

UNIT REPORT

Pharmacy (PharmD) - Reviewer's Report - Academic**Data**

Generated: 6/5/19, 9:40 AM

Pharmacy (PharmD)

PharmD Pharmacy Mission

Mission:

The University of Florida, College of Pharmacy promotes the health and welfare of the citizens of Florida and the Nation by preparing graduates in Pharmacy to take independent professional responsibility for the outcome of drug therapy in patients. Graduates will have a strong scientific foundation, sensitivity to cultural diversity, and the ability to assume leadership roles in practice, the community, and the profession.

Start: 07/01/2017

End: 06/30/2018

2017-18 PG 1 Admit high-quality competitive students

Goal: Admit high-quality competitive students.**Evaluation Method:**

PCAT Composite Scaled Score – Benchmark -at national mean or above

Sci GPA – Benchmark - 3.25 or above

Offers made/offers accepted – Benchmark = 1.25

Results:

Dr. Shauna Buring, Associate Dean of Professional Education, reviewed the results.

PCAT Mean Scaled Composite Score for 2017-2018 was 417 which is **ABOVE** the national mean of 400.Undergraduate Science GPA for 2017-2018 was 3.36 which is **ABOVE** the minimum benchmark of 3.25.The ratio of offers made/offers accepted was 1.26 is **ABOVE** the benchmark of 1.25.**XOn Campus:** true**XProgram CIP:** 51.2001**XOnline:** false**XOther Site:** false**XIf Other Site:**

2017-18 PG 2 High quality curriculum

Goal: Students experience a high quality curriculum**Evaluation Method:**

The AACP/ACPE Survey is administered to **ALL** graduating PharmD students every year and evaluates student perceptions concerning curriculum quality through 42 distinct items. AACP also provides national and peer institution benchmark data for comparisons with the University of Florida's College of Pharmacy. Peer institutions are based upon the 2016 US News and World report of the top 10 Colleges of Pharmacy in the United States.

Benchmarks: College of Pharmacy is within 5% of Peer Institutions for all curriculum related survey items in the AACP Graduating Student Survey.

Results:

Dr. Shauna Buring, Associate Dean of Professional Education, reviewed the results.

Of the items from the AACP survey that addressed the quality of the curriculum, there were no items that the College of Pharmacy was below peer institutions by more than 5%. See attachment for a complete report.

Attached Files

XOn Campus: true**XProgram CIP:** 51.2001**XOnline:** false**XOther Site:** false**XIf Other Site:**

2017-18 PG 3 Students are satisfied with their education

Goal: Students are satisfied with their education from COP.**Evaluation Method:**

National Survey (AACP Survey): AACP/ACPE Survey - Item 79: "If I were starting my pharmacy program over again I would choose the same college/school of pharmacy."

Benchmarks: College of Pharmacy is within 5% of Peer Institutions

Results:

Dr. Shauna Buring, Associate Dean of Professional Education, reviewed the results.

A review of item 79, indicates that UF COP is significantly above peer institutions by 4.9%.

Significant Differences between 2018 UF Strongly Agree/Agree % and Benchmarks (Year-to-Year, Peer, and National)

