

# Report of the Council of Deans ACPE (Pearls for ACPE Self-Study Preparation) Task Force

January 11, 2010

Stephanie Gardner (Arkansas), Chair; Members: Mehdi Boroujerdi (Albany), Martin Brown (Long Island), Jan Engle (Illinois at Chicago), Dick Gourley (Tennessee), Greg Leader (Louisiana at Monroe), Jeanette Roberts (Wisconsin)

## Background

The Council of Deans ACPE (Pearls for ACPE Self-Study Preparation) Task Force was formed by American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy Council of Deans Chair Patricia Kroboth (Pittsburgh) at the COD Business Session held at the 2009 AACP Annual Meeting in Boston, MA.

The Task Force was given the following charges:

- *Interview deans and/or their designees from representative schools regarding their experiences with successful practices and/or the things they wish they had done. The schools for consideration would be those who have been or are undergoing evaluation under ACPE Standards 2007.*
- *Develop a quick guide resource of “pearls” that will facilitate the process for member schools as they conduct their self-study evaluations and report in preparation for ACPE accreditation.*
- *Evaluate the “noteworthy examples” provided by ACPE and determine how they can be best utilized by the membership.*

## Process

The Task Force met in person at the Annual Meeting after it was formed. Discussion centered on fulfilling the first two charges. It was determined to conduct telephone interviews with the deans and/or their designees from the schools meeting the criteria in the first charge. The following list of questions was developed:

- *When was your visit?*
- *Who served on your team?*
- *What was your overall impression?*
- *Which three standards caused you the most concern?*
- *What would you have done differently in retrospect?*
- *What did you do that you would recommend to others?*
- *What really worked for you?*

Twenty-one schools were subsequently identified that met the criteria. Each Task Force member was assigned approximately three schools to contact for an interview. Sixteen schools participated in the interviews.

## Nuggets from Experience and Wisdom

Schools were asked what they would recommend to others and to identify things that worked well for them. They were also asked what they might have done differently in retrospect. In many cases the items suggested for retrospection corresponded to items recommended by other schools. The following section attempts to categorize the advice offered by the schools as well as additional items put forth by members of the Task Force.

- **Start Early**

Most schools recommend beginning the self-study process approximately two years ahead of the scheduled on-site visit although one school indicated this was not sufficient time for it.

*Point to consider:*

- What is the culture at your school with respect to accomplishing tasks or projects? If committees accomplish charges in a timely fashion then perhaps two years will be sufficient. On the other hand if the work of committees tends to drag or is only completed with considerable prodding then consider allowing additional time for the self-study.
- STOP! Early on you need to consider what the expectations of self-study are with respect to upper university administration and/or your institution's governing body (Board of Regents, Board of Trustees). Institutions vary considerably, in some cases the delivery of a completed self-study is all that is expected or required. Other places these external constituencies to your school may expect to be engaged, to varying levels, in the process at a very early stage. If you are unsure find out. Regardless of the expectations it's advisable to keep your immediate superior informed on a regular basis regarding progress of the self-study.
- Establish a timeline with deadline dates for different phases of the self-study to be completed. Some find that an effective method of doing this is to start from the date that submission or approval of the self-study is required and work backward assuring that sufficient time is allotted for each step.

- **Identify Experienced and Competent Leadership**

Schools typically select one or two individuals to serve as chair or co-chairs, respectively, to head the self-study process. Usually selected from among the faculty, it is recommended that these individuals should have a record of experience and competence as well as a demonstrated ability to lead, particularly as it relates to committee work. The individuals should be familiar with the self-study process and ideally, should have participated in at least one prior visit to their institution. One great quality for the self-study leader to have is inclusiveness, as individuals from most constituencies of the school will be involved in the process. Other able individuals should also be selected to lead subcommittees or other working groups involved in the self-study (*see below: Organize the Self-Study Process*).

*Points to consider:*

- Send your self-study leader and/or your lead team to all meetings where ACPE discusses accreditation. Significant information and insight may be obtained from these sessions both

from the formal presentations and from the question and answer periods that often is unavailable elsewhere. Those attending should ensure that pertinent information is widely disseminated back at the school.

