Crosswalk between the ACPE Standards and the FIP Nanjing Outcomes
Abby Kahaleh BPharm, MS, MPH, PhD1, Miranda Law PharmD2, See-Won Seo PharmD2, Toyiin Tofade, MS, PharmD, BCPS, CPCC2
1Roosevelt University College of Pharmacy
2Howard University College of Pharmacy
3Albany College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to compare and contrast the 2017 Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education Standards (ACPE) Standards with the 2017 Nanjing Outcomes.

Specifi cally, to determine the pharmacy education standards necessary for meeting the International Pharmaceutical Federation (FIP) Nanjing Outcomes in the ACPE Standards.

Background
In 2017, the International Pharmaceutical Federation led the development of the Nanjing Statements on Pharmacy and Pharmacist Educations (Nanjing Outcomes).

The Nanjing Outcomes consisted of 67 statements representing international expectations for effective pharmaceutical education.

Within the USA, pharmacy education standards are set forth by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE), with the most recent updates to these standards in 2016.

As pharmacy education becomes increasingly globalized, knowledge on the similarities and differences between US standards and global outcomes will provide insight on areas of pharmacy education in the USA relative to the rest of the world.

Methods
Three members of the ACPE SID conducted a thorough review of the ACPE Standards and Nanjing Outcomes to identify which Nanjing Outcomes are aligned with the ACPE Standards.

The reviewers highlighted recurring themes of pharmacy education and areas of uncertainty that revealed residual outcomes that were possible to be mapped.

A fourth reviewer, an expert on pharmacy education, evaluated the results of the mapping to ensure face validity of the findings.

Conclusions/Implications
- Results of this research identified competencies that may require further evaluation. Notably, the Nanjing Outcome (1.1) recommends a large strategic workforce planning on local and national levels, to better meet local health needs. These competency findings may help pharmacy educators to better understand how global competencies correspond to US national standards.

- Select ACPE standards that remain unmapped highlight the unique focus of pharmacy education within the USA and may provide insight into where pharmacy education could move forward in the future.

In summary, both ACPE and FIP meet these competencies to continuously improve the quality of education. Ultimately, all accrediting organizations can collaborate in identifying strengths and areas for improvement in global pharmacy education.
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Graph 1: Comparison of Mapped ACPE Standards to Nanjing Outcomes

Nanjing Standards: 1. Student Planning, curricular and professional levels should include the role of individuals.

7.1 The accreditation system should also include the standards that have been developed and adopted with external stakeholders.

7.3 The accreditation system should use policies and procedures that measure the capacity to produce, develop, and implement a comprehensive system of national measurement and evaluation.