

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES OF PHARMACY
2010 COUNCIL OF FACULTIES BUSINESS MEETING**

Salons H-K, Grand Ballroom
Crystal Gateway Marriott ~~ Arlington, VA
Monday, February 8, 2010
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Call to Order

Chair Gary Matzke (Virginia Commonwealth) called the Council of Faculties (COF) Business Meeting to order at 2:05 pm in Salons J and K of the Crystal Gateway Marriott, Arlington, Virginia, on Monday, February 8, 2010.

Introductions and Comments

Chair Matzke began by welcoming everyone and introducing other members of the COF Administrative Board including Dana Hammer (Secretary; Washington), John Bosso (Chair-elect; South Carolina-MUSC), and Julie Szilagyi (Immediate Past Chair; Houston). Virginia (Ginger) Scott (Chair-elect designee; West Virginia) and Cecilia Plaza (AACP Staff) were unavailable due to inclement weather. Chair Matzke previewed the agenda and reminded participants that the link to the agenda and minutes were emailed to members prior to the meeting.

Quorum Committee Report

Quorum committee reported at 230pm we had a quorum with 29 members representing 28 schools.

Report of the Chair

Chair Matzke reported that we are halfway through our year's business and the committees and task forces are working hard. We started off the year with the 2009 Annual meeting theme of "Starting the Revolution." We are hoping to continue to propose solutions. The major questions we asked then were:

- How are we developing leadership in our students and faculty?
- How does your institution permit risk taking and learning from mistakes?
- Are we resting on our past laurels? Are we striving to improve upon what we do?

A question of late is: How involved have you and your colleagues been in the health care reform dialogue? What awaits us in the next 6 months? Continued work from the task forces and committees. For the rest of us, the question is how can we contribute?? We encourage you to contact us with your ideas. The call for volunteers for next year's committees and task forces will be issued later this spring.

Report of the Secretary

Dana Hammer reported that the minutes of the 2009 COF Business Meeting held July 20, 2009 in Boston, MA, were available via download from the AACP website. An email invitation was sent to members in January with the link. The minutes were received and approved.

Report on Board of Directors Activities

COF Immediate Past Chair Szilagyi (Houston) reported that BOD has been busy, such as working with Bernard Consulting Corporation to help the Association create a new strategic plan. BOD is currently reviewing a draft mission and vision statements, six critical issues, and some proposed strategic directions for each of the critical issues. The critical issues will constitute AACCP's major initiatives.

Other initiatives include the online Assessment and Accreditation Management System. An advisory committee is working with online corporation to help them provide this product to our members.

American Pharmacy Educator week – Rebecca Morgan, Communications Director, received 13 reports from schools about to their activities. There is an official bill in the House to recognize this week. We need 40 more sponsors for this proclamation.

Global alliance of pharmacy educators – BOD discussed this as a loose network of pharmacy educators and associations around the world, and that AACCP could serve as a clearinghouse for requests for professional and technical assistance to existing and emerging international schools of pharmacy.

Primary care – AACCP talks with other health care organizations to advance team delivered care. AACCP will serve as a clearinghouse for some of this information. President Baldwin charged the Argus Commission this year with preparing recommendations for curriculum, pharmacy practice acts and leadership initiatives for AACCP and member schools.

IPPE requirements – an experiential education working group has collapsed the 200 competency statements into Pre-APPE Performance Expectations: 10 core performance statements that are “must have,” and 5 more that are optional. These have been sent back to working groups for further development. The IRAAC will be working with the assessment SIG on how to measure these competencies. The 300 hour IPPE requirement has not changed, although ACPE is considering the use of simulations to serve as some of those hours.

AACCP received a grant through HRSA's Patient Safety and Clinical Pharmacy Collaborative to establish a virtual national learning meeting on the role of motivational interviewing in the management of diabetes.

Financial audit reported positive results – revenues are ahead of where we were last year.

AFPE was unable to provide NIP or Gateway support. AACCP is pursuing alternate funding opportunities in discussion with AFPE and other organizations.

Associate Institutional Membership Status was approved for Concordia, U of Maryland Eastern Shore, D'Youville and Presbyterian.

