Assessment Committee Annual Report

Assessment Committee Membership:

Candace Barnett (Chair)
John Bauer (Dept. Pharmaceutical Sciences)
Liza Chapman (Alum)
Melissa Crooks (Student)
Joseph Dye (Dept. Pharmacy Practice)
Lisa Lundquist (Dept. Pharmacy Practice)
Haileen Zhang (Dept. Pharmaceutical Sciences)
Objectives (Status ✓ = complete)

2010-11 Objectives:

1. Examine how we assess the effectiveness of service learning and make recommendations to the service learning director for changes if warranted. (✓)
2. Examine the effectiveness of student focus groups and make recommendations to course coordinators and faculty based on results found. (✓)
3. Develop a methodology to assist Department Chairs in “closing the loop” on peer and student evaluations of faculty teaching. (✓)

On-going objectives:

4. Review results of recurring AACP standardized curriculum quality surveys and transfer data to parties responsible for using the data. Request disposition reports from data users on selected items. (✓)
5. Provide oversight to recurring assessments including AACP standardized curriculum quality surveys, licensure examination results, graduating students’ practice intentions survey, P3 self-assessment of preparedness for entering the fourth year, and End of Year examinations. Ensure results are transferred to parties responsible for using the data. (✓)
6. Provide oversight to the End of Year examination process. (✓)
7. Remain available as individuals and a group to advise on assessments on an as-needed basis. (✓)

Service Learning. Items on the form completed by service learning (SL) preceptors to evaluate student performance were edited to more directly relate to SL outcomes. The Assessment Committee also recommended the completed SL evaluations be transferred electronically to the Director of SL, removing the student from the process. The Director of SL reported back that the changes had been implemented.

Focus Groups. A survey of the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 focus group members was conducted. The results for the 2011 EOY examinations were as follows: 15% for P2 students, 99% for P3 students, and 99% for P3 students. The P2 student who failed followed the new EOY examination remediation procedures, which became effective 2009, failing the second multiple choice exam attempt, written exam, and oral exam. Per requirements, the student started the process over and passed the multiple choice exam. Feedback was obtained from the student and faculty involved in the process for evaluation. The P3 student who failed, passed on the second multiple choice exam attempt.

Closing the Loop on Peer and Student Evaluations of Teaching. In summer 2011 a form was designed for department chairs to document for each of their faculty, changes in teaching (method, style, classroom management techniques, etc.) that occurred in the previous academic year, the genesis for the change (student or peer evaluation), and success of the changes based on current teaching evaluations. The Department Chairs have indicated they will continue to update this form yearly. The Assessment Committee will monitor the record as confirmation that student and peer evaluations are used to effect positive change.

End of Year Examination Oversight. In October 2010 the item analyses from the 2010 administration of the End of Year (EOY) examinations were distributed to course coordinators for use in teaching during the 2010-11 academic year and in making revisions to selected items for the 2011 exam. For the P1 exam, 23 of 144 questions were brought to the faculty’s attention, for the P2 exam, 15 of 128 questions, and for the P3 exam, 20 of 128 questions. The results for the 2011 EOY exams were as follows: The first time pass rates were 100% for P1 students, 99% for P2 students, and 99% for P3 students. The P2 student who failed followed the new EOY examination remediation procedures, which became effective 2009, failing the second multiple choice exam attempt, written exam, and oral exam. Per requirements, the student started the process over and passed the multiple choice exam. Feedback was obtained from the student and faculty involved in the process for evaluation. The P3 student who failed, passed on the second multiple choice exam attempt.

Examination of Results from AACP Curriculum Quality Surveys. In 2010-11 we examined the results of the AACP Survey of Graduating Students (class of 2010). We also examined the results of the AACP Alumni Survey administered in summer 2010 to the alumni (2008 graduates). The Committee noted far fewer items warranted a written disposition this year than in the past. We also noted the response rate to our alumni survey continues to be low and determined to enlist the help of our newly hired Director of Communications,
and Marketing in the future. Data were transferred to the entire faculty and specific parties responsible for using the data, who provided written dispositions of how they would use the data for program improvement.

