



HLC Accreditation 2016-2017

## **Federal Compliance Form**

---

Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant

---

### **Appendix W**

## **Physician Assistant Program Accreditation**

---

**Additional information:**



*Accreditation Review Commission on Education  
for the Physician Assistant, Inc.*

March 11, 2011

John E. McCarty  
*Executive Director*

12000 Findley Road, Suite 150  
Johns Creek, GA 30097  
Phone: 770-476-1224  
Fax: 770-476-1738  
Email: [johnmccarty@arc-pa.org](mailto:johnmccarty@arc-pa.org)

Donald L. Beggs, PhD  
President  
Office of the President  
Wichita State University  
1845 Fairmount Box 0001  
Wichita State, KS 67260-0001  
E-mail address: [Don.Beggs@wichita.edu](mailto:Don.Beggs@wichita.edu)

Dear Dr. Beggs:

The Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA) is an independent accrediting body authorized to accredit qualified PA educational programs leading to the professional credential, Physician Assistant (PA). Accreditation is a process of quality assurance that determines whether the program meets established standards for function, structure and performance. ARC-PA does not accredit any academic degree awarded by the sponsoring institution of the PA program. The sponsoring institution is solely responsible for determining which specific academic degree (e.g., BA, BS, MS, etc.) to award.

At its most recent meeting, the Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA) reviewed the application and supporting materials submitted from the **Wichita State University Physician Assistant Program**.

The ARC-PA is pleased to notify you that the program has been granted **Continued Accreditation**. Please note that the program is approved for up to **144** students, the maximum student capacity as specified in the program's application. The approximate date for the next comprehensive review of the program by the ARC-PA will be **March 2018**. The program will be contacted by the ARC-PA in advance of that review regarding specific details of the application, reports, and site visit.

**Collaborating Organizations:** American Academy of Family Physicians • American Academy of Pediatrics • American Academy of Physician Assistants • American College of Physicians • American College of Surgeons • American Medical Association • Physician Assistant Education Association

**Member:** Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA)

**Recognized by:** Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)

For publicity purpose the program and institution must use the following narrative, unaltered, as provided by the ARC-PA:

The ARC- PA has granted **Continued Accreditation** to the Physician Assistant Program sponsored by Wichita State University. Continued accreditation is an accreditation status granted when a currently accredited program is in compliance with the ARC-PA *Standards*.

Continued Accreditation remains in effect until the program closes or withdraws from the accreditation process or until accreditation is withdrawn for failure to comply with the *Standards*. The approximate date for the next comprehensive review of the program by the ARC-PA will be **March 2018**.

An accreditation letter often includes the word(s) “note” or “general/additional comments”. The definitions for these words as used by the ARC-PA are as follows.

Note - An explanation that often will accompany a citation in the accreditation letter or other correspondence dealing with program compliance with the *Standards*. The purpose of the “note” is to clarify the issue of noncompliance with a specific Standard for the program and not to specify “how to” comply with the cited Standard.

General/Additional Comment(s) - Narrative that may be included in the accreditation letter or other correspondence with the program from the ARC-PA possibly linked with a specific Standard(s) that conveys a concern or expresses congratulatory comments. The purpose of the “Additional Comment(s)” is to clarify for the program a more global issue between the ARC-PA and the program but not to give advice or specify “how to” resolve the issue(s). Unless stated otherwise a response or corrective action to this type of commentary is not required.

During its review of the program, the ARC-PA noted areas of noncompliance with the *Standards* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition) which are presented as citations in the accompanying document. The citations listed are referenced to *Standards* under which the program was evaluated.

Additional Comment: Even though the program was reviewed using the *Standards*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, the citation references in parentheses refer to the *Standards*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, which became effective in September 2010. Programs are advised to review these standards and any accompanying annotations in considering their responses to the citations.

**Please see the companion word document for the citations and for the program to use in submitting the required report.** The program must submit a report no later than July 1, 2011.