Section	Item	2018 All Campuses GSS vs 2017 GSS				2018 All Campuses GSS vs 2018 National Benchmark				2018 All Campuses GSS vs 2018 Peer Benchmark			
		2018 SA/A% Valence	Benchmark	Benchmark Difference	Z Score	2018 SA/A% Valence	Benchmark	Benchmark Difference	Z Score	2018 SA/A% Valence	Benchmark	Benchmark Difference	Z Score
Section VII: Facilities, Experiential Sites and Educational Resources	75. Access to educational resources (e.g., library, electronic data bases) was conducive to learning.	96.2%	92.5%	3.7%	1.89	96.2%	96.7%	-0.5%	-0.43	96.2%	98.5%	-2.2%	-2.47
	76. During pharmacy practice experiences, access to educational resources (e.g., library, electronic data bases) was conducive to learning.	98.1%	95.7%	2.4%	1.63	98.1%	96.9%	1.2%	1.11	98.1%	98.1%	0.0%	-0.01
Section VIII: Overall Impressions	77. I am prepared to enter pharmacy practice.	97.0%	95.7%	1.3%	0.79	97.0%	95.9%	1.1%	0.88	97.0%	96.4%	0.5%	0.43
	78. If I were starting my college career over again I would choose to study pharmacy.	88.7%	83.0%	5.7%	1.87	88.7%	81.5%	7.2%	2.96	88.7%	77.6%	11.1%	4.04
	79. If I were starting my pharmacy program over again I would choose the same college/school of pharmacy.	94.7%	90.1%	4.6%	1.99	94.7%	85.4%	9.3%	4.26	94.7%	89.8%	4.9%	2.50

Any z-score above +1.96 or below -1.96 indicates a significant difference.

Color (copy 2)
 Null
 Sig. ABOVE Benchmark
 Sig. BELOW Benchmark

XOn Campus: true

XProgram CIP: 51.2001

XOnline: false

XOther Site: false

XIf Other Site:

2017-18 SLO 1 Foundational Knowledge

Outcome:

1.1 Knowledge: Develop, integrate, and apply knowledge from the foundational disciplines (i.e., pharmaceutical, social/behavioral/administrative, and clinical sciences) to evaluate the scientific literature, explain drug action, assess and solve therapeutic problems, and advance population health and patient-centered care.

SLO Area (select one): Knowledge (Grad)

Assessment Method:

Satisfactory Achievement on Transcending Concepts: The Pharm.D. curriculum is designed so that a set of “transcending concepts” are woven across the courses in years 1 through 3. Each transcending concept represents a content area that is essential for practice as a pharmacist. Courses typically have content that covers multiple transcending concepts.

Each exam administered in the Pharm.D. program is administered using ExamSoft. ExamSoft allows each individual question to be tagged according to transcending concept category. Using the tagging system in the ExamSoft assessment software, a longitudinal analysis report will be generated and analyzed at the end of each academic year to determine whether each student has met the minimum standard of achievement across the transcending concepts.

The following transcending concepts will be assessed for the 2017-2018 academic year as a weighted average: pathophysiology, pharmacology, medicinal chemistry, pharmacotherapy.

Standard of Achievement: At least 90% of students will earn at least a 69.5% score on the aggregate of the transcending topics.

Calculation of a transcending concept percentage score of an individual student: {summation of # of points the student correctly answered that were tagged to each transcending concept} / {total # of points available tagged to the four transcending concepts above}

Example: Student John Smith received 5 of 10 points for pathophysiology, 90 of 100 points for pharmacology, 60 of 80 points for medicinal chemistry, and 50 of 60 points for pharmacotherapy. Thus, the student earned 205 points out of 250 points possible for a percentage of 82%.

SLO Not Assessed This Year: false

Results:

An overwhelming 99% of students are meeting the minimum competency for pathophysiology, pharmacology, medicinal chemistry, pharmacotherapy.

Start: 07/01/2017

End: 06/30/2018

Threshold of Acceptability: 90

How many students did you assess for this outcome?: 779

How many students met the outcome?: 775

What percentage of students met the outcome?: 99

Does this meet your threshold of acceptability?: Yes

2017-18 SLO 2 Essentials for Practice and Care

Outcome:

2.1 Patient-Centered Care: Provide patient-centered care as the medication expert (collect and interpret evidence, prioritize patient needs, formulate assessments and recommendations, implement, monitor and adjust plans, and document activities). 2.2 Medication use systems management: Manage patient healthcare needs using human, financial, technological, and physical resources to optimize the safety and efficacy of medication use systems. 2.3 Health and wellness Promoter: Design prevention, intervention, and educational strategies for individuals and communities to manage chronic disease and improve health and wellness. 2.4 Population-based care Provider: Describe how population-based care influences patient-centered care and influences the development of practice guidelines and evidence-based best practices.

