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Welcome & Introductions
Presentation Objectives

• To understand:
  ➢ The timing of the upcoming accreditation review
  ➢ The importance of accreditation
  ➢ CanERA - What is it?
  ➢ The accreditation standards
  ➢ The accreditation process
  ➢ Residents’ role in the accreditation process
  ➢ What to expect and 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)
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
Royal College program reviews will occur on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays*  
- Survey team deliberations will occur on Wednesdays and Fridays  
CFPC Site and Enhanced Skills program reviews will occur Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, November 25-27, 2020  
- Family Medicine and Enhanced Skills deliberation will occur Tuesday, December 1
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
• 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
Why is resident input important?

- Resident input is a cornerstone of the PGME accreditation system
- Learners’ perspective is needed to inform evaluation of residency education
- Consideration of good practices in online meeting management and confidentiality
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
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
• The CFPC Red Book (Family Medicine Specific standards)
How are the new standards different?

• 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.
• Written in alignment with the new standards organization framework.

**However – A PROGRAM IS STILL A PROGRAM!**
Standards Organization Framework

Accreditation Domain

- Standard
  - Element
  - Requirement
    - Indicators (Mandatory and Exemplary)
  - Requirement
    - Indicators (Mandatory and Exemplary)
  - Requirement
    - Indicators (Mandatory and Exemplary)
  - Requirement
    - Indicators (Mandatory and Exemplary)

Key level of focus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Organization (Standard 1 &amp; 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., Org structure; leadership &amp; support; residency program committee; communication/collaboration; learning sites (e.g., selection, IIAs, site coordinator/supervisor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Program (Standard 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., Education design and delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources (Standard 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., Clinical, physical, technological, human, and financial resources; coordination with other residency programs to share resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners, Teachers, and Admin. Personnel (Standard 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., Learning environment, safety, wellness, supervision, support for residents, teachers and admin. personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous Improvement (Standard 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI of the residency program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Governance (Standard 1,2,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g., 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>E.g., 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>CI of postgraduate structure and governance, residency programs (e.g., internal review, support to build CI capacity), and learning sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accreditation Review Process
Royal College: Regular Accreditation Review Process

Program/Inst. Submits CanAMS Evidence Instruments → Specialty Committee (SC) Provides Input → Accreditation Review

Residency Accreditation Committee Makes Final Decision → SC Reviews Report & Provides Input → Surveyors develop Report and Recommend Decision
Family Medicine: Regular Accreditation Review Process

Program/Inst. Submits CanAMS Evidence Instruments → Accreditation Review

Residency Accreditation Committee Makes Final Decision ← Surveyors develop Report and Recommend Decision

Final Decision Provided to Institution/Program
Royal College: What information informs the accreditation decision?

- Interviews*
- Documents available onsite (e.g., resident files**)
- Resident Doctors of Canada Synthesis Report
- Background Information

*Specialty Committee Input (and related program response) – RC programs

Data Integration (Future)

Populated CanAMS Program Profile & AFI Instrument

Recommendation
Family Medicine: What information informs the accreditation decision?

- Interviews*
- Documents available onsite (e.g., resident files**)
- Resident Doctors of Canada Synthesis Report
- Background Information
- Populated CanAMS Program Profile & AFI Instrument
- Data Integration (Future)

Recommendation
Royal College: Who contributes to the accreditation decision?

**Residency Accreditation Committee**
- Medical education experts
- 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 education experts
- From outside the discipline
- Some programs may also have a resident surveyor
- Two surveyor model; full team votes on recommendation

**Specialty Committee**
- Discipline representatives
- Representing the five geographical regions in Canada
- Up to 9 voting members
**Family Medicine: Who contributes to the accreditation decision?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency Accreditation Committee</th>
<th>Central Program Accreditation Review Team (Surveyors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Medical education experts</td>
<td>• Medical education experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents, and others (e.g., Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada (AFMC))</td>
<td>• Resident surveyors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 20 voting members</td>
<td>• Two/three surveyor model at the site and ES program level; full team votes on recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Final Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities for Resident Input

- Annual CanRAC Resident Survey (in development!)
- Meeting with Surveyors
- RDoC Pre-Accreditation Questionnaire
- Regular Provision of Feedback to the Program

Opportunities for Residents to Contribute to Program Improvement
Conjoint Task Force on Resident Input into the Accreditation Process ("Resident Task Force")

• **Mandate:** Explore opportunities and make concrete recommendations to ensure resident input into the accreditation process

