

Institutional Research and Assessment Committee (IRAC) meeting September 28-29, 2009

Attendees:

Cindy Stowe (Arkansas), Chair
Ronnie Allen (Xavier)
Julie Hixson-Wallace (Harding)
Steve Scott (Purdue)
Deb Strupe (Maryland)
Reza Taheri (Loma Linda)
Margarita Divall (Northeastern)
Danielle Taylor (AACP staff)
Jen Patton (AACP staff)
Cecilia Plaza (AACP staff)

Pharmacy Education Assessment Services (PEAS)

The IRAC was asked to develop strategies to increase the success of PEAS (ie, increase tool submission, use of tools by members, and the use of the discussion board). Some barriers to using PEAS that were identified by the Committee were: concerns over intellectual property, the reciprocity of receiving tools in addition to submitting tools, and the call for submissions not reaching all the possible people who would submit a tool at the college. The consensus of the Committee was that the creation and implementation of the proposed Assessment SIG would be the biggest boost to all areas of PEAS – particularly the use of the discussion board component. Some of the strategies they identified are:

- Collaborating with different SIGs since assessment cut across the different groups represented in those different groups
- Query AJPE to determine potential tools and ask the authors to submit them to PEAS
- Since authors often submit tools as appendices to their manuscripts which are not included in the final publication due to space limitations, request that the editors of AJPE encourage those authors to submit those tools to PEAS.
- In email communications include links to the featured tools to help draw people in – similar to the technique using in the AACP Advocacy Updates sent by Will Lang.
- Provide an update on the status of PEAS at the Dean's Retreat, including potentially a short demo, as well as ask Deans to provide the name of people to push submission request to that could be "champions" to encourage others at the college to submit.
- Request that the new Assessment SIG once formally formed use the discussion board for interaction among members to increase use of this part of PEAS

Assessment Award

The Committee came to consensus on putting the following wording in the call for submissions for the 2010 Award for Excellence in Assessment:

Submissions are welcome in any focused area of programmatic assessment. Suggested areas for the 2010 Award are:

- Student Assessment of Professionalism
- Continuous Professional Development of teaching (didactic or experiential)
- Student Learning Outcomes for IPPEs

Financial Survey

The Committee participated in a conference call with Charlotte Klaus (Colorado) and Jim Bono (UIC) from the Academic Financial Officers (AFO) SIG concerning that group's proposed revisions to the AACP Financial Survey. The AFO SIG wanted to create uniform, replicable, clear points of data out of the financial survey because they had discovered within their membership patterns of misunderstandings with multiple possible interpretations of items on the current financial survey. The IRAC decided to proceed with the pilot test of the revised version of the financial survey with the following steps added to the pilot study methodology:

- A query of CEO deans be conducted to determine support for a revised survey since this group constitute the ultimate consumers of those data.
- Potential vetting with the COD administrative board
- Over sampling of private colleges/schools since they were not as represented in the group that developed the revised survey
- Schools that did not participate in the current financial survey will be asked to complete the revised survey to determine if it is easier to complete and thus could increase response rates. Special consideration will be given to sample those colleges/schools that do not have financial officers.

Employer Survey

The committee worked on drafting an employer survey for inclusion in PEAS.

IPPE Taskforce Discussion

The Committee was tasked with looking at the competencies generated from the AACP IPPE Taskforce and recommend general strategies for assessing them. The Committee came with up the following:

The Institutional Research Assessment Committee (IRAC) of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) was asked to consider and recommend general strategies for assessment of pre-advanced pharmacy practice experience (APPE) requirements as defined and developed by the AACP Task Force on Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experience (IPPE) Competencies.

IRAC recommends that all APPE syllabi include specific prior learning outcome statements for each experience (e.g. expected necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes) and suggests that the Task Force report be used as a guide in developing these prior learning outcome statements. Student achievement of these outcomes should be assessed and documented by schools and college prior to students entering APPE training. Assessment activities should include a mix of summative and formative methodologies as appropriate for the type of outcome being assessed, and may include (but is not limited to):

- Paid pharmacy experiences (e.g. co-op education and/or internships) with employer and faculty evaluations and/or student self reflection;
- Unpaid pharmacy experiences (e.g. IPPE training) with preceptor evaluation and/or student self reflection;
- Non-pharmacy experience (e.g. service learning) with site evaluation and student self reflection and/or facilitated discussion; and

- Simulated/laboratory experiences such as lab practicals (e.g., compounding – sterile & non-sterile, communication – counseling & conflict resolution) and objective structured clinical examinations.

Schools and colleges should also evaluate student readiness to enter APPE training and student achievement of program specific pre-APPE outcomes through periodic and systematic data collection from APPE preceptors using surveys (e.g. ACPE/AACP Preceptor survey), focus groups, and/or other appropriate evaluative methods.

Surveys

In addressing the various recommendations put forth by the various Committees of the Association and came up with the following:

Source	Recommendation	Action by IRAC
COF Faculty Affairs Committee:	Recommendation 3: AACP survey the faculty or add questions to the existing AACP's faculty survey to determine the non-monetary needs of the faculty based on age, faculty rank and title— as well as reasons for both entering and leaving academia.	Using the COD for guidance for both: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRAC to develop a survey to administer to all new faculty identified through AACP when they receive their free first year membership. • IRAC to potentially develop an exit survey for faculty to determine reasons for leaving to be reported back in aggregate. Would be given directly to faculty leaving as opposed to the AACP Faculty Vacancy Survey which is completed by the college/school
Report of the 2008-09 Professional Affairs Committee	Recommendation 2. AACP should collaborate with ASHP to track outcomes of residents.	A subgroup of IRAC members could participate but the Committee felt that this should be an ASHP driven initiative
	Recommendation 4. AACP should develop an electronic toolbox that provides access to examples of successful partnership models as well as the tools (example contracts, responsibility delineations, core curricula, accreditation form examples, technology descriptions, etc.) that facilitate the development of	The Committee felt that this was outside of the purview of IRAC

	new partnerships in postgraduate pharmacy education.	
	Recommendation 6. AACP should systematically collect data through Institutional Research to increase visibility of the capacity and contributions of member institutions involvement in residency programs.	IRAC to develop a survey to administer to all new faculty identified through AACP when they receive their free first year membership.
Report of the 2008-09 Research and Graduate Affairs Committee:	Recommendation 1: The AACP Institutional Research Enrollment and Graduation Surveys should collect enrollments and graduation data from all formally recognized college/school of pharmacy dual degree programs. The number of students enrolled and graduating from the PharmD program component should be reported as usual. The number and type of dual degrees awarded should be reported only after both degrees have been awarded and reported to AACP as a separate dual degree category.	IRAC referring AACP to the Graduating Student Survey item on dual-degree completion. The IRAC felt that these data would be too difficult given that they are often not concurrent conferred degrees and are such small numbers of the total student population.

The IRAC will also develop a brief form for submission of recommendations from Committees of the Association to provide more information on context and rationale to facilitate consideration of proposed actions.