ACGME Program Requirements for Graduate Medical Education in Selective Pathology
Summary and Impact of Focused Requirement Revisions

Requirement #: II.A.2.a)-II.A.2.a).(1)

Requirement Revision (significant change only):

II.A.2.a) Program leadership, in aggregate, must be provided with support equal to a dedicated minimum time as specified below for administration of the program. This may be time spent by the program director only or divided between the program director and one or more associate (or assistant) program directors. (Core)

II.A.2.a).(1) Programs with up to four approved fellow positions must be provided with a minimum of 10 percent time. Programs with five or six approved fellow positions must be provided with a minimum of 20 percent time. Programs with seven or more approved fellow positions must be provided with a minimum of 20 percent time plus an additional 0.5 percent time for each approved position. At a minimum, the program director must be provided with the salary support required to devote 10 percent FTE of non-clinical time to the administration of the program. Additional support for the program director and the associate program director(s) must be provided based on program size as follows: (Core)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Approved Fellow Positions</th>
<th>Minimum Aggregate Program Director/Associate Program Director FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specialty-Specific Background and Intent: The additional 0.5 percent time is for each approved fellow position in the program, not just the approved fellow positions over seven. For example, a program with an approved complement of seven fellow positions must be provided at least 23.5 percent time for program leadership. A program approved for 10 fellow positions must be provided with at least 25 percent time for program leadership; and a program approved for 18 fellow positions must be provided with at least 29 percent time for program leadership.

1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:
   The proposed change is in alignment with the ACGME’s new guidance related to dedicated administrative time.

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   As reflected in the Background and Intent for Common Program Requirement II.A.2., the ultimate outcome of graduate medical education is excellence in resident/fellow education and patient care. The Common and specialty-specific Program Requirements related to administrative time and support are intended to ensure the program director and, as applicable, the program leadership team, are able to devote...
a sufficient portion of their professional effort to oversight and management of the program to ensure an effective and high-quality educational program.

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   **No impact is anticipated.**

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?
   The requirements define the required minimum dedicated time for administration of the program based on program size. For some programs, the new requirements represent a decrease in the minimum administrative time and support required for program leadership, while for others they represent an increase.

   Programs for which the required minimum has decreased are encouraged to consider whether additional time and support should be provided based on factors such as program complexity and level of experience among the members of the program leadership team. It is anticipated that some programs may choose to decrease administrative time and support to the level specified in the new requirements if that is sufficient to meet the administrative requirements of the program. Other programs may determine that the time and support currently provided is optimal and elect not to make a change.

   Programs for which the requirements for administrative time and support have increased will need, in partnership with their Sponsoring Institution, to provide additional support for administrative time as specified in the requirements. Both provision of support for the time required for the leadership effort and flexibility regarding how this support is provided are important. Programs, in partnership with their Sponsoring Institution, may provide support for this time in a variety of ways. Examples include, but are not limited to, salary support, supplemental compensation, educational value units, or relief of time from other professional duties. Program directors and, as applicable, members of the program leadership team, who are new to the role may need to devote additional time to program oversight and management initially as they learn and become proficient in administering the program. It is suggested that during this initial period, the support described above be increased as needed.

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

---

**Requirement #: II.A.2.b)**

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

For Programs that do not function as a dependent subspecialty of an ACGME-accredited pathology residency program must be provided with a minimum of 20 percent time. These programs that have seven or more approved fellow positions must be provided with an additional one percent time for each approved position; the program director must be given at least 0.20 FTE of additional protected time beyond the scale noted in II.A.2.a).(1).(a)-(c) for administration of the program.
Specialty-Specific Background and Intent: The additional one percent time is for each approved fellow position in the program, not just the approved fellow positions over seven. For example, a residency-independent program with an approved complement of seven fellow positions must be provided at least 27 percent time for program leadership. A residency-independent program approved for 10 fellow positions must be provided with at least 30 percent time for program leadership; and a residency-independent program approved for 18 fellow positions must be provided with at least 38 percent time for program leadership.

1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:
   The proposed change is in alignment with the ACGME’s new guidance related to dedicated administrative time. Because independent subspecialty programs are not dependent on a core pathology residency program, they cannot take advantage of the resources of the core program. Therefore, these programs require more dedicated administrative time.