• **Resident Task Force Membership:**
  – Resident co-chairs
  – Resident Doctors of Canada (RDoC) & Fédération des Médecins du Quebec (FMRQ) (resident and staff representation)
  – CanRAC
  – Postgraduate Dean

CanERA
Excellence in Residency Accreditation
Excellence dans l'agrément des programmes de résidence
Resident Task Force: Discussions & Recommendations

• Guiding principles and proposed model for resident input

• Annual CanRAC resident survey (aggregate results to inform program of CQI and accreditation)

• FRMQ/RDoC resident questionnaire
  – i.e., standardizing and improving the process for integration of the questionnaire into the accreditation review process
Opportunities for Resident Input

- Annual CanRAC Resident Survey
- Meeting with Surveyors
- RDoC Pre-Accreditation Questionnaire
- Regular Provision of Feedback to the Program
CanRAC Annual Resident Survey

- Resident Task Force developed 13 questions focused on:
  - Quality of clinical environment
  - Supervision
  - Intimidation/harassment
  - Appropriate work balance
  - Quality of academic environment
  - Feedback and Assessment
  - Overall holistic question

- Aligned faculty survey (slightly reframed questions)
Opportunities for Resident Input

- Annual CanRAC Resident Survey
- Meeting with Surveyors
- RDoC Pre-Accreditation Questionnaire

Regular Provision of Feedback to the Program
Accreditation provides us with a unique opportunity to shape our program and to ensure that our voice is included as this full accreditation happens only once every 8 years.
Role of RDoC and PARO

- Helps inform and educate residents about the nature and importance of residents’ role in accreditation process
- Advocates for resident input and involvement into the accreditation process and the standards development process
- Distributes of the RDoC Pre-Accreditation Questionnaire (RPQ) to all residents at the University of Toronto
- Appoints resident surveyors on accreditation review teams
- Writes RPQ and Synthesis Reports
What is the RDoC Pre-Accreditation Questionnaire (RPQ)?

- Developed by RDoC and used since the early 1980’s to gather residents’ perspectives on their training prior to the accreditation
- Questionnaire is sent by PARO to all residents at the University of Toronto
- RPQ now closed and reports being written
- Confidential - results are anonymized and are not provided to the programs, the Colleges, the hospitals, or the university
- Useful tool for resident surveyors on the accreditation teams - provides “on the ground” perspectives from residents
**RPQ Summary Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RDoC pre-accreditation questionnaire (RPQ)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reports to resident surveyors</strong></th>
<th><strong>Synthesis Reports to Survey Team chairs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Adapted before each accreditation to reflect changes occurring over time</td>
<td>▶ Helps determine which programs should be visited by resident surveyors</td>
<td>▶ High-level summary of the RPQ reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Confidential</td>
<td>▶ Intended to prepare resident surveyors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Questions for each accreditation criterion</td>
<td>▶ Helps optimize discussions during meetings with residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Spotlight on innovations and improvements to be made</td>
<td>▶ <strong>Only resident surveyors receive the RPQ Report</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Concerns and innovations are aligned to the Standards</td>
<td>▶ Also receives the Synthesis Reports (high-level summary shared with the Survey Team chairs)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Final report communicates anonymous, aggregate data*
RPQ Reports

- RPQ Reports are being prepared by PARO
- Intended to prepare the resident surveyors for the accreditation review and helps optimize discussions during onsite meetings with residents at the Toronto accreditation
- Only the resident surveyors on the accreditation review teams will have access to the RPQ report
RPQ Synthesis Reports

- Prepared by RDoC
- This is a high-level, de-identified summary report of the survey results
- The Synthesis Report is shared only with the chairs of the CFPC and Royal College review team
Residents are critical to the accreditation process, and our input is highly valued within the accreditation process.

Accreditation provides residents with a mechanism to effect positive changes in residency programs that, in many situations, will result in significant long-term benefits.
Key Takeaways

The accreditation process:

- Is aimed at enhancing quality of your training
- Is not intended to criticize your program or training site
- Is collaborative exercise
- And, your participation as a resident is essential.

You play a key role in the accreditation process and continuous improvement of your program!
Key Takeaways

- Accreditation is an ongoing process – you don’t have to wait until the onsite visit to identify areas for improvement.

