



Committee for Accreditation of
Healthcare Simulation Programs

Human Simulation Accreditation Standards Companion Document

2024 Standards

This Companion Document has been designed to help you with becoming accredited. Primarily it serves these purposes:

1. Provide insight and information for applicant programs.
2. Explain and describe the types of evidence expected to meet each of the Standards.
3. Ensure clarity for what is provided prior to the site visit as part of the accreditation packet.

IMPORTANT: the descriptions and evidence provided are NOT prescriptive. The SSH Accreditation Standards are designed to allow Simulation Programs in any setting to apply. It is recognized that there are many ways to achieve outcomes as well. As such, any evidence listed is representative of the types of information that has been acceptable. This companion document should not be considered a prescriptive list of items all Programs must complete, but rather a tool to help each Program identify how to best meet each standard. Should you have any questions about any of the Standards or criteria, or feel that they do not fit your Program for any reason (e.g., cultural), please contact the SSH Accreditation Program at accreditation@ssih.org.

DOCUMENT ELEMENTS

The standards for each area of Accreditation are broken into different elements:

▪ Standard Area Description (in the dark blue area) -High-level description of the overall content in the area of accreditation (Core-ARTSF)	
1. Section header (boldfaced type with a number in the light blue area) -The title for the section that groups items together, each area of accreditation has its number of sections.	
<i>a. Standard statement (italicized with a lower-case letter in the light blue area)</i> -This is the standard. Evidence should be provided based on the criteria in the subsections below.	
i. Criterion (items listed in the white area in the left column of the table) - These are the items that must be provided to demonstrate meeting the standard.	▪ The column (in the white area) to the right side of the Criterion in the companion document is where the Program can find information about the intent of specific criteria; and examples, clarifications, and descriptive information that will help the Program respond to each standard and criterion.

TERMINOLOGY

- **DEMONSTRATE:** This term is consistently used for overall Standards statements. “Demonstrate” means the Program must show how the standard is met (through the criterion). There are often many ways to demonstrate meeting individual criterion.
- **DESCRIBE:** This term is used to indicate that a narrative is sufficient as evidence to meet a particular criterion. If documentation is requested in addition to the description, the criterion will specify with the following phrase: “*Describe and provide supporting documentation.*”
- **DOCUMENT:** This term is used to indicate that some form of documentation must be provided as evidence to meet a particular criterion. Examples of this could include providing a list of items such as equipment, a policy, and procedure, a floorplan, simulation design forms, etc. If a description is required in addition to the documentation requested, the criterion will specify the following phrase: “*Describe and provide supporting documentation.*”
- **PROGRAM:** The term “Program” refers to the simulation center or organization that is applying for accreditation. The Program could refer to a stand-alone facility, a collaborative simulation consortium, or the Program could be part of an overarching organization.
- **HUMAN SIMULATION EXPERTS:** Include individuals who are considered: SP Directors, SP Managers, SP Coordinators, SP Educators
- **PROGRAM DIRECTOR:** All SSH Standards and Criteria use the term “Program Director” to describe the person with primary authority for the

Simulation Program. The person in this role, however, does not need to have the official title of “Program Director.

