Minutes ACPE Administrators Workshop, Chicago, 20-21. April 2017

Further materials, all presentations:

https://sharepoint.acpe-accredit.org/cpeadminworkshop/default.aspx
Username: workshop@acpe-accredit.org
Password: acpe1234

To think about and/or to do for the SC and/or the board:

Standard 12 – Achievement and impact of mission and goals

Why does EAHP needs a CE program at all? The answers to this questions leads to the mission and the deduced goals.

Extracted from our webpage and for everyone to reconsider:

EAHP Scientific Committee - Educational Mission
The European Association of Hospital Pharmacists is committed to providing educational innovation and training of hospital pharmacists to a level of specialisation and maintain continuing professional development (CPD). We will facilitate and enhance the professional growth of European hospital pharmacists and develop hospital pharmacy in order to promote the best and safest use of medicines and medical devices for the benefit of patients in Europe.

EAHP Scientific Committee - Educational Goals
- To identify the educational needs of EAHP members and prepare educational programmes to meet those needs
- To provide knowledge and application based educational programmes to assist pharmacists who practice in hospitals meet their patient care responsibilities and expand their professional roles and goals.
- To share best practice, innovation and educational programmes that can be applied to daily practice
- To promote hospital pharmacy practice research

Can we document how we are achieving our mission and goals? Which are our EAHP goals through which we can achieve our mission? Our we discussing adapting our mission/goals after reviewing the findings/evaluation of our sessions?

We have to think about and discuss if our mission and the defined goals are specific and measurable enough. This is important when it comes to complying with standard 12 (achievement and impact of mission and goals). This is where we need to improve based on the ACPE reports of the previous years. Standard 12 refers to the overall alignment of our CE activities with regard to our EAHP mission and goals. In the report to ACPE we need to tell which outcomes at an overall/programmatic level (not for each seminar) we achieved.

What are the results, what was the observed change, what did the participants take away? Key is the alignment with goals. Do we have a strategic/annual plan for this? Are we doing things (i.e. planning our seminars/sessions/our whole congress) intentionally or random?

For all congress' seminars a roster could be made, including the average evaluation results at a glance (i.e. participants per seminar, % of positive scores, etc.). See Standard 12 Evaluation Template

Standard 2 – Gap analysis and educational needs

How can we better analyze, understand and capture the educational needs of our congress attendees?

- CTF and defined competencies could be used to identify gaps and educational needs for planning EAHP events and selecting seminar topics or even congress schemes.
- Gaps could be identified using the survey results, as we specifically asked for capabilities as being a barrier for statements implementation.
- New major treatment guidelines – are pharmacists aware of them?
- Looking at the pipelines – new molecules to come, new disease areas to be addressed?
- Explicitly analyzing the evaluation forms with regard to learning assessment questions
- Newspaper articles, broad media coverage of hospital pharmacy related topics (e.g. patient safety, infection rates, empty pipelines etc.)
- Further suggestions compare Sample Questions for needs assessment

Helpful could be that for every seminar/workshop – already in the planning phase – a concrete educational need is identified and written down – as additional part of the abstract.

If we ask our attendees in the congress evaluation, in which topics they are interested, then follow-up questions with more details should prompt, to yield more results.

Overall ACPE prefers and sees a tendency towards smaller events in order to better address educational needs.

In any case, clear documentation of identified gaps and addressed educational needs is needed in the reports.

Standard 3, 4 - Activity Types and Learning Objectives

Selection of activity types (i.e. knowledge-, application-, or practice-based activities) should be aligned with the overall educational mission and goals. When writing the abstracts (i.e. learning objectives) verbs (see ACPE slides) should be aligned with the activity type. Not more than 4 learning objectives for 1 hours (rule of thumbs)

For application-based activities (in our case: workshops or interactive sessions): use self-reported performance improvement, e.g. What do you intend to change after returning to your workplace? What is your commitment to change after having attended this workshop? What can you do differently after having attend this workshop?

Results of these questions (e.g. in the evaluation forms) could be seen as indicators or proxies for change in practice. More difficult to accomplish, but more useful for information purpose would be specifically designed post-activity surveys for capturing performance changes.

Standard 6 - Faculty

Make it clear to the faculty who the target audience is (i.e. in the first contact letter or further faculty guidance material). The type of learning assessment and the specifics of each activity type (i.e. our expectations) should be clearly explained to the presenters. Some ACPE-accredited institutions work with faculty briefing via standardized webinars, which is thought to be better for archiving.

Standard 6, 7, 8 - Teaching and learning methods

Most of the education providers experience difficulties to bridge their educational offers between seasoned generation and the younger generation. The latter often prefers more engagement, e.g. via a gadget, the others prefer more lecture-style sessions.

Polling could be used for bigger groups with the advantage of being anonymous, e.g. using Polling everywhere software. If colored cards are used, the questions should be yes/no questions or dichotomous ones. For further learning purposes, in addition to PowerPoint slides, more emphasis should be placed on other instructional materials, e.g. references, cited guidelines, further reading, checklists, relevant apps, etc.

Standard 9, 10 – Learning assessment and feedback

The emphasis here is on feedback to the learners, in our case the congress/academy attendees. Both methods (informal assessment, i.e. discussions, exchange with neighbors vs. formal, i.e. tests – pre/post) can be used, but ACPE prefers not to have an imbalance towards informal methods.

