

Annual Performance Report Professional

Department/Program: **School of Pharmacy**
 Date submitted: **October 5, 2010**
 Person(s) submitting report: **Erin Timpe, Chair, Outcomes Assessment Committee SOP**

1. Please list student benchmarks/outcomes/objectives for your department/program (Copy and paste from your Assessment Plan):

Below are key outcomes from the School of Pharmacy (SOP) Assessment Plan. The full Assessment Plan that the School of Pharmacy uses may be found in Appendix A.

Benchmark/ Outcome	Performance Indicator or Assessment	Criteria for Passing	Where Are the Benchmarks / Outcomes Assessed?
Achievement of Learning	NAPLEX (Pharmacy Board) Exam & appropriate law exam	National Association of Boards of Pharmacy determines – above 95% pass rate	Following 4 th professional year
Problem Solving & Critical Thinking	Capstone Project	C or better in Capstone Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience	4 th professional year
Curriculum Quality Improvement	American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy Continuous Quality Improvement surveys of faculty, students, preceptors & alumni	Comparable to benchmarking institutions	Graduating students assessed immediately prior to graduation. Faculty, preceptors and alumni assessed the year prior to accreditation.
Accreditation by Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education	Accreditation reviews	Full accreditation status	Every 4 to 6 years

2. Please provide data from your assessment measures. Include data for all program assessments:

a. The full assessment plan for the School of Pharmacy appears in Appendix A.

Data has been collected for each method reported in the assessment plan and has been disseminated as is also stated in the plan to appropriate faculty, students and committees. Data for specific outcomes identified in number 1 appear below.

b. Achievement of Learning: NAPLEX Exam and appropriate law exam pass rate.

These are standardized exams that students must pass to become licensed pharmacists. Results for the Class of 2010 will be communicated to us in October 2010.

The SIUE SOP Class of 2009 achieved a 97.26% passing rate on the NAPLEX licensure examination for the period of May 1 – August 31, 2009. Seventy-three out of 80 students in our first graduating class took the exam during this time period. The national passing rate overall was 95.03% for all takers and 97.50% for first time candidates. Overall, there were more than 10,000 examinees during this time period. This exam pass rate is above our set criteria of passing of greater than 95%.

c. Problem Solving & Critical Thinking: Capstone Project (Senior Project).

Students are evaluated on their project declaration, paper, and poster research project completed as a Capstone project in the final year of the program. The project declaration and paper are evaluated by the Capstone coordinator and the poster is evaluated by several faculty and outside preceptors. Each of these pieces is used for the final grade of the project. All 76 students in the Class of 2010 achieved a 'C' grade or better on their capstone projects. We had 58-A's and 18-B's in the course this year. The rubrics used to evaluate these projects appear in Appendix B.

d. Curriculum Quality Improvement (CQI): American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACCP) CQI surveys of faculty, students, alumni and preceptors.

These surveys are standardized surveys from the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy that allow for benchmarking among Schools of Pharmacy. Questions on these surveys are grouped into questions about such things as the curriculum, student services, resources available, faculty support and development and overall impressions of the program. We completed the survey of faculty, graduating students, preceptors and alumni during the summer of 2010. All survey results were shared with all SOP faculty at the September faculty meeting.

The survey of *faculty* was primarily positive. The survey results included responses from 84.44% of SOP faculty. The following items included only agree and strongly agree responses: The college/school has a sufficient number of qualified faculty; My campus work environment is safe; Laboratories and other non-classroom

environments are conducive to learning; The Pharm.D., program prepares students to search the health sciences literature and apply state and federal laws and regulations to the practice of pharmacy; and In my opinion, the proportion of my time spent on teaching is appropriate. Other items that included between 18.4%-39.5% disagree or strongly disagree responses included: I receive formal feedback on my performance on a regular basis; The college/school consistently applies promotion and/or tenure policies and procedures; I receive adequate support staff resources; The college/school effectively manages poor academic performance of students; I receive adequate guidance on career development; Funds are available to support my faculty development; Programs are available for non-practice faculty to orient them to the pharmacy profession and professional education; and Programs are available to me to help me develop my competence in research and/or scholarship. No items had greater than 39.5% disagree/strongly disagree response. Items with the noted disagree/strongly disagree response were forwarded to the Dean and to the Faculty Development and Academic Standards and Progression Committees. The Academic Standards and Progression Committee met in September to work on revising the policy on remediation of students and reviews progression policies yearly. The Faculty Development Committee has included the noted faculty development items on the agenda to discuss this year. Consideration is being given to creating a Vice Chair position in the Department of Pharmacy Practice to assist with the formal feedback of faculty and for career advice. Regarding the lack of support staff, the SOP has lost three secretaries this year that have not been able to be replaced due to budget constraints. Recently, the School of Pharmacy has submitted a request to fund one secretarial position through non-state funds.