Definitions

- **Human Simulation:** a recognized methodology that involves human role players interacting with learners in a wide range of experiential learning and assessment contexts.
- Lewis, K.L., Bohnert, C.A., Gammon, W.L. *et al.* The Association of Standardized Patient Educators (ASPE) Standards of Best Practice (SOBP). *Adv Simul* 2, 10 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41077-017-0043-4>
- **Simulated Patients (SPs):** a person who has been carefully coached to simulate an actual patient so accurately that the simulation cannot be detected by a skilled clinician. In performing the simulation, the SP presents the ‘Gestalt’ of the patient being simulated; not just the history, but the body language, the physical findings and the emotional and personality characteristics as well.
- Barrows H. *Simulated Patients (Programmed Patients: The Development and Use of a New Technique in Medical Education)*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas; 1971.
- **Embedded Participants (EPs):** an individual who is trained or scripted to play a role in a simulation encounter in order to *guide the scenario*. Based on the objectives, the level of the participants and the needs of the scenario, guidance may be positive or negative and used as a distractor. An EP may be known or unknown to the participants. ***as defined by the Healthcare Simulation Dictionary*
- **Standardized Patients:** individuals who are trained to portray a patient with a specific condition in a *realistic, standardized and repeatable* way (where portrayal/presentation varies based only on learner performance). SPs participate in teaching and assessment of learners including but not limited to history/consultation, physical examination and other clinical skills in simulated clinical environments. SPs can also give feedback and evaluate learner performance. ***as defined by the Healthcare Simulation Dictionary*
- **Human Simulation Experts-** Those who work to develop expertise in Human Simulation methodology and are responsible for training and/or administering SP-based simulation. Some may be trainers who exclusively work with SPs, while some may be faculty or healthcare professionals who work with SPs as part of their clinical and/or academic roles.
- Lewis, K.L., Bohnert, C.A., Gammon, W.L. *et al.* The Association of Standardized Patient Educators (ASPE) Standards of Best Practice (SOBP). *Adv Simul* 2, 10 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41077-017-0043-4>
- **Human Simulation Educator** - A person with specialized knowledge in a specific area who can provide relevant information to ensure the simulation is credible and/or accurate for Human Simulation portrayal. These are individuals who are Faculty external to the Human Simulation Program, Subject Matter Experts, or Simulated Patients whose primary role is to consult in case development and not training of SPs/EPs.

HUMAN SIMULATION STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

- The area of Human Simulation will be available to Programs that demonstrate regular recurring simulation educational activities with clearly stated objectives (knowledge, psychomotor skills, and behaviors) and provide evidence of ongoing improvement of Human Simulation activities

The Five sections of the Human Simulation Standards are related to:

- (1) Human Simulation Activities (2) Human Simulation Educational Design (3) Qualified Human Simulation
(2) Educators, (4) Human Simulation Training, and (5) Human Simulation Evaluation and Improvement

1. ACTIVITIES WITH HUMAN SIMULATION

a. The Simulation Program is committed to providing high-quality Human Simulation activities.

- This is the standard. Evidence should be provided based on the criteria in the subsections below.

<p>i. Describe and provide supporting documentation for how the Program links its Human Simulation education/assessment activities to the Program's mission, goals, and/or strategic planning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe how the Human Simulation activities specifically link to the mission and/or vision of the Program. ▪ Example: The Center “xxx” completes an annual review of all programs offered just prior to the close of the fiscal year, and all Human Simulation activities are reviewed by the Center's team to ensure that the target mission is being met. ▪ Supporting documentation, e.g., copy of last annual review as described in the example. ▪ It is helpful to include discussion and examples of how human simulation education/assessment activities are aligned with the strategic plan goals for the Program.
<p>ii. Describe and provide supporting documentation for the qualifications of the individual(s) that oversee Human Simulation educational/assessment activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The intent of this criterion is for the Program to describe that they have a deliberate process in place for selecting (an) individual(s) who oversee(s) the Human Simulation activities who has/have the knowledge and understanding of Human Simulation principles and practices. ▪ Example: Job description/Position description that outlines the minimal human simulation experience qualifications would qualify as supporting documentation. ▪ Written description includes details of experiential alignment with Human Simulation pedagogy such as formal training, mentored practice, and/or years of on the job experience.

<p>iii. Document: Provide documentation of three (3) Human Simulation activities developed by the Program. During the site review process, the SSH reviewers will review up to three activities (through recorded video).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In this section we would like to see a diverse sampling of your Human Simulation activities as developed by the Program. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summative assessment (i.e. OSCE) 2. Formative assessment 3. Procedural assessment ▪ Examples should demonstrate Human Simulation educational activities (formative and summative) following the Human Simulation Educational Design process you will refer to in the following standard.
---	--

2. HUMAN SIMULATION EDUCATIONAL DESIGN

a. The Simulation Program designs Human Simulation activities that are evidence-based, engaging, and effective.

- This is the standard. Evidence should be provided based on the criteria in the subsections below.