**AACP Graduating Student Survey – 2010 Graduates.** The Curriculum Committee was encouraged to focus on the following items: interpretation of economic data, elective course offerings, awareness of opportunities to participate in faculty research. This latter item was also transferred to Dept. Chairs and the Coordinator for the electives Introduction to Research and Project Development. The Office of Experiential Education focused on IPPEs (value in preparing for APPEs, involvement in direct patient care, quality of sites, and process for assigning IPPEs) and the variety of elective APPEs. Items on management of academic and professional misconduct by students went to Student Affairs and Admissions (SAA) and to the Honor Council and Professionalism Committee. Adequacy of study areas and common spaces went to SAA and the Dean.

**Alumni Survey – 2008 Graduates.** The Curriculum Committee was encouraged to focus on the following items: development of disease management programs, informatics, and sequencing of the curriculum. The Office of SAA was directed to the item about the alumni’s choice of Mercer for their education, as was the Dean. The Dean was also directed to the items involving communication with alumni, encouragement of alumni involvement, and provision of leadership in pharmacy. Department chairs were directed to the item about commitment to developing professionalism, fostering leadership, and serving as mentors and positive role models, as was the Professionalism Committee, which was also directed to the item about the culture promoting professional behavior and harmonious relationships.

**Disposition Reports.** All disposition reports adequately addressed the items noted and indicated continued monitoring would occur by the above parties. Noteworthy items included: changes implemented to four P1 courses to improve interpretation of economic data relevant to disease treatment, the addition of several elective courses over the past two years, approval of an 8th APPE (elective), the promotion of research opportunities with prospective students by the Office of SAA, the determination that though we teach informatics, we do not use the terminology and plans to change this, continued intention to seek approval for a new building, and the hiring of a director of communications and marketing in January 2011.

**Graduating Students’ Practice Intentions.** A survey of our 2010 graduates revealed that 62.4% planned to practice in chain or independent community pharmacies; 6% - hospital pharmacy practice; 14.3% - residencies; 6.05% - other settings including the government, managed care, and pharmaceutical industry; and 10.5% undecided. It was noted that this was the first time we have had a significant number of students answering undecided which most likely reflects the current job market.

**Examination of NAPLEX and MPJE Results from 2010 Graduates.** The pass rate for Mercer’s 131 first time NAPLEX test takers in May-Aug 2010 was 92.37% compared to the national pass rate of 95.31% and state of 94.05%. The pass rate for Mercer’s 175 first time MPJE test takers in May-Aug 2010 was 94.89% (natl=95.50%, state=93.93%). Prior to 2010 the NAPLEX scores of Mercer graduates had risen for four consecutive years. Upon receipt of the October 2010 NAPLEX scores, an Ad Hoc Committee on NAPLEX was formed to investigate. The Ad Hoc Committee examined the results of an audit conducted by the Curriculum Committee in 2010 wherein our PharmD curriculum was mapped to the NAPLEX competency statements. Because no areas of deficiency were noted, the Ad Hoc Committee focused its recommendations upon students’ self-directed preparation for taking NAPLEX. A full report was issued by the ad hoc committee.

**Student Evaluations of Didactic and Experiential Teaching.** The cumulative and individual scores for student evaluations of faculty teaching and courses in the didactic and experiential curriculum were compiled and distributed to applicable data users. For the didactic curriculum, on a 5-point scale, the mean rating for course overall was 3.94 for Fall 10 and 3.99 for Spring 11. The mean rating for overall teaching ability was 4.16 for Fall 10 and 4.2 for Spring 11. For the experiential curriculum, the mean rating in academic year 2010-11 for overall
teaching ability of primary APPE preceptors was 4.45 and for IPPE preceptors was 4.67 on a 5-point scale. The mean overall rating of the site/experience was 3.66 (4-point scale) for APPEs and 4.52 (5-point scale) for IPPEs.

**P3 Preparedness to Enter P4 Year.** In spring 2011 P3 students rated on a 4-point scale how well prepared they felt to perform 27 practice activities. Students entered their individual results in their portfolios and were encouraged to pursue self-directed learning prior to starting the P4 year. The cumulative results were examined, noting items where at least 1/3 rated their feelings of preparedness as fair or less. The four items identified were compared to data from the past three years. Students are consistently noting the following areas, despite documented coverage in the curriculum: convey information to professional groups, analyze scientific literature, and evaluate serum drug levels. Graduating Student Survey results and alumni survey results indicate students feel well prepared in the practice functions upon completion of the program. The results were transferred to the Director of APPEs for communication to preceptors and students along with a reminder that the P4 year will provide continued instruction and help students gain confidence in performing practice functions.