- Two schools recommended that the self-study leader complete the ACPE training for on-site evaluators and, preferably, participate in several site visits (or in the words of one school, "as many site visits as possible in preparation").
- Now is probably not the time to give opportunity to that special and very promising young faculty member to build experience as the self-study leader (as one school found much to its regret). If you want to provide that experience-building you might consider having such a person serve as a subcommittee chair or lead some other working group related to the self-study.
- One school found it beneficial to utilize its standing Institutional Research and Assessment Committee, led by school's assistant dean for assessment, as the overall coordinating group for the self-study.

- **Organize the Self-Study Process**

Many schools organize their self-study process by forming subcommittees, teams or task forces that correspond to the six sections of the standards (mission, planning and evaluation; organization and administration; curriculum; students; faculty and staff; and facilities and resources). Typically these groups are formed explicitly for the self-study process.

*Points to consider:*

- Most schools recommend that these working subgroups be inclusive in that there are representatives from the various constituencies or stakeholders of the school. This might include not only faculty but also students, alumni, staff, preceptors as well as others. Some schools include representatives of all constituencies on each subgroup while others may use a subset of the constituencies that they feel are most pertinent to the subgroups' various assignments.
- The leaders of all the subgroups should come together with the leadership for the overall self-study on a frequent basis. For many schools this group is established formally as the Self-Study Steering Committee or other similar name. Schools vary as to whether such meetings are held at regularly intervals (such as monthly) or on an as-needed basis. Schools that hold as-needed meetings are likely to find that the interval between meetings decreases as the self-study process moves from its beginning phases toward completion.
- Two schools reported success by utilizing existing standing committees, where possible, and assigned standards that were relevant to the committees' existing charges. One of the schools noted that this resulted in less need to bring working groups "up to speed" since members were already familiar with existing issues.
- The standards that apply to curriculum are quite extensive. One school facilitated the review of these standards by dividing the tasks between two working groups, one for the didactic portion and the other for the experiential portion. Another school also divided the work, this time by dividing it between a curriculum group and a curricular assessment group.

- One school found that identifying and empowering a small team for each of the 30 standards worked well for it.

- **Educate the Participants**

One school held an all day session on campus to discuss the standards, ACPE requirements, the self-study template and the rubric with faculty, students, preceptors and other constituents who were to be directly involved in the self-study process to assure that everyone understood the expectations and how the template and other forms were to be completed. This was found to be particularly beneficial. Another school prepared starter packets of information that were distributed to each member of its task force. The packet included the school's previous self-study report, the previous evaluation team report, the ACPE standards, as well as other documents and data that were already available when the packets were assembled.

*Points to consider:*

- ACPE's expectations and processes with respect to self-study have changed considerably. Even faculty and others that have considerable previous experience with self-studies would probably benefit from a session as outlined above.
- Two schools, when asked what they would do differently, specifically indicated they would have had training sessions that covered the same material as mentioned above.

- **Make Use of ACPE Staff**

ACPE makes professional staff available for consultative visits. Utilize this service. Schools report arranging for staff visits at various stages of their self-study process, some at the beginning, some near the mid-point, and others as they are nearing completion. Regardless of the timing of the visits all schools report that ACPE staff visits are particularly beneficial in providing appropriate guidance and direction. Exclusive of visits, consult with ACPE staff whenever you have questions. Guessing as to what is right or how to proceed is unwise, and may be seriously detrimental to your self-study if a bad guess early in the process ends up leading you far down a wrong path.

*Points to consider:*

- Prepare a schedule of meetings and/or events for the staff visit in advance. Consider which individuals and groups might benefit most from consulting with the staff member. If you are unsure about this just ask. The ACPE staff will often provide recommendations for visits depending on your stated goals and needs.
- Consider consulting with ACPE staff even for interim reports. One school noted that throughout the process of preparing its latest interim report the school asked ACPE staff at key points to review its approach to the areas of concern. The school reported that this removed a lot of the uncertainty that existed in preparing the report and believed that it also largely resulted in ACPE's very positive assessment of its efforts to address the issues.