Failure to respond satisfactorily to the above requested information may result in a reconsideration of the program’s accreditation status or an earlier scheduling of the next comprehensive review.

The ARC-PA policy regarding submission of required reports is as follows:

Failure to provide the required report/document by the specified deadline will be cause for:

- the program to be placed on Administrative Probation
- the required information to be resubmitted for a future ARC-PA meeting agenda

The ARC-PA reminds the program to review the *Standards* (4<sup>th</sup> Edition) which came into effect September 1, 2010. When cited, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition Standard(s) if appear in a different location in the 4<sup>th</sup> Edition it is noted in parenthesis behind the Citation.

The ARC-PA web site (<http://www.arc-pa.org/>) houses copies of the Educational Standards (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition and 4<sup>th</sup>) with a Standards Comparison document, an accreditation manual, as well as other informational documents designed to be helpful to programs. The Accredited Program section includes a resource page with several resources for programs (analysis, objectives/competencies/syllabi). These resources updated periodically include materials from ARC-PA presentations at national meetings and a schedule of upcoming programming being offered by the ARC-PA. This section also includes a link to program data related to the business before the ARC-PA. The Continuing and Provisional sections include applications and forms for use as programs prepare for accreditation.

The ARC-PA appreciates the commitment and dedication to quality PA education as demonstrated by your participation in the accreditation process. If you have questions or concerns, do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,



John E. McCarty  
Executive Director

- c. Peter A. Cohen, PhD, Dean, College of Health Professions e-mail address: [peter.cohen@wichita.edu](mailto:peter.cohen@wichita.edu)  
Sue Nyberg, MHS, PA-C, Program Director e-mail address: [sue.nyberg@wichita.edu](mailto:sue.nyberg@wichita.edu)  
James B. Hammond, MA, PA-C, Chair, ARC-PA  
Lynn D. Fleisher, PhD, Esq., ARC-PA Legal Counsel



*Accreditation Review Commission on Education  
for the Physician Assistant, Inc.*

## **Wichita State University – Citations**

A narrative response to each citation should be included below each citation on this document in the comment fields and **return this completed document in its current Word format**. If supplemental documents are needed to complete a response, please so indicate in the narrative and append those to the report starting with appendix 1 etc. Be sure to “save” the document before sending. The program response is due no later than July 1, 2011 indicating the manner in which the citations have been addressed/resolved and details about how the program plans to assure compliance in the future.

The program should submit its report **electronically as an attachment to [arc-pa@arc-pa.org](mailto:arc-pa@arc-pa.org)** and mail **one original and three copies (two sided, three hole punched, no staples or binders, secured with clips or rubber bands) to:**

John E. McCarty  
Executive Director  
Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant  
12000 Findley Road, Suite 150  
Johns Creek, GA 30097

Note: Even though the program was reviewed using the *Standards*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, the citation references in parentheses refer to the *Standards*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, which became effective in September 2010. Programs are advised to review these standards and any accompanying annotations in considering their responses to the citations below.

1. **Standard** A3.07d (A3.15d, e) The following must be defined, published, and readily available to prospective and enrolled students - required academic and technical standards.

**Note:** There exists a misunderstanding of what is implied by the term technical standards. The program provided, as evidence, the expected required academic performance but not the technical Standards. The typical information detailing the level of capacity needed to meet the physical and mental demands of the PA program that needs to be available to potential applicants who could self-assess their ability to perform as expected is absent.

**Comment:** The 4<sup>th</sup> edition of the *Standards* provides clarity to the expectation of the content of what is included in “technical standards”, that definition being - Non-academic requirements for participation in an educational program or activity. They include physical, cognitive and behavioral abilities required for satisfactory completion of all aspects of the curriculum and for entry into the profession.

**Response:**

2. **Standard C3.06 (C3.04)** The program must document a summative evaluation of each student toward the end of the program to assure that students are prepared to enter clinical practice.

