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Welcome & Introductions
Presentation Objectives

• To understand:
  ➢ Timing of the upcoming accreditation review
  ➢ The importance of accreditation
  ➢ CanERA – What is it?
  ➢ The accreditation process
    ➢ What to expect based on your role in the program
    ➢ How to prepare for the accreditation review

Canadian Residency Accreditation Consortium:
The conjoint group representing the Royal College, CFPC, and CMQ tasked with the development and ongoing improvement of CanERA

Canadian Excellence in Residency Accreditation:
The name given to the new system of accreditation

Canadian Accreditation Management System:
The digital accreditation management system, a fundamental component of CanERA
CanRAC’s Response to the Global Pandemic

- recognize the impact of COVID-19 on clinicians, residents, and staff, and on the healthcare and medical education systems in general
- consider and prioritize the safety of all individuals along with the practicality of travel
- make the best decisions possible based on the information available
- communicate that information as it becomes known, and revisit decisions regularly as the situation changes
CanRAC’s Response to the Global Pandemic

• maintain critical operations as much as possible with flexible and creative solutions, balanced against the many other demands on health care providers
• maintain the integrity and rigour of the CanERA accreditation process
• manage individual exceptions, both in the moment and with guidance at later points in the process, rather than shifting all accreditation activities downstream (recognizing that it is uncertain how long the COVID-19 pandemic may persist)
U of T November 2020 Regular Review

In consideration of “Zoom Fatigue”, multiple time zones and additional factors, some modifications have been made to the original plan:

- **Two week duration:** Review will begin on Sunday, November 22, 2020 and conclude on Friday, December 4, 2020

- Program reviews will occur on **Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays**
  - Survey team deliberations will occur on Wednesdays and Fridays
Impact of COVID-19

• Acknowledgment of exceptional times
• Accreditation does not ignore the present circumstances but does not focus on them; objective is to evaluate residency programs and institutions as would occur in a typical accreditation review
• Royal College’s Principles for Decision-making in a Changing Environment
Why is accreditation important?

• Ensures the quality of residency education provided to residents across Canada
• Provides an external, objective evaluation against required expectations
• Contributes to the internal continuous quality improvement (CQI) of residency programs and institutions
CanERA introduces ten key changes...

- New Standards: updated for institutions and programs to improve clarity
- New Evaluation Framework: including rating at the requirement level, and identification of leading practices and innovations
- Institution Review Process: consisting of an enhanced institution review, including an institution accreditation decision
- New Decision Categories & Thresholds: to improve consistency of decisions
- 8 YR Cycle & Data Integration: regular accreditation reviews, balanced with ongoing integration of quality improvement data
- Enhanced Accreditation Review: refined processes, enabling efficient and focused accreditation reviews
- Digital Accreditation Management System (CanAMS): to facilitate accreditation & quality improvement activities
- Emphasis on the Learning Environment: increased focus on the quality and safety of the learning environment
- Emphasis on Continuous Improvement: including a focus on empowering and supporting institutions and residency programs
- Evaluation and Research: systematic approach to the continuous improvement of CanERA
Regular CanERA Review Process

Program/Inst. Submits CanAMS Evidence Instruments

Specialty Committee (SC) Provides Input

Residency Accreditation Committee Makes Final Decision

SC Reviews Report & Provides Input

Surveyors develop Report and Recommend Decision

Accreditation Review
Standards of Accreditation
Standards of Accreditation

Institution (PGME) Accreditation

• General Standards of Accreditation for Institutions with Residency Programs (Replacing the “A” Standards)

Residency Program Accreditation

• General Standards of Accreditation for Residency Programs (Replacing the “B” Standards)

• Specific Standards of Accreditation for each discipline (template aligned with general standards)
Features of the CanERA Accreditation Standards

• Increased focus on outcomes (“Show me that it works”).
• Increased clarity of expectations, including increased clarity around required evidence within the AMS.
• Renewed emphasis on the learning environment and continuous improvement.
• Accommodation of time and competency based education models.
Standards Organization Framework
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Key level of focus
## Residency Program Accreditation Standards

### Program Organization (Standard 1 & 2)
Org structure; leadership & support; residency program committee; communication/collaboration; learning sites (e.g., selection, IIAs, site coordinator/supervisor)