- The surveyors want to hear what programs have done to address concerns or issues within the program before the visit and starting this process now, is the best opportunity you have, to make your programs the best they can be.
For more information

- Visit the RDoC webpage *Accreditation FAQ* for University of Toronto residents at:

  https://residentdoctors.ca/pre-accreditation-utoronto-2020/

- View RDoC YouTube videos recorded by residents for residents:
  - *Accreditation: What, why, and how it impacts residents on how you can prepare*
  - *How you can shape your program through accreditation*

- If any questions about the upcoming accreditation review please contact:
  - *Your program director and/or postgraduate office*
  - *PARO or RDoC*
Opportunities for Resident Input

- Annual CanRAC Resident Survey
- Meeting with Surveyors
- RDoC Pre-Accreditation Questionnaire
- Regular Provision of Feedback to the Program
Royal College: Meeting with the Surveyors – What to expect

• Residents as a group will meet with a team of 2 surveyors

• Four residents not from the University of Toronto are part of the Royal College program review team
  o They may be assigned as a surveyor for your program
  o Resident surveyors are assigned to a variety of programs!
  o Residents are full survey team members, appointed by RDoC
Family Medicine: Meeting with the Surveyors—What to expect

- Residents as a group will meet with a team of 2-3 surveyors

- **Two residents** from schools outside of University of Toronto are appointed to the Family Medicine review team
  - They may be assigned as a surveyor for your site or enhanced skills program
  - Resident surveyors are **assigned to a variety of sites and enhanced skills programs**!
  - Residents are **full members of the team**, appointed by RDoC
Resident Meeting with Surveyors

- Accreditation is a key **opportunity** for residents to discuss their program openly with the **aim to improve its quality**
- Feedback given to surveyors will continue to help your program **promote areas of strength and focus on areas that require improvement**
- Be open and honest with surveyor
- Comments made in meeting with surveyors will **remain anonymous**
- There are no opportunities to connect with surveyors outside of your appointed meeting time. **Please provide all feedback during your scheduled meeting time.**

Note: you may also be involved in an institution-level review meeting (learning site visit)
Resident Meeting with Surveyors: Themes

- The program’s strengths and areas for improvement
- Interaction with PD or SD (accessibility, support, etc.)
- Environment (supportive, positive, safe?, Fatigue Risk Management (FRM))
- Opportunities to provide feedback
- Communication throughout the program
- Policies/processes (are they effective?)
- Available resources (e.g., career and wellness services, workspace)
- Resident assessment (e.g., How do you receive feedback on your performance?)

CanERA
Excellence in Residency Accreditation
Excellence dans l'agrément des Programmes de Résidence

Resident Meeting with Surveyors: Themes

• Supervision and educational experiences (e.g., are they aligned with your level of training/competence, appropriate?)
• Competence by Design (as appropriate)
• Clinical responsibilities (e.g., do they interfere with mandatory academic activities?)
• Scholarship and research (e.g., do you have access to mentorship/protected time?)
• Consideration of personal learning needs and career aspirations
• Comments in meetings are anonymous
How can you prepare for the meeting?

• Review the standards

• Prior to the accreditation review meet together as a group to discuss the strengths and areas for improvement of your program (1-2 months prior to the accreditation review); Set priorities for discussion with the survey team – align feedback provided with the standards

• Ensure all residents in your program/at your site have an understanding of what to expect

Note: Wherever possible, concerns about your residency program should be identified prior to the accreditation review (e.g., at the RPC, as part of the University-led internal review, etc.)
### Possible outcomes for your program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Status</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accredited Program</td>
<td>Next Regular Accreditation Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action Plan Outcomes Report (APOR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited Program on Notice of Intent to Withdraw</td>
<td>External Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timeline:**  
- Preliminary recommendation provided the week of the accreditation review  
- Final decision: Spring 2021
What happens after the accreditation decision?

• Your program may have follow-up required prior to the next regular accreditation review in eight years.

• Your program is responsible for:
  – addressing areas for improvement (AFI) identified
  – ongoing alignment with the standards, including the continuous quality improvement of the program
  – Addressing any AFIs identified based on data integrated throughout the cycle (e.g., the CanRAC annual survey)
Opportunities for Resident Input

- Annual CanRAC Resident Survey
- Meeting with Surveyors
- RDoC Pre-Accreditation Questionnaire
- Regular Provision of Feedback to the Program
Ongoing Role of Residents in the Accreditation Process

• Provision of feedback to the residency program/participation in continuous quality improvement activities
  – Communication to and from resident rep on RPC
  – Participation in evaluations of the overall program, learning experiences, teachers, etc.

• Completion of the annual CanRAC administered resident survey
Key takeaways

• Prepare with the other residents in your program or at your site (review the standards, discuss strengths & areas for improvement)
  – Wherever possible, concerns about your residency program should be identified prior to the accreditation review (e.g., at the RPC, as part of the University-led internal review, etc.)
What if you have more questions?

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

• Questions about CanERA?
  – www.canera.ca
Q&A
Thank You!