BOD appointed an ad-hoc committee to review criteria, selection processes, and tangible components of all association-wide awards.

BOD approved the legislative agenda for this year.

AACCP President Jeff Baldwin (Nebraska) commented that good progress is being done on revision of draft AACCP strategic plan. PEAS is FREE to members. Pre-APPE doesn't replace IPPE, but IPPE is subsumed into pre-APPE. There may be some room for simulations in the requirements.

Buzz Kerr (AACP staff) commented on the HRSA patient safety and clinical pharmacy collaborative services project. It is not a grant that all schools can apply for – several schools were built into the original grant and they are rolling out the project. The work will be done regionally.

Introduction of COF members present

Since we had a small number of attendees, Chair Matzke asked for everyone present to introduce themselves.

Committee Updates

1. Faculty Affairs Committee – Gary Matzke reported on behalf of Nick Popovich (UIC) and Joe Gugliemo (UCSF)

As part of the 2009-2010 Faculty Affairs Committee charge regarding faculty development, the Committee previously authored a background document which reviewed the published state of affairs of faculty development in schools of pharmacy and other health care professional schools. As a next step, the Committee surveyed a sampling of schools of pharmacy. The results in their interim report represent faculty development in 12 schools of pharmacy. These results will serve as the source for the creation of more refined questions that will be used in an audience response session at the upcoming AACP Annual Meeting. One or more Faculty Affairs Committee teleconferences will take place in early spring to finalize the precise questions, logistics and format of the Annual Meeting session. See Appendix A

2. Resolutions and Standing Rules Committee – Matzke reported that the committee has been inactive and has nothing to report.
3. Nominations Committee – Szilagyi reported Sally Huston (Georgia), Nancy Nickman (Utah) and Robert Talbert (Texas-San Antonio) were collecting nominees and providing a slate of candidates for chair-elect of the section. Call for nominations has gone to COF listserv three times. Those who have been nominated will be reviewed and the committee will select candidates from the slate later this spring. Please see full report in Appendix B.
4. Task Force on Faculty Renewal – Matzke reported on behalf of co-chairs Robin Zavod (Midwestern-Chicago) and Renee Dehart (Arkansas). They have put in a request for annual meeting programming. Renewal refers to various types of sabbaticals. Rejuvenation retolling and renewal. They have a first draft of a white paper and literature review complete. They are in the process of contacting schools to collect data via interviews. They hope to have interviews completed by end of Feb. Their work should be finished by end of March. Please see full report in Appendix C.
5. Joint COF/COD Task Force on Faculty Workforce -- Brian L. Crabtree (Mississippi) reported that this task force has been busy – it is a large group of people. This task force has been ongoing and group is still identifying issues as well as producing a toolkit, such as collecting best practices. Faculty recruitment. One question is how many academics have participated in academic APPEs, residency related requirements, and graduate programs. Want to collect syllabi from these experiences. Mentoring is also a key component. Their group has collected best practices evidence. They want to develop programming on organizational climate and culture so they will do this for the 2011 AM. Relationship with and role of dept chairs is also key in faculty retention. There is some programming being developed on this topic for the 2010 AM. 2nd charge – determine reliability and validity of instruments to measure numbers of faculty workforce for 2010, 2012 and 2015. AACP has data on open positions and lost positions. ACPE will provide data about anticipated new schools. All of these data will help to project faculty demand. Please see full report in Appendix D.
6. Task Force on Preparation of Pharmacy Faculty and Students to be Citizen Leaders and Pharmacy Advocates -- Matzke reported on the behalf of co-chairs Leigh Ann Ross (Mississippi) and Kristin Janke (Minnesota) They finalized a 35-page survey document that will be distributed to schools –

will need to be completed most likely by a variety of individuals – they submitted for a special session and have drafted a white paper. Please see full report in Appendix E.

Old Business

Legislative Update: William (Will) G. Lang, AACP VP for Policy and Advocacy

Will reported that the most recent activity has been the appropriations process, which is making adjustments to the President's budget. Thankfully his budget did not cut education and health care, outside of the CDC, most budgets were maintained or enhanced slightly (eg, NIH). Congress considers target budget numbers to determine how they will meet or exceed those. They need to complete their work by end of Sept. Will will keep us updated on how this process continues.