The survey of **graduating students** revealed all positive results and items exceeded those of our benchmarking institutions (seven other masters program, state supported institutions). The survey response was 100% of the graduating class of 2010. The SOP Outcomes Assessment Committee did not identify any areas that needed to be reviewed further from these survey results.

The survey of **alumni** was positive as well. We had 79 graduates in the Class of 2009 and had 40 responses to the survey for a response rate of 51%. Seventy percent of respondents indicated their primary state of practice is Illinois. The primary practice settings reported included: chain community pharmacy (45%), independent community pharmacy (7.5%), hospital (27.5%), clinic-based pharmacy (7.5%), consultant (2.5%), academia (2.5%), government or regulatory agency (2.5%), and other (5%). Sixty-seven percent of alumni indicated minimal or moderate current involvement in pharmacy organizations. The following items had no strongly disagree or disagree responses: the current Dean is providing leadership in

pharmacy; the college/school provided an environment and culture that promoted professional behavior and harmonious relationships among students; faculty, administrators, preceptors and staff, the faculty administrators, and staff were committed to developing professionalism fostering leadership and to serving as mentors and positive role models; I knew what the program outcomes were; the curriculum provided opportunities to engage in active learning; I was encouraged to assume responsibility for my own learning; the faculty were effective leaders; the faculty displayed respect for their colleagues and students; the PharmD program prepared me to search the health sciences literature and maintain professional competence. There were two disagree responses and one strongly disagree response to: the courses I took prepared me to enter my first pharmacy job. The following items had a greater than 10% disagree or strongly disagree response (percent disagree and strongly disagree): since graduation, the college/school has solicited my input/feedback for programmatic improvement (15%); the curriculum was properly sequenced (12.5%); pharmacy related elective courses met my needs as a PharmD student (12.5%); the college/school provided an adequate number and mix of practice facilities for experiential education (15%); the PharmD program prepared me to manage the system of medication use (12.5%) and apply state and federal laws and regulations to the practice of pharmacy (22.5%). One respondent indicated strongly disagree while all others were strongly agree or agree to the statements: if I were starting my education over today, I would choose pharmacy as a career, if I were starting my education over today I would choose the same college/school of pharmacy, and as I reflect on my pharmacy education, I would rate the overall quality of my education experience as very good. Several changes have been made to the program since the first class graduated including the addition of more electives and experiential rotation sites. Information from this survey will be provided to the curriculum and experiential education committees. An alumni council has been formed to address alumni needs and to involve alumni in school activities.

Preceptors are practitioners in various settings who instruct students during their experiential rotations during their final year of pharmacy school. This survey request was sent out to 79 preceptors selected by the Director of Experiential Education who represented a distribution of all preceptors. Sixty preceptors responded. Seven schools that we have chosen as our benchmarking institutions also completed the survey and data from our preceptor survey was compared against the aggregate results of these institutions. Overall, the results compared very similarly, although all slightly better, than the aggregate of our benchmarking institutions. The following items had a greater than 10% disagree or strongly disagree response (percent disagree and strongly disagree): I receive the results from student evaluations of my rotation (20%), I know how to utilize the process

that exists within the college/school to effectively manage academic misconduct by students (15%), I know how to utilize policies of the college/school that deal with harassment and discrimination (13.4%), and I am aware of the mechanism to provide feedback to the college/school regarding the PharmD curriculum (15%). The results of this survey have been shared with the Experiential Education Committee.

e. Accreditation by Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education.

We achieved our initial full accreditation status in 2009. The standard accreditation process is for an additional accreditation review to occur 2 years after initial accreditation. We are therefore scheduled to have a review in March of 2011. There were a few items identified in the 2009 report that the program has been continuing to monitor (for example: creation of student portfolios and curricular assessment). We have been working to fully achieve the standards recommended to be monitored.

