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Outline of presentation

• CAMPEP – Mission & Purpose
  • CAMPEP Structure
  • REPRC function
  • Accreditation Process
  • Application Template
• Hub & Spokes – Policies (G:05 Affiliate Sites)
  • Key points
Relative roles of SDAMPP, AAPM, CAMPEP, and ABR for the Education of Medical Physicists in the United States

- **AAPM**
  - Definition
  - What is medical physics?

- **SDAMPP**
  - Implementation
  - How best to educate?

- **ABR**
  - Certification
  - Individual certified to practice?

- **CAMPEP**
  - Accreditation
  - Program accredited to educate?
CAMPEP
Commission on Accreditation of Medical Physics Educational Programs

It is a nonprofit organization whose objectives are the review and accreditation of educational program in medical physics
CAMPEP

Mission – to promote consistent quality education of medical physicists by evaluating & accrediting Graduate, Residency and Continuing Educational programs that meet high standards established by CAMPEP in collaboration with its sponsoring organizations
Sponsoring Organizations

AAPM
CCMP
ACR
RSNA
ASTRO
CAMPEP Composition:

1. Graduate Education Program Review Committee (GEPRC)-accredits Graduate, Certificate and DMP programs
2. Residency Education Program Review Committee (REPRC)-accredits residency and DMP programs
3. Continuing Education Committee
4. CAMPEP Board of Directors
Purpose of the REPRC

That section of CAMPEP that is responsible for the accreditation and reaccreditation of residency (DMP) programs in medical physics
2014 INITIATIVE

To sit for the ABR board examination in 2014 and beyond, applicants must have graduated from a CAMPEP accredited residency program (DMP)
Pathways to Residencies

- Graduate from CAMPEP accredited graduate program – MS or Ph.D
- CAMPEP accredited certificate – PhD physics or closely related field
- DMP: MS + 2 year residency
Guidelines for Accreditation of Residency Programs

G.05: Affiliated Sites

Policy & Procedures Document

www.campep.org

Under Residency Education Programs
Accreditation Process

1. Institution submits fee & self-study for review
2. Consistent with Residency Standards
3. Reviewed by volunteer program, mostly program directors
4. Site visit
5. Evaluation and Self-Study submitted to REPRC for vote
6. Evaluation and Self-Study submitted to CAMPEP BOARD
Approximate Timeline for Review

Assign review team (1→ 2 mo)
Evaluate self-study (3→ 5 wks)
Institution response to evaluation (4→ 6 wks)
Schedule site visit (1→ 4 mo ???)
Review team submits report to REPRC for discussion/vote (2 wks)
REPRC sends recommendation to CAMPEP BOD (2 wks)

Accreditation process: 5 mo → 10 mo
Reminder

48 “volunteer” reviewers
36 (Therapy) + 12 (Imaging)

Patience in Review Process
**Site Visit Format:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting /Activity</th>
<th>Primary discussion topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Orientation to the Facility and the Residency Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical development of the Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of the Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee</td>
<td>Organisation of the Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time allocation of residents to “routine” clinical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remedial education for non-CAMPEP graduate entrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>Roles of the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time commitment of the Faculty to Resident training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance expectations of Faculty as regards Resident training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Salary support, its origin and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment benefits, sick leave etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for travel and other professional expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Director</td>
<td>Commitment of the Medical Physics Department to the Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation of Faculty resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research expectations of residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO Director or designate</td>
<td>Commitment of the RO Department to Physics Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction of Radiation Oncology with Medical Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radiation Oncology academic activities open to Physics residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Degree to which the Program met expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance between training and “routine” clinical physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity for input into Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to evaluate Faculty as Resident mentors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Continuation of site visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tour of the Facility</td>
<td>The range of and access to technology and treatment modalities Accommodation for Residents Availability of educational resources – library and internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record inspection</td>
<td>Resident selection Program Committee minutes Evaluation of Residents Residents evaluation of the Program and Program components Additional components listed in VI D of the Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation (closed)</td>
<td>The site reviewers are sequestered for approximately three hours to complete the first draft of their report. They will require access to the Program Director during this time to provide clarification of any residual issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>The site reviewers will provide feedback to the institution as a result of the visit. The accreditation status of the program can only be determined by the CAMPEP Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section G: Residency Program Accreditation

G.05: Affiliate Sites

Policy: Medical Physics Residency Education Programs encompassing affiliate sites (a.k.a hub and spoke programs) shall ensure that uniform standards and procedures are maintained across all participating facilities.

