### ACGME Program Requirements for Graduate Medical Education in Pediatric Critical Care Medicine

#### Summary and Impact of Major Requirement Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement #:</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement Revision (significant change only):</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:</td>
<td>Currently, pediatric subspecialty program directors need to comply with requirements in two separate documents: 1) the Program Requirements for Graduate Medical Education in the Subspecialties of Pediatrics; and, 2) the Program Requirements for Graduate Medical Education in Pediatric Critical Care Medicine. Having one comprehensive integrated set of requirements should simplify finding related requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Will the proposed requirement or revision necessitate additional institutional resources (e.g., facilities, organization of other services, addition of faculty members, financial support; volume and variety of patients), if so, how?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement #:</th>
<th>II.B.3.d).(1)-II.B.3.d).(1).(h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement Revision (significant change only):</td>
<td>In addition to the pediatric critical care medicine faculty members, ABP- or AOBP-certified faculty members and consultants in the following subspecialties must be available:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.d).(1)</td>
<td>neonatal-perinatal medicine; (Core)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.d).(1).(a)</td>
<td>pediatric cardiology; (Core)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.d).(1).(b)</td>
<td>pediatric endocrinology; (Core)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.d).(1).(c)</td>
<td>pediatric emergency medicine; (Core)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.B.3.d).(1).(e) pediatric gastroenterology; (Core)
II.B.3.d).(1).(f) pediatric hematology-oncology; (Core)
II.B.3.d).(1).(g) pediatric infectious diseases; and, (Core)
II.B.3.d).(1).(h) pediatric nephrology. (Core)

1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:
   Instead of requiring representation from each of the pediatric subspecialty areas (as is currently the case), the requirement for other pediatric subspecialty faculty members has been tailored to fit the needs of each pediatric subspecialty. This should relieve the burden of requiring what may be non-essential faculty members.

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   Not applicable

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   Not applicable

4. Will the proposed requirement or revision necessitate additional institutional resources (e.g., facilities, organization of other services, addition of faculty members, financial support; volume and variety of patients), if so, how?
   Not applicable

5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?
   Not applicable


Requirement Revision (significant change only):

II.B.3.d).(2) In addition, appropriate consultants must be available in related disciplines with experience in pediatrics, including allergist and immunologist(s); (Core)
II.B.3.d).(2).(a)
II.B.3.d).(2).(b) anesthesiologist(s); (Core) [Moved from II.B.2.b).(1) and VIII.A.2.b]
II.B.3.d).(2).(c) child abuse pediatrician(s); (Core)
II.B.3.d).(2).(d) child and adolescent psychiatrist(s); (Core) [Moved from II.B.2.b).(1)]
II.B.3.d).(2).(e) child neurologist(s); *(Core)* *(Detail)* [Moved from II.B.2.b).(1)]

II.B.3.d).(2).(f) congenital cardiac surgery surgeon(s); *(Detail)* [Moved from VIII.A.2.b)]

II.B.3.d).(2).(g) medical geneticist(s); *(Detail)* [Moved from II.B.2.b).(1)]

II.B.3.d).(2).(h) neurological surgery surgeon(s); *(Core)* *(Detail)* [Moved from VIII.A.2.b)]

II.B.3.d).(2).(i) neuroradiologist(s); *(Detail)*

II.B.3.d).(2).(j) orthopaedic surgery surgeon(s); *(Detail)* [Moved from VIII.A.2.b)]

II.B.3.d).(2).(k) otolaryngologyist(s); *(Core)* *(Detail)* [Moved from VIII.A.2.b)]

II.B.3.d).(2).(l) pathologist(s); *(Detail)* [Moved from II.B.2.b).(1)]

II.B.3.d).(2).(m) pediatric surgeon(s); *(Core)* *(Detail)* [Moved from II.B.2.b).(1) and VIII.A.2.b)]

II.B.3.d).(2).(n) physiatrist(s); *(Detail)*

II.B.3.d).(2).(o) radiologist(s); and, *(Core)* [Moved from II.B.2.b).(1)]

II.B.3.d).(2).(p) trauma surgery surgeon(s); *(Detail)* [Moved from VIII.A.2.b)]

1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:
   The requirement for other faculty members has been tailored to fit the needs of each pediatric subspecialty. This should relieve the burden of requiring what may be non-essential faculty members, and clearly identify which specialists are essential to the education of fellows in the program.

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   Having faculty members from related disciplines should enhance fellow education, patient safety, and patient care quality by providing interdisciplinary education and care.

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   Not applicable

4. Will the proposed requirement or revision necessitate additional institutional resources (e.g., facilities, organization of other services, addition of faculty members, financial support; volume and variety of patients), if so, how?
There may be a cost to hiring new faculty members if the Sponsoring institution does not already have these specialists.

5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?
   Not applicable

---

**Requirement #: II.D.1.-II.D.1.i)**

**Requirement Revision (significant change only):**

**II.D.1.** In order to enhance fellows’ understanding of the multidisciplinary nature of pediatric intensive care, the following personnel with pediatric focus and experience should be available:

- **II.D.1.a)** child life therapist(s); (Detail) [Moved from II.C.1.]
- **II.D.1.b)** dietician(s); nutritionists; (Detail) [Moved from II.C.1.]
- **II.D.1.c)** hospice and palliative medicine professional(s); (Detail)
- **II.D.1.d)** critical care subspecialty nurse(s); (CoreDetail) [Moved from II.C.1.]
- **II.D.1.e)** pharmacist(s); (DetailCore) [Moved from II.C.1.]
- **II.D.1.f)** respiratory therapist(s), (DetailCore) [Moved from II.C.1.]
- **II.D.1.g)** physical and occupational therapist(s); (Detail) [Moved from II.C.1.]
- **II.D.1.h)** social worker(s); and, (DetailCore) [Moved from II.C.1.]
- **II.D.1.i)** speech and language therapist(s). (Detail) [Moved from II.C.1.]