**Note:** WSU PA Program students receive a summative evaluation using 2 PACKRATs and 2 OSCEs approximately one year apart and a final chart review that all competencies have been achieved. The faculty states they use one standard deviation away from the national mean as a passing score. The second year OSCEs, which are part of their summative evaluation, fall seven months before graduation in July, but they will schedule the last PACKRAT to be within the 4 months prior to graduation.

**Comment:** Summative evaluation includes evaluation of multiple domains, however the program plans to utilize PACKRAT, which is explicitly not designed for this purpose, as an objective summative evaluation it is a self-assessment tool for students.

The ARC-PA expects that a program demonstrating compliance would incorporate a written exam that correlates with the didactic and clinical components of the program's curriculum and that measures if the learner has the knowledge and skills to enter clinical practice. The 4<sup>th</sup> Edition Standard C3.04 provides clarity on the expectation of summative evaluation.

**Response:**

Submitted By:

Program Director Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date sent to ARC-PA: \_\_\_\_\_



WICHITA STATE  
UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF  
HEALTH PROFESSIONS

*Department of Physician Assistant*

June 24, 2011

John E. McCarty  
Executive Director  
Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant  
12000 Findley Road, Suite 150  
Johns Creek, GA 30097

Dear Mr. McCarty,

As requested, I am writing to provide a response to the two citations received by the Wichita State University Physician Assistant Program during its accreditation site visit on October 25 – 26, 2010. The Program's response is included in the accompanying document.

I hope that the information contained herein is satisfactory. Should there be any questions regarding the information required, I would be happy to address them.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Sue M. Nyberg'.

Sue M. Nyberg, MHS, PA-C  
Chair and Associate Professor

cc: Donald Beggs, President  
Peter Cohen, Dean  
Richard Muma, Associate Provost  
Donna Hawley, Institutional Research



*Accreditation Review Commission on Education  
for the Physician Assistant, Inc.*

## **Wichita State University – Citations**

A narrative response to each citation should be included below each citation on this document in the comment fields and **return this completed document in its current Word format**. If supplemental documents are needed to complete a response, please so indicate in the narrative and append those to the report starting with appendix 1 etc. Be sure to “save” the document before sending. The program response is due no later than July 1, 2011 indicating the manner in which the citations have been addressed/resolved and details about how the program plans to assure compliance in the future.

The program should submit its report **electronically as an attachment to [arc-pa@arc-pa.org](mailto:arc-pa@arc-pa.org)** and mail **one original and three copies (two sided, three hole punched, no staples or binders, secured with clips or rubber bands) to:**

John E. McCarty  
Executive Director  
Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant  
12000 Findley Road, Suite 150  
Johns Creek, GA 30097

Note: Even though the program was reviewed using the *Standards*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, the citation references in parentheses refer to the *Standards*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, which became effective in September 2010. Programs are advised to review these standards and any accompanying annotations in considering their responses to the citations below.

1. **Standard** A3.07d (A3.15d, e) The following must be defined, published, and readily available to prospective and enrolled students - required academic and technical standards.

**Note:** There exists a misunderstanding of what is implied by the term technical standards. The program provided, as evidence, the expected required academic performance but not the technical Standards. The typical information detailing the level of capacity needed to meet the physical and mental demands of the PA program that needs to be available to potential applicants who could self-assess their ability to perform as expected is absent.

**Comment:** The 4<sup>th</sup> edition of the *Standards* provides clarity to the expectation of the content of what is included in “technical standards”, that definition being - Non-academic requirements for participation in an educational program or activity. They include physical, cognitive and behavioral abilities required for satisfactory completion of all aspects of the curriculum and for entry into the profession.