- **Collect Documents Early**

It is expected that a wide variety of documents will be utilized by your working groups to assess compliance with the accreditation standards. Documents required and/or suggested by ACPE are listed at the beginning of each one of the six major groups of standards in the *ACPE Standards 2007 Self-Study Template for Colleges and Schools* available on the ACPE website. Work toward collecting these documents should be done early in the self-study process as a major portion of each subgroup's work will be based on evaluating how they demonstrate compliance with the standards.

*Points to consider:*

- A number of documents may be required by more than one subgroup. Consider compiling a master list of the documents and identifying the individual(s) and/or group(s) responsible for obtaining (or developing if the document does not yet exist) the materials. This will likely be appreciated by those who might otherwise receive many requests from multiple subgroups for various documents. This should also aid in reducing those circumstances where potentially conflicting information and data might be obtained due to utilizing different sources for the same requests.
- One school reported success in utilizing the University's course management system as a repository for gathered documents thus facilitating distribution and access to all working groups. Another school reported using Microsoft SharePoint for much the same purpose as well as a means for individuals to provide input through the entire self-study process.

- **Assess, Assess, Assess**

As one school put it, "Assess everything!" Keep in mind that self-study is an assessment process and that many, if not most, of the procedures, standards, and best practices for doing programmatic, institutional and curricular assessments can and do apply toward self-study. Think about how you might apply what has been learned from AACCP meetings and institutes, as well as from your own faculty development programs on assessment, to your self-study process. Assessments derived only from your programmatic and/or curricular assessment plans, while necessary, are probably not sufficient. ACPE expects that much of the evidence for meeting the standards to be derived from quantitative and qualitative assessments.

*Points to Consider:*

- Ensure that your school participates in the AACCP/ACPE surveys of graduating students, faculty, alumni and preceptors. These surveys are required for the self-study. Pay attention to survey opening and closing dates to best ascertain that you are participating in survey administrations that are timely for your self-study yet are as near the date of your on-site evaluation as possible for utilizing the results.
- Standard No. 3: Evaluation of Achievement of Mission and Goals was problematic for several schools. The school must have an evaluation plan that assesses achievement of the mission and goals. It is beneficial to demonstrate the linkages between the school's vision and mission statements and its goals. Goals should be presented within the context of an overall strategic plan for the school. Ideally, for ease in demonstrating that goals are being

- achieved, outcomes for the goals should be expressed in terms that are measurable as well as have stated metrics/indicators that confirm achievement. The evaluation plan should then detail the assessments that will be utilized for measuring achievement of the goals. You likely will be asked to demonstrate when assessments conducted as part of your evaluation plan indicate that changes or improvements are needed toward achievement of your mission and goals that the information has been utilized for the same. Some schools reported that tables or charts showing how assessments were used for quality improvement were appreciated by the site evaluation team.
- Standard No. 15: Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning and Curricular Effectiveness was also problematic for several schools. Schools must carry out curricular assessment activities as a component of their overall evaluation plan. A key point to keep in mind is that the evaluation plan is not limited to curricular assessment. It must include evaluation of the school's mission and goals as indicated in the bullet point immediately above. One way schools have ensured that curricular assessment is not the sum of their overall evaluation plan is to develop a separate curricular assessment plan that is then linked to the overall plan. While a separate curricular assessment plan is not required by Standard 15 it is recommended by schools that have developed the same. Similar to the overall evaluation plan, curricular assessment activities should be linked to the curricular goals or outcomes of the professional program. Likewise, you will need to demonstrate how assessment results have been utilized for curricular improvement. Again, tables and charts that illustrate this will aid the evaluation team in its review.
  - One school suggested having the chair of each team do an initial evaluation (prior to starting self-study) of his/her team's assigned standards and whether the program is in compliance. By doing so, immediate steps to strengthen the program's position might begin earlier than waiting until issues are later identified in self-study. A second school had its executive committee read through the standards and started working on solutions in a few areas before the official self-study process began.
  - In a similar vein to the preceding bullet point another school indicated that as it went through the self-study it tried to correct problems as they were identified, thus helping to assure that plans for corrective actions were already in place.
- **Closing the Loops, Achieving Buy-In**

