

IRAC Meeting Minutes November 16-17, 2010

Committee Members:

Margarita DiVall, Committee Chair
Mehdi Boroujerdi (Albany)
Kimberly Deloatch (UNC)
Julie Hixson-Wallace (Harding)
Cheryl Holcomb (Kansas)
Eric Johnson (Oklahoma)
Reza Taheri (Loma Linda)
Charles Taylor (Minnesota)
Jeffrey Wadelin (ACPE Staff)
Jennifer Patton (AACP Staff)
Danielle Taylor (AACP Staff)
Cecilia Plaza (AACP Staff)

Financial Survey Discussion

- Discussion of the purpose of the survey and the need to set up objectives that are specific to the survey.
- Uses identified included: peer comparisons among institutions (to the extent that that happens) and those data feeding into the AAMS as they relate to Standard 30 for the Self-Study.
- There was discussion that the survey should be revised to answer questions related to what deans really want to know – which the Committee agreed were items similar to the ones on the last page of the proposed revised survey rather than the other items.
- There was a desire to be able to benchmark on items within the financial survey that ACPE requests (mainly connected to Standard 30).
- There was discussion about what the different types of business models were at each of the schools and that there could be a need for different, more “customized” surveys for different types of institutions (eg, public versus private).
- From an ACPE perspective, the IRAC was asked whether ACPE should change from asking for financials for the previous 2 years and the current year to asking for financials for 1 year past, the current year, and the projections for the following year.

Recommendations:

1. Suspend the pilot of a revised financial survey for the 2010-2011 cycle in order to gather more information from CEO deans as to their needs with regard to financial information. It was recommended that a representative sampling of deans be used to ascertain what the critical questions that deans wanted answered from a financial survey. Potential areas to address include:
 - Difference in public versus private institutions
 - Does the college/school have a financial officer or does the dean complete the financial survey?
 - Would having an FAQ section/format be more helpful?
 - Which of the sections on the existing financial survey are more often used?

Subgroup of IRAC working group: Eric, Cheryl, Mehdi, Julie, and Charles
2. Review the timing of the administration of the revised financial survey to maximize utility in budget projections.
3. IRAC said that it would be more useful for ACPE to ask for financials for 1 year past, the current year, and the projections for the following year.

Curriculum Quality Perception Surveys

The results of the Rasch analysis of the 4 Curriculum Quality Perception Surveys was discussed. No changes were recommended based on these analyses. Recommendations were provided on how to improve the User’s Guide in

terms of greater detail on how to make comparisons and use those data. The IRAC considered changes/recommendation proposed by survey users and the Committee's recommendations are summarized below:

Recommendations:

1. Add a pull down option for selected items of each of the surveys as to further ascertain potential reasons for disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with item 86 on the graduating student survey.
2. Addition of a comment box at the end of each of the major sections of the surveys rather than just at the end of the survey to capture thoughts and comments as they occur to help further explain responses to items.
3. Collapsing the choices for distance/satellite/branch campus since definitions of these can vary and different schools may use different terms but mean the same thing.
4. On the faculty survey, items related to the proportion of time spent on teaching, service, scholarship, and clinical practice will have a revised scale to indicate the direction in which they agree or disagree (ie, too much, appropriate, too little). This change is intended to provide more information to the school.
5. On the preceptor survey, an "other" choice was added as an option for non-pharmacy bachelor's degrees.
6. Put relevant sections of the Graduating Student survey into an alternate version of that survey that colleges/schools could access through PEAAS to use in other years in the curriculum.
7. See dual degree recommendations below

Excellence in Assessment Award

IRAC determined that the naming of priority areas was too limiting and could restrict the number of submissions. The 2011 call for submissions will not name priority areas.

Dual Degree Data Collection discussion

The IRAC discussed the importance of dual degree programs, the purpose of the collection dual degrees, the distinction between dual versus joint degree programs, the difference between enrolled and conferred, and the double counting of PharmD graduates and graduate degree program graduates. Based on this discussion the following recommendations were made:

Recommendations

1. Given that some of these data are already being collecting, IRAC suggested that there needs to be a better job of reporting those data. The IRAC recommends using the relevant item on the Alumni Survey and the Graduating Student Survey (adding an element of time to the item on the Graduating Student Survey) as proxies to capture when respondents intend to complete their dual degree beyond the PharmD.
2. If AACP were to track dual degrees, should focus on PharmD/PhD program since those were less likely to be joint degree programs with another university and easier for colleges/schools of pharmacy to track and report.