<p>i. Describe how the Program determines the need for Human Simulation educational/assessment activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe the process used by the program to determine the need for Human Simulation Education/Assessment activities. This could include linking to the strategic plan goals, formal needs assessment survey, quality improvement data, or curricular driven needs. ▪ Examples of the needs assessments that would drive the implementation of Human Simulation Education/Assessment activities could include (but are not limited to): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Curricular driven needs (i.e., OSCEs) 2. Credentialing for privileging and/or licensing 3. Root cause analysis of a sentinel event has demonstrated the need for an assessment of competencies 4. Formal needs assessment survey
<p>ii. Describe how the Program designs Human Simulation education/assessment activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If your Program creates AND adapts existing assessment activities, please describe the process used for each. ▪ It is not required to develop activities de-novo. Previously developed activities from elsewhere in the Program, institution, or healthcare simulation community can be used. However, these activities must be appropriate for the Program's Human Simulation goals. ▪ Discuss how an educator with Human Simulation expertise is included in the design process. In this discussion, please outline the role of Program educators and SMEs in this process and how they collaborate with the individual with Human Simulation expertise. ▪ If the process involves the use of a standardized tool, discuss how the expertise of the

	human simulation expert is recognized in that process.
iii. Describe and provide supporting documentation for the process of developing or selecting instruments/tools utilized in Human Simulation education/assessment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe how the instruments/tools created AND/OR chosen, measure learners' attainment of the activity's learning objectives (e.g., this could include faculty rubric, SP checklist, etc.). ▪ Provide supporting documentation of the process described above- e.g., minutes of meetings, email exchange, etc. If you create AND adapt, provide an example of each. ▪ Provide supporting documentation for the reliability and validity determination of an Assessment tool/instrument developed or adapted. If you have original and adapted instruments/tools provide documentation for one of each.
iv. Describe and provide supporting documentation for the process to ensure inter-rater reliability for educational/assessment activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This could include the process to train individuals for inter-rater and intra-rater reliability. ▪ Provide documentation of the tools that are utilized to ensure inter-rater reliability. ▪ In the description, be sure to include the intentional process, training documents and/or tools utilized. ▪ Include the initial and ongoing process to ensure reliability for all Human Simulation activities.
v. Document: Provide a list of the Human Simulation educational activities that follow the design process (maximum of 10; minimum of 3).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This criterion intends to determine that the Program conducts Human Simulation educational/assessment activities. Activities will be reviewed to ascertain whether the Program follows the process that they have outlined below. Please utilize a similar list format consistent with the components listed below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course/sessions name 2. Simulation methodology 3. Learner- type and level 4. Instruments/tools 5. Evaluation process ▪ The site reviewers will review at three (3) Human Simulation educational/assessment activities from the provided list. Please be prepared to offer additional Human Simulation educational/assessment activity materials upon request.

<i>b. The Simulation Program determines that Human Simulation promotes realism to meet the learning objectives of the educational activities</i>		
i.	Describe how Human Simulation is utilized to promote the level of realism to meet designated learning objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This criterion is designed to provide the reviewers with an understanding of how learning objectives, realism/fidelity and the Human Simulation modality are utilized to design the simulation activity. This should include how the setting (physical space) and modality of human simulation is chosen for assessment/education activities. ▪ Examples would include: Hybrid, OSCEs, Small Group, One-on-One, etc.
ii.	Describe your process to match the appropriate level of standardization to meet the stated learning objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These could include any or all of the following processes to standardize the learning experience: ▪ This criterion seeks to understand how the design process provides standardization for the learning/assessment activity ▪ Description of how SPs are oriented to the education activity process, learning objectives, environment and instruments/tools should be included. ▪ Examples could include any of the following items: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minutes 2. Door notes 3. Pre-briefing statements ▪ Describe how participants are informed of the grading/formative feedback process and the consequences of not meeting passing standards, and the need to remediate. ▪ Provide supporting examples of SP scripts and assessment rubrics ▪ Provide examples of how standardization is implemented which could be in the form of a policy, procedure, guideline for educational simulation practice. Examples are always welcome ▪ Describe how Assessors are chosen for Human Simulation Assessment activities. Could include (but is not limited to) standardized patients, faculty observers, peer-reviewers, etc.). ▪ Describe technology support for Human Simulation Assessment activities (audio-visual capture, checklists, grading, etc.).
iii.	Describe and document the process utilized by the Program to ensure physical and psychological safety of SPs in the design of the activity (e.g. number of rotations, number of breaks, physical, cognitive, and psychological challenges).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This criterion is intended to provide the reviewer with an overview of the policies, procedures, and actions that discuss how to assure physical and psychological safety of the Standardized Patient. This discussion should be included as part of the design process of the simulation educational activity. ▪ Examples could include any of the following documents:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policies and procedures that guide the physical and psychological safety of SPs 2. An SP Handbook provided to the SPs 3. Information that outline Program-Wide safety concepts 4. Recruitment of SPs and the opt-out process / procedure 5. An example of the rotational plan for SPs for a given educational activity, including number of rotations, number of breaks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The discussion should include the processes that are instituted if challenges occur during a training (i.e. the SP needs to break related to psychological challenges)
--	--