It is critically important to keep all stakeholders informed on the overall progress of the self-study and to obtain buy-in on its contents. As mention previously under Organizing the Self-Study Process the leaders of the working subgroups along with the leader(s) of the overall self-study should meet on a regular basis. Yet there is a continuing need to keep individuals and/or groups external to the self-study steering committee informed on progress and issues. As a dean, it is possible that you may not be part of the steering committee or any of the working groups. As one dean said, "I stayed out of the way and let the Self-Study Committee do its work."

*Points to Consider:*

- Members of the steering committee should be kept well-informed on the progress of each subgroup. One school found it particularly effective that as the first and second drafts of each subgroup's report was completed to have the respective chairs present their findings to the steering committee. Steering committee members reviewed each document and provided feedback to the subgroup chairs.
- Ensure that there is a mechanism to keep yourself as well as other members of the administrative team updated on a regular basis. Several schools suggest making the self-study a permanent agenda item on the executive committee or administrative team meetings. Invite the self-study head, and if needed heads of selected subgroups, to give reports.
- Ensure that the entire faculty is updated on a regular basis. Without regular updates faculty members may have difficulty determining progress on the self-study beyond the subgroup(s) they are serving on. As other schools have done, consider making the self-study a permanent agenda item for faculty meetings in a similar fashion as suggested for the administrative team.
- Ensure that there are mechanisms in place to keep other stakeholders informed on progress. Consider the culture of your institution in determining the appropriate frequency, depth and breadth of the updates. One school reported that the self-study was discussed at each student class meeting held in the year leading up to the on-site evaluation visit.
- As drafts of the self-study become available ensure that they are widely distributed. Consider the format for distribution. Schools report distributing drafts on paper, CD-ROM, via the Internet or an intranet, using one form or a combination of several. Make sure that all stakeholders are aware of whatever mechanism has been put in place to receive comments and corrections.
- As various drafts of the self-study are made available many schools hold town hall meetings and/or retreats to consider the document. Some schools might hold just one such event while others hold several. Invitee lists also vary. In some cases, often in regard to an early draft, a retreat might just involve the steering committee or perhaps all members of the various working groups. Other individuals might also attend such as members of the administrative team. Other schools may hold individual events for specific groups of stakeholders such as the entire faculty, student leaders or the entire student body, alumni, preceptors, and/or others. Finally, some schools fully embrace the concept of a town hall meeting by extending invitations to all stakeholders. Whatever the setting these meetings typically involve presentations of the self-study, often with individual subgroup chairs leading their sections of the report. Time is allotted for questions, comments and pointing out errors. Schools report that these types of events are effective for gaining buy-in as differences of opinions can be discussed, compromises agreed to and consensus built. It should also be noted that such events are also helpful for providing faculty and others who may not read the report with some familiarity with the process and findings.

- **Preparing the Report**

First, and foremost, be sure to use the *ACPE Standards 2007 Self-Study Template for Colleges and*

*Schools* for preparing the report and pay careful attention to the *ACPE 2007 Self-Study Guide* in completing the template. Additionally, ACPE encourages the submission of the self-study in electronic format. Electronic documents should conform to *ACPE Guidelines for Preparing Electronic Self-Study Documents*. Each of the above mentioned documents may be found on the ACPE website.

