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Over the course of its lifetime and ACGM accredited program has a variety of responsibilities both to its trainees and to the specialty review committee that oversees its activities. Among these responsibilities are responding to the problems and concerns that arise during the annual review process at the ACGME accreditation is conducted through a peer review process. When a specialty review committee colloquially called an RC convenes to review a program, members of that committee do a thorough assessment of whether that program is adhering to the specialties program requirements. By comparing a program to the published minimum requirements for that specialty, the RC can then make a determination as to whether the program is in substantial compliance with those peer developed standards. While we all hope that our programs withstand the scrutiny of the review process and pass with flying colors, occasionally a significant area of noncompliance is identified and the RC issues the program a citation.
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When this happens, the ACGME, expects the program to respond to the citation by giving the RC and update on how its efforts to address the issue or issues are going. Issues identified in a citation are important enough that our review committee expects a program to provide this information annually as part of the annual update in the accreditation data system. In addition, our response to citations as required under a variety of specific circumstances such as when requesting an increase in compliment or in advance of a site visit. Ultimately the information and best practices shared in this video are designed to help you create an effective response to citations for submission to the RC as part of your program's annual update. Again, citations are issued by a review committee when they determined that a program fails to adhere to the common or specialty program requirements. This is also the case with the recognition committee, which assesses whether a program with osteopathic recognition is in compliance with the osteopathic recognition requirements.
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These citations are communicated to programs in their annual letter of notification and tracked in the ACGME accreditation data system so that the committee can follow up on the citation as part of the program's next annual review cycle. When a program receives a citation, the review or recognition committee encourages a program to correct the citation as soon as possible as a follow up to assure a prompt response. The committee reviews each citation annually until it is satisfied that the requirement has been met. At that point, the committee will resolve the citation so the program no longer needs to respond. If the committee believes that a citation is not corrected or is only partially corrected, the citation is extended for another year. Your goal for the annual update is to accurately portray your program to the review or recognition committee so that the committee can determine whether the program meets the relevant requirements.
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If there is a citation, the program needs to explain precisely how that citation has been corrected. For optimal communication with the review or committee, it is wise to avoid a number of common mistakes. The first common mistake is to not respond directly to the citation. This can happen when you misunderstand the citation or when you put in so much detail, you lose sight of the question. It is not helpful to simply make a statement that you meet the requirement without providing information on how you have corrected it or will correct it. In addition, sometimes comments and statements are too vague and general to explain how the requirement is being met when responding to a citation extended from the previous year. Do not just repeat what you said last year. Since you know that was not acceptable to the committee.
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A better response would be to give as detailed and explanation as possible. Some ways to be specific or to give examples of how you have addressed the citation or to give specific numbers when describing procedural deficiencies or publications or new faculty when possible. It is helpful to gauge the impact of changes that you've made. This may be through monitoring the resident survey or gathering information directly from the residents or faculty. Sometimes you will have supplemental material that may be helpful to the RC. Sometimes the program may receive a citation for a requirement that the program has actually met, but with the information available it was unclear to the committee that this was the case. The citations are like false positives and occur when the communication from the program was unclear, incomplete or misunderstood.
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Even though it may be natural to be frustrated or angry after receiving a citation, the best response is to improve the communication to make it crystal clear to the committee how that particular program requirement was met. If you know how the miscommunication occurred, you may explain it frequently. However, you may not know for certain. Sometimes a citation may be based on responses to a resident or faculty survey because there is a lag between when the survey was administered and when the review committee actually sees the results of that survey. It may be after the program has already responded. The goal is to give the information that the committee needs to make an accurate decision.
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Sometimes you may not have known that you have been non compliant with a program requirement or your program may not have had enough time or opportunity to respond to the citation in this case. Some programs are tempted to write a vague positive sounding response to the citation or go around the citation without actually addressing the crux of the issue. These answers may cast doubt on the credibility of the program. Committee is usually conclude that there has not been adequate progress and extend the citation for another year. If a program has not corrected the citation, it is better to be upfront and not pretend that you have corrected a citation when you have not. In this case it would be best to describe your plan to address the citation. As always, it is helpful to be specific in your plan and it's particularly helpful to have a timetable showing how you will implement your plan. You may also want to describe how you have included the residents or other faculty in developing the plan and how you plan to monitor or measure the improvement in addressing the citation.
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Areas for improvement are very different from citations. When a program receives a notice of an area for improvement suggested by the committee, it is not a citation and does not have a direct impact on the program's accreditation status. You should think of this as a hint from the committee that it is noticed something that may be awry. It may indicate a downward trend in some aspect of the program that may result in a future citation. Well, an RC does not require a formal response to an AFI. It would be best for the program to consider each area for improvement as a potential future citation and review that AFI carefully to see whether there are any corrections that need to be made. Sometimes after investigation, the program may decide that an area for improvement may not actually be a problem. If there is a misperception because of a survey or missing data, it may be helpful to explain why this area for improvement is not of concern to the program so that the committee could be reassured and not issue future AFIS or citations.
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Since there is no specific field in which to respond to. AFIS in ADSL programs can take advantage of the major changes section to provide the RC with an explanation or update on an AFI. In summary, it's important that programs respond to the citations carefully and thoughtfully. Your goal is to assure the review committee that requirements are met and that any citation has been addressed and corrected. The best way to do that is to be specific and when possible, give examples and numbers. You should avoid blanket statements but give detailed descriptions when it's appropriate. It may be helpful to have someone knowledgeable about the accreditation process such as your Dio or an experienced program director. Proofread your responses before you submit it to ads. This helps ensure that the RC and other readers can understand how your response directly answers the citation. Accurately describing a program allows the review committee to make the best decision possible when reviewing your program every year. Reviewing a program's response to it. Citations is an important mechanism to RCS for monitoring, evaluating and documenting the results of a program's progress on issues that potentially affect as trainees, faculty, and the environment in which they were giving the most effective response to your program. Citations is the best tool you have as a program for communicating accurately and efficiently with the review committee. Thank you for joining us and for your commitment and contribution to graduate medical education.