



ACPE Open Forum: Accreditation Standards 2016

AACP Interim Meeting
Arlington, Virginia • February 10, 2014



Speakers

- **Robert S. Beardsley, RPh, PhD**
Past President, ACPE Board of Directors
Professor, Pharmaceutical Health Services Research
School of Pharmacy, University of Maryland
- **Jeffrey W. Wadelin, PhD**
Associate Executive Director, ACPE



ACPE Board of Directors

- Stephanie Gardner, PharmD, EdD
(AACP, 2010–2016)
President
- Bruce Canaday, PharmD
(APhA, 2010–2016)
Vice President
- Michael A. Moné, RPh, JD
(NABP, 2006–2018)
Secretary/Treasurer
- Robert Beardsley, RPh, PhD
(AACP, 2008–2014)
- Barbara G. Burch, MS, EdD
(ACE, 2010–2016)
- Dennis K. McAllister, RPh
(NABP, 2010–2016)
- Anthony Provenzano, PharmD
(APhA, 2011–2014)
- Victoria F. Roche, PhD
(AACP, 2012–2018)
- Timothy L. Tucker, PharmD
(APhA, 2012–2018)
Board Liaison to the International Commission
- Donna S. Wall, PharmD
(NABP, 2008–2014)
Board Liaison to the CPE Commission



Appointees to the ACPE Board of Directors Effective June 2014

- Lori J. Duke, PharmD
Assistant Dean of Experiential Programs for the University of Georgia, College of Pharmacy
(AACP, 2014–2020)
- John C. Kirtley, PharmD
Executive Director of the Arkansas State Board of Pharmacy
(NABP, 2014–2020)
- Anthony Provenzano, PharmD
Director of Clinical Services for New Albertson's, Inc.
(APhA, 2014–2020)



DRAFT STANDARDS 2016



What prompted ACPE to revise the Accreditation Standards?

- Experience gained in accreditation reviews since adoption of the Doctor of Pharmacy standards in 2007
- Feedback from ACPE stakeholders regarding quality improvement of the standards
 - Outcomes of the 2012 ACPE Invitational Conference
- Expansion of the scope of pharmacy practice in state laws and regulations (i.e., collaborative practice with prescribers)
- Revision of the AACP's Center for the Advancement of Pharmacy Education (CAPE) Educational Outcomes in 2013



What prompted ACPE to revise the Accreditation Standards?

- Joint Commission of Pharmacy Practitioners' (JCPP) *Vision of Pharmacy Practice*
 - Released in 2013
- *Pharmacists' Patient Care Process*
 - Under development by 11 collaborating organizations, including ACPE
 - Will be included in *Standards 2016* once finalized
- Key references:
 - *Health Professionals for a New Century: Transforming Education to Strengthen Health Systems in an Interdependent World*
 - *Core Competencies for Interprofessional Collaborative Practice*



What are the major differences in Draft Standards 2016?

- *Draft Standards 2016* represent evolutionary change rather than revolutionary change. Key differences include:
 - Format
 - Philosophy and Emphasis
 - Importance of Assessment
 - Organization of Standards
 - Organization of Guidance
 - Innovation
 - Glossary



What are the major differences in *Draft Standards 2016?*

Format – yielded two distinct documents:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 26 standards – Required (key) elements for successful accreditation – Assessment elements – Required documentation for each individual standard – Standards contain the “must” statements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Developed to provide insights into colleges’ and schools’ efforts to address the standards and enhance the quality of their PharmD programs – Guidance contains the “should” and “could” statements |
|---|---|



What are the major differences in *Draft Standards 2016?*

- *Philosophy and Emphasis* – The standards ensure that graduating students are “practice-ready” and “team-ready”
- Greater emphasis on critical educational outcomes identified by CAPE and the assessment of student achievement of outcomes
- *Draft Standards 2016* focus on the:
 1. Development of students’ professional knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors, and attitudes, including scientific foundation, knowledge application, and practice competencies
 2. Manner in which programs must assess students’ acquisition of knowledge
 3. Mastery of skills and achievement of competencies
 4. Importance of both curricular and co-curricular experiences in advancing the professional development of students



What are the major differences in *Draft Standards 2016?*

- *Importance of Assessment – Draft Standards 2016* emphasize assessment as a means of improving the quality of pharmacy education
 - Valid and reliable assessment mechanisms will provide insights to programs' strengths and deficiencies
 - Throughout the Standards, “adequate,” “sufficient,” and “appropriate” appear
 - Programs are expected to utilize assessment data to determine if the available resources are “adequate, sufficient, appropriate” to allow for compliance with the Standards



What are the major differences in *Draft Standards 2016?*

- *Organization of Standards – Draft Standards 2016* address the same critical areas as previous versions, but are restructured, simplified and clarified
- Organized into three major sections:
 - Educational Outcomes
 - Structure and Process to Promote Achievement of Educational Outcomes
 - Assessment
- Uniformly include the verb “must,” indicating an absolute requirement for accreditation
- Four appendices are included within the Standards
 - Appendix 1 describes the required elements of the didactic component of the curriculum
 - Appendix 2 details expectations within the Pre-APPE curriculum
 - Appendix 3 describes experiential learning expectations within the curriculum
 - Appendix 4 outlines the documentation needed for the standards and key elements



What are the major differences in Draft Standards 2016?