*Points to Consider:*

- A number of schools noted to be honest and forthright. ACPE notes the same in its Self-Study Guide. Be straightforward and if you have a weakness, identify it and provide a method for resolving the issue. Don't try to hide anything from the site team. Remember, the team's primary job is to confirm what is contained in the self-study.
- While weaknesses should be identified don't forget your strengths. Self-study is a time to consider the entirety of your program. While there may be a natural tendency to focus on areas that need improvement take the opportunity to also highlight the positives and recent achievements.
- Consider asking other schools if they are willing to share their self-studies. Many are happy to do so. (Some schools have even published their self-studies on their websites. You might even consider publishing your own self-study when it is completed. If everyone were to do so it would be a phenomenal way to share ideas and best practices.) Seeing how another school has approached its report may be a significant aid toward guiding the preparation of your own report. Plagiarism, of course, is frowned upon.
- An interesting perspective suggested by one school is to adopt of an attitude of becoming better as the self-study is written. The idea is that instead of merely establishing that you meet a standard this will also cause you to identify areas for improvement.
- ACPE has established guidelines for the length of the overall report as well as the length devoted to each individual standard. Most individuals with previous experience with self-studies will find these length requirements considerably abbreviated from what they are accustomed to. It's suggested to be prepared for extensive editing on initial draft submissions to pare them down to acceptable lengths.
- One school highly recommended the use of a robust document management system for the preparation of the self-study. It noted that due to the new length requirements the DMS facilitated managing the increased number of iterations of the report due to the tighter editing requirements. The DMS also eased the management of the many documents and appendices.
- Establish style guidelines for your report including elements such as tense for prose; abbreviation usage; references to external documents and appendices; usage of honorifics and position titles; formatting of tables, various types of paragraphs and bullets including indentations and spacing between; as well as all other matter of presentation. ACPE's Self-Study Guide includes specifications for font size and line spacing. Consider holding a working session for all those individuals involved in writing the report to ensure they are knowledgeable with regard to style and usage. It is true that, as grade school teachers have admonished for time immemorial, neatness counts. Or as you may suggest to faculty

members, wizened or wise, the report should take on the air of the art of pharmaceutical elegance.

- Several schools made use of a designated writing team to prepare drafts as the self-study neared its final stages. It is suggested that this team be comprised of experienced writers who may not necessarily be members of the self-study steering committee, depending upon individual writing ability. Remember, space is limited and it takes considerable talent to craft concise yet informative prose that fully addresses each standard.
  - When it comes time for the final draft some schools elect to choose just one or perhaps two individuals to prepare it with the desire to help ensure a consistent style and tone of voice. Some schools also may opt for an outside editor. A couple of responding schools utilized a paid professional editor. Another hired an outside proofreader. One other school enrolled the services of its Director of the Writing Program. One of the schools sounded a note of caution, however, in regard to utilizing an editor that was unfamiliar with pharmacy and academia. The caution was "don't" based on its experience with the same.
  - Ensure that the report is user friendly. It's suggested that printed copies of the report be spiral-bound so that they might lay flat for ease in reading. One school prepared a companion document that included selected appendices sent separately to site team members for their convenience. Follow ACPE's recommendations in the Self-Study Guide for electronic document preparation. Two schools that took particular care to ensure well-prepared electronic documents with extensive hyperlinks reported being commended by the site team. In addition to the commonly used CD-ROM for distribution one school reporting sending site team members the electronic documents on a USB flashdrive, noting that many newer laptops do not have optical drives to accommodate a CD.
  - Be aware of not only the school's, but also any institutional policies, that relate to the required approvals before the self-study may be sent to ACPE and make sure each required approval is obtained.
- **Preparing for the Site Visit**

Woe to the school that prepares the acme of self-study reports that inadequately prepares for the site visit. Make sure everyone and everything is ready for the big event.

*Points to Consider:*

- Ensure that all faculty, student leaders, key staff, preceptors, university officials and any other individuals that may be meeting with the site team have a copy of the final self-study report. While everyone should be expected to read the report in its entirety make sure that members of committees or other groups that are scheduled to meet with the team are thoroughly familiar with the section(s) that pertain to them as well as associated supporting documents and appendices. It may be helpful to provide these individuals with the specific page numbers they are to review.
- Provide all faculty and all other persons involved with the self-study a complete walk through of the site visit process. Be sure to distribute the agenda to all. Ensure that all persons scheduled to meet with the team, either as a member of a group or individually, has

entered the appointments on their calendars as well as committed their obligations to memory.

