls takes longer; exhibitors are dissatisfied with attendance; legal offices are becoming more involved like grants; but it is generally improving.

02. Auditing and 3rd parties

Five of 11 conduct audits. Three of 11 use a third party to manage exhibits. Such companies include: Tullyvision/Exhibitor Map and CHIME with PSAV, Blue Sky, Fen Way, Anchor and Chime, CE21, Cadmium, and Educational Measures.

03. No online enduring materials

No programs have done any exhibits or advertisements with online enduring materials.
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