3. QUALIFIED HUMAN SIMULATION EXPERTS/EDUCATORS

A. *The Simulation Program has personnel with expertise in designing educational activities for Human Simulation.*

- This is the standard. Evidence should be provided based on the criteria in the subsections below.

<p>i. Describe the process to ensure that Human Simulation experts (Educators internal to the Simulation Program) are included in the scenario/case design of Human Simulation activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ This criterion intends to determine that the Human Simulation Experts/Educators within the Program who have expertise in Human Simulation education and methodology.▪ An example is a Clinical SME may be different than an individual with SP methodology expertise▪ This could include the process to develop the scenario / case completed with clinical SME and then reviewed by the individual(s) with SP methodology expertise.▪ The narrative will assist to demonstrate how these identified experts are included in the scenario/case design of Human Simulation activities.▪ This can be demonstrated by examples of policies, meeting minutes, a standardized design template with pedagogy guidance, etc.
<p>ii. Document: Submit accreditation biosketches for Human Simulation experts who engage in the design of Human Simulation activities. (Maximum of 5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Providing SSH accreditation bio-sketches for the most active Human Simulation experts. These should be individuals who are familiar with the design process. These can be individuals that have been previously submitted.▪ The biosketches should demonstrate, information related to expertise in Human Simulation.▪ Examples of expertise in Human Simulation might include any of the following:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Publications (including abstracts)2. Presentations (local, regional and national meetings)3. Formal training (i.e. certification course, degree, continuing education courses, in-house orientation/training)4. Training of individuals practicing Human Simulation (years of on-the-job performance)

b. *The Simulation Program has a process to assure ongoing professional development and competence of its Human Simulation experts.*

<p>i. Describe the evaluation and feedback processes for Human Simulation experts. (SP Educators, SP Managers, SP Coordinators etc.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Descriptions should discuss the process for how evaluation and feedback are provided to the Human Simulation experts regarding their performance. Minimally, this should include: who provides the feedback, how often, when does it happen (timing), and how it is documented. ▪ Discussions of how the evaluation information is used for performance improvement expectations would be ideal ▪ Describe the process of providing evaluation and feedback to the Human Simulation experts. Minimally this could include the how, how often, topical content included, and how feedback process is documented. ▪ Examples could include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formal evaluation process 2. Developmental Planning 3. Informal feedback processes 4. Self-evaluation processes. 5. Learner feedback ▪ Discussions any other formalized way evaluative feedback information is utilized in the quality improvement process for the Human Simulation Program would be ideal.
<p>ii. Describe and provide supporting documentation of opportunities for Human Simulation experts to engage in professional development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe the process for professional development for your Human Simulation Educators specific to Human Simulation. Process discussion should identify how often, who pays, and how documentation takes place. ▪ Document over the last 24-month period, professional development opportunities offered and completed for the Human Simulation educators submitted in Standard 3.a.ii. ▪ Examples of supporting documentation of professional development activities could be, but is not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certificates of completion of SP in-house training programs, webinars, or other online programs 2. Agendas/Outlines of course content provided 3. CE certificates 4. Attendance at local, national and international conferences for Human Simulation

C . The Simulation Program has access to qualified Human Simulation Educators.