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   As reflected in the Background and Intent for Common Program Requirement II.A.2., the ultimate outcome of graduate medical education is excellence in resident/fellow education and patient care. The Common and specialty-specific Program Requirements related to administrative time and support are intended to ensure the program director and, as applicable, the program leadership team, are able to devote a sufficient portion of their professional effort to oversight and management of the program to ensure an effective and high-quality educational program.

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   No impact is anticipated.

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?
   The requirements define the required minimum dedicated time for administration of the program based on program size. The new requirements represent a decrease in the minimum administrative time and support required for program leadership for all programs.

   Programs for which the required minimum has decreased are encouraged to consider whether additional time and support should be provided based on factors such as program complexity and level of experience among the members of the program leadership team. It is anticipated that some programs may choose to decrease administrative time and support to the level specified in the new requirements if that is sufficient to meet the administrative requirements of the program. Other programs may determine that the time and support currently provided is optimal and elect not to make a change.

   Both provision of support for the time required for the leadership effort and flexibility regarding how this support is provided are important. Programs, in partnership with their Sponsoring Institution, may provide support for this time in a variety of ways. Examples include, but are not limited to, salary support, supplemental
compensation, educational value units, or relief of time from other professional
duties. Program directors and, as applicable, members of the program leadership
team, who are new to the role may need to devote additional time to program
oversight and management initially as they learn and become proficient in
administering the program. It is suggested that during this initial period, the support
described above be increased as needed.

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

Requirement #: II.A.3.c).(1)

Requirement Revision (significant change only):

[Qualifications of the program director must include at least three years of active
participation as a specialist in:]

   Track A: surgical pathology or an area of focused anatomic pathology. (Core)

1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:
   The proposed change clarifies the Review Committee’s expectations regarding who
   may qualify to serve as program director of a Track A (surgical pathology) selective
   pathology program.

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient
   safety, and/or patient care quality?
   The proposed change allows for a larger pool of qualified program director
   candidates. For a Track A (surgical pathology) program, the program director
   candidate does not have to have three years of active participation as a specialist in
   surgical pathology, as the Review Committee would also accept a candidate who
   had participation in an area of focused anatomic pathology. Since more individuals
   would now qualify to serve as program directors of Track A (surgical pathology)
   programs, programs can appoint the best person to be in charge of fellow education.

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   No impact is anticipated.

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?
   No impact is anticipated.

5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?
   No impact is anticipated.

Requirement #: II.A.3.d)

Requirement Revision (significant change only):

[Qualifications of the program director:]
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1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:
   The proposed change clarifies the Review Committee’s expectations for who may qualify to serve as program director of a selective pathology program.

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   The proposed change requires that program directors have experience as educators to be more familiar with how an educational program operates. This will likely translate to a more positive and productive learning environment for the fellows.

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact continuity of patient care?
   No impact is anticipated.

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?
   No impact is anticipated.

5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?
   No impact is anticipated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement #: II.A.3.e).1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement Revision (significant change only):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[Qualifications of the program director</strong> should include completion of a fellowship in the identified area of the selective pathology program. <em>(Core)</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Track A programs, the fellowship may have been completed in surgical pathology or in an area of focused anatomic pathology. <em>(Core)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Describe the Review Committee’s rationale for this revision:
   The proposed change clarifies the Review Committee’s expectations for who may qualify to serve as program director of a Track A (surgical pathology) selective pathology program.

2. How will the proposed requirement or revision improve resident/fellow education, patient safety, and/or patient care quality?
   The proposed change allows for a larger pool of qualified program director candidates. For a Track A (surgical pathology) program, a program director candidate does not have to have completed a surgical pathology fellowship. The Review Committee would also accept a candidate who completed a fellowship in a Track B (focused area of anatomic pathology) program. Since more individuals would now qualify to serve as program directors of Track A (surgical pathology) programs, programs can appoint the best person to be in charge of fellow education.

3. How will the proposed requirement or revision impact 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?
   No impact is anticipated.

5. How will the proposed revision impact other accredited programs?
   No impact is anticipated.