SLO Area (select one): Skills (Grad)

Assessment Method:

Skills Lab OSCE: An OSCE (Objective Structured Clinical Exam) requires students to perform practice skills during an encounter with a patient-actor. Students progress through a series of stations (each is 5-10 minutes in length) where they encounter a patient with a problem. The exam is developed using a blueprint of the SLOs and is designed so there is validity and reliability. See **Appendix I** for examples of two rubrics used at each OSCE station. **The example in Appendix I measures SLO 2.1.**

Benchmark: Competency defined by faculty as >78%.

Threshold of Acceptability: 90% of students are expected to have a total % correct score of 78% or above.

Attached Files

SLO Not Assessed This Year: false

Results:

Dr. Shauna Buring, Associate Dean of Professional Education, reviewed the results.

87.9% of students are successful in the OSCE environment with a benchmark of at least >78%.

While 87.9% is below the threshold, the OSCE team has and continues to modify the OSCEs to better measure student outcomes and modify the curriculum to improve student outcomes. The Class of 2019 3PD OSCE scores were low, in part, because of novelty education effects for both faculty and students as the Class of 2019 is the first class to experience the new curriculum. The Class of 2019 in the third professional year for the 2017-2018 academic year had 64 students below the 78% benchmark, while the Class of 2020 in the third professional year for the 2018-2019 academic year had only 11 students below 78%. This suggests that modifications on the part of the OSCE team and faculty experience in the new curriculum appear to be an effective means to address this issue.

Start: 07/01/2017

End: 06/30/2018

Threshold of Acceptability: 90

How many students did you assess for this outcome?: 497

How many students met the outcome?: 437

What percentage of students met the outcome?: 88

Does this meet your threshold of acceptability?: No

2017-18 SLO 3 Approach to Practice and Care

Outcome:

3.1 Problem Solver: Identify and assess problems; explore and prioritize potential strategies; and design, implement, and evaluate the most viable solution. 3.2 Educator: Educate all audiences by determining the most effective and enduring ways to impart information and assess understanding. 3.3 Patient Advocate: Assure the patient's best interests are represented. 3.4 Interprofessional Collaborator: Actively participate and engage as a healthcare team member by demonstrating mutual respect, understanding, and values to meet patient care needs. 3.5 Includer (Cultural Sensitivity): Recognize social determinants of health in order to diminish disparities and inequities in access to quality care. 3.6 Communicator: Effectively communicate verbally and nonverbally when interacting with an individual, group, or organization.

SLO Area (select one): Skills (Grad)

Assessment Method:

Students will complete a portfolio of professional activities and objects.

Description of assessment method:

At the start of the 1PD year all students complete the following documents and add them to their portfolio:

- Strengths Finder/Quest Signature Themes
- Learning Preferences <https://www.webtools.ncsu.edu/learningstyles/>
- GRIT-S score (attached)
- Self-Rating Scale of Self-Directed Learning (attached)

The following documents are created in the 1st year and updated in the portfolio every year after that:

- Curriculum Vitae

The following documents are completed each academic year in years 1-3: (1 cycle document is attached)

- Continuing Professional Development Draft
- Continuing Professional Development Revision
- Continuing Professional Development Complete

These CPDs are completed in a cycle (draft-revision-complete) Each student completes 3 full cycles.

Threshold of Acceptability: 95% of students will complete the portfolio.

Benchmark: Completion of all elements of the portfolio is considered standard for meeting this benchmark.

SLO Not Assessed This Year: true

Results:

Dr. Shauna Buring, Associate Dean of Professional Education, reviewed the results.

100% of the 757 students completed this requirement by submitting a complete portfolio according to Dr. Michelle Farland.