- *Innovation* – Colleges or schools may choose avenues other than those suggested in the guidance document to achieve compliance with the standards.
 - ACPE requires evidence that standards are being met
- *Glossary* – Expanded to provide definitions or clarification of terms used throughout the standards and guidance documents



**GUIDANCE DOCUMENT TO
STANDARDS 2016**



What is the Guidance Document?

- Created to help colleges and schools of pharmacy understand the breadth and depth of issues underlying the achievement of each standard
 - Goal of enhancing the quality of their Doctor of Pharmacy programs
- Suggested strategies for quality improvement employ the verb “should” or “could” and are based on evidence from the literature or the evaluation of successful programs (or both)



What is the Guidance Document?

- Framed as *suggested strategies* for quality improvement
- Based on evidence gleaned from the literature and the evaluation of successful programs
- Compiled from responses provided by multiple stakeholders and the profession as a whole

Experience has shown that when these strategies are implemented, quality improves!



Who was involved in drafting *Draft Standards 2016 and the Guidance?*

- Developed by a subcommittee of the ACPE Board and staff
 - Input from a broad range of constituents interested in and affected by pharmacy education
- Over a thousand interested individuals participated in the revision process by:
 - Responding to surveys
 - Participating in ACPE's 2012 Invitational Conference
 - Sharing best-practices



Standards Revision Subcommittee

- **Robert S. Beardsley**
University of Maryland, School of Pharmacy
Co-chair of the Standards Revision Subcommittee
- **Jeffrey W. Wadelin**
ACPE and Co-chair of the Standards Revision Subcommittee
- **J. Gregory Boyer**
ACPE
- **Bruce Canaday**
Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, University of the Sciences
- **Tony Provenzano**
New Albertson's, Inc.
- **Victoria F. Roche**
Creighton University School of Pharmacy and Health Professions
- **Peter H. Vlasses**
ACPE



Standards Ad Hoc Review Panel

- **Mike Burleson, RPh**
Kentucky Board of Pharmacy
- **Craig Cox, PharmD, BCPS**
Texas Tech University, School of Pharmacy
- **Katherine Kelley, PhD**
Ohio State University College of Pharmacy
- **Anandi Law, BPharm, PhD**
Western University College of Pharmacy
- **Melissa Medina, EdD**
University of Oklahoma, College of Pharmacy
- **Susan Meyer, PhD**
University of Pittsburgh, School of Pharmacy
- **Adam Persky, PhD**
University of North Carolina, School of Pharmacy
- **Matt Osterhaus, BPharm**
Osterhaus Pharmacy



Standards Ad Hoc Review Panel

- **Jack Reynolds, PharmD**
Northeastern University School of Pharmacy
- **Rebecca Salbu, PharmD, CGP**
Touro College of Pharmacy
- **Steve Simenson, BPharm**
Goodrich Pharmacy
- **Marilyn Speedie, PhD**
University of Minnesota College of Pharmacy
- **William Zellmer, MPH**
Consultant



How do I comment on *Draft Standards 2016*?

- Comments on *Draft Standards 2016* can be provided online, by e-mail, by mail, or through participation in open forums at professional meetings
 - Online: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/FFGTB67>
 - E-mail: standards@acpe-accredit.org
 - Mail: Comment letters may be mailed to ACPE
 ACPE – *Draft Standards 2016*
 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 4100
 Chicago, IL 60603
 - Open Forums at Professional Meetings

***Comments will be accepted through
December 15, 2014***



How long will I have to implement necessary changes before *Standards 2016* take effect?

- Although there is a generous timeline that allows for planning, evolution and adaptation of professional degree programs – **don't wait to innovate!**
- *Standards 2016* will be used to evaluate programs undergoing accreditation after July 2016



Where can I get copies of these documents?

- All information and documents pertaining to the revision process for *Draft Standards 2016* can be found at:

<https://www.acpe-accredit.org/deans/StandardsRevision.asp>



OPEN FORUM



Open Forum Framework

- The session is being recorded, so please approach a microphone, introduce yourself and share your affiliation
- State your comments or feedback
- The purpose of the session is for ACPE to ***listen*** to your feedback
- The session is not structured for discussion or debate on specific issues



Effective Feedback

- Feedback is best when it provides specific suggestions for improvement
 - Provide the number/name of the specific standard(s) that you are commenting on
- Comments are constructive and forward-thinking
- Share examples and/or resources that support the context of your feedback



FLOOR IS OPEN FOR COMMENTS



ACCREDITATION COUNCIL FOR PHARMACY EDUCATION

