This Companion Documents 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 (as compared to what will be viewed during the site visit).

IMPORTANT: the descriptions and evidence provided are NOT prescriptive. The SSH Accreditation Standards are designed to allow simulation programs in any setting apply. It is recognized that there are many ways to achieve outcomes as well. As such, any evidence listed are representative of the types of information that has been acceptable. This companion document should not be considered as 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 criterion, 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:

- Area description (in dark blue)
  - High level description of the overall content in the area of accreditation (Core-ART/S)
- Section header (bold face type with a number in the light blue)
  - The title for the section that groups items together, each area of accreditation has its own number of sections.
- Standard statement (italicized with a lower case letter in the light blue)
  - This is the actual standard that must be met.
- Criterion (items listed in the white areas)
  - These are the items that must be provided to demonstrate meeting the standard.

The column on the right side of the tables is where the examples, clarifications, and descriptive information can be found.

TERMINOLOGY:
**Demonstrate**: this term is consistently used in Standards statements. This means the program must actually 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.

**Document**: this term is used to indicate that some form of documentation must be provided as evidence to meet a particular criterion.
## Teaching/Education Standards and Measurement

Accreditation in the area of Education will be available to Programs that demonstrate regular, recurring simulation educational activities with clearly stated objectives (knowledge, psychomotor skills and behaviors) and provides evidence of ongoing improvement of educational activities.

The 4 sections of Education Standards are: (1) Education Design, (2) Qualified Educators, (3) Educational Activities, and (4) Evaluation and Improvement.

### Overall Intent of Teaching/Education Standards:
Application for Accreditation in the area of Teaching/Education will be limited to those Programs who demonstrate regular, recurring activities with defined curricula and ongoing validation that employs simulation methodologies appropriate for learning objectives to instruct, teach, or train participants for formative integration of cognitive, procedural, and attitudinal goals. The Program will be able to demonstrate effectiveness of their curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. The Simulation Program is committed to providing high-quality simulation educational activities. | • A highly functioning, effective, and sustainable Program ensures all educational activity is linked to its mission and/or goals.  
• The response to this criterion should demonstrate how the Program ensures educational activities are in line with Program mission and/or goals.  
  SAMPLE: The Assistant Director of Simulation Program ABC completes a review of educational activity quarterly to ensure that all educational activity is consistent with the mission of Simulation Program ABC. A quarterly report is created and shared with the Director and Advisory Committee of Simulation Program ABC. The previous 8 quarterly reports are attached as Appendix x. |
| i. Document or describe how the Program links its educational activities to the Program’s mission and goals. | |
| ii. Describe and document the qualifications of the individual(s) that oversee simulation educational activities. | • In many cases the simulation expert who oversees educational activities is the same person as the Program Director identified in Core Standard 4.a. If this is the case, the information submitted for Core Standard 4.ai should be referenced here and may be sufficient.  
• If the simulation expert overseeing educational activities is not the same as the Program Director, then their specific qualifications of the simulation expert should be included in the response to this criterion.  
• Examples of simulation expertise/qualifications may include:  
  o Post Graduate work in simulation education training.  
  o Evidence of accumulated experience in using simulation in healthcare education for at least 2 years.  
  o Continuing education courses in simulation  
  o Simulation certification |
### iii. Provide documentation of simulation educational activities (maximum 3).

- This documentation is all of the documents that are part of an educational activity. They are typically items such as:
  - Needs analysis documentation
  - Goals and objectives
  - Scenarios
  - Schedule of activities
  - Debriefing documents
  - Evaluation and other forms
  - Other items as appropriate
- Videos are also often a part of the documentation of the activities. These need not be submitted as part of the accreditation packet, but the packet should indicate their presence and include a brief description. These may be some of the videos that will be viewed during the site review as indicated in Core Criterion 1.a.iv.