Procedure:

.01 The primary site (hub) of a Program encompassing affiliate sites (spokes) is the organization employing the Program Director.

.02 An affiliate site is a participating site but under separate governance and budget than the primary site.

.03 All correspondence between CAMPEP and the Program shall be through the Program Director at the primary site.

.04 The Program Director is ultimately responsible for ensuring compliance of the Program, as implemented at all participating sites, with CAMPEP requirements.

.05 Affiliate sites must appoint Associate Program Directors who are accountable to the Program Director for, among other things, ensuring compliance with the Residency Education Program as submitted in the Self Study and accredited by CAMPEP.

.06 All records related to the operation of the Program at all sites must be accessible by the Program Director either electronically or in hard copy.
Standards for Accreditation of Residency Educational Programs in Medical Physics

Revised March 2015

Preamble

Medical Physics is a branch of physics that applies the concepts and principles of physics to the diagnosis and treatment of human diseases. Medical Physics encompasses four fields: Imaging Physics, Nuclear Medicine Physics, Radiation Oncology Physics and Medical Health Physics. This document focuses on the essential educational and experience requirements needed to engage in medical physics research and development, and to enter a residency program in preparation for clinical practice of one of the first three fields.

Terms such as “shall”, “must”, “require”, “should”, “may” and “recommend” are frequently used in these standards. The terms “shall”, “must”, and “require” denote items or activities that CAMPEP believes are mandatory components of an educational program. That is, they are required components. The terms “should”, “may” and “recommend” are considered desirable but not essential components of an educational program.
# Residency Standards
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1. Program Goal and Objectives

The objective of a residency educational program in medical physics is to instill into its graduates a level of competency sufficient to engage in independent clinical practice in a specified field of medical physics. The knowledge and skills that the resident should attain during residency education include:

1.1. The technical knowledge and skills related to the sophisticated technologies used in the practice of medical physics;
1.2. A critical awareness and evaluation of research and scholarship in the field;
1.3. An understanding of the protocols and practices essential to the deployment of technologies to detect, diagnose and treat various illnesses and injuries;
1.4. The ability to use analytical and research methods to solve problems arising in the clinical environment;
1.5. The professional attributes and the ethical conduct and actions that are required of medical physicists;
1.6. The communication and interpersonal skills that are necessary to function in a collaborative environment;
1.7. An awareness of the complexity of knowledge in the field and a receptiveness to other interpretations, new knowledge, and different approaches to solving problems;
1.8. An awareness of the need for confidentiality of patient information and familiarity with relevant regulations;
1.9. An appreciation of the clinical purpose and applications of sophisticated technologies;
1.10. The acknowledgement of the role of medical physicists in a clinical environment in which physicians, nurses, technologists and others work in cooperation;
1.11. The sensitivity to potential hazards that residents may encounter and appropriate measures to take to prevent risks to themselves and equipment;
1.12. The recognition and correction of suboptimal application or unsafe use of technologies;
1.13. The commitment to continued education so that practice knowledge and skills remain current.
C A M P E P
Commission on Accreditation of Medical Physics Education Programs, Inc.
Confidential

Program Evaluation

Residency Program: *******

Program Director: **********

Reviewers: # 1, #2, #3, Physician

Date of Site Visit: To be scheduled following response from institution

Date of Evaluation: 6/15/15

Notes:
This report makes reference to the Self-Study document submitted as part of this review process and which contains full details of the program.