Start: 07/01/2017

End: 06/30/2018

Threshold of Acceptability: 95

How many students did you assess for this outcome?: 757

How many students met the outcome?: 757

What percentage of students met the outcome?: 100

Does this meet your threshold of acceptability?: Yes

2017-18 SLO 4 Personal and Professional Development

Outcome:

4.1 Self-aware: Examine and reflect on personal knowledge, skills, abilities, beliefs, biases, motivation, , shaunaand emotions that could enhance or limit personal and professional growth. 4.2 Leadership: Demonstrate responsibility for creating and achieving shared goals, regardless of position. 4.3 Innovator: Engage in innovative activities by using creative thinking to envision better ways of accomplishing professional goals. 4.4 Professional: Exhibit behaviors and values that are consistent with the trust given to the profession by patients, other healthcare providers, and society.

SLO Area (select one): Professional Behavior (Grad)

Assessment Method:

Portfolio

Mentor Evaluation

Benchmarks: Portfolio competency defined by faculty; Mentor evaluation rubric defines competency

SLO Not Assessed This Year: true

Results:

Start: 07/01/2017

End: 06/30/2018

Threshold of Acceptability:

How many students did you assess for this outcome?:

How many students met the outcome?:

What percentage of students met the outcome?:

Does this meet your threshold of acceptability?:

Programmatic Use of Results

Program: Pharmacy (PharmD)

Programmatic Use of Results:

Based on a review of data for the program goals, it was determined that we continued to admit quality applicants and our students were very satisfied with their degree program. In light of this data, the College has decided to maintain its current admissions practices.

Due to the excellent performance by students on the transcending concepts included in examinations, the college has decided to continue teaching and assessing these concepts threaded throughout the curriculum.

The scoring for OSCEs was re-evaluated and the method for setting the passing threshold was confirmed as the best approached based on the literature. The OSCE team discussed the scenarios used, objectives being measured and slightly modified both the OSCE scenarios and the curriculum for alignment.

No changes have been made to the portfolio assignment as the data has been deemed useful and the students are in compliance with this requirement. The College has decided to continue to use this as a measure of professionalism.

Program Results Not Reported This Year:

PharmD Pharmacy

End: 06/30/2018

Start: 07/01/2017

Providing Department: Pharmacy (PharmD)

Assessment Cycle (All AAPs):

Analysis and Interpretation: Completed by December – each year (Curriculum Assessment Sub-committee completes analysis and interpretation between May and December each year)

Program Modifications: Completed by January – each year (Curriculum Committee recommends any modifications 1 month after analysis & interpretation)

Dissemination: Completed by March – each year (Results are shared with Executive Committee & Faculty Governance Council 2 months after analysis & interpretation; Results are also shared with the College faculty each year; A general report is shared with alumni and other stakeholders)

Note about this Table: For each cycle year (row header), the cells within a column indicate what class year is assessed. The college will collect the indicated assessment data with each class year of students (ie, all students in Years 1 through 4).

Assessment	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	
SLOs					
1.1 Knowledge	Post-graduation		PCOA (National Exam)		NAPLEX (National Exam)
Skills					
2.1 Patient-Centered Care	Years 1 and 3	Years 1,3 and Year 4	Years 1,3 and Year 4	Years 1,3,4	
2.2 Medication Use Systems Management	Years 1 and 3	Years 1,3 and Year 4	Years 1,3 and Year 4	Years 1,3,4	
2.3 Health and Wellness Promoter	Years 1 and 3	Years 1,3 and Year 4	Years 1,3 and Year 4	Years 1,3,4	
2.4 Population-based Care Provider	Years 1 and 3	Year 1 and 4	Years 1,3 and Year 4	Years 1,3,4	
3.1 Problem-solver	Years 1 and 3	Years 1,3 and Year 4	Years 1,3 and Year 4	Years 1,3,4	
3.2 Educator	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1	Years 1,3,4	
3.3 Patient Advocate	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1	Years 1,3,4	
3.4 Interprofessional Collaborator	Year 1-Team Assessment and OSCE, Year 3- OSCE	Year 1-Team Assessment, Year 3 and Year 4 - OSCE	Year 1-Team Assessment, Year 3 and Year 4 - OSCE	Years 1,3,4	
3.5 Includer (Cultural Sensitivity)	Years 1 and 3	Years 1,3,4	Years 1,3,4	Years 1,3,4	
3.6 Communicator	Years 1 and 3	Years 1,3,4	Years 1,3,4	Years 1,3,4	
Professional Behavior					
4.1 Self-aware	Years 1-4	Years 1-4	Years 1-4	Years 1-4	
4.2 Leadership	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1 and Year 4	Year 1 and Year 4	
4.3 Innovator	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1 and Year 4	Year 1 and Year 4	
4.4 Professional	Years 1-4	Years 1-4	Years 1-4	Years 1-4	