### iv. Onsite, provide at least 3 videos of simulation educational activity for reviewers to examine.

- This should not be submitted with the accreditation packet. Reviewers will select 3 videos onsite to review.
- The intent of this criterion is to provide a realistic portrayal of simulation education occurring in the Program.
- Please do not create a promotional video to demonstrate this criterion.
- The videos provided should be representative of the Program’s primary activity. The videos may cover multiple settings (SPs, mannequin-based simulations, debriefing, etc)
- Some Programs do not retain video. In this case, it is requested that the Program seek permission from learners/educators to capture video for the purposes of accreditation review only. This video can be destroyed after the site visit.

### 2. EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY DESIGN

#### a. The Simulation Program designs simulation educational activities that are evidence based, engaging, and effective.

- This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).

#### i. Describe how the Program assesses need for simulation educational activities.

- The intent of this criterion is to assure Programs base educational content on a known need or gap. In other words, Programs should not develop educational content just because it's “cool” or “interesting.”
- The response to this criterion should demonstrate a process by which Programs utilize various sources (needs analysis, gap analysis, expert assessment, learner request, regulatory requirements*) to inform educational activity/curricular development.
- Regulatory requirements may include topics required by credentialing or
ii. Describe how the Program designs simulation educational activities.

- The premise of this criterion is that Programs should use a thoughtful and deliberate process as well as sound educational principles in the development of simulation courses.
- Educational principles used in development of simulation courses may stem from theories of adult learning, experiential learning, active learning, etc. If specific learning theories are utilized, these should be identified.
- This should include how simulation specific items such as briefing and debriefing are designed and developed as well as the normal educational elements such as goals and objectives.
- All individuals involved in the simulation design should be familiar with the process provided in response to this criterion.

iii. Provide tools used in the design of simulation educational activities.

- Documentation and tools that may be useful for demonstrating this criterion may include:
  - A process map on how assessed needs translate to the design of course curriculum.
  - Policy and procedure related to simulation curriculum design.
  - Meeting minutes of groups involved in simulation curriculum design.
  - Needs assessment tool utilized in the simulation curriculum design process.
  - Checklist/tool to ensure each step of the design process is completed.
- All tools used in the design process should be submitted (e.g. needs/gap analysis questionnaire; acceptable objectives terminology etc).

iv. Provide a list of educational activities that follow the design process (maximum of 10). Onsite reviewers will choose three (3) activities to review.

- This may be the same list (or some portion of) what was provided in Core criterion 3.c.i. The documentation to meet that Standard can be references as long as the items for this criterion are clearly marked.
- The Program can submit a separate list if desired.

b. The Simulation Program determines how simulation modalities, locales, and/or realism will meet the learning objectives.

- The premise of this criterion is that not all simulation modalities are appropriate for all learning objectives. Additionally, there are different accrediting bodies.

i. Describe how simulation modalities, locales, and/or level of realism are determined when designing simulation educational activities.
locales that may be utilized, and differing levels of realism chosen to meet goals and objectives. For example:

- a mannequin that does not feature chest tube insertion would not be appropriate when the learning objective includes the procedural skill of chest tube insertion.
- Utilization of a simulation lab setting may not provide the appropriate locale or realism needed that an in-situ setting can provide.

- The response to this criterion should demonstrate how the Program ensures that for a given educational activity, the modality of simulation, locales, and/or realism chosen are appropriate.
- Programs often meet this criterion by describing/documenting their educational review and/or approval process, especially when that process has a specific step to ensure that the simulation modality is appropriate for the learning objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. The Simulation Program has personnel with expertise designing simulation educational activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Describe the process to ensure that simulation experts are included in the design of simulation educational activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii. Submit accreditation biosketches for simulation experts that are involved in the design of simulation educational activities. (maximum of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The premise of this criterion is that experts in simulation should be involved in the development of simulation courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Accreditation Biosketch can be used. Other formats such as the NIH style are acceptable. Regardless of format, the biosketch should highlight simulation expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programs should not submit the CVs for these individuals in response to this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The response to this criterion should demonstrate that the people most involved in simulation course development have expertise in simulation-based education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For some Programs, the people involved in developing courses are also educators. In this case, the response to Teaching/Education 3.a.i may be sufficient to meet this criteria if the biosketches include specific expertise in simulation course development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. QUALIFIED EDUCATORS

a. The Simulation Program has access to qualified educators.