- Consider an inclusive format for inviting students, preceptors, as well as faculty for individual meetings, to meet with the on-site team.
- Carefully review the list of required on-site documents as indicated in the ACPE Self-Study Template. Consider making available other documents that team members may find useful or informative. Take the extra effort to assure that all on-site materials are attractively presented and neatly and logically arranged.
- Consider holding practice sessions with the different groups that will be meeting with the site team. If the self-study lead or another member of your school has attended an ACPE training session for site evaluators consider distributing and discussing the list of potential questions that is provided to attendees of the ACPE training. If you do not have that list of questions ask your colleagues at other schools if they would be willing to share.
- ACPE will provide a suggested agenda for the team prior to the visit. Consider it carefully and work with ACPE to develop a final agenda that is appropriate for your school. Perhaps you have a committee structure that is somewhat different than the one presented in the sample agenda. Or maybe you know that the time specified for transportation to and from experiential sites is not reflective of the actual time required. The goal is to assure that you have a workable agenda that may be easily adhered to for the site visit.
- Prepare your schedule such that individuals that are transporting team members from one appointment to another, to experiential sites, as well as to and from airports, hotels and restaurants are well informed and can clearly answer questions that team members might have. Plan travel routes, as well as alternative routes, in advance, whether by foot or car. Consider routes, while relatively direct, that might provide some historical or cultural perspective to your community or that offer pleasant scenery. Advise transporters to wash cars and clean their interiors. Make sure drivers escorting team members to experiential facilities are familiar with parking and the entrance(s) to be used. If drivers from the school are not utilized arrange for ground transportation from a reliable company.
- On a similar note to the above ensure that individuals conducting on-campus and off-campus tours of facilities are able to adequately articulate the purpose and use of all facilities in the tours. Wherever possible, try to have individuals responsible for stops on the tour available to briefly discuss the area and answer questions. This should also be the case for on-campus tours of non-school facilities such as the library, computer labs and other areas. Ask the other departments to also make someone available to meet team members on tour.
- Ensure that all areas that will be seen and visited by team members are clean and tidy, lights are working, and heating and cooling is comfortable. Individuals who regularly participate in on-site visits are accustomed to the smell of fresh paint so don't be shy about using the powers that a fresh coat can bring toward sprucing up an area. Faculty and staff should be advised to clean up their offices, laboratories and other personal workspaces. Neatness and cleanliness also apply to the persons of faculty and staff. Encourage the wearing of appropriate business attire for the duration of the team's visit.

- A few welcome signs posted around the school are sure to be appreciated. Also consider welcoming messages on display boards or other signage by campus entrances that will be utilized by the team.
- Team members will usually arrive in the afternoon of the first day of the site visit. Some may have traveled long distances. Consider having available light sandwiches, other snacks and sweets, and beverages. When team members arrive one of the first things to remember is to point out the restroom facilities available for their use. Keep in mind that restroom facilities may receive heavier use than normal during the team's visit. Check facilities on a regular basis for cleanliness and adequacy of supplies such as soap and paper towels. Also indicate where team members may stow their personal belongings such as coats and suitcases while they are on-campus.
- Consider having coffee, tea, water, sodas and other appropriate beverages available for all team sessions. Small pastries or sweets will also likely be appreciated. Have staff available to quickly bus the room between sessions by removing used cups, napkins and other items, straightening the beverage service area, and refilling pots, sugar and cream containers, and other items as needed.
- ACPE will likely ask for assistance in making hotel and restaurant reservations. Ask if any team members have special needs or requirements such as disabled access rooms or dietary restrictions or preferences. Consider these needs not only for hotels and restaurants but also for access to any facilities the team may utilize and food that is served while the team is on-campus. Since you may not have opportunity to frequent your local inns visit them to check on quality of facilities and service as well as cleanliness. Team members often like to work over dinner so identify restaurants that are able to offer a quiet and reasonably secluded area for the team.

- **A Few More Nuggets**

Not all gems are easily classified, even by the most experienced lapidary. Here are a few more for your perusal.