### Education Program (Standard 3)
Education design and delivery

### Resources (Standard 4)
Clinical, physical, technological, human, and financial resources; coordination with other residency programs to share resources

### Learners, Teachers, and Admin. Personnel (Standard 5, 6, 7, 8)
Learning environment, safety, wellness, supervision, support for residents, teachers, and admin. personnel

### Continuous Improvement (Standard 9)
Ongoing evaluation and improvement of the residency program
Program Accreditation Standards: Explicit reference to the “academic lead of the discipline”

- Explicit expectation that the faculty of medicine, PG office, and academic lead of the discipline provide sufficient support to the PD (Indicator 1.1.2.1)
- Actions and decisions of the RPC are to be communicated to the academic lead of the discipline in a timely manner (as well as to others) (Indicator 1.2.3.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Governance (Standard 1,2,3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision/mission, leadership and support, postgraduate education committee, policy development, resources, collaboration, sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners, Teachers, and Admin. Personnel (Standard 4,5,6,7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning environment, safety and wellness, supervision, support for residents, teachers, and administrative personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous Improvement (Standard 8 &amp; 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing evaluation and improvement of PG structure and governance, residency programs (e.g., internal review, support to build CI capacity), and learning sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institution Accreditation Standards: Explicit reference to the “academic lead of the discipline”

- Collaboration between the academic lead of the discipline and the postgraduate dean for the appointment of each program director (Indicator 1.2.4.2)

- Program director performance review (Indicator 1.2.4.5)
  - Effective process that uses multiple sources of feedback
  - Regular and formal review
  - Collaboration between the academic lead of the discipline and the postgraduate office
What information informs program accreditation reviews?

- Documents available onsite (e.g., resident files**)
- Resident Org. Synthesis Report
- Background Information
- Specialty Committee Input (and related program response)
- CanAMS instruments
- Interviews
- Recommendation
- Data Integration (Future)
## Who contributes to program accreditation decisions?

### Residency Accreditation Committee
- Medical educators (peer reviewers)
- Range of disciplines
- Fellows, Residents, and others (e.g., Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada (AFMC))
- 23 voting members
- Final Decision

### Program Accreditation Review Team (Surveyors)
- Medical educators (peer reviewers)
- From outside the discipline
- Some programs may also have a resident surveyor
- Two surveyor model; full team votes on recommendation

### Specialty Committee
- Stewards for the relevant discipline
- From the five geographical regions in Canada
- Up to 9 voting members
When you meet with the surveyors...

• Focus of discussion may include (but is not limited to):
  – Relationship, communication, and collaboration with residency program/program director/RPC
  – Resources (teachers, admin support, faculty development, research, etc.)
  – Teacher assessment (e.g., process, how is excellence recognized?)
  – PD leadership
  – The programs collaboration with other programs/divisions/departments

• Note: You will also be invited to participate in a meeting specific to the review of the institution
# Possible Accreditation Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
<th>Institution-level</th>
<th>Program-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accredited New Institution/Program</td>
<td>External Review</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited Institution/Program</td>
<td>Next Regular Review</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APOR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Review</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited Institution/Program on Notice of Intent to Withdraw</td>
<td>External Review</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of Accreditation</td>
<td>New application</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APOR = Action Plan Outcomes Report
Timeline for Final Decision

• Preliminary recommendation provided the week of the accreditation review
  • Includes details for each program’s areas for improvement (AFIs) so that any quality improvement work can begin

• Final decision: Spring 2021
Ongoing Accreditation Expectations

• It’s not “over” – accreditation is a process of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)

• The residency program is responsible for:
  – Self-evaluating against the standards and maintaining compliance with the standards
  – Addressing and tracking progress associated with areas for improvement
  – Keeping CanAMS up to date!

• The institution has similar responsibilities
Ongoing Role of the Division/Department Head

- Collaborating with the residency program and institution to meet the accreditation standards
- Providing feedback to the residency program and participating in continuous improvement activities
- Maintaining an understanding of the general and discipline-specific standards
Q&A
What if you have more questions?

• Questions re. the upcoming accreditation review:
  – Your program director and/or postgraduate office
  – Your postgraduate office will contact us if necessary

• General questions about CanERA?
  – www.canera.ca