

Report of the 2008-09 COF Faculty Affairs Committee

Chair:

Virginia (Ginger) G. Scott, West Virginia University School of Pharmacy

Members:

Amy Broeseker, Samford University McWhorter School of Pharmacy

Catherine Hatfield, University of Houston College of Pharmacy

Cynthia Kirkwood, Virginia Commonwealth University

Donald Kishi, University of California, San Francisco School of Pharmacy

James Kuperberg, College of Pharmacy, Touro - California

Manas Mandal, University of Southern Nevada College of Pharmacy

Susan Staggs, University of Iowa College of Pharmacy

The 2007-2008 Council of Faculties (COF)/Council of Deans (COD) Task Force on Emerging Issues in Pharmacy Education conducted an environmental scan to identify emerging issues with the greatest potential impact on schools and colleges of pharmacy over the next 5-10 years from the perspective of faculty members and deans. Faculty salaries, availability of experiential sites, and the impact of the accreditation standards were identified as the top three issues by both the COF and COD. Based on these issues, Chair Julianna E. Szilagyi identified three charges for the 2008-2009 COF Faculty Affairs Committee. Each charge will be stated followed by discussion and the Committee's recommendation. To accomplish these charges, the Committee met via teleconference six times. Prior to the first conference call, the Committee reviewed the 2007-08 Final Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the COF and 2007-08 Emerging Issues Task Force Final Report.

Charge 1: Address how faculty can best be familiarized with the accreditation standards and how they can contribute to overall assessment activities in order to improve the educational process as well as meet accreditation standards.

A list of activities that familiarize the faculty on the accreditation standards was compiled from schools represented on the Committee and personal contacts with faculty from other schools and colleges of pharmacy. It was suggested from the comments obtained that faculty members could be unfamiliar with the accreditation standards unless one of three events occurs - development of the curriculum for a new school, curriculum revisions within their school, and/or preparation of their self-study report for accreditation. The recommendation is that schools and colleges focus on enhancing the knowledge of faculty members on the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education's (ACPE) Accreditation Standards and Guidelines for the Professional Program in Pharmacy Leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy Degree. Some current activities include using the accreditation standards as a required reading for new faculty orientation; discussing the accreditation standards at faculty and/or department retreats; a faculty development program focusing on the linkage between the accreditation standards and program assessment; curricular mapping to show the linkage between educational outcomes and accreditation standards; and monitoring the linkage between the school/college's strategic planning, accreditation standards, curriculum and various committee activities through the

Programmatic Assessment Committee. Teaching/learning strategies based on generational difference should be considered in assisting faculty comply with the various methods used.

The Committee agrees with Dean Joseph DiPiro's comments published in the *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education's* article titled "The 21st Century Abraham Flexner" that the time has come when the pharmacy profession must evaluate the quality and scope of pharmacy education in preparing students to critically think and adequately practice in the 21st Century. This need is even greater with the changes in information systems and newer technologies. Thus, the recommendation is the American Association of College of Pharmacy (AACP) commission an organization external to pharmacy education and pharmacy accreditation to evaluate and determine whether the quality and scope of pharmacy education adequately prepare pharmacy students to practice in the 21st Century.

Charge 2: Identify and evaluate means by which compensation/salaries can be improved to reward existing faculty and recruit new faculty.

Over the last several years, this issue identified by faculty members in the 2007-2008 Faculty Affairs Committee Report has been discussed on many levels of the association. To better understand the activities of the association regarding this issue, committee reports and journal articles listed in the references were reviewed by the Committee. One report, especially the "Report of the 2006-2007 COF/COD Task Force on Faculty Workforce," focused on recruitment and retention of faculty. Additionally, in light of the downturn in the United States economy and monetary cuts in many of the universities, the Committee focused on determining the other non-monetary needs of faculty. Through discussions, it became evident that faculty incentives, monetary and non-monetary, vary among schools as to tenure versus non-tenure and standards for promotion between different titles and ranks. The non-monetary needs will probably also differ based on generational differences. To fully understand the needs of faculty, a mechanism for rewarding existing faculty and recruiting new faculty members in light of the economy should be determined. The results should be analyzed by age, rank and position of a faculty member. Two additional questions of interest would be the following: 1) Why did you choose academia as a career? 2) What would cause you to leave academia? One recommendation is to survey the faculty or add questions to the existing AACP faculty survey to determine the non-monetary needs of the faculty based on age, faculty rank and title. A second recommendation is to compile the reasons why faculty members currently leave academia or move to another academic institution. These data should be readily available from all schools since this information is part of their ACPE self-study report.

Charge 3: Explore the issue regarding the availability of experiential sites and suggest what can be done to ensure that adequate quality sites are available.