New Business

Health Care Reform and the impact on pharmacy education and research – Lang reported that some of the work that has already been incorporated into the existing legislation is a direct result of our advocacy. Most of the examples that are brought forth by the major pharmacy associations come from academic pharmacy. We are the ones who generate the evidence. No one is sure what the final outcome of HCR will be – the President is committed to seeing the process through. Obama plan was a set of principles upon which HCR should be based. This is different from the Clinton plan, which was very detailed. Both the House and Senate have detailed plans, however. Overarching issues are insurance reform and access to care, which has unfortunately overshadowed some of the details such as quality of care (eg, use coordinated care and the Medical home concept). We need to remind our Congressional representatives and Senators about some of these details – this is where our individual advocacy comes in. Congress needs to continue their work on *comprehensive* HCR, not just access and insurance issues. It is important to continue our work on interprofessional care and education.

AACP could ask for Title VII programs that support health science education be renewed (eg, such as AHEC programs and Geriatric centers), but it would be more effective to put these items in a BIG bill that goes altogether, rather than having Congress vote on these individual items. All the letters that AACP sends to the hill are located on the website. The current bills before Congress are lengthy, but truly it is not dense material – it is not hard to read and digest. Will reminded us that there are resources on the website with suggested ways to interact with your legislators. If we were to call and offer help to staffers, that would be welcomed by them. They are hungry to learn and educate their bosses.

Structure and Function of COF -- Matzke reviewed the history of the Council and its structure and membership, most notably that in previous iterations of the AACP's governance structure COS had representation of their members on COF administrative board. John Bosso reported that the current COS has helped to give faculty members greater representation on the BOD. There is still significant overlap amongst Councils, Sections, SIGs, etc. Matzke noted that we want to develop potential solutions to optimize the efficiency of the organization. The COF admin board is considering a resolution to present at the Annual Meeting that would include representatives from COS on the COF admin board.

Steve Scott (Purdue) noted that we are challenged with documenting and remembering our history, and it seems to happen in academia that we are good at publishing what we implement, but not good at publishing our follow up (such as did this work?).

Bosso noted that there are efforts at the Association to archive our history so that we can better include it in our decisions. AACP needs some sort of clearinghouse activity to help prevent overlap amongst all of the various council, section and SIG activities.

Tracy Hageman (Oklahoma) noted that as a fellow when selecting a project, it was hard to find what other initiatives were already occurring in the organization.

Kim Deloatch (UNC) noted that there is an overwhelming amount of communication, surveys, etc, that come from the organization and it is difficult to keep everything organized.

Crabtree believes that there needs to be a forum where all of us can discuss issues related to being pharmacy educators, and not always discipline specific issues.

Open Forum

Comments and discussions were made concerning a perceived decrease in AACP attendance by science faculty and the question was raised as to how to encourage their participation.

Adjournment

Chair Matzke adjourned the meeting at 3:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Hammer, COF Secretary

Faculty Affairs Committee -- Nick Popovich (UIC) and Joe Guglielmo (UCSF)

As part of the 2009-2010 Faculty Affairs Committee charge regarding faculty development, the Committee authored a background document which reviewed the published state of affairs of faculty development in schools of pharmacy and other health care professional schools. As a next step, the Committee surveyed a sampling of schools of pharmacy. The results in their interim report represent faculty development in 12 schools of pharmacy. These results will serve as the source for the creation of more refined questions that will be used in an audience response session at the upcoming AACP Annual Meeting. One or more Faculty Affairs Committee teleconferences will take place in early spring to finalize the precise questions, logistics and format of the Annual Meeting session. See Appendix A