This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).
### i. Submit accreditation biosketches for the most active educators (maximum of 5).

- The intent of this standard is to gain a sense of the quality, experience, and training of the Program's educators.
- A key educator is someone regularly involved with simulation education in the Program.
- The Accreditation Biosketch can be used. Other formats such as the NIH style are acceptable. Regardless of format, the biosketch should highlight simulation education experience/expertise.
- CVs for key educators should not be included unless it clearly presents simulation-specific experience/expertise.
- Though 5 (max) biosketches are included in this application, biosketches for all key educators should be available for onsite review.

### b. The Simulation Program selects educators to match the learner group’s level of study.

This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).

### i. Describe the process to match the qualifications of the educator to the characteristics of the educational activity.

- The premise behind this criterion is that an educator should participate in learning activities for which they are qualified. For example, a radiologist with no experience/education in securing airways should probably not be educating anesthesia students in airway management.
- The Program should have a process by which they ensure educators are appropriate for assigned educational activities.
- While educators may not have received formal training in educational theory, they should be trained, at least internally, to the educational activity they are conducting.

### c. The Simulation Program has a process to assure ongoing development and competence of its simulation educators, at least annually.

This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).

### i. Describe the evaluation and feedback processes for simulation educators.

- The premise behind this criteria is that all educators should be evaluated at least annually.
- This evaluation should be specific to simulation education.
- General performance reviews are not sufficient to meet this criterion unless it specifically addresses simulation education. For example, an educator that is employed by the School of Nursing typically receives an annual performance review by the School of Nursing but unless this performance review specifically addresses simulation education, it would not be sufficient to meet this criterion.
- The Program does not have to evaluate all educators by the same process, but all educators should be evaluated in some way. For instance, “core” or “key” educators may have a more intensive evaluation than
educators that only occasionally participate in simulation activities. Even so, all simulation educators should be evaluated annually in some form.

- **Sources of evaluation may include:**
  - Self-evaluation
  - Evaluation by designated simulation expert(s)
  - Evaluation by learners
  - Peer review
- **Educator evaluations should be based on at least two sources (i.e., not limited to learner evaluation alone).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii.</th>
<th>Provide a list of simulation educators (maximum of 10). Onsite reviewers will choose three (3) educators to review.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of the educators may be listed in response to Core criterion 4.c.iii.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iii.</th>
<th>Document or describe opportunities for educators to engage in professional development that is specific to simulation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The intent of this standard is to identify how educators engage in a continuous improvement process to develop and refine their simulation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional development for educators that are considered “core” simulation staff are submitted in Core criterion 4.c.iii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing professional development of educators may include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Educators attending organizational, regional, national or other conferences or educational events relevant to simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Educators attending vendor or “in-service” training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internal (local) training opportunities for educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attendance records are helpful for professional development activities, especially internal activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In some Programs, professional development opportunities for educators are the same as professional development opportunities for “core” simulation staff. In this case, the response to Core criterion 4.c.iii may be referenced here and may be sufficient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d.</th>
<th>The Simulation Program has a process to assure orientation and development of those who participate in the delivery of educational activities but are not simulation experts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The intent of this criterion is to understand how non-simulation experts involved in simulation education are oriented to the simulation environment. Commonly, non-simulation experts are subject matter experts (SMEs) or content experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This can include orientation to the simulation environment; the simulation modalities used by the Program; simulation specific elements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such as briefing/orientation, debriefing, and feedback; and educator assessment and program evaluation process.

