D'Youville College School of Pharmacy

March 2010 Assessment Report

Pharmacy Goals, Objectives & Outcomes

1. Advancing Academic Excellence

1.2 EOCs/ABOs and Content Taught Sequentially/Progressively

Are the Educational Outcomes and Competencies and content being taught in a sequential, progressive manner?

Measure: Development of new hybrid professional development scale combining rigor-relevance & stages of professional mastery

Details/Description: In order to assist faculty and preceptors in documenting student progression within the didactic and experiential components of the curriculum (see DYCSoP Educational Outcomes and Comptencies, Attachment 1), we had initially proposed to utilize a mastery scale to describe the progression of skill acquisition from novice to expert (see Attachment 2), and the Rigor-Relevance framework developed by Dr. William Daggett to describe progression of knowledge acquisition (see attachment 3). This framework outlines a two-dimensional, 4-quadrant scale for Bloom's taxonomy across single and multiple disciplines. However, it was evident that utilization of two different scales, one for knowledge acquisition in predominantly didactic coursework, and the other for skill acquisition predominantly during practice experiences, was not feasible. The School of Pharmacy needs to modify the original skill-based mastery scale to include a more robust description of knowledge development.

Acceptable Target: Professional Development Framework with six levels of competency (four levels will be displayed in the curricular mapping). Two extremes will be reserved to assess competency level of poor performance level and excellent performance level.

Ideal Target: Professional Development Framework with six levels of competency (four levels will be displayed in the curricular mapping). Two extremes will be reserved to assess competency level of poor performance level and excellent performance level.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Complete no later than end of August 2010.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Gettman (Assessment Committee) and Bob Drobitch (Curriculum Committee). Will also confer with Dr. Donegan since she has had experience with these two instruments.

Findings for Development of new hybrid prof develop scale combining rigor-relevance & stages of prof mastery

Summary of Findings: Development was completed on a new hybrid professional development scale combining aspects of the rigor/relevance framework and the stages of professional mastery scale to track levels of professional development through the four year Pharm.D. curriculum. (See Attachment 4, Professional Development Framework.)

Results: Acceptable Target Achievement: Met; Ideal Target Achievement : Approaching

Recommendations : Use to display progression of student performance on our DYCSoP Educational Outcomes and Competencies and Ability Based Outcomes in the DYCSoP Curricular Map. N = Novice, A = Advanced Novice, B = Beginning Proficient, and P = Proficient.

Reflections/Notes : The assessment committee will need to revisit our Professional Development Framework at the conclusion of AY 2010-2011 to assess its applicability to both the didactic and experiential portions of our Pharm.D. Curriculum.

1.3 Students Development of Knowledge, Skills, & Attitudes

Do the students feel that they have developed in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes at levels necessary for their entry into practice?

Measure: Development of "Super Rubrics" for AY 2010-2011

Program level; Indirect - Focus Group

Details/Description: A focus group of faculty volunteers will be formed to develop "super rubrics" (that is rubrics that will be utilized in more than just one course) that will be necessary for our first year courses.

Acceptable Target: Focus group must develop and approve a "super rubric" for student peer evaluation during courses (especially for collaborative learning practicums).

Ideal Target: Develop and approve as many "super rubrics" as the focus groups is necessary and posted for easy access by faculty and students (for example, on Taskstream AMS, Moodle or pharmacy s-drive).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Super Rubrics must be developed and posted by the end of July 2010 for faculty to consider adopting for their courses.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. David Gettman, Assessment Committee, and Faculty Volunteers for Focus Group.

Findings for Development of "Super Rubrics" for AY 2010-2011

Summary of Findings: Five "super rubrics" were developed for course instructors to consider utilizing in our first year: 1.) peer evaluation form - especially for the 6-semester sequence of collaborative learning practicums, 2.) self evaluation form - especially for the 6-semester sequence of collaborative learning practicums, 3.) crtical thinking rubric, 4.) oral presentation rubric - especially for 7-minute videotaped presentation in systems course, and 5.) written presentation rubric - especially for research project proposal posters in systems course. Dr. Donegan championed 1 & 2. Dr. MacEvoy championed 3. And, Dr. Gettman championed 3 & 4. Attachment 3 was developed as a "bank of items" as Dr. MacEvoy felt it would be better to have items that a course instructor could pick and choose for inclusion into a rubric.

Results: Acceptable Target Achievement: Met; Ideal Target Achievement : Approaching

Recommendations : The best way to develop these super rubrics would appear to find volunteer faculty who know tghey will need to develop one or more of these super rubrics for an upcoming course. Later, future course instructors can pick and choose which super rubrics they wish to adapt for their own course needs. We are waiting to see if the "bank of items" approach might work as an alternative pedagogy for our super rubrics.

Reflections/Notes : It would be prudent for the assessment committee to work with the faculty development committee on the issue of developing super rubrics or adapting them for the use of specific courses.

1.4 Use of Varied Teaching/Learning Methods

Does the school utilize varied teaching and learning methods to produce graduates who become competent pharmacists?