3. Number of students completing Senior Assignment:

- a. Summer 09: 0
- b. Fall 09: 0
- c. Spring 10: **76**
- d. Total head count: **76**

4. Number of students meeting Senior Assignment Expectations:

- a. # of students who did not meet expectations: **0**
- b. # of students who met expectations: **18** (B or C grade)
- c. # of students who exceeded expectations: **58** (A grade)

5. After reviewing the assessment results the department has decided to: (check one)

- Stay the course and continue to monitor; we're satisfied that the program is preparing students to meet the benchmarks/outcomes/goals.
- Monitor the results and investigate causes; we may need to make changes but need more information to make that decision. (please list what you plan to investigate)**
- Make changes. (please list changes below)

Comments:

As we are still a relatively new program, we are monitoring the program closely. We will have a visit from our accrediting body in March 2011.

6. After reviewing our student benchmarks/outcomes/objectives the department/program has decided to: (check one)

X Keep the student benchmarks/outcomes/goals and measures used to evaluate the goals.

- Modify the benchmarks/outcomes/goals. (please list modifications below)
- Modify the assessment measures used to evaluate the benchmarks/outcomes/goals. (please list modification below)

Comments:

7. Please write a brief summary of continuous improvement efforts undertaken by the program in 09-10.

The School of Pharmacy has participated in multiple efforts in 2009-2010 to try to maintain an excellent program. Some are listed below:

- a. Curriculum: A task force has been created to evaluate the pharmacotherapeutics courses in the curriculum. A second task force has also been created to evaluate the pre-pharmacy requirements. A curricular evaluation plan was created.
- b. Assessment: The outcomes assessment committee is investigating methods to assess overall knowledge throughout the curriculum.
 - i. Assessment Plan: Data is continually being collected related to the School of Pharmacy Assessment Plan. This information is shared with faculty regularly. These data include information about student stress, student professionalism, surveys of faculty and graduating students, and student progression. An employer survey of graduates' preparedness for the workplace will be conducted in fall 2010.
 - ii. Performance Assessment: A faculty retreat focused on this topic and an implementation committee is working to begin objective structured clinical exams of students in fall 2011 and will collect data related to tested competencies.
- c. Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education Report: A few standards will continue to be monitored. The outcomes assessment committee is working to use a portfolio system to fully meet one of the standards.
- d. External Audit: The program is due for an internal audit this year. We are in the process of collecting data and monitoring this data to ensure that we are meeting the mission and goals of the School. Specifically, we are gathering data related to providing high-quality health care to the central and southern regions of Illinois.
- e. Strategic Planning: We are in the process of revisiting the strategic plan for the School that was created in 2009. A faculty retreat focusing on the strategic plan is planned for November 22, 2010.

Appendix A:

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY EDWARDSVILLE SCHOOL OF PHARMACY ASSESSMENT PLAN

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville School of Pharmacy is committed to an assessment plan that embodies a continuous quality improvement (CQI) perspective and a seamless process. The plan utilizes indicators to assess the following goals and objectives.

The goals for assessment at SIUE School of Pharmacy are:

1. To assess the activities of the School of Pharmacy in achieving its stated goals.
2. To improve student learning and student life.
3. To document to stakeholders the achievement of stated goals.

The assessment objectives for students are:

1. To demonstrate student's achievement of learning for various abilities:
 - a) knowledge
 - b) problem solving & critical thinking
 - c) communication
 - d) social awareness (including cultural competency) and responsibility
 - e) life long learning
2. To determine satisfaction with School of Pharmacy experiences.

The assessment objectives for faculty are:

1. To assess development and documentation of teaching abilities.
2. To assess development and documentation of scholarship abilities.
3. To assess documentation of service contributions.
4. To assess collegiality

The assessment objectives for program evaluation are:

1. Evaluate student's pre-pharmacy preparedness for the pharmacy professional program and effectiveness of student admissions decisions.
2. Evaluate effectiveness of academic programs.
3. Evaluate effectiveness of professionalization of students.
4. To assess the success of student organizations.

The assessment objectives for external stakeholders evaluations are:

1. Evaluate satisfaction with School graduates.
2. Evaluate satisfaction with student experiential education.
3. To determine perceptions of quality and ranking of School.
4. To document potential contributions to society.
5. To assess success of the advancement office.