- Include who is doing the orientation (e.g. which Program staff and what expertise, use of external simulation experts etc).

| ii. Describe the evaluation and feedback processes for those that participate in the delivery of educational activities but are not simulation experts. | • The premise of this criterion is that feedback is needed and this feedback should be used to implement changes in educational approach.
  • The feedback process referred to in this criterion may be formative in nature.
  • The feedback referred to in this criterion differs from the annual evaluation in Teaching/Education 3.c..i in that this criterion refers to more immediate feedback for individuals who are not the same level of expertise. For instance, if a specific issue is identified related to a specific educator (this could come from peer observation, participant evaluation, etc), how is it communicated with the educator and how is it followed up?
  • The Program should provide three examples of how an educator issue was identified, how the feedback was communicated to the educator, and the changes that occurred as a result of the feedback.
  • The response to this criterion should be specific for feedback/changes in educators, not in educational content (curriculum). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. The Simulation Program has mechanisms in place to evaluate educational activities. | • The intent of this criterion is for programs to demonstrate how educations materials (curricula) are reviewed and updated on a regular basis.  
• Policies and/or procedures related to how educational materials are reviewed and updated should be included here.  
• Reviews may be accomplished in multiple ways: expert review, peer review, internal feedback or other appropriate processes.  
• Documentation should demonstrate a process for how curriculum is reviewed and updated - including the reviewer’s qualifications. Examples may include:  
  o An internal policy or process map on curriculum review.  
  o Annual needs assessment  
  o Program evaluation feedback, including information on and how it has been utilized for curricular improvement  
  o Review based on expert opinion or available evidence base documentation.  
  o Use of Quality Improvement data/Risk Management data.  
SAMPLE: The Simulation Curriculum Committee meets quarterly to review educational materials. At least once a year, each simulation course is reviewed and a Simulation Curriculum Review Form (attached as Appendix x) is completed. The completed form is reviewed by the Program Director and is filed on the shared drive in the corresponding course folder. Each course information sheet has a small box with development and revision dates. At the time the completed Simulation Curriculum Review Form is filed, the revision date on the course information sheet is also updated to reflect the most recent review date etc… |
| i. Document or describe that simulation educational activities are evaluated in a systemic and routine manner. | • The intent of this criterion is to determine if the Program is meeting intended educational objectives for the educational activities.  
• All learner evaluations should include a question related to the educational activity meeting the stated educational objectives.  
• The process should be well-defined and familiar to those involved in simulation education (learners, educators, etc).  
• It is understood that for any given Program, a variety of processes may be utilized to conduct and collect course evaluations.  
• Not every course must be evaluated. In some cases, Programs may elect |
| ii. Document that educational activity evaluations ensure educational objectives were met. | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iii.</th>
<th>Provide evaluations from educational activities (at least 3, maximum 5) over the past 24 months.</th>
<th>• This criterion may be met by simply including evaluations from 3-5 courses (offered within 24 months) as attachments to the accreditation packet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><strong>The Simulation Program’s simulation educational activities are reviewed and updated at least annually.</strong></td>
<td>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| i. | Document or describe the Program’s process to review and update simulation educational activities. | • The premise of this criterion is that there should be a process by which course evaluations are used to inform changes to simulation educational activities (and curricula).  
• This process sometimes involves reviewing literature, or consulting other experts to get feedback on potential changes.  
• The process by should be reliable and reproducible. This may be accomplished by a checklist, or tool, that is used when evaluations reveal changes that should be considered in simulation curricula.  
• If there is a committee or body that reviews evaluations to prompt curricular changes, meeting minutes may be included as an appendix. |
| ii. | Provide examples (at least 3, maximum 5) of changes implemented based on educational activity review process. | • The intent of this criterion is to have the Program demonstrate how the changes identified in Teaching/Education 4.b.1 have been implemented and served to improve educational activities.  
• Documentation should indicate which educational activity was improved based on the evaluations and updates. |