*Things to Consider:*

- Two schools reported that site team members had difficulty understanding presented financial documents. It is recommended to present this information in a very standardized format particularly if your school or institution is wont to use the arcane forms of the mystical cult of not-for-profit accountants.
- One school recommended to make sure an experienced dean from a like school is on the site visit team. Have a discussion early-on with ACPE and discuss the composition of the team. There are no guarantees that your requests will be honored but dialogue on this issue may be useful.
- By all means possible have your IPPE and APPE courses up and running when the site team visits.

- Don't neglect programs you may be closing. One school had a nontraditional PharmD program that was in the process of graduating its remaining five students. The team wanted a detailed progress report on this group.
- IPPEs should include time spent in both institutions and community pharmacies. Don't substitute additional experience in one if the student has well-documented work experience in the other. It won't fly.

## Standards that Caused Difficulty

Schools were asked to identify three standards that caused them difficulty. The following summarizes their replies as well as elaborations, if provided.

### **Standard No. 2: Strategic Plan** *(2 schools)*

One school identifying this standard had been cited previously for its strategic planning process with respect to the lack of involvement of all the school's constituencies in the process. The self-study chair was aware of this concern and made attempts to engage the then dean to remedy this issue before the site visit but it ended up not being addressed. As a result the school was cited on this issue and asked to address it in an interim report. The other school did not provide additional information.

### **Standard No. 3: Evaluation of Achievement of Mission and Goals** *(5 schools)*

One school indicate its difficulty was due to not having a formal plan of assessment as well as for not well utilizing the assessments that were being done to effect change through continuous quality improvement. A second school indicated it had a comprehensive college evaluation plan and that its self-study was replete with examples of assessment activities used to make improvements. The school was uncertain why the evaluation team recommended further documentation. A third school indicated it was asked to submit departmental strategic plans in addition to its overall strategic plan. The school noted it seemed a little artificial to go back and separate out the departmental goals from its strategic plan since the plan was put together by the entire faculty at a retreat. Two additional schools did not provide elaboration.

### **Standard No. 5: College or School and University Relationship** *(1 school)*

The school did not provide elaboration.

### **Standard No. 7: College or School Organization and Governance** *(1 school)*

The school did not provide elaboration.

### **Standard No. 9: The Goal of the Curriculum** *(1 school)*

The school identifying this standard indicated it received a partially compliant rating due to its NAPLEX pass rate being consistently below the national pass rate. The school has been cognizant of that fact and has been working on strategies to improve the passing rate. The school expressed concern, however, that its passing rate did not fall in a range that would trigger ACPE review as per its policies and procedures. The school was left with uncertainty as to what passing rate would be considered acceptable.

**Standard No. 10: Curricular Development, Delivery and Improvement (3 schools)**

One school identifying this standard indicated that it had very little time to develop and implement IPPEs. The school had a plan for implementation but indicated in its self-study that due to a lack of resources the plan would be difficult to implement. As the school expected, it was cited. A second school indicated the site team was concerned about the lack of active learning and variety of teaching methods in its old curriculum and the implementation of its new integrated curriculum. The third school indicated the site team expressed concern that in-progress classes of student were not required to complete the expanded IPPEs and APPEs. The school had previously notified ACPE that state regulations prohibited it from subjecting matriculated students to the new requirements and the school was in receipt of a letter of acknowledgment and understanding from ACPE in this regard. Yet the school was found to be partially in compliance with the standard.

**Standard No. 11: Teaching and Learning Methods (1 school)**

The school identifying this standard indicated the team felt that there needed to be more integration, active and self-directed learning, and use of small groups. The team was also concerned that syllabi were not consistent across all courses and those syllabi did not indicate how courses fit into the overall curriculum.

**Standard No. 13: Curricular Core—Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Values (2 schools)**

One school identifying this standard indicated it had difficulty for the same reason as was cited for Standard 10, that there was a concern about the lack of active learning and variety of teaching methods in the old curriculum and the implementation of its new integrated curriculum. The second school indicated that the site team was concerned that, while the school had developed a curricular map, that it did not map the curriculum against Standards 2007 Appendix B.