Measure: Incorporation of Team Based Learning into First Year of Collaborative Learning Practicums

Program level; Indirect - Focus Group

Details/Description: Assessment Committee had discussion on possible use of team based learning into our collaborative learning practicums. Suggestion was made to curriculum committee on use of team based learning to help students integrate material from our two departments in the P1 year. Dr. Gettman suggested a method for putting these materials together after reading three textbooks on TBL as follows:

1. Team-based Learning: A Transformative Use of Small Groups in College Teaching. Eds. Larry K. Michaelsen, Arletta Bauman Knight, L. Dee Fink. (2004) Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

2. Team-Based Learning for Health Professions Education: A Guide to Using Small Groups for Improving Learning. Eds. Larry K. Michaelsen , Dean X. Parmelee , Kathryn K. McMahon , Ruth E. Levine, (2007)

3. Team-Based Learning: Small Group Learning's Next Big Step. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, Eds. Larry K. Michaelsen, Michael Sweet & Dean X. Parmelee, (2008)

Dr. Gettman also suggested using the Immediate Feedback Assessment Technique (IF AT) scratch off cards (see http://www.epsteineducation.com/home/about/how.aspx) in the CLPs while he uses the TurningPoint audience Response System in his "Systems" course.

Acceptable Target: Develop all TBL materials for Fall 2010 before Fall 2010.

Develop all TBL materials for Spring 2011 before Spring 2011.

Ideal Target: Develop all TBL materials before AY 2010-2011.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Integrate materials from all courses into CLP and develop TBL materials (irATs, tRATs).

Key/Responsible Personnel: David Gettman (Assessment Committee) and Bob Drobitch (Curriculum Committee).

Supporting Attachments:

 Team Based Learning (Larry Michaelsen) Website (Web Link)

Findings for Incorporation of Team Based Learning into First Year of Collaborative Learning Practicums (see Curriculum Committee Report)

2. Shaping Pharmacy Practitioners

2.1 Progress in the Experiential Program

How are students progressing in the Experiential Program?

Measure: Sequence of IPPEs to Address the New Standards for Experientials

Program level; Indirect - Other

Details/Description: Wuller & Luer (Southern Illinois University Edwardsville) published article on an IPPE sequence that was developed with 1 module in each semester of the first 2 professional years. Semesters were 18 weeks in length with IPPE taking place in the middle weeks as dedicated time blocks when no concurrent didactic courses were scheduled. Learning exercises were developed to build a progressive foundation in preparation for advanced pharmacy practice experiences (APPE).

Acceptable Target: Develop 4 semester IPPE sequence like Edwardsville.

Ideal Target: Expand to a 6 semester IPPE sequence (with service learning IPPE AND interdisciplinary IPPE included).

Implementation Plan (timeline): AY 2009-2010.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Jack Koford (Experiential Committee) and David Gettman (Assessment Committee).

Supporting Attachments:

 A Sequence of Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experiences to Address the New Standards for Experiential Learning.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Findings for Sequence of IPPEs to Address the New Standards for Experientials

(See Experiential Committee Report)

5. Excellence in Human, Financial & Physical Management

5.4 Quantity and Quality of Physical Resources

Does the school have adequate quantity & quality of physical resources?

Measure: Montante Library Pharmacy Acquisition Plan

Indirect - Other

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. David Gettman & Jill Church

Supporting Attachments:

 2008 Basic Resources (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 AACP Core Journals List (2009) (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Results: Acceptable Target Achievement: Not Met

AACP Core List of Journals - what Montante Library has in AY 2009-2010 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 List of Pharmacy-related databases in Montante Library AY 2009-2010 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 Pharmacy Journals (in print form) - what Montante Library has in AY 2009-2010 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 Pharmacy Titles Available Full Text in DYC Databases - AY 2009-2010 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 Pharmacy-related Books in R2 Digital (online) Library (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 Pharmacy-related Books ordered in 2007-08 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 Serials that we automatically receive updates for as they are published (Adobe Acrobat Document)

5.6 Matriculation, Progression and Graduation Rates

Does data on student matriculation, progression and graduation rates correlate with measures associated with admissions data?

Measure: Matriculation Interview Process (Use of Multiple Mini-Interviews)

Program level; Indirect - Interview

Details/Description: Assessment Committee performed literature search for published articles (medical schools) on use of the Multiple Mini-Interviews. Eight articles were found and given to admissions committee to construct for our School of Pharmacy candidates.

Acceptable Target: 3 MMI stations.

Ideal Target: 6 MMI stations.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Before start interviews.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Canio Marasco (Admissions Committee) and David Gettman (Assessment Committee).