**Response:** Our Program's citation of Standard A3.07d (A3.15d, e) resulted in reevaluation of our Program's academic and technical standards by the Program faculty. We agree that our past method of combining academic and technical standards under one heading, may have been confusing to prospective students and should be separated in order to fully meet the 4<sup>th</sup> edition standard. Our previously published standards were also lacking in detail regarding technical standards. As a result, we have revised our academic and technical standards, to more clearly specify details of the physical, cognitive and behavioral abilities necessary to begin didactic coursework and then satisfactorily complete all requirements for Program graduation and successful practice as a PA. In addition, the standards were revised with the goal that prospective students would be able to more easily recognize them as skills/abilities that a student must have/demonstrate at the time of admission. They will also replace the old standards in our information packet which is provided to potential applicants who request information or attend Program information sessions. This information is also provided to applicants who are selected for an on-site interview. The new academic and technical standards are to be in place on our website by August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011.

Beginning with the Class of 2014 (admitted June 2012), written acknowledgement by the student of their ability to meet these technical standards (with or without accomodation) will be requested prior to beginning didactic activity.

Our REVISED STANDARDS are as follows:

#### Academic Standards

Academic Standards required for admission to the WSU Physician Assistant Program:

- Completion of a bachelor degree from a regionally accredited U.S. college or university (Degree/transcript analysis of foreign degrees is required to determine equivalency.)
- Completion of all program course prerequisites
- Minimum GPA of 3.00 (4.0 scale) is required for both overall and prerequisite courses

#### Technical Standards

The Wichita State University Physician Assistant Program curriculum incorporates the teaching of technical skills necessary for the practice of medicine with appropriate supervision. Students must be able to perform successfully in a wide variety of clinical situations, and therefore are required to have adequate ability in physical, cognitive and behavioral areas. Students are expected to confirm their ability to meet the following standards (with or without reasonable accommodations consistent with applicable law) upon admittance to the program.

PHYSICAL abilities required for satisfactory completion of curriculum:

- The ability to observe demonstrations and other forms of instruction, as well as the observation of patients for physical evaluation is necessary. Observation necessitates the functional use of vision both at a distance and close at hand. Other sensory modalities, such as touch and smell enhance observation.
- The ability to communicate effectively in English is necessary. Communication necessitates the ability to speak, hear and perceive nonverbal communication. Writing, reading, interpreting graphs and diagrams, as well as computer literacy, are also essential for effective communication throughout the PA Program curriculum and in patient care.
- The ability to perform physical exams, diagnostic tests, surgical procedures, and treatment modalities for general and emergent medical care requires sufficient sensory and motor function is necessary. The curriculum requires that students have coordination of both gross and fine

muscular movements, equilibrium and other sensory function to perform tasks such as intubation, catheterization, suturing, cast application, palpation, auscultation, administration of intravenous medication, basic life support (BLS), advanced cardiac life support (ACLS), etc.

COGNITIVE abilities required for satisfactory completion of curriculum:

- Analytical reasoning, problem solving, critical thinking, and the ability to intellectually grasp a large volume of information are essential for successful completion of the curriculum. These skills would include understanding of measurements and calculations. Students will be required to integrate information from patient histories, exams, and diagnostic tests and then relate it to medical knowledge to form diagnoses and treatment plans.

BEHAVIORAL abilities required for satisfactory completion of curriculum:

- A motivation to provide service to others while demonstrating care and compassion is an essential quality of a physician assistant. In addition, the student must possess a level of maturity that is expressed through ethical and professional behavior, the ability to complete tasks without unnecessary delay, dependability, initiative and the use of clean and tactful language. This level of skill, motivation and professionalism are essential qualities to be demonstrated by a student progressing through a difficult program and into professional medical practice.
- The practice of good judgment when choosing patient care, including the ability to identify ones limit of knowledge and seek help is also necessary.
- Flexibility and the ability to function effectively while experiencing the stressors of a curriculum which includes a demanding schedule, changing clinical environments, and uncertainties inherent to medical care.
- The ability to maintain appropriate relationships with colleagues, faculty, patients and other health care professionals conducive to providing quality medical care and services is also essential for successful progression and competent practice.

