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In November 2021, the Oath of a Pharmacist was updated to include the following statement, “I will promote inclusion, embrace diversity, and advocate for justice to advance health equity.” These words underscore the responsibility of Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) programs and the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education to reconsider how diversity, equity, inclusion, and antiracism are integrated within curricula and programmatic processes. To fully embrace the new Oath, the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education and PharmD programs should consider the incorporation of diversity, equity, inclusion, and antiracism concepts utilizing the recommendations of external expert bodies with overlapping and complementary frameworks. The intent is not to add more to the accreditation standards or curricula, but rather to intentionally integrate inclusive approaches into programmatic processes and delivery. This can be accomplished through the alignment of our accreditation standards, PharmD programs, and the Oath that is the foundation of the pharmacy profession.

A small but significant change occurred across the nation at commencement ceremonies for the Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) class of 2022. An expanded Oath of a Pharmacist welcomed the newest members of the pharmacy profession with each graduate uttering this new statement, “I will promote inclusion, embrace diversity, and advocate for justice to advance health equity.” These 14 words highlighted the responsibility of new graduates and practicing pharmacists to address diversity, equity, inclusion, and racism. Given the health care gaps experienced by individuals from minoritized populations and medically underserved areas, this update was timely and in alignment with community needs.

For new pharmacists to promote inclusion, embrace diversity, and advocate for justice in the name of health equity, there is an expectation that related knowledge, skills, and attributes must be intentionally developed. Are PharmD programs encouraged, supported, and held accountable to take action to meet the larger needs of society? The likely answer is that academic pharmacy has a lot of work to do, and teaching about Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Anti-racism (DEIA) can be improved.

During the 2021–2022 academic year, the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) Council of Deans formed a Task Force to focus on DEIA. The Task Force was charged to conduct an environmental scan to identify successes, challenges, needs, and opportunities to help programs navigate change. The overarching themes of the DEIA Task Force’s work can be found in the Table. The identified areas of improvement are based on the domains identified in the framework published by the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE), which include institutional structure; policies and procedures; resource allocation; academic equity and student success; curriculum and pedagogy; hiring retention and promotion;
Within higher education, meaningful programmatic changes are driven by the accountability of articulated standards developed and influenced by external accrediting bodies. The role of accreditation is to ensure high-quality training of a competent workforce using a comparison against defined standards. The Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE) is revising the accreditation standards 2016 for PharmD programs. In addition to other planned changes, the updated ACPE standards should consider societal needs and health inequities intersecting with DEIA efforts as well as incorporating recommendations of external expert bodies with overlapping and complementary frameworks (eg, NADOHE, Curriculum Outcomes Entrustable Professional Activities [COEPA], Interprofessional Education Collaborative, Joint Commission of Pharmacy Practitioners Pharmacist Patient Care Process [PPCP], and the Oath of a Pharmacist).

While this commentary could be interpreted as a request for an expansion of pharmacy accreditation standards (Standards), the authors concur with Fulford and colleagues, who argued that intentional effort should be used to simplify and integrate the work of the expert bodies into the standards by stripping down and letting go of old traditions allowing room for innovation. To allow for innovation, we must allow colleges and schools of pharmacy to have a higher level of autonomy within the curriculum to determine the areas of emphasis to meet the healthcare needs of the communities we serve. This should include the ability of individual programs to define the depth and breadth of coverage of different pharmacologic and pharmacotherapeutic principles while increasing emphasis on advancing leadership and communication skills that can be utilized with diverse populations, understanding health care disparities, closing health care gaps, and developing professionals prepared to enter practice. When considering the diverse populations that reside in our communities it is important to pay attention to and work to address the inherent disparities influenced by race, religion, living in medically underserved areas, political affiliation, age, gender, sex, physical ability, and/or sexual orientation. Ultimately, there is no “one right way” to approach DEIA efforts or to deliver a PharmD program; rather, the focus should be on meeting the organization where it is, in alignment with societal needs and along a continuum of development to support growth through continuous quality improvement.

We applaud the work of the AACP 2021–2023 Academic Affairs Committee with the integration of the Center for the Advancement of Pharmacy Education 2013 Educational Outcomes, Entrustable Professional Activities, PPCP, and the updated Oath of the Pharmacist to coalesce and simplify the overlapping themes into COEPA, which will likely be used as a roadmap for the updated ACPE standards related to educational outcomes. ACPE is encouraged to be thoughtful in the reimagining of the standards by allowing some domain areas, such as DEIA to be viewed as expected components that are holistically integrated within standards beyond Section I: Educational Outcomes to include Section II: Structure and Process to Promote Achievement of Educational Outcomes and Section III: Assessment of Standards and Key Elements. It is the opinion of the authors that we should approach all that we do through a DEIA lens.

Making improvements that truly address social and healthcare inequities, requires confluence of policies, culture, and curriculum to be viewed through a DEIA lens utilizing the NADOHE domains. The goal is not another checklist or expansion of the Standards with additional required assessment reports, but rather a commitment to and accountability for continuous quality improvement intended to be a lifelong and individualized DEIA journey for each pharmacy program. Programs seeking guidance for how to begin incorporating DEIA efforts
can find practical suggestions in the DEIA Task Force Report as well as the NADOHE Framework. To create a more socially just health system, we must aspire to do better, acknowledge our roles individually and institutionally, and act to support meaningful change through structured continuous quality improvement. This can be accomplished through the alignment of our accreditation standards, PharmD programs, and the Oath that is the foundation of our profession.
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