1. *Does your campus or school have any formal (or informal) faculty development programs (including mentoring)?* A common theme reported by Committee members was that it was difficult to unequivocally confirm whether formal or informal programs existed. In most instances, information was either incomplete or unknown, even when solicited from department chairs or deans. This finding seems important and suggests that faculty development programs are not well-advertised, well-known on campus. Interviewees were less aware of campus-based programs as opposed to school-based programs. From a campus perspective, 11/12 schools offered some form of faculty development programs, however, some were limited to only a select group of faculty (e.g. solely research-based vs. teaching-based or intended for a specific faculty group, e.g. women faculty). The existing faculty development programs varied from instructional design to research development. Most, but not all, have a mandatory campus-based new faculty orientation program. Most, but not all, have a campus-organized mentor program. Campus mentorship programs vary from a single mentor overseeing total faculty responsibilities to solely research-based mentorship. Some mentor programs are mandatory and others are “as needed”. In reviewing the availability of SOPs faculty development programs, 10/12 surveyed schools had a formal SOP-based mandatory mentor-mentee program which was the primary mechanism for faculty development. In some instances, the junior faculty member is provided both a “research mentor” as well as a “teaching mentor”. It was stated by some interviewees that “SOP department chairs do extensive mentoring during the first year of a faculty appointment”. Some schools offer regular retreats centered upon research, teaching, and/or time/life management. One program stated that a Faculty Development Committee was recently started which is responsible for networking, providing workshops on teaching, research. Another program previously incorporated 3 complementary programs (individual faculty development program, seed research grant program, technology support program), however, these programs are currently suspended due to budget issues.
 - a. *Are campus programs available to SOP faculty?* For those with faculty development programs, all (11/11) have campus programs which are available to SOP faculty.
 - b. *Please describe the available campus faculty development programs*
 - i. *Research-based faculty development programs:* 8/12 offer research-based faculty development programs, and sometimes, but not always, provide the same program to either basic science or clinical scientist faculty. Research-based faculty development programs were more likely to be offered to basic science faculty than to clinical scientists. The most oft-mentioned research-based programs were workshops regarding grant-writing, IRB compliance, and responsible conduct of research.

- Some institutions have a campus-based Office of Research which provides grant writing consultation, grant editing. Three institutions have clinical scientist-specific research development programs and these are generally associated with a CTSL.
- ii. *Teaching/Patient Care-based faculty programs, e.g., Teaching Academies:* All 12 institutions offer teaching-based faculty development programs. The programs vary from informal lectures to fully developed teaching academies or centers for education and instructional development.
 - iii. *Women:* 6/12 universities offer some form of faculty development programs for women. Three are formal programs, including a past funded Center of Excellence, while the scope for others is a faculty support group for women.
 - iv. *Underrepresented Minorities (URM):* While many SOPs state there are formal programs to *recruit* URM, none of the 12 schools have an active faculty development program for URM. One offers a campus-based office of multicultural affairs that deals with minority issues, but it is unclear whether or not this office involves faculty development.
 - v. *Volunteer, adjunct faculty:* All surveyed schools offer some form of *SOP-coordinated* faculty development programs, however, none offer *campus-wide* programs for volunteer faculty.
- c. *Is there any objective evidence the faculty development program(s) is (are) effective?* The answer to this question is identical for both campus-organized and school of pharmacy-organized faculty development. Answers to this question range from “not sure” to simply restating known *potential* indicators (grants, publications) that might be used as evidence of success of faculty development. We were unable to find truly objective evidence that these programs are “effective”.
- d. *Are faculty required to participate or made aware of AACP’s “Education Scholar” or ACCP “Teaching and Learning Certificate Program” or the Mentor Exchange program through ASHP?* Most state that they are unsure whether faculty are even aware of any of these programs. Most state that some or all of these programs are made available to faculty, however, none require them as part of a faculty development program. Some specify one program over another, e.g. the ACCP FIT program.

**INTERIM REPORT OF THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE
COUNCIL OF FACULTIES
Submitted by Julie Szilagyi, Chair
January 2010**

Committee Members:

Sally Houston (Georgia)
Nancy Nickman (Utah)
Julie Szilagyi (Houston)
Robert Talbert (Texas)

Charge:

The committee is charged with developing procedures for recruiting, vetting and evaluating candidates for chair-elect designate.

