

PLAN FOR COMPREHENSIVE STANDARDS REVIEW

Review Timeline

- March – April 2022: Circulate to COSPP draft plan for conducting the comprehensive standards review; finalize draft plan.
- May 2022 Board Meeting: Present to the board COSPP’s draft plan for the upcoming comprehensive review of standards (timeline, questions, and overall process) for review, revision and approval.
- June – July 2022: Send out memo to stakeholders announcing and describing the comprehensive review process, including questions to address; invite written comments over a 3-month or so period.
- Fall 2022: Invite stakeholder representatives to the fall CNME board meeting to offer their feedback on the current CNME standards and suggestions for revisions/additions.
- Early 2023: Convene COSPP meeting to consider written suggestions received and feedback from stakeholder meeting; based on input, draft recommended changes to the standards to present to the board at either its spring 2023 meeting or an earlier special board meeting.
- Spring 2023: Following the board review, revision and approval of draft recommended revisions, circulate the draft revisions for public comment over a 3-month period.
- Summer or early fall of 2023: Convene COSPP meeting to review input on standards revisions and to make final proposed revisions to the standards to present to the board.
- Fall 2023: Present final draft standards revisions to the board for review and approval; if needed, convene a special board meeting to discuss.
- Winter 2023 or early 2024: Publish updated handbook containing revisions to the standards.

General Questions to Stakeholders

1. Are there any elements or criteria in any the standards should be removed? If so, what are they and why is this necessary?
2. Are there any important elements that have been left out of any of the standards? If so, what are they and why is this necessary?
3. Do some of the current standards contain elements or criteria that should be shifted to different standards? If so, please outline the specific changes you suggest and why they would be helpful.
4. Are there redundancies or duplications in the current standards that should be eliminated? If so, please outline what they are.
5. Are there any unclear wordings, ambiguities, contradictions or inconsistencies in specific sections that should be addressed? If so, please outline.
6. Do we need to add any new standards? If so, what are they and why are they needed?

7. Do you have any general observations about the current accreditation standards? What do you like or dislike about the current CNME standards?

Specific Questions to Stakeholders

1. Have you observed any widespread weaknesses in regard to skills and/or knowledge among recent ND graduates that the CNME should address in ND educational standard (i.e., Standard VI, “Program of Study”)? If so, please list.
2. Given the various scopes of ND practice currently found in the U.S. and Canadian jurisdictions that license/regulate NDs—and how these scopes may evolve—what aspects of academic or clinical of ND education, if any, need further development?
3. Given trends in healthcare insurance coverage for ND services, are there any aspects of the academic or clinical ND educational standards that need further development? If so, please list.
4. The CNME educational standards reference the goal of graduating “primary care/general practice physicians/doctors”: Is this still appropriate as a fundamental goal of ND education and training? If not, what, if anything, should be specified as the fundamental goal?
5. The CNME has recently revised its accreditation standards to allow for the use of telemedicine and simulations to fulfill a portion of the clinical training requirements, including a limit of 25% for telemedicine contacts and 10% for simulations: What further revisions, if any, might be needed to clarify and/or strengthen these aspects of clinical training?
6. Given that there are some ND programs where ND students share classes with students enrolled in a different healthcare program—or who are getting an ND degree jointly with another degree—are any revisions/additions needed in the CNME standards to address these situations? If so, please outline your suggestions.
7. Assessment continues to be a challenging area for some ND programs: Are any revisions needed in Standard VII, “Assessment of Student Learning and Program Evaluation”? If so, please outline your suggestions.
8. The CNME is considering implementing a hybrid format for conducting comprehensive evaluation visits for reaccreditation of ND programs—i.e., handling some of the meetings via videoconferencing prior to the onsite campus portion of the visit so that the onsite portion is less rushed and/or of shorter duration. Would utilizing a hybrid evaluation visit format be potentially helpful to schools? If so, which parts of a visit could be handled virtually instead on campus?