The Compounding Chronicles — June 2026

Are You Audit-Ready or Audit-Reactive?

Most pharmacy leaders are familiar with this scenario: an inspector or an accreditor asks for competency documentation, training records, or evidence of staff qualification for compounding activities. What appears to be a straightforward request can quickly turn into a time-consuming effort to locate records scattered across binders, spreadsheets, shared drives, learning systems, and manager files.

Usually, the problem is not a lack of effort or concern for compliance. Pharmacy organizations invest significant time into onboarding, annual education, and operational training. The challenge is proving competency in a way that aligns with current regulatory expectations and that can be consistently demonstrated during inspections.

As compounding requirements continue evolving under enforceable USP chapters, many organizations are discovering that compliance is no longer centered on whether policies exist. It increasingly depends on whether organizations can show objective evidence that personnel are trained, competencies have been validated, and procedures are being followed consistently across sites, shifts, and staff.

Why Assumed Competency Creates Audit Risk

One of the most common operational risks in compounding programs is reliance on assumed competency.

Pharmacy teams often have highly experienced pharmacists and technicians who have performed sterile or nonsterile compounding for years. Managers trust them, peers rely on them, and many have trained others. While experience is valuable, inspections and audits generally focus on documented evidence rather than institutional trust or historical performance.

Inspectors may ask for evidence of initial training, ongoing competency assessment, technique observation, remediation following failed assessments, media-fill testing, garbing competency, hazardous drug handling training, or procedural reassessment schedules. When those records are inconsistent, incomplete, or difficult to retrieve, organizations become vulnerable to findings even when staff are technically capable.

This is where many pharmacy leaders experience frustration. Competency may exist operationally but remains difficult to prove administratively.

The practical solution is to move from informal confidence in staff performance to documented, repeatable competency assessments. Organizations that reduce audit risk tend to establish structured competency programs with standardized observations, defined reassessment intervals, documented remediation, and clear records showing completion and accountability.

The goal is not simply documenting for the sake of documentation. The goal is to create a defensible process that demonstrates staff readiness and supports safe, consistent compounding practices.

The Challenge of Consistency Across Sites and Staff

Another challenge affecting compounding programs is inconsistency in technique across staff, shifts, or facilities.

Even in organizations with strong SOPs, operational variation develops over time. A technician may perform garbing steps in a slightly different order than other staff members. Cleaning practices may vary between shifts or locations. One location may interpret workflows differently from another facility within the same health system. Staff leaders may unintentionally teach slightly different approaches based on habit or experience.

None of these differences necessarily indicate poor intent or unsafe practice. Most variation develops gradually through workflow adaptation, turnover, training inconsistencies, or local operational habits. However, variability becomes problematic when organizations are expected to demonstrate standardized practice during inspections.

The takeaway? Written SOPs alone rarely guarantee consistency.

Ensuring standardized compounding technique requires a more structured approach to training and competency assessments. Organizations that reduce variability typically establish repeatable onboarding processes, role-based competency expectations, standardized observation methods, and recurring reassessments designed to reinforce technique over time.

Consistency matters because compounding quality and inspection readiness should not depend on who trained an employee, which location they work in, or what shift they happen to cover.

Taking a More Practical Approach to USP Chapters

For many pharmacy leaders, compliance can feel fragmented because requirements are distributed across multiple responsibilities, including training, environmental monitoring, hazardous drug handling, SOP adherence, quality activities, and competency documentation.

This often creates a disconnect between operations and compliance.

Training may live in one system. Competency documentation may exist elsewhere. SOP acknowledgments may be tracked separately. Environmental monitoring logs and remediation documentation may sit in entirely different workflows.

As a result, compliance becomes reactive rather than operational.

A more practical approach is integrating compliance requirements into daily pharmacy processes rather than treating them as disconnected regulatory obligations. Instead of responding to training gaps when inspections occur or documentation requests arise, organizations can build recurring workflows around required assessments, policy review schedules, remediation, retraining, and competency assessment.

Clear accountability also matters. Designating oversight responsibility for training, competency schedules, and documentation management helps reduce missed requirements and improve organizational consistency.

Organizations that operationalize compliance typically experience fewer surprises during inspections because required activities become part of routine practice instead of episodic preparation.

Moving From Fragmented Documentation to Inspection-Ready Audit Trails

One of the most common barriers to inspection readiness is fragmented documentation.

Many organizations maintain competency records in paper files, continuing education systems, spreadsheets, email chains, HR systems, and department folders. Individually, these processes may appear manageable. Collectively, they create retrieval challenges during audits and inspections.

Inspection readiness depends heavily on documentation readiness.

Pharmacy leaders increasingly need the ability to retrieve records quickly, demonstrate competency timelines, show procedural acknowledgments, document remediation efforts, and provide evidence that required reassessments occurred according to policy.

Organizations improve audit readiness when they standardize how documentation is collected, stored, and retrieved. Centralized records, consistent naming conventions, time-stamped training activities, documented observations, and defined retention processes reduce confusion and improve defensibility.

More importantly, structured documentation creates visibility. Leadership can more easily identify missing competencies, overdue reassessments, incomplete training, or unresolved remediation before they become inspection concerns.

A Clearer Way to Track and Prove Competency

The growing emphasis on documented competency has created a practical need for greater visibility into staff performance.

Pharmacy leaders need clearer answers to operational questions: Who has completed required competencies? Which assessments are overdue? Have failed observations been remediated? Are competency requirements consistent across facilities and roles?

Without visibility, organizations often rely on manual follow-up, spreadsheets, or institutional memory to monitor readiness. These approaches become increasingly difficult to manage as organizations expand, staffing changes occur, or requirements evolve.

Tracking competency more effectively does not simply support inspections. It improves operational consistency and reduces uncertainty.

Organizations that strengthen competency visibility are better positioned to identify gaps early, reinforce standardized technique, reduce variability, and respond confidently when documentation is requested.

Compliance Becomes More Manageable When It Becomes Operational

Compounding compliance is no longer just about maintaining policies and training programs. Pharmacy leaders are expected to demonstrate validated staff competency, standardized techniques, and inspection-ready documentation through processes that are consistent, repeatable, and easy to prove when needed. Many organizations struggle, not because training or procedures are absent, but because competency and documentation are fragmented across systems, sites, or workflows.

CriticalPoint believes pharmacy success is driven not by simply meeting regulatory requirements, but by achieving operational compliance through consistent best practices that exceed minimum standards and strengthen performance across the organization. When competency assessments, documentation, and training become standardized parts of daily workflows, organizations strengthen consistency across staff and sites, improve inspection readiness, and build more sustainable pharmacy performance.

Want to view our other blogs? Access our entire Compounding Chronicles library here!

Learn about CriticalPoint's product offerings!