Time Frames for Assessment Implementation

Data collected	Method(s)	Timeline	Responsibility	Analysis, Dissemination
Students				
Achievement of Learning				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge 	Course exams Assignments	Continuous	Course faculty	Individual Students Course Faculty
	Student data: GPA of the class; # of students with D's, F's, and no credits, # of students on academic probation, # of students dismissed; grades for course blocks; students graduating, NAPLEX pass rate	Annually	Student Affairs	Student Affairs Faculty Academic Standards and Progression Committee
	Electronic portfolio program	This is currently being evaluated and piloted for future use.	Faculty Individual Students	Faculty
	APPE student portfolio	P4 year	Individual Students Preceptor Office of Experiential Education	Individual Students Preceptor Office of Experiential Education
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problem solving & Critical thinking 	Case studies Assignments Course Exams	Continuous	Course faculty	Individual Students Course Faculty
	Summary of teaching and learning methods	Annually	Academic Affairs	Faculty
	Senior Capstone project	P4 year	Students Mentors Capstone Coordinator	Individual Students Course Faculty Mentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral communication 	Simulations & Presentations	Continuous	Course faculty	Individual Students Course Faculty
	Summary of teaching and learning methods	Annually	Academic Affairs	Faculty

Data collected	Method(s)	Timeline	Responsibility	Analysis, Dissemination
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written communication 	Assignments	Continuous	Course faculty	Individual Students Course Faculty
	Course specific reflective portfolio	Following IPPEs	Office of Experiential Education	Students Faculty
	Summary of teaching and learning methods	Annually	Academic Affairs	Faculty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social awareness (including cultural competency) & responsibility 	Course specific reflective portfolio	During Service Learning IPPE	Office of Experiential Education	Students Faculty Experiential Education Committee
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Life long learning 	Course specific reflective portfolio	Continuous	Course faculty	Individual Students Course Faculty
	Exit interviews	End of P4 year	Student Affairs	Faculty Dean
	APPE student portfolios	P4 year	Individual Students Preceptor Office of Experiential Education	Individual Students Preceptor Experiential Education Committee
Stress and satisfaction with school experiences	Stress survey	Annually P1 - P3 years	Student Affairs Academic Affairs	Students Assessment Committee Dean Faculty
	Town hall meetings	Each semester	Dean's Office	Students Faculty
	Exit interviews	End of P4 year	Student Affairs	Faculty Dean

Faculty				
Teaching	Teaching evaluations Peer reviews	End of semester	Department Chair	Individual Faculty Department Chair
	Annual report	Annually	Department Chair Faculty	Individual Faculty Department Chair Dean (P&T Process)

Data collected	Method(s)	Timeline	Responsibility	Analysis, Dissemination
	Department summaries	Annually	Faculty Department Chair	Faculty Department Chair Dean
Scholarship	Annual report	Annually	Department Chair Faculty	Individual Faculty Department Chair Dean (P&T Process)
	Department summaries	Annually	Faculty Department Chair	Faculty Department Chair Associate Dean for Research Dean
Service	Annual report	Annually	Department Chair Faculty	Individual Faculty Department Chair Dean (P&T Process)
	Department summaries	Annually	Faculty Department Chair	Faculty Department Chair Dean
Collegiality	Annual report	Annually	Department Chair Faculty	Individual Faculty Department Chair Dean (P&T Process)
	Department summaries	Annually	Faculty Department Chair	Faculty Department Chair Dean

Program				
Pre-pharmacy preparedness & Effectiveness of Student Admissions Decisions	Regression analysis of admissions data & 1 st year GPA	Yearly	Student Affairs	Faculty Student Affairs Admissions Committee
Effectiveness of Academic Programs	Individual course evaluations	Every semester	Academic Affairs	Faculty
	Aggregate course evaluation data	Every semester	Academic Affairs	Assessment Committee Faculty
	Curriculum mapping	Ongoing	Academic Affairs	Faculty Curriculum Committee

Data collected	Method(s)	Timeline	Responsibility	Analysis, Dissemination
	Content mapping	Ongoing	Academic Affairs	Faculty Curriculum Committee
	Exit interviews	End of P4 year	Student Affairs	Faculty Dean External Stakeholders
	AACP curriculum quality surveys	Faculty – every other year Preceptors – before accreditation cycle Graduating Students – annually Alumni – before accreditation cycle	Academic Affairs	Assessment Committee Student Affairs Faculty
	Preceptor site visits and evaluations of preceptors	Evaluations following each rotation	Office of Experiential Education	Experiential Education Committee
	University program review	With Accreditation	Accreditation Self Study Committee University Director of Assessment	Faculty External Stakeholders
Professionalism	Surveys	P1 prior to IPPE1 P2 after IPPE4 P4 after APPEs	Student Affairs Academic Affairs	Students Faculty Assessment Committee
	Experiential assessments	Following each IPPE and APPE rotation	Office of Experiential Education	Experiential Education Committee
	Reflective portfolio	End of IPPEs & APPEs	Office of Experiential Education	Experiential Education Committee
Success of student organizations	Annual reports	Annually	Student organizations Student Affairs Director of Development and External Affairs	Faculty External Stakeholders