<p>i. Describe the process to ensure qualified educators (Subject Matter Experts, Faculty and SPs/EPs) are included in the development of Human Simulation activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Reviewers will be looking for the documented process the Program uses to review their educators to determine their expertise in Human Simulation activities. ▪ Additionally, the process for Human Simulation design should follow any identified policies outlining responsibilities for each role during the design process. ▪ Examples would include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design template utilized outlining simulation pedagogy 2. Role delineation of each participant: SME, Faculty, SP/EP, Simulation Educators 3. Policy, procedures and process that discusses how collaboration occurs during the entire design and implementation process.
<p>ii. Document: Submit accreditation biosketches for Human Simulation educators who engage in the design of Human Simulation activities (maximum of 5, minimum of 1 SP biosketch)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bio sketches should contain information relating to expertise in Human Simulation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Biosketches could be the same as utilized in 3.a.ii. Please assure that there is a biosketch representing each participant in the design process to demonstrate Human Simulation expertise. ▪ Documentation of expertise might include any of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Case expertise 2. Longevity of tenure in the position 3. Formal training (i.e. certification course, degree, continuing education course, in-house orientation/training) 4. Informal training in Human Simulation (years of on-the-job performance) 5. Publications on Human Simulation 6. Presentations on Human Simulation 7. Certification 8. Expertise in education and/or assessment methodology

*d. The Simulation Program has a process to assure orientation and development of those who participate in the design of Human simulation activities, **but are not simulation experts.***

- This is the standard. Evidence should be provided based on the criteria in the subsections below.

<p>i. Describe and provide supporting documentation on the orientation process for those subject matter experts who participate in the design of Human Simulation activities <i>but are not Human Simulation experts</i>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe your Program's process to ensure orientation and onboarding of all Faculty, Educators, Subject Matter Experts, etc. that are external to the simulation program and not experts in Human Simulation education design activities. ▪ Examples: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide documentation of the orientation process for these individuals. 2. This would be enhanced by providing an agenda, course content, policies and procedures, checklists related to the process, or course content.
<p>ii. Describe the evaluation and feedback processes for those who participate in the delivery of Human Simulation educational activities <i>but are not Human Simulation experts</i>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe the process providing feedback to those who participate in the delivery of Human Simulation educational/assessment activities would include, but is not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formal evaluation surveys from learners 2. Informal processes (i.e. huddles, mentoring that take place to assure quality improvement of the educational/assessment human simulation experiences 3. Formal inter-rater reliability data 4. Peer evaluation feedback from observed Human Patient Simulation education/assessment activity (copy of the tool) 5. SP Evaluation tool/process
<p>4. Human Simulation Training</p> <p><i>a. The Simulation Program has a process to recruit, onboard, and train individuals who participate in the role of Simulated Patient (SP) or Embedded Participant (EP).</i></p> <p>- This is the standard. Evidence should be provided based on the criteria in the subsections below.</p>	
<p>i. Describe and provide supporting documentation for the process utilized to recruit SPs/EPs for the Program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outline the process utilized for recruitment, interview and selection of SPs/EPs for the Program. ▪ Describe the process that highlights how you interview during the SP recruitment, ▪ Supporting documentation could look like any of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy/procedures for hiring 2. Job descriptions 3. Performance of a case 4. Standardized interview questions

<p>ii. Describe and provide documentation for the onboarding process of SPs/EPs to participate in Human Simulation activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description should identify the training topics that are included in the onboarding process. ▪ Supporting documentation could look like any of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course Content and Agendas for training program 2. Policy and Procedures 3. SP Handbook and/or Manual 4. Checklists for accomplished training elements
<p>iii. Describe the process to match the characteristics of the SP/EP to the activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description should discuss how SP/EP characteristics are linked to the learning outcomes of the activity. Additional attributes to be discussed would potentially include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SP / EP availability, experience and skill 2. Case Demographics/Individuals in the process to match characteristics . 3. Curricular guidelines 4. Trained in giving feedback / assessment (formative and summative feedback)
<p>iv. Describe and provide documentation for the training an SP/EP undergoes on case portrayal, evaluation tools, and/or feedback techniques.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing a copy of course materials utilized for the formal training , including information on individual elements of training as noted below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timeline for SPs to receive their simulation SP activities 2. Evaluation tools and/or feedback techniques 3. Case portrayal scripts 4. Case training agendas, including time frames for topics trained
<p>v. Describe how the Program promotes physical and psychological safety in SP/EPs training. (e.g. opt out, de-roling, risks)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This includes how the SP is trained for potentially difficult cases ▪ How the SP is giving the opportunity to opt out before and during an activity ▪ Identifying potential triggers for SP activities ▪ Resources available to SPs who may experience psychological distress ▪ Opportunities provided to SPs de-role their cases ▪ Include any policies and procedures that reflect the inclusion of SPs and safety.