For application-based activities (i.e. workshops) colored cards don't work, so more sophisticated methods of learning assessment are needed.

One example could be Minute Papers. Participants are asked to give feedback: "What was the most important thing you learned during the presentation?". Reflection is considered an active learning strategy. Also possible is a more formal pre/post-test comparison with open questions. Preferred are also learning assessment using patient cases.

With regard to preparing questions and answers for the audience flaws should be avoided (i.e. flaws with regard to testwiseness and irrelevant difficulty). These two things make it easy for the participant to get the right answer even though they did not understand the content.

So, questions should/need to be reviewed prior to the educational event. All questions asked should address the learning objectives. For a bigger audience, the use of colored cards is fine, but the presenters should explain at the end the correct answer and should give feedback and background information to contextualize.

ACPE prefers that the facilitators summarize the results of the pre/post comparison in the facilitators reports. If group discussions are used for learning assessment (e.g. in application-based activities) the results (i.e. the main talking points) of if should be written in the facilitators report.

Overall Policies and Procedures

Documentation is key with regard to all aspects of ACPE accreditation. The report can either be written in word format (doesn't have to be hundreds of pages, but needs to refer to rubric only); could also be different pdfs compiled in a pdf portfolio.

At the moment ACPE is working at a standardized template for reports.

Every accredited body needs to have a CPE Manual, that describes all policies and procedures in the respective organization. Does EAHP have a CPE manual?

Actually, for bigger accreditation purposes a CE Team could be beneficial. Within EAHP, that's actually the role of the SC?

For a conference, the target audience needs to be defined only once.

Recordkeeping for 6years, all possible paper-less.

The ACPE webpage and available resources for download were presented. Webinars relating to and explaining all standards are offered, if further training and information is needed.
All accreditation providers are listed on the webpage (open access), with the history of accreditation process and its actual status.

Standard 11 – Evaluation of CPE Activity
This refers to the evaluation of each individual activity. The question we should ask ourselves is: What are we using this amount of information for? Actually, it should be used to inform further programme improvement in a structured way. The assessment and interpretation of formal feedback needs to be documented.

Although the key evaluation elements are determined by Standard 11, additional items might be included in order to grasp more information, especially in terms of standard 12 (overall achievement of mission and goals! – here is our weakest part!)
e.g. We should discuss what does a score 3 out of 5 mean? Is this considered a positive result? Acceptable?
Evaluation results should be compiled, interpreted, reviewed by SC and forwarded to faculty.
We need to have a discussion about which evaluation score(s) should trigger action by the SC, e.g. repeating a certain topic, having the speaker again or not?

With regard to post-activity feedback, one idea might be to send out a survey a certain time after the congress, investigating about any occurred practice changes or sustained knowledge.

According to the ACPE directors, there is a trend to go back to paper evaluations, as participants are more inclined to write down feedback right after the session, than go to a survey later on.

Different experiences are shared among the workshop participants.
In addition to the officially needed evaluation questions, some providers ask for additional feedback (voluntary): What could we do to improve? What could we have done better? These additional questions only pop up, if the participants agree to give feedback on this. The possibility of improving something is – according to US colleagues – leading to a substantial amount of feedback and good ideas.
Another improvement of feedback responses is to add explanations why specific questions are asked. Or to run a separate post-activity survey: What did you like and why? Participants could be asked to give their e-mail if they would be willing to answer this post-activity survey.

Our congress app could be used for evaluation purposes. ASHP is preprogramming the evaluations, when participants preplan their congress/seminar attendance. Using a QR Code for each seminar (displayed in the programme book) could directly lead to the survey monkey-link for a specific seminar evaluation.

Specific learning objectives are most often used in evaluations, not a generic statement. This yields better information for learning assessment and further identification of needs. If this is not possible, then at least a free text box to give information in which terms learning objectives were not met could be beneficial.

If education for different profession is provided, feedback should be summarized and aggregated per each profession.

Standard 5 - Commercial Support
Mechanisms to resolve conflict of interests are presented: pre-review slides, facilitators report and many others (see ACPE materials). There is a very new ACPE flowchart explaining what constitutes a financial relationship, in any amount, no financial threshold. Furthermore, there is a new definition of what is considered a commercial interest. We have to check this, if we are here already updated.
The evaluation results should be specifically analyzed if there is any sign of commercial bias reported by the participants.

Miscellaneous thoughts and issues that came up:
- Investigation using Poll Everywhere software or congress app to assist with active learning strategies (e.g. pre-post-test questions, interaction with audience)
- Distribute self-assessment questions prior to the events (e.g. in the abstract book or via the app).
- ACPE started to work on interprofessional education events. Is this something for EAHP? Expansion to technicians? Offering educational events also for other healthcare professions? The underlying motto is: interprofessional education is needed for interprofessional tasks, and as pharmacy is truly an interprofessional undertaking, the pharmacy profession is best equipped to do so. Jointaccreditation.org; Plan as a team, provide as a team
- Collaboration with other education accrediting body in Europe – identify and work together, beneficial also for statement implementation
- The key player in this is the CPE Administrator (who is it?), who is qualified by background, education, training and/or experience in the field of pharmacy

21.04.2017, Stemer Gunar