---

1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:
   **The requirement for personnel has been tailored to fit the needs of each pediatric subspecialty. This should relieve the burden of requiring what may be non-essential personnel, and clearly identify the personnel essential to fellow education in the program.**

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   **Having personnel from related services should enhance fellow education, patient safety, and patient care quality by providing interprofessional education and care.**

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   **Not applicable**

4. Will the proposed requirement or revision necessitate additional institutional resources (e.g., facilities, organization of other services, addition of faculty members, financial support; volume and variety of patients), if so, how?
There may be a hiring cost if the Sponsoring Institution does not already have these personnel.

5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?
   Not applicable

Requirement #: IV.B.1.b).(1).(f)

Requirement Revision (significant change only):

Fellows must demonstrate competence in providing or coordinating care with a medical home for patients with complex and chronic diseases. *(Core)*

1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:
   Providing care in line with medical home concepts is not new and incorporates many of the principles contained in requirements related to multi-disciplinary/interprofessional teams that provide coordinated, continuous, comprehensive, patient- and family-centered care.

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   A medical home permits integration of services centered on the comprehensive needs of the individual patient and family, leading to decreased health care costs, reduction in fragmented care, and improvement in the patient/family care experience.

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   Participating in medical home care should have a positive impact on the continuity of patient care by monitoring and anticipating the health care needs of patients.

4. Will the proposed requirement or revision necessitate additional institutional resources (e.g., facilities, organization of other services, addition of faculty members, financial support; volume and variety of patients), if so, how?
   For institutions that do not utilize a medical home approach, institutional support and resources may be needed. Elements of providing a medical home, which may require additional resources, are addressed in requirements related to faculty and other personnel.

5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?
   Not applicable

Requirement #: IV.B.1.b).(1).(i)-(j)

Requirement Revision (significant change only):

IV.B.1.b).(1).(i) Fellows must demonstrate the ability to provide compassionate end-of-life care and be able to perform an accurate brain death examination. *(Core)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV.B.1.b).(1).(j)</th>
<th>Fellows must be able to safely perform transport of a critically ill patient. (Core)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:</td>
<td><strong>The list of patient skills was updated to be consistent with the Entrustable Professional Activities and curricular activities that have been developed by the subspecialty community.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?</td>
<td><strong>These skills fall within the scope of a practicing pediatric critical care intensivist.</strong> Requiring that fellows demonstrate the ability to perform these activities will ensure that fellows have the skills needed to provide adequate patient care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Will the proposed requirement or revision necessitate additional institutional resources (e.g., facilities, organization of other services, addition of faculty members, financial support; volume and variety of patients), if so, how?</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Requirement #: IV.C.1.a)-b)**

Requirement Revision (significant change only):

| IV.C.1.a) | Assignment of rotations must be structured to minimize the frequency of rotational transitions, and rotations must be of sufficient length to provide a quality educational experience, defined by continuity of patient care, ongoing supervision, longitudinal relationships with faculty members, and meaningful assessment and feedback. (Core) |
| IV.C.1.b) | Clinical experiences should be structured to facilitate learning in a manner that allows fellows to function as part of an effective interprofessional team that works together longitudinally with shared goals of patient safety and quality improvement. (Core) |

1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision: **The requirements reflect the need for programs to consider the impact of frequent rotational transitions, such as occurs when fellows are scheduled for a series of short rotations, and the resulting disruption in supervisory continuity, on patient care and fellow education. They are also intended to address the impact of assigning supervising faculty members for very brief assignments.**
2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   The intent of the requirements is to ensure that programs consider the impact of frequent rotational changes and the accompanying lack of supervisory continuity on patient care. This new requirement prioritizes patient safety and education in curriculum planning.

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   The requirements are intended to minimize the frequency of rotational transitions and emphasize the importance of supervisory continuity. It is expected that this will have a positive impact on continuity of patient care.

4. Will the proposed requirement or revision necessitate additional institutional resources (e.g., facilities, organization of other services, addition of faculty members, financial support; volume and variety of patients), if so, how?
   It is not anticipated that additional resources will be needed.

5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?
   Not applicable

---

Requirement #: IV.C.3.

Requirement Revision (significant change only):

Fellows must have at least 12 months of clinical experience. *(Core)*

1. Describe the Review Committee's rationale for this revision:
   Providing a minimum of 12 months of clinical experience has been an expectation of the Review Committee for many years. It is stated in the current FAQs, and will now be codified in the Program Requirements.

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   As this has been the practice, no impact is anticipated.

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   Not applicable

4. Will the proposed requirement or revision necessitate additional institutional resources (e.g., facilities, organization of other services, addition of faculty members, financial support; volume and variety of patients), if so, how?
   As this has been the practice, no impact is anticipated.

5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?
   Not applicable

---

Requirement #: IV.D.3.d.(1)

Requirement Revision (significant change only):
Fellows must have at least 12 months dedicated to research and scholarly activity including project completion, and presentation of results to the scholarship oversight committee. (Core) [Moved from IV.B.2.c)(1)]

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision: Providing a minimum of 12 months of research experience has been an expectation of the Review Committee for many years. It is stated in the current FAQs, and will now be codified in the Program Requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality? As this has been the practice, no impact is anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care? Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Will the proposed requirement or revision necessitate additional institutional resources (e.g., facilities, organization of other services, addition of faculty members, financial support; volume and variety of patients), if so, how? As this has been the practice, no impact is anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs? Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>