1. Compliance refers to CAMPEP published standards
2. Observations are general comments related to performance of the program within the context of the appropriate CAMPEP standards.
3. Requirements are conditions that must be met by the program as part of the accreditation process. The responses to the requirements shall be provided in your next annual report submitted to CAMPEP.
4. Recommendations are suggestions by the program reviewers that are offered as improvements in the program but that are not requirements for accreditation. The response to recommendations shall be provided in your next annual report.
5. Clarifications are issues raised by the reviewers that require additional information from the institution.
ACCREDITATION

- **Initial accreditation** – for 3 years expiring 31 Dec. of third year – 2 year extension with acceptable annual reports
- **Provisional** – accreditation limited to less than 5 years & may be extended to 5 years pending interim report
- **Deferred** – programs requiring additional time to be compliant
- **Withheld** – non-compliant with CAMPEP standards and appears changes could not be achieved within reasonable time period
Residency Public Website

Posted on programs website:

• # students applying per year
• # residents accepted per year
• # residents graduating per year
• # residents certified per year
• Resident activity post residency
• No names or individual information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Year</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Offers</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Certified</th>
<th>Positions Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>clinical, academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>(no position)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>academic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Residency Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Accredited</th>
<th>In Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuc Med</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affiliate Sites

(Spoke)

(3 / 2)
Hub and Spoke program requirements described in Policies and Procedures Manual page 59
G.05: Affiliate sites
POLICY

Medical Physics Residency Education Programs encompassing affiliate sites (spokes) shall ensure that uniform standards and procedures are maintained across all participating institutions.
Procedure

• The primary Program site the one employing the PD
• Spoke site under separate governance & budget
• All correspondence between CAMPEP through PD
• PD has ultimate responsibility for program compliance
• Affiliate spokes must appoint Associate PD to insure compliance
• All records related to operation of the program must be available at all sites
• Site visits at all affiliated sites
Accreditation Applications for Hub & Spokes Programs include

1. Official letter from PD institution confirming participation of named affiliates (spokes)
2. Diagram describing the organizational structure & clear accountability lines
3. Official letters from all affiliate sites requesting CAMPEP accreditation
4. Letters of agreement between the affiliate sites and primary site describing liability, responsibility, accountability and any financial arrangements
Residency Program Description

Affiliate Agreements

- Generic agreement developed outlining roles & responsibilities of MBPCC and affiliate sites
- Minor changes (i.e., unrelated to residency training) made in each agreement specific to the affiliate’s program
- Completion of final agreements took ~1 year

Medical Physics Residency Program

Affiliate Agreement

This Medical Physics Residency Program Affiliate Agreement (the “Agreement”) is entered into by and between:

Mary Bird Perkins Cancer Center, a Louisiana non-profit corporation, represented herein by its President and Chief Executive Officer, Todd D. Stevens (hereinafter called “MBPCC”); and

who did declare as follows:

WHEREAS, the purpose of this Agreement is to set forth the roles and responsibilities of each party that desire to and which MBPCC permits to participate in MBPCC’s Medical Physics Residency Program (the “Residency Program”);

WHEREAS, MBPCC will affiliate with those institutions that, from time to time, agree to participate in the Residency Program as described in this Affiliate Agreement;

WHEREAS, initially, MBPCC proposes to affiliate with institutions capable of fulfilling the Affiliate obligations; those organizations include, but are not limited to, Wilma-Raigden Cancer Center in Shreveport, LA, Oncologics, Inc. (for the Louisiana locations exclusively), and The University of Mississippi Cancer Center in Jackson, MS;

WHEREAS, the primary purpose of the Residency Program is to provide clinical residency training in radiation oncology physics for M.S. and Ph.D. degree holders, to address a national shortage of medical physics residency positions;

WHEREAS, the Residency Program is not a component of the joint LSU / Mary Bird Perkins Medical Physics Program;

WHEREAS, this Agreement is intended to establish an Affiliate that will maintain at least one medical physics resident in radiation oncology physics and work with MBPCC to provide clinical medical physics training;

WHEREAS, the Residency Program will be operated pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the American Association of Physicists in Medicine (AAPM) Report 96, “Essentials and Guidelines for Hospital-Based Medical Physics Residency Training Programs” and the Commission on Accreditation of Medical Physics Educational Programs, Inc. (CAMPEP) “Guidelines for Accreditation of Residency Education Programs in Medical Physics”;
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Specific Concerns