The committee met via conference call to discuss the process to be followed and to begin the search for candidates. The committee has also communicated via email regularly. Members were assigned to contact section chairs and SIG members to encourage nominations from the sections. Committee members also communicated with their networks to facilitate identification of possible candidates. Information regarding past chairs was distributed to the committee as well. A call for nominations was distributed via the Council of Faculties listserv twice. A third call will be sent when classes resume in January. In addition, a call for nominations will be made at the COF Business Meeting during the Interim Meeting, via the House of Delegates listserv and AACP newsletters.

The committee will soon meet to finalize the process and begin evaluating the nominees. The deadline for nominations is March 31, 2010.

**AACP COF Task Force on Faculty Renewal
January 2010 Report/Update**

1. Task Force Membership

Robin Zavod, Midwestern University Chicago College of Pharmacy
 Renee DeHart, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences
 Naushad M Khan Ghilzai, LECOM School of Pharmacy
 Bernie Olin, Auburn University
 Rajan Radhakrishnan, University of Southern Nevada
 Susan Conway, University of Oklahoma
 Kelly Goode, Virginia Commonwealth University
 Brad Shin, University of Findlay
David Johnson, Duquesne University remains unengaged

2. Task Force Charges

- A. Document the faculty renewal opportunities that have been utilized by Schools and Colleges during the last 10 years
- B. Tabulate the number of faculty who have availed themselves of these opportunities and create a means to collect information that documents the value of such programs to the faculty who participated in them;
- C. Ascertain what the barriers are to the implementation and utilization of a faculty renewal program
- D. Propose mechanisms to enhance the utilization of faculty renewal opportunities. Furthermore, the committee will be expected to prepare a report for publication on the association's web site and submit a request for a special session at the 2010 Annual Meeting

Faculty Renewal Definitions

- **Sabbatical/Faculty Renewal**: "A period of leave for eligible faculty consisting of either a quarter/semester/half-year at full-pay or one year at one-half pay." (As previously defined by the 2006-2007 COF Faculty Affairs Committee)
- **Mini-Sabbatical/Faculty Renewal**: A period of leave for eligible faculty for no less than one month and no more than 3 months with pay.
- **Focused Time**: Full or part time participation over the course of an undetermined period of time (not considered leave) in a program to enhance or acquire new skills or to promote career change and/or advancement.

2. Number of Task Force Meetings (since last report): 2

- A. 10/9/2009: teleconference (7/9 committee members present)
- B. 12/2/2009: teleconference (5/9 committee members present)
- C. Next meeting scheduled for early February 2010

3. AACP Special Session Submission: completed by December 14th deadline

Title: How to "Afford" the Three R's: Rejuvenation, Retooling, Renewal.

Description: No funding, time or coverage – three real barriers. Traditional sabbaticals may be dinosaurs, but that doesn't mean faculty renewal is out of the question. This session will focus on: 1) summary of AACP institution participation in faculty renewal; 2) non-traditional renewal opportunities/strategies; 3) examples of renewal plans of varying lengths.

Objectives: The Session participant will be able to:

1. Summarize the current faculty renewal landscape, including barriers and solutions associated with faculty participation.
2. Compare non-traditional renewal opportunities/strategies with those available at their home institution.

3. Evaluate the value of renewal plans of varying lengths for implementation at their home institution.

4. Subcommittee: Survey Development (Robin, Renee, Kelly)

Survey items finalized; introduction for interview finalized; IRB proposal submitted to Midwestern University – received “exempt” status in late December (see attached for finalized survey and IRB submission).

5. Subcommittee: Literature Review (Bernie, Rajan, Brad)

Manuscript/white paper introduction DRAFT has been submitted (see attached). The subcommittee will finalize its contribution to the paper after all of the data collection has been completed.

6. Subcommittee: Professional Organization Opportunities (Susan, Naushad)

A list of opportunities made available by various professional organizations (science based, healthcare based) has been completed (see attached documents). Uniform formatting of the two documents will be addressed after data collection has been completed. A written discussion of these findings will be developed after data collection has been completed.