AACP Disciplines/Faculty Vacancy Survey

The IRAC discussed the following points:

- biomedical sciences were neither medicinal chemistry nor pharmacology and that there was a growing use of this term in the Academy and NIH.
- Pharmacogenetics would be sub-discipline of both pharmaceutical sciences and pharmacy practice.
- Possibility of defining pharmacotherapy separate from pharmacy practice.

Recommendation

1. Conduct an exploratory study to quantify the issue of needing to revise the AACP discipline and sub-discipline list as they exist on AACP Institutional Research surveys.

Subgroup of IRAC working group: **Margarita**, Charles, Mehdi

Race/Ethnicity

IRAC discussed allowing respondents to select more than 1 race/ethnicity on the survey. The different ways these data are collected in other surveys was discussed such as IPEDS which allows respondents to select more than 1 race/ethnicity but reports these data as “2 or more” and the differences in the Department of Education versus the Census. More specific data on the race/ethnicity of students would help faculty recruitment to represent the student population. It was also discussed that some colleges/schools may not look as diverse because of the current limitation of only being able to select 1 race/ethnicity. IRAC will examine how non-PharmCAS schools collect race/ethnicity data.

Collection of data by campus

ACPE already requires these data and it was recommended that AACCP match these data collection forms to allow for simplification of collection and allow for comparisons across campuses.

Alumni Survey – collection of data beyond 5 years

IRAC discussed the issue of allowing collection of data from alumni more than 5 years post graduation. The IRAC concluded that that more than 5 years would be for a different purpose than curricular evaluation and that with curricular change data collection could not go too far out.

Recommendation

1. Put relevant sections of the Alumni survey into an alternate version of the Alumni Survey that colleges/schools could access through PEAAS.

Entry/Exit Survey Development Brainstorming

Entry Survey:

- What are other professional associations currently using (eg, AAMC, ADEA, AACN)?
- What is the appropriate timing relative to when a faculty member begins their appointment? This could affect the results (eg, looking at orientation, hiring versus culture and fit)
- Is there more that could be done during recruitment (ie culture) that could eventually affect retention?
- What attracted people to certain schools up front versus other choices? What went right or wrong in the search and recruitment process?
- Given a new generation of faculty – what are their expectations, fears, and drivers? What is attracting them to academia and what is needed to keep them?
- Were the resources promised delivered?
- Are there differences in these factors between tenure-track and non-tenure track?

Recommendation:

1. Examine possibility of following a cohort of new faculty longitudinally across time, re-surveying the cohort 3 years later to see what changed.

Subgroup of IRAC working group: Kim, Margarita, Julie and Reza

Exit Survey:

- Examine issue of mentoring (eg “it take a village to raise a faculty member”)
- Are there ways to capture contingency plans for faculty retirements?
- Should not view exit from college as a negative thing because change can be healthy
- Are preceptors included in this survey as faculty? What are their needs?

Recommendation:

1. Ask colleges/schools to share exit surveys as a resource to begin with when IRAC is ready to work on this survey.

Review of Profile of Pharmacy Faculty (PPF) and Profile of Pharmacy Students (PPS)

The IRAC discussed potential improvements to the reporting in the PPF and PPS.

PPF Discussion:

- Concern over the percent increase in salaries in the PPF and that these data could be artificial.
- Administrative stipends in addition to reporting of base salaries could be useful so schools can ascertain if their stipends are comparable and fair.
- It would be useful to know the change in salary going from assistant to associate professor and from associate to full professor.
- How do advanced credentials affect salaries?

PPS Discussion

- Does a missing school imply it was not-reported or that it was a zero?
- Is there consistency in how respondents are reporting residencies? Are people listing affiliated residencies?
- What is the percentage of students pursuing post graduate residency training?
- Add a footnote for clarification between PharmD1 and PharmD2
- Connect some of the tables to the item asked on the respective survey