**Standard No. 14: Curricular Core—Pharmacy Practice Experiences (9 schools)**

Two of the schools identifying this standard did not provide further elaboration. The remaining seven schools all indicated that IPPEs were a concern with three of these schools also indicating that APPEs were a concern. Of the schools further elaborating two indicated they had not yet implemented their IPPEs and one indicated the team recommended an adjustment to ensure all IPPE activities were actual patient care situations and that there needed to be better definition and documentation of the progressive nature of the IPPEs. One school indicated the team was concerned that the language in its course catalog regarding APPEs did not match ACPE's language. Finally, one school indicated it had not adequately addressed the required number of hours for both IPPEs and APPEs. The school indicated that while some individuals at the college were aware of the number of hours that had been specified by ACPE for both IPPEs and APPEs that the information did not get to all of the people at the school that needed to know.

**Standard No. 15: Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning and Curricular Effectiveness (4 schools):**

One school identifying this standard indicated it had poorly described its assessment plan in the self-study. A second school indicated its problems revolved around the need to ensure an appropriate feedback loop for assessment data so that it is used for curricular improvement. A third school while not

providing express elaboration about the cause of its difficulties did express concern with assessment being yet another unfunded mandate and wondered if there is real evidence to support mandating certain assessment activities such as portfolios. A fourth school did not provide additional elaboration.

**Standard No. 19: Progression of Students** (3 schools)

One school identifying this standard indicated the team's concern with student progression in various courses and the need to identify and remove barriers to progression. The two other schools both expressed concern that there is unclear guidance on the various percentages related to progression that are acceptable. One of these schools indicated its percentages were favorable in relation to peer schools and the other school indicated its percentages were well with the national ranges reported by AACCP. Both of these schools indicated they were at somewhat of a loss as to what they needed to achieve to be in compliance. One of these schools also reported confusion over how progression data should be presented. It indicated it had been provided with a table before the site visit and then after site visit it received a second table requesting data to be reported in a different format.

**Standard 22: Student Representation and Perspectives** (1 school)

The school did not provide elaboration.

**Standard 24: Faculty and Staff—Quantitative Factors** (7 schools)

Five of the schools did not provide further elaboration. One school indicated that faculty numbers in social and administrative sciences were specifically of concern while the remaining school indicated that it was an issue with faculty/student ratios.

**Standard 25: Faculty and Staff—Qualitative Factors** (1 school)

The school did not provide elaboration.

**Standard 26: Faculty and Staff Continuing Professional Development and Performance Review**  
(1 school)

The school identifying this standard indicated the issue related to not having a school wide policy with respect to continuing professional development and performance review even though its departments on an individual basis had long standing policies and procedures on the same.

**Standard 27: Physical Facilities** (2 schools)

The two schools identifying this standard did not provide further elaboration although one indicated it knew it would not meet the standard.

**Standard 29: Library and Educational Resources** (1 school)

The school identifying this standard indicated it was a result of university budget cuts that had left it without appropriate library resources.

**Standard 30: Financial Resources** (6 schools)

Three of the schools identifying this standard did not provide further elaboration. One school indicated financial resources had been a long standing problem due to inadequate state funding for the professional degree program. A second school indicated the team was concerned about contingency

planning related to changes in the economy as well as for the potential impact of a new degree program coming online. The third school felt that team members did not sufficiently understand the complexities of university finances. The team was critical that students in the school were charged a differential tuition than the general undergraduate tuition for the university. The team seemed unconvinced of the justifications offered such as evidence of higher costs to deliver programming including faculty salaries and that it was not an undergraduate program but rather a first professional doctoral program. Secondly, the school reported that the team focused on what it considered to be a relatively weak contribution to the finances of the school from research grants even though both the school and the university are considered primarily teaching intensive institutions.

### **Noteworthy Examples**

The Task Force contacted ACPE regarding the final charge to evaluate “noteworthy examples” and determine how they can be best utilized by the membership. The Task Force was informed that ACPE has recently begun submitting examples of “best practices” to the AACP Board of Directors based on site visits during the last six months. ACPE asks the dean at the time of their site visit if they would agree to be identified based on a “noteworthy example” noted during the visit. The Task Force suggests that this information be shared with the membership through the AACP website.