Supporting Attachments:

 An Admissions OSCE - the multiple mini-interview.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 Assessment of non-cognitive traits.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 Discerning quality - using the multiple mini-interview.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 Experiences of the multiple mini-interview - a qualitative analysis.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 Factors affecting the utility of the multiple mini-interview in selecting candidates.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 MMI - Ratings and Interviewer Characteristics.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

 MMI predict clerkship and licensing exam performance.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Multiple Mini-Interview Question Bank.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Findings for Matriculation Interview Process (Use of Multiple Mini-Interviews)

Results: Acceptable Target Achievement: Met; Ideal Target Achievement : Approaching

Substantiating Evidence:

 MMI Station 1 - Extraversion Scenario & Rubric (Microsoft Word)

 MMI Station 2 - Agreeableness Scenario & Rubric (Microsoft Word)

 MMI Station 3 - Neuroticism Scenario & Rubric (Microsoft Word)

 MMI Station 4 - Openness to Experience Scenario & Rubric (Microsoft Word)

 MMI Station 5 - Conscientiousness Scenario & Rubric (Microsoft Word)

MMI Station 6 - Group Work Scenario & Rubric (Microsoft Word)

5.8 Assessment Activities throughout Program

Are the multitude of Assessment Activities performed throughout the program effective in support of the mission, vision and goals of DYCSOP?

Measure: Course Review Process

Program level; Direct - Other

Details/Description: Curriculum Committee needs to put into place a regular course review process. Decision made to mirror the process used at the University of Pittsburgh.

Acceptable Target: Just Before classes start AY 2010-2011.

Ideal Target: Two months before classes start AY 2010-2011 so can review first set of P-1 syllabi.

Use Excel Spreadsheet to expedite course intergration process for Collaborative Learning Practicum.

Implementation Plan (timeline): AY 2009-2010

Key/Responsible Personnel: Bob Drobitch (Curriculum Committee) and David Gettman (Assessment Committee).

Supporting Attachments:

 Course Integration Process - Excel File for Insertion into Poster.xlsx (Excel Workbook (Open XML))

 Curriculum Committee Course Review Process draft(1).doc (Microsoft Word)

 Standardized Syllabus-draft.doc (Microsoft Word)

Measure: Faculty Survey - American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy

Program level; Indirect - Survey

Details/Description: This survey collects information from pharmacy faculty and is intended to gather perceptions regarding curriculum quality. The survey was initiated and designed by the AACP/ACPE Task Force on Assessment and Accreditation in 2002 and was revised in 2007 to reflect the release of ACPE's Standards 2007. The intent of the survey is for the colleges and schools of pharmacy to use it as both a curriculum assessment tool and to provide data during a self-study and accreditation review.

Section I: Administrative System

Section II: Recruitment and Retention

Section III: Infrastructure

Section IV: Role and Governance

Section V: Faculty Development

Section VI: Curriculum, Teaching, and Assessment

Section VII: Developing and Supervising Students

Section VIII: Academic Roles

Section IX: Demographic Questions

http://aacp.surveydomain.com/

Acceptable Target: 75% faculty participation

Ideal Target: 100% faculty participation

Implementation Plan (timeline): This survey will open in March for school administration and will close at the end of June (each AY).

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. David Gettman and Leadership Team

Supporting Attachments:

 AACP Faculty Survey (Blank) (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Findings for Faculty Survey - American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy

Summary of Findings: Only staff is Dean's administrative assistant and Assistant Dean of Faculty and Student Affairs administrative assistant.

Results: Acceptable Target Achievement: Met; Ideal Target Achievement: Approaching

Recommendations : Need staff for experiential program and secretaries for both department chairs. Need to form DPC to help handle promotion and tenure issues. Need to improve response rate on faculty survey and develop supplemental questions.

Reflections/Notes : As reflected in the survey, we need to elect faculty members to our DPC so that we can participate in the review process as outlined in the AAUP contract.

Here is language from the contract related to election of members for the DPC:

"Whenever reasonable, the members of a department to be elected to its DPC shall be tenured and hold credentials and a

record of performance at least at a level expected for the candidates to be reviewed by them. "

"Members shall be elected for two (2) year terms, with two (2) regular members elected on even years and one (1) member and the alternate elected in odd years. Elections shall take place at the last department meeting of the academic year preceding the one in which the new members are to begin their terms of service. Faculty members elected to the DPC must have completed or shall have completed at the end of the academic year in which they are elected three (3) years of full-time service at faculty rank at D'Youville College. In extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the department,this requirement may be waived by a simple majority vote of the department. "

Once the DPC committee is formed the members can elect a chair and meet the other requirements. We need to get this committee up and running so that we can follow through with our faculty evaluations.

Substantiating Evidence:

AACP Faculty Survey Summary Report for DYCSoP - 20 JULY 2010 (Microsoft Word)

Response Rate: 84.62%

AACP_Faculty_Survey_-_Peer_Comparisons_with_DYCSoP_-_20_JULY_2010 (Microsoft Word)

Total number of responses: 121; SAME PHARMACY FACULTY SURVEY; BUT, SUMMARY REPORT FOR THE SELECTED 5 SCHOOL(s).

(I.E., UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO, LAKE ERIE COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE, ST. JOHN FISHER COLLEGE, HARDING UNIVERSITY, HUSSON UNIVERSITY)