7. Contact List for Interviewing

An Excel spreadsheet has been updated to reflect discussions with initial contacts at each school/college of pharmacy. These discussions were designed to help each task force member identify exactly who we need to “interview” to gain access to this type of institution data/awareness related to faculty renewal. Task Force members will be contacting 13-16 institutions to set up telephone interviews with these individuals. It was decided that the survey will be sent to each interviewee ~1 week prior to the scheduled interview so that there will be some opportunity for institutional data to be collected prior to the phone conversation. Interviews should be conducted in the month of January 2010/early February 2010.

8. Logistics Related to Data Collection

All data will be entered by Task Force members onto institution specific documents (can be typed directly into electronic WORD document) and sent to Robin for data entry. Name of institution should appear in the file name. We will need to identify someone to assist Robin on the statistical analysis.

Report of the AACP COD-COF Joint Task Force on Faculty Workforce
January 13, 2010

Charges:

1. Identify mechanisms, resources, and policies that could be developed and implemented within schools and colleges of pharmacy that would enhance the quality of life of faculty.
2. Evaluate the reliability and validity of the association's current mechanism(s) to identify faculty supply and demand at any point in time and project the future needs of the academy.
3. Identify future agenda items for the Faculty Workforce Task Force.

The task force held its first meeting July 21, 2009 during the Annual Meeting in Boston. Charges were reviewed, charge leaders identified, and members assigned. Shane Desselle is the leader for charge 1. Kathy Knapp is the leader for charge 2.

In keeping with a goal to produce specific recommendations to be implemented by member institutions and included in programming at meetings, the task force has had conference calls, extensive email communication, and exchange of draft documents. The first charge has been largely addressed. The subcommittee agrees that greater effort in a more systematic manner is needed in four key areas. A comprehensive document is in draft form but key summary points are as follows:

1. Faculty recruitment: A faculty shortage creates a greater workload for existing faculty, which diminishes vitality, productivity, and overall quality of life. The committee has identified certain "best practices" in recruitment strategies, none of which are new ideas, but have not been systematically implemented and assessed.
 - a. Academic APPE rotations are offered by many schools, but we do not know by how many, what components are typically included and how many students participate. Example syllabi could become part of a toolkit for schools and colleges.
 - b. Academic rotations for post-graduate residents, fellows, and graduate students are recommended. ACCP and ASHP recommend inclusion of uniform teaching objectives in residency standards. The task force will likely recommend communication from AACP to ACCP and ASHP to advocate inclusion of academic or pedagogical training in residency programs as a standard. The task force will recommend that graduate programs in member institutions include orientation or primers on teaching and life as a faculty member. Additionally, we will recommend that non-pharmacist graduate students attend orientation sessions about the pharmacy profession, pharmacy education, and how pharmacists fit in the health care system.
 - c. The task force will endorse the AACP initiative on National Pharmacy Educator Week and encourage continuation of this program.
 - d. Inclusion of academia at career fairs attended by students at many campuses along with individual mentoring of professional and graduate students during their years in the degree programs is recommended.
 - e. Staff development targeted at IPPE and APPE preceptors may improve their quality of life and potentially identify individuals who are interested in moving to academia.

2. Mentoring: The task force will cite evidence that formal mentoring programs are associated with improved faculty job satisfaction, commitment, reduced turnover, and other indicators of faculty quality of life. Yet, even an informal poll among task force members shows that only about half of schools represented by task force members offer a formal mentoring program. We will offer examples of best practices in structuring a program. These include input from a variety of sources, making programs holistic and not focused only on scholarship, identifying specific goals and expectations, and others.
3. Organization climate and culture: Poor relationships with administrators and colleagues is often cited as reasons to leave an organization or the academy. The task force will recommend programming to identify elements of a positive workplace climate and methods to create them. Examples are creating a shared vision, sense of community, and faculty and staff development and collaboration,
4. Role of the department chair: Related to organization climate, faculty satisfaction is dependent on the relationship with the department chair. The task force will recommend programming for department chairs and offer specific suggestions for elements of such programming. Additionally, we will recommend program development for faculty members, especially junior faculty members, on establishing rapport and gaining confidence and support from department chairs.

