

EDUCATION

IN PRACTICE

A36

ASPIH ORGANISATION RE-ACCREDITATION: IMPLICATIONS AND WORTHINESS

Carrie Hamilton¹, Caroline Tomkins¹, Nichola Martin¹, Kirsten Howson¹, Jess Spencer¹, Anna Thame¹; ¹*Simcomm Academy, United Kingdom*

Correspondence: carrie.hamilton@simcommacademy.com

10.54531/WRDJ7861

Table 1-A36. Recommendation from 2021 accreditation and responses for 2024 re-accreditation

Recommendation from 2021 accreditation	Response for submission 2024 re-accreditation
Standard 3: Educators must be competent in the process of debriefing	
Ensure that the peer reviews are carried out at regular <u>intervals</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established an Education Manager position and strategy Regular peer reviews with accompanying detailed records Annual facilitator self-assessment declaration Actor role player (ARP) peer reviews ARP mentoring system
It was unclear from the evidence and the interviews whether alternative methods for debriefing are being explored/implemented as different situations may suit different models.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of debriefing module by facilitators Curated library of training films for facilitators Train the Trainer program includes SHARP and RUST models Exploration of different models, including Diamond, PEARL, and Origami
Standard 8: Regular evaluation of programmes and faculty is undertaken to ensure that content and relevance is maintained.	
Ensure that the evaluations are carried out on a regular basis and ensure that activity meets the wider partners goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation criteria is based upon clear learning objectives Pre and post Likert scale assessment are aligned with learning objectives Evaluation reports generated by a dedicated data analyst Regular team reviews of evaluations process Information on evolving practice and feedback from stakeholders is utilised to guide ongoing improvements to course content and delivery Repeated session demand indicates content relevance. Regular appraisal of faculty performance using established proforma
Standard 11: Faculty have a responsibility for patient safety and to raise concerns regarding learner performance within educational settings, including SBE interventions.	
Ensure formal policies in place to ensure that all faculty would know how to deal with this situation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive facilitator handbook includes policies for addressing challenging group dynamics and ensuring safety for all involved. Simulation exercises in Train the Trainer program focus on participant behaviour management. Terms and Conditions outline clear expectations for participant behaviour towards ARPs. Integration of policies, procedures, and training promotes a culture of safety and effective performance management.
Standard 21: There is a clear alignment to the wider organisational and stakeholders needs, acting as a quality and risk management resource for organisations to help achieve the goals of improved patient safety and care quality.	
Continue to strengthen and expand the links between Sim Comm and partners. Explore how to explicitly capture impact on patient safety. Robust documentation for QA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commitment to strengthening partnerships, aligning with stakeholder needs and enhancing collaboration Focus on capturing impact of initiatives on patient safety Implemented rigorous evaluation process to assess impact collaboratively. Evaluation findings promptly shared with partner organizations for transparency and accountability. Quality assurance policy and social media strategy support partners and promote patient care and safety. Aligned with 'Delivering the NHS Patient Safety Syllabus' and stay informed about relevant policies and legislation through various sources.

Table 1: Recommendations from 2021 and responses for 2024 re-accreditation

Introduction: This abstract presents a comprehensive overview of our organisation's journey towards re-accreditation with the Association for Simulated Practice in Healthcare (ASPiH), the UK's national simulation accrediting body. Following initial accreditation in March 2021, several recommendations were made, necessitating a thorough evaluation of specific areas of our simulation education practices. The primary focus was on addressing identified needs, ensuring alignment with accreditation standards, and fostering continuous improvement in simulation-based education [1].

Methods: Over the intervening three-year period, we reviewed the ASPiH recommendations and gradually revised our simulation education practice, encompassing updates to our programme evaluation, faculty training, and stakeholder engagement. Working with the original standards, in tandem with the updated standards, we wanted to work in a progressive way, matching to both the original and current 2023 standards [2]. Every staff member within the organisation was involved and led on a dedicated area of improvement, with regular standards update action planning sessions, consulting stakeholders, simulated patients and patient groups. We worked with a three-year Gantt chart, watching our progress in a visual manner.

Results: Through diligent efforts, significant progress has been made in enhancing simulation education practices. A comprehensive summary can be found in table 1, but these are key take-aways: Peer reviews are undertaken at regular intervals ensuring educator competence in the debriefing process, addressing the recommendations of Standard 3. Regular programme and faculty evaluations are conducted to maintain content relevance, meeting the requirements of Standard 8. Formal policies have been established to address faculty responsibilities for patient safety and learner performance concerns, as per Standard 11, and robust documentation for quality assurance has been developed, aligning with Standard 21, Table 1-A36.

Discussion: By addressing the recommendations outlined by ASPiH in 2021, we have strengthened our simulation education practices, ensuring alignment with accreditation standards and organisational goals. Accreditation and re-accreditation with ASPiH serve as a catalyst for organisational growth, fostering a culture of excellence and innovation in simulation education [3]. By embracing recommendations and driving continuous improvement initiatives, our organisation remains at the forefront of advancing simulation-based healthcare education, ultimately enhancing patient outcomes and healthcare delivery. From this position, we feel able to support other organisations as they work towards initial or re-accreditation, aligning with the new standards.

Ethics statement: Authors confirm that all relevant ethical standards for research conduct and dissemination have been met. The submitting author confirms that relevant ethical approval was granted, if applicable.

3. Bohnert CA, Lewis KL. Certification, accreditation and professional standards: striving to define competency, a response to ASPiH Standards for Simulation-Based Education: Process of Consultation, Design and Implementation. *BMJ Simulation and Technology Enhanced Learning*. 2018;4(3):105–107.



REFERENCES

1. Crawford SB. ASPiH standards for simulation-based education: process of consultation, design and implementation. *BMJ Simulation and Technology Enhanced Learning*. 2018;4(3):103–104.
2. Diaz-Navarro C, Laws-Chapman C, Moneypenny M, Purva M. The ASPiH Standards—2023: guiding simulation-based practice in health and care. Available from: <https://aspih.org.uk>.