SLO Assessment Rubric (All AAPs):

University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric

Program:

Component	Criterion	Rating			Comments
		Met	Partially Met	Not Met	
Mission Statement	Mission statement is articulated clearly.				
	The program mission clearly supports the College and University missions, and includes specific statements describing how it supports these missions.				
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Assessment Measures	SLOs are stated clearly.				
	SLOs focus on demonstration of student learning.				
	SLOs are measurable.				
	Measurements are appropriate for the SLO.				
Research	Research expectations for the program are clear, concise, and appropriate for the discipline.				
Assessment Map	The Assessment Map indicates the times in the program where the SLOs are assessed and measured.				
	The Assessment Map identifies the assessments used for each SLO.				
Assessment Cycle	The assessment cycle is clear.				
	All student learning outcomes are measured.				
	Data is collected at least once in the cycle.				
	The cycle includes a date or time period for data analysis and interpretation.				
	The cycle includes a date for planning improvement actions based on the data analysis.				
	The cycle includes a date for dissemination of results to the appropriate stakeholders.				

Component	Criterion	Rating			Comments
		Met	Partially Met	Not Met	
Measurement Tools	Measurement tools are described clearly and concisely.				
	Measurements are appropriate for the SLOs.				
	Methods and procedures reflect an appropriate balance of direct and indirect methods.				
	The report presents examples of at least one measurement tool.				
Assessment Oversight	Appropriate personnel (coordinator, committee, etc.) charged with assessment responsibilities are identified				

Research (Graduate and Professional AAPs only):

The Pharm.D. program is a professional degree and therefore, does not require a research project.

Measurement Tools (Graduate and Professional AAPs Only):**NABP Board Exam (Administered upon Graduation):**

The NAPLEX Exam is required for licensure and measures 3 knowledge areas according to a blueprint (application of knowledge related to SLOs 1-3). (See - National Association of Boards of Pharmacists website for blueprint details: <http://www.nabp.net/programs/examination/naplex/>) Benchmark: >95% pass rate; above both State and National Passing rate

Skills Lab OSCE:

An OSCE (Objective Structured Clinical Exam) requires students to perform practice skills during an encounter with a patient-actor. Students progress through a series of stations (each is 5-10 minutes in length) where they encounter a patient with a problem. The exam is developed using a blueprint of the SLOs and is designed so there is validity and reliability.

AACP Survey:

A survey that is administered nationally to graduating Pharm.D. students, preceptors, faculty, and alumni at all Colleges/Schools of Pharmacy. See Appendix III for the Graduating Student Survey. Items (#10-29) of this survey provide indirect measures of student competency (esp SLOs 1-3). The results include peer and national benchmark data. This survey gathers data that provides data related to not only indirect performance assessment measures but also metrics related to program quality.

Population Health Project Rubric:

Year 1 students enrolled in PHA5007 will be grouped into teams to complete this assignment. Each team will be expected to complete a final project on an assigned special population that incorporates concepts learned throughout the course and culminates in a final poster presentation by the team. Teams will work to identify relevant health issues and corresponding determinants of these health issues for their assigned population.