Any applicant/student with a question about these technical standards or their ability to meet them is strongly encouraged to discuss them with the Wichita State University Office of Disability Services ([www.wichita.edu/disabilityservices](http://www.wichita.edu/disabilityservices)) prior to the interview process. Any student with an ability limitation or in need of special accommodation should notify the Program Director in writing prior to the beginning of didactic coursework or immediately upon obtaining knowledge, awareness or diagnosis of such a condition requiring accommodation.

2. **Standard C3.06 (C3.04)** The program must document a summative evaluation of each student toward the end of the program to assure that students are prepared to enter clinical practice.

**Note:** WSU PA Program students receive a summative evaluation using 2 PACKRATs and 2 OSCEs approximately one year apart and a final chart review that all competencies have been achieved. The faculty states they use one standard deviation away from the national mean as a passing score. The second year OSCEs, which are part of their summative evaluation, fall seven months before graduation in July, but they will schedule the last PACKRAT to be within the 4 months prior to graduation.

**Comment:** Summative evaluation includes evaluation of multiple domains, however the program plans to utilize PACKRAT, which is explicitly not designed for this purpose, as an objective summative evaluation it is a self-assessment tool for students.

The ARC-PA expects that a program demonstrating compliance would incorporate a written exam that correlates with the didactic and clinical components of the program's curriculum and that measures if the learner has the knowledge and skills to enter clinical practice. The 4<sup>th</sup> Edition Standard C3.04 provides clarity on the expectation of summative evaluation.

**Response:** In response to this citation, the Program reevaluated our Summative Evaluation policy and made several changes and modifications that will ensure full compliance with the intent of Standard C3.06. The original policy had included several elements within our summative evaluation that occurred outside the four month window and which could be considered more formative rather than summative. Also, rather than relying on the PACKRAT as the primary examination-type assessment of medical knowledge, Program faculty will develop a comprehensive, summative examination which will be administered beginning in May 2012, within 4 months of Program completion (July).

The final Summative Student Evaluation process to which this policy refers occurs within the final four months of the Program. As determined by the summative evaluation, students who are not adequately prepared to graduate may be required to complete further remediation, have delayed graduation, and/or be dismissed from the Program. In May (students graduate in July) Program faculty will conduct an individual summative evaluation of each student's cognitive and clinical skills, interpersonal skills, patient care skills, and professionalism to verify that each student is prepared to enter clinical practice. The components of this summative evaluation include the following five assessments: 1) score on the Program Summative Examination (newly developed); 2) PACKRAT score; 3) summative review of all rotation evaluation scores for each of the six PA Competency areas; 4) review of student's Professional Development Self-Assessment; and 5) Master's research project (paper and oral defense).

#### Procedure

In May of the clinical year, each student's academic advisor completes the Summative Student Evaluation Form and reviews all applicable assessment data. The PA Departmental Admission and Progressions Committee meets to review and discuss the completed Summative Evaluation Forms. Any student not meeting minimum criteria are further evaluated by the Committee and may be subject to completion of further remediation, delayed graduation, or dismissal from the Program. When the option of remediation is thought to be most appropriate, a targeted remediation plan is developed by the Admissions and Progressions Committee. The remediation plan may or may not result in delayed graduation. Where severe deficiencies exist, dismissal may be deemed appropriate. Any one deficiency can trigger a closer review by the Committee; however, failing any one component of the Summative Evaluation will not automatically trigger implementation of a formal remediation plan. For example, a student who passes the Program Summative Exam, does well clinically, but fails the PACKRAT would likely be counseled and encouraged to study aggressively for the boards but would likely not be required to comply with a formal remediation plan. However a student failing both the Program Summative Exam and PACKRAT and displaying some weaknesses as indicated by preceptor evaluations would be. The results of the Committee's assessments are then discussed with each student individually.

#### Components of the Summative Evaluation and Definitions of Pass/Fail

1) The Program Summative Exam is administered in May. A failing score on the Program Summative Exam will be defined as < 65%.