The importance of issues related to the availability and quality of introductory and advanced pharmacy practice experience (IPPE and APPE) sites is of extreme importance with the increase in enrollment of many current schools or colleges and the increase in the number of new schools or colleges of pharmacy. Programmatic concerns regarding the quality and

availability of sites were discussed and issues were identified relating to the practice site and to the school/college of pharmacy. Practice site concerns include: lack of resources at the site, competition for experiences among other IPPE, APPE and residency experiences, and variation between schools/colleges of pharmacy (e.g. evaluations, compensation, expectations, and schedules). Concerns at the schools/colleges of pharmacy include: lack of resources of faculty and staff, ensuring quality at every site, competition for experiences from other schools/colleges of pharmacy and other experiences (i.e. IPPEs, APPEs, and residency experiences), differences in compensation, decreased loyalty of sites, and expectations and requirements of preceptors.

The Committee also reviewed the work regarding a district wide collaboration for quality assurance in experiential education by the Experiential Education Directors in the National Board of Pharmacy District 5. Additionally, the committee spoke with the members of AACP's Experiential Section and individuals from several regional groups of schools/colleges of Pharmacy Experiential Directors from across the nation to determine current activities being done to assure the quality of experiential sites.

The committee discussed standardization among experiential education and how this could contribute to the quality and quantity of practice experiences. Some areas of standardization may include expectations of experiential sites and preceptors, students and preceptor evaluation tools, expected outcomes for both IPPE and APPE, and site development visits. Programming at the AACP annual meeting such as the session "Quality Assurance Program in Experiential Education" at the 2009 Annual Meeting should be continued and encourage schools/colleges to hold joint preceptor development programs.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Schools and colleges focus on enhancing the knowledge of faculty members on the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education's (ACPE) Accreditation Standards and Guidelines for the Professional Program in Pharmacy Leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy Degree.

Recommendation 2: AACP commission an organization external to pharmacy education and pharmacy accreditation to evaluate and determine whether the quality and scope of pharmacy education adequately prepares pharmacy students to practice in the 21st century.

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.

Recommendation 4: AACP compile the reasons why faculty currently leave academia or move to another academic institution.

Recommendation 5: AACP convene a task force to develop standardization for introductory and advanced pharmacy practice sites which may include expectations of experiential sites and preceptors, students and preceptor evaluation tools, expected outcomes for both IPPE and APPE, and site development visits.

Recommendation 6: AACP should continue programming at the annual meetings on the quality of experiential education and encourage schools and colleges to hold joint preceptor development programs.

References:

Report of the 2006-07 COF Faculty Affairs Committee. Van Tyle JH, Brazeau GA, Broedel-Zaugg K, James J, Jadhav A, Murphy, J, Ryan, M.

Final Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee Council of Faculties 2007-2008

AACP Task Force on Faculty Recruitment and Retention 2008 Annual Meeting Report. Poirier T, Marrs J, Lee K, Olin J, Bruce S, Jones M, Howard P, Cappuzzo K.

AACP COD/COF Emerging Issues Task Force Final Report. Brown D, Doukas P, Johnson-Fanin A, Gardner S, Duncan-Hewitt W, McCarthy R, Schmoll B.

Report of the 2006/2007 COF/COD Task Force on Faculty Workforce.

DiPiro J. The 21st Century Abraham Flexner. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2008;August 15;72(4):79.

Spivey CA, Chisholm-Burns MA, Murphy J, Rice L, Morelli C. Assessment of and recommendations to improve pharmacy faculty satisfaction and retention. *Am J Health-Syst Pharm.* 2009;66(Jan 1):54-64.

Raehl CL. Changes in Pharmacy Practice Faculty 1995-2001: Implications for junior faculty Development. *Pharmacotherapy.* 2002;22(4):445-462.

Raehl CL, MacLaughlin EJ, Bond CA. Upgrading nontenure-track pharmacy practice faculty from second- to first-class citizens. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2003; 67(4):1-2.

Professional Experience Site and Preceptor Quality Assurance. Developed by the NABP District 5 schools/colleges of Pharmacy (Creighton University, Drake University, North Dakota State University, South Dakota State University, University of Iowa, University of Minnesota, University of Nebraska Medical Center and University of Wyoming.

Experiential Site and Preceptor Quality Assurance Process. Developed by Rhonda M. Jones, Creighton University School of Pharmacy and Health Professions.

Professional Development Committee Executive Summary 12/2/2008. Astle J, Besinque K, Copeland D, Kahaleh A, Kieser M, See C, Talluto B, Tyczkowski.

Weller, Angela. Information seeking behavior in generation Y students: Motivation, critical thinking, and learning theory. *J Academic Librarianship.* January 2005;31(1):46-53.