Based on initial work, possible programming proposals for the 2010 Annual Meeting, most likely as special sessions, include (a) creating and affecting a positive climate at the college/school and departmental levels, and (b) faculty mentoring. We will also propose renewal of targeted programming for department chairs, highlighting the importance of relationships between faculty and chairs with regard to quality of life. Integrated throughout the work of all members on all four emphasis areas will be the importance of gender, cultural sensitivity and generational dynamics. Based on an emerging and comprehensive document that describes all of the above in extensive detail, including various resources, submission of the final report to the American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education is a consideration.

The charge 2 subcommittee members have discussed changes in the faculty shortage in the recent past, possibly easing in some areas, remaining significant in other areas and certain academic disciplines. We discussed that data currently available through AACP may not take into account faculty vacancies that may have been eliminated in budget reductions. We concluded existing data may be dated and that new research is needed. Faculty growth will be related to the following three areas:

- professional degree program expansion in existing institutions
- opening of new schools and colleges of pharmacy
- growth of graduate and postgraduate professional programs, including PGY1 and PGY2 residency positions sponsored by the schools and colleges of pharmacy

Realizing that survey “fatigue” may present a challenge, we propose collecting data from deans of schools and colleges of pharmacy to estimate the expected faculty size annually from 2010 to 2015. An instrument is in development.

Submitted by and on behalf of the Work Force Task Force,

Brian

Crabtree

Task Force on Preparation of Pharmacy Faculty and Students to be Citizen Leaders and Pharmacy Advocates

**Progress Report
January 2010**

This Task Force is charged with collecting information and formulating ideas regarding the following:

- 1) Tabulate and characterize the courses or processes that are in place at the various institutions to develop leaders and health care advocates;
- 2) Develop a means to document the leadership and advocacy contributions by faculty and students within their community as an indicator of the success of these programs; and
- 3) Create a mechanism to characterize and select the best practices for leadership and advocacy development throughout the curriculum.

Furthermore, the committee is expected to prepare a White Paper and submit a request for a special session at the 2010 Annual Meeting to share their findings and elicit a dialogue with the members of the COF.

Task Force Members:

Leigh Ann Ross, PharmD, BCPS, Chair
Kristin Kari Janke, Ph.D., Vice-Chair
Leticia R. "Tish" Moczygemba, PharmD, PhD □
Anna Legreid Dopp, PharmD
Gerald Gianutsos, PhD, JD
Cynthia Boyle, PharmD
Rabia Tahir, PharmD
Kam Nola, PharmD, MS
Cameron C. Lindsey, PharmD, BC-ADM
Karen Whalen, PharmD, BCPS, CDE

Second Quarter Progress Report:

During the second quarter, the COF Task Force on Preparation of Pharmacy Faculty and Students to be Citizen Leaders and Pharmacy Advocates met via conference call on October 8, October 12, and October 26 and completed the remainder of the work via e-mail correspondence.

The work of the Task Force in the second quarter has continued to focus on charge #1 (to tabulate and characterize the courses or processes that are in place at the various institutions to develop leaders and health care advocates) and the additional charge to submit a request for a special session at the 2010 Annual Meeting.

With regard to charge #1, the Task Force is surveying Schools/Colleges of Pharmacy to collect information on the courses and other activities related to leadership or advocacy in place or in development. The survey addresses both student and faculty activities (charge #2). It was determined that the information will likely not be obtained from one

person at each institution, but several individuals. Therefore, we are administering the survey by phone and speaking with the appropriate persons at each institution. Through this direct contact with schools, we hope to identify best practices for leadership and advocacy in the curriculum (charge #3). During this quarter, the survey was finalized, administration criteria were developed, schools/colleges were assigned to task force members, and the electronic documentation tool was completed. A tentative deadline to complete survey administration/documentation is set for January 31, 2010.

The Task Force also focused work this quarter on the charge to submit a request for special session programming at the AACP Annual Meeting in July 2010. The programming request was developed and submitted to AACP in December.

The Task Force will begin work on the charge to prepare a White Paper at the next scheduled meeting in January.

Respectfully submitted,

Leigh Ann Ross, Task Force Chair