<i>B. The Simulation Program has a process to provide evaluation/feedback for SP/EP participants in the Human Simulation Program.</i>	
i. Describe the evaluation/feedback an SP/EP receives during a Human Simulation activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description should include how SP/EP's receive information to improve their performance in a Human Simulation activity. ▪ Elements to include in the process description would be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How often this occurs? 2. Who provides the evaluation/feedback? 3. Copy of the evaluation tool 4. Formal versus informal methodologies utilized 5. Documentation of the evaluation/feedback process
ii. Document: Provide evaluations/feedback (minimum of three) that follow this process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents could include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Learner feedback 2. Educator feedback 3. Self-evaluation process 4. Peer-evaluation process 5. Standardized/formalized template
<i>c. The Simulation Program has a process for providing professional development for participants (SPs/EPs) in the Human Simulation Program.</i> - This is the standard. Evidence should be provided based on the criteria in the subsections below.	
i. Describe the professional development opportunities available to SPs/EPs who regularly participate in Human Simulation activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides the opportunities for ongoing professional development of SPs/EPs who participate in Human Simulation activities. This description should include how often and how documentation takes place. ▪ Examples could include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SP in-house training programs, webinars, or other online programs 2. In-house training programs, webinars, or other online programs, 3. CE activities 4. Attendance at local, national and international conferences

5. EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT

- *a. The Simulation Program has a structured process to evaluate Human Simulation activities.*

- This is the standard. Evidence should be provided based on the criteria in the subsections below.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>i. Describe and provide supporting documentation that Human Simulation activities are evaluated systematically and routinely.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Provide the process for systematic review and evaluation of Human Simulation activities.▪ This description should answer the following questions:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. How does the Education/Assessment activity meet the stated learning objectives?2. Is the Education/Assessment activity reliable and valid for the level of the learner?3. What opportunities for improvement were/will be implemented to improve assessor performance, materials, timing, etc?4. How is information shared with pertinent entities (i.e. administration, faculty)5. Time frames for assessment/reassessment▪ Examples might include the following:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Policies and procedures that guide the regular evaluation of Human Simulation educational activities and curricular alignment2. Quality improvement processes that guide process improvement of SP/EP training, portrayals |
| <p>ii Document: Provide supporting documentation that the Human Simulation activity evaluation process ensures objectives are met.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Supporting documentation should demonstrate a systematic process to ensure that learning objectives are met, from a minimum of two sources.▪ Examples could include the following:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Standardized Post activity evaluation template2. Learner Feedback3. SP/EP Feedback4. Quality improvement activities taken to ensure learning objectives are met5. Faculty Assessment6. Assessment Rubrics |

<p>iii. Document: Provide evaluations from Human Simulation activities (at least 3, maximum 5) over the past 24 months</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide supporting documentation of 3-5 Human Simulation educational activity evaluations over the last 24 months indicating learning objectives were met ▪ These simulation activities should be representative of your educational and assessment Human Simulation activities. ▪ Documentation should reflect your learner population of service and link to your strategic goals.
<p><i>b. The Simulation Program's Human Simulation activities are reviewed and updated at least annually</i> - This is the standard. Evidence should be provided based on the criteria in the subsections below.</p>	
<p>i. Describe the Program's process to review and update Human simulation activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The description should illustrate a systematic and ongoing process of review and revision of Human Simulation activities. Time frames for evaluation should be stated. ▪ Documentation could include the following items: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy/procedures 2. Annual minutes to curricular meeting updates 3. Formal feedback processes 4. Informal feedback processes
<p>ii. Document: Provide examples (at least 3, maximum 5) of changes implemented based on the Human Simulation activity review process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide examples from the systematic annual review process. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Curricular updates 2. Quality improvement changes 3. Faculty, SP, or learner recommendations