2) The PACKRAT is administered in April. A failing score on the PACKRAT is defined as a score less than 1 standard deviation (SD) below the national mean for that year. Because the SD

from the national mean is so large, the SD used for these purposes will be calculated from the mean WSU exam score. For Example: If the national mean was 150/225 and the WSU class mean was  $155 \pm 15$  for that year, then passing would be set at  $\geq 135$  ( $150 - 15$ ). To evaluate the practicality of this pass/fail definition, we applied it to several years' worth of past student data to simulate the outcomes and we were satisfied with the results. This definition was also applied to our 2011 summative evaluations.

3) Preceptors evaluate each student's performance on clinical rotations using a Likert-scale questionnaire designed from the PA Competencies in the areas of medical knowledge, interpersonal skills, patient care skills, professionalism, practice-based learning, and system-based practice. Mean scores from all rotations were obtained from E-value for each student. A failing score can occur in any one of the six PA competency areas and is defined as a score less than two (2) standard deviations below the class average for that competency. For Example: If the class average for Medical Knowledge is  $4.25 \pm 0.25$  for that year, then passing will be set at  $\geq 3.75$  ( $4.25 - 0.50$ ). This definition was applied to our 2011 summative evaluations and we were satisfied with the results.

4) Students are asked to complete a Professional Development self-assessment using the same questionnaire as their preceptors. These data are evaluated subjectively by comparing the student's actual rotation evaluation score means to those from the student's self-assessment. The goal was to identify students who are unaware of their limitations to an extent that may be considered inappropriate or unsafe. For Example: If a student consistently receives lower scores in the areas of Medical Knowledge from preceptors and has a low PACKRAT and/or Summative Exam score but then evaluates him/herself as superior in the area of Medical Knowledge, that may indicate poor self-awareness. This subjective assessment was incorporated into our 2011 summative evaluations and we were satisfied with the results.

5) Completion of the student's final research project/paper and oral defense occurs in April or May. Evaluation of each student's research project/paper is completed by the student's research advisor. The oral defense is evaluated by a small group of faculty. A failing score on the research paper was defined as  $< 72\%$ . The oral defense is evaluated as pass/fail. The research paper was incorporated into our 2011 summative evaluations and we were satisfied with the results.

Submitted By:

Program Director Name: Sue M. Nyberg, MHS, PA-C

Date sent to ARC-PA: 6/20/2011



*Accreditation Review Commission on Education  
for the Physician Assistant, Inc.*

August 5, 2011

John E. McCarty  
Executive Director  
**12000 Findley Road, Suite 150**  
**Johns Creek, GA 30097**  
**Phone: 770-476-1224**  
**Fax: 770-476-1738**  
**Email: [johnmccarty@arc-pa.org](mailto:johnmccarty@arc-pa.org)**

Sue M. Nyberg, MHS, PA-C  
Department Chair and Associate Professor  
Wichita State University  
1845 N Fairmount  
Wichita, KS 67260-0043  
Email address: [sue.nyberg@wichita.edu](mailto:sue.nyberg@wichita.edu)

Dear Ms. Nyberg:

The Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA) recently reviewed the letter and report dated June 24, 2011.

Disposition: Based on its evaluation the Commission accepts the response.

The ARC-PA reminds the program to periodically review the *Standards* 4th Edition. Our web site (<http://www.arc-pa.org/>) houses copies of the Educational Standards (4th Edition) and accreditation manual, as well as other informational documents designed to be helpful to programs.

The ARC-PA appreciates the commitment and dedication to quality PA education as demonstrated by your participation in the accreditation process. If you have questions or concerns, do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. McCarty".

John E. McCarty  
Executive Director

c: Peter A. Cohen, PhD Dean, College of Health Professions [peter.cohen@wichita.edu](mailto:peter.cohen@wichita.edu)  
James B. Hammond, MA, PA-C, Chair, ARC-PA  
Lynn D. Fleisher, PhD, J.D., Legal Counsel, ARC-PA