Team Project - Faculty Poster Evaluation	
You've already rated students with this rubric. Any major changes could affect their assessment results.	
Criteria	Ratings
Project Content (Poster and Verbal Presentation)	Thoroughly but concisely presents main points of the project. Comprehensively thoughtful analysis of the issues. Narration and/or answering of questions is engaging. 12pts
Visual Presentation of Poster	Overall visually appealing; not cluttered; Colors and patterns enhance readability and readability of the project. Graphics are engaging and enhance the text. Content is clear. 6pts
Documentation of Sources	Cites all data/ references. References are excellent and show thoughtful insights. 6pts
Spelling and Grammar	No spelling and grammar mistakes. 6pts
Total Points:30	

Career Coach Program Assessment:

Career Coaches will be asked to complete assessments on students. See below for assessment rubric:

- Curriculum Vitae
- Continuing Professional Development (CPD)
 - Fall semester meeting should review the completed CPD cycle with all sections done including Reflection, Plan, Learning Activities, and Evaluation
 - Spring semester meeting should review the draft CPD (Reflection and Plan sections only) and following the meeting with the student the revised CPD (Reflection and Plan sections that are updated based on your conversations with the student during the meeting)

Assessment Questions: (Please note that this assessment does not contribute to the students grades, it is a measure of us to monitor student progression in these areas.)

1. Did you meet with this student face-to-face or via video conference (e.g. Skype, FaceTime, Zoom, etc)?
2. Self-Awareness: How would you rate the student's level of self-awareness? (We define self-awareness as being able to examine and reflect on personal knowledge, skills, abilities, beliefs, biases, motivation, and emotions that could enhance or limit personal and professional growth)
 - a. Needs Improvement: The student has not yet identified his/her strengths and areas for improvement
 - b. Meets Expectations: The student has thoughtfully identified strengths and areas for improvement. During the current CPD cycle, the student has made effort to complete activities to work on areas needing improvement.
 - c. Exceeds Expectations: The student has thoughtfully identified strengths and areas for improvement. For multiple CPD cycles, the student has completed activities to work on areas needing improvement.
3. Professionalism: How would you rate the student's level of professionalism? (We define professionalism as being able to exhibit behaviors and values that are consistent with the trust given to the profession by patients, other healthcare providers, and society.)
 - a. Needs Improvement: More than 2 of the following need development: adherence to deadlines, professional verbal and written communication, respect, attentiveness, commitment to excellence, inquisitiveness.
 - b. Meets Expectations: The student needs development in 1-2 of the following: adherence to deadlines, professional verbal and written communication, respect, attentiveness, commitment to excellence, inquisitiveness.
 - c. Exceeds Expectations: The student displays all of the following characteristics and skills: adherence to deadlines, professional verbal and written communication, respect, attentiveness, commitment to excellence, inquisitiveness.
4. Career Planning & Continuing Professional Development
 - a. To what extent has the student established a career path?
 - i. Not defined: the student is undecided about his/her career area in pharmacy.
 - ii. Somewhat defined: the student is somewhat sure about the type of pharmacy practice he/she desires. He/She can state a desired future career path, but is contemplating multiple career options.
 - iii. Defined: the student has clearly identified a future career path/area of pharmacy practice.
 - b. How would you rate the student's ability to establish personal goals as part of Continuing Professional Development?
 - i. Needs Improvement: The student is unable to create a personal goal that will enable him/her to make steps towards a career path.
 - ii. Meets Expectations: The student is able to create personal goals that will enable him/her to make steps towards a career path.
 - c. How would you rate the student's ability to accomplish personal goals as part of Continuing Professional Development?
 - i. Needs improvement: The student did not complete activities that correlated with pre-determined goals.
 - ii. Meets Expectations: The student completed activities that correlated with pre-determined goals, though not all goals were accomplished.
 - iii. Exceeds Expectations: The student completed activities that correlated with pre-determined goals and all goals were accomplished.

Assessment Timeline (Graduate and Professional AAPs only):