1. Self-study explicitly address communication within the program
   • frequency
   • format – videoconference etc.
   • membership at program meetings

2. Detailed rotation schedule – identify mentors at affiliated sites

3. If spoke affiliate send residents to sub-spokes within their system→ must identify mentor at each location
Letter from the Associate PD at each affiliate must confirm

1. Program completion consistent with Program self-study
2. Resident remedial activities (didactic/clinical) consistent with self-study
3. All documentation including evaluations of and by the resident across all sites consistent with the self-study
4. PD is acknowledged as having ultimate responsibility for accreditation of the program
Program Review of Spoke Affiliates

1. One member from the main hub
2. Second member from either the hub or spoke affiliate
3. At least once a year
4. Ensure meeting expectations of the hub
   • appropriate records maintained
   • quality of the education
New affiliate/spoke sites added to an accredited program?

- New site provide CAMPEP with a self study to be reviewed by CAMPEP
- The site must have all the associated structure & documentation previously described
- Require a site visit
- Additional fees will be assessed by CAMPEP for conducting the site review
Key Points to Remember

• Single body with clear line of responsibility
• Single faculty albeit with different affiliations
• Spoke site under separate governance & budget
• Residents communicate regularly with each other through meetings or tele/video conferences
• Elected resident to sit on the residency committee
• Standardized evaluation mechanism
• Written contractual agreement among components
• Director at the Hub is responsible for the entire program
Match affect hub and spoke program?

Suggest affiliated sites enter the match separately from the home site

Candidates may have a preference for a particular site
Thank you for your attention
Hub and Spoke Residencies
A reviewer’s perspective

John A. Antolak, PhD

AAPM Hub and Spoke Webinar #4
Oct 15, 2015
Outline

• What are reviewers looking for?
• How to prepare for the site visit?
• Hub site visit
• Spoke site visit
• Summary
What do reviewers want to see?

Program basics

• Key elements for a residency program need to be in place
  • CAMPEP Standards
  • Hub and spoke agreements
What do reviewers want to see?

The Hub

• The “hub” program should be complete
  • Either accredited or able to become accredited on its own

• Administrative support, with centralized record-keeping
  • How does the hub support the spokes?

• Institutional support at a high level to demonstrate stability
  • Are administrators aware of and supportive of the hub and spoke arrangement?

• Spirit of collaboration, feeling of “one program”
What do reviewers want to see?

The Spoke

• The “spoke” program may be complete, but can have some holes
  • Less than complete set of rotations
  • Incomplete administrative support

• The hub site helps fill the gaps
  • Possibly with other spokes

• Spokes with unique capabilities may help the overall program

• Spirit of collaboration, feeling of “one program”
How to prepare for the site visit?

• Site visit agenda
  • Make sure key players are available
  • Make sure records are organized
  • Be prepared to demonstrate collaborative ability
    • Tele and/or video conferencing
• Consider having key spoke personnel (mentors and residents) visit the hub site on the first day
Hub Site Visit

- Very similar to a normal site visit, meetings with
  - Program directors
  - Residents
  - Mentors
  - Administrators
- Tour of facilities, office space
- Review of records
  - Electronic record-keeping can be helpful
- Demonstration of collaboration
Spoke Site Visit

- Can be much shorter than a normal site visit
- Reviewers may split up to visit multiple sites
- Tour of facilities to help assess quality of training and suitability of the environment
- Meetings with local staff and administrators
  - Are they familiar with the program?
  - Do they see it as added value?
  - Long term prospects
Summary

• Reviewers want to see good accredited programs
• Reviewers want to see one program with multiple sites
  • Not multiple programs thrown together for convenience
• Finding a compatible hub program can make it possible for a spoke program to provide accredited training
• Helping to meet the need for qualified medical physicists
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Questions & Discussion

Please ask questions using the Question tab on the webinar control panel
Hub and Spoke Webinar #4: CAMPEP Perspective

Question/Answer Session
- To send questions to the speaker, please enter them into the question box in the Go-To-Meeting toolbar.