Data collected	Method(s)	Timeline	Responsibility	Analysis, Dissemination
External Stakeholders				
Satisfaction with school graduates	Survey of sample of employers	Every 5 years	Assessment Committee Director of Development and External Affairs	Faculty External Stakeholders
Satisfaction with student experiential education	Preceptor surveys	Bi-annual	Office of Experiential Education	Experiential Education Committee
Perceptions of quality and ranking of School	Benchmarking data from ACPE	Annually	Assessment Committee	Dean Faculty
Document contributions to the society	Document curricular and co-curricular community outreach	Annually	Director of Development and External Affairs	External Stakeholders
Assess success of development and external outreach efforts	Development updates and Annual report	Annually	Director of Development and External Affairs	Faculty External Stakeholders

Appendix B:



School of Pharmacy

Capstone Project Rotation
Project Declaration Assessment

Student:				Date:	
Capstone Project Title:					
Criteria	Excellent 2	Good 1.5	Needs Development 1	Unacceptable 0	Score
Communication:					
Spelling and grammar errors.	The writing is free of spelling and grammar errors.	The writing contains less than 5 spelling and/or grammar errors.	The writing contains more than 5 spelling and/or grammar errors.	The writing contains so many errors that the audience is confused.	
Elements of Declaration:					
Introduction and Methods	The introduction and methods are clearly defined.	The introduction and methods are defined but are missing key background studies and the methods are unclear.	The introduction and methods are missing several key background studies and/or the methods do not fit the project.	No introduction and methods are defined.	
Results and Conclusion	Appropriate projected results and a conclusion are given. This may only be a sentence or two.	Projected results and a conclusion are given but may not fit the project.	Projected results are given but do not fit the project and/or the conclusion is inappropriate.	No results or conclusions for the study are defined.	
Projected time line	A well-defined time line is presented that is appropriate for the project.	A time line is presented but has elements that are unreasonable.	A time line is presented but all elements are unreasonable.	No time line has been developed.	
Timing	All elements of the project	Some elements of the project	The project declaration is	No project declaration is	

	declaration are present and turned in on time.	declaration are incomplete but turned in on time.	incomplete and/or turned in late.	available.	
Total Points (maximum score = 10)					

Evaluator Comments:



School of Pharmacy

Capstone Project Rotation
Paper Grading Assessment

Student:				Date:	
Capstone Project Title:					
Criteria	Excellent 4	Good 3	Needs Development 2	Unacceptable 0	Score
Communication:					
Spelling and grammar errors.	The written paper is free of spelling and grammar errors.	The written paper contains less than 5 spelling and/or grammar errors.	The written paper contains more than 5 spelling and/or grammar errors.	The written paper contains so many errors that the audience is confused.	
Appearance	The written paper is neatly typed and meets all of the formatting requirements.	The written paper is typed and only partially meets all of the formatting requirements.	The written paper is typed but does not meet any of the formatting requirements.	The written paper is hand written and does not meet any of the formatting requirements.	
Language	The written paper used language appropriate for the intended audience and flows smoothly from idea to idea.	The written paper used language appropriate for the intended audience but the sentence structure is choppy.	The written paper used a mixture of appropriate and inappropriate language for the intended audience and the sentence structure is choppy.	The written paper used inappropriate language for a research paper and there was no sentence structure.	
Elements of Paper:					
Abstract	Abstract is present and contains all of the required elements	Abstract is present but is missing one or two required elements	Abstract is present but is missing more than two required elements	No abstract is present.	

	providing a brief and concise overview of the project within the 250 word maximum.	within the 250 word maximum.	and/or does not conform to the 250 word maximum.		
Introduction	The introduction clearly states the research purpose or hypothesis, reviews relevant literature and engages the audience.	The introduction states the research purpose or hypothesis and reviews current literature.	The research purpose or hypothesis is difficult to find and/or the literature review is inappropriate.	No introduction is clearly defined.	
Methods	The methods section clearly describes in detail how the project was conducted and could be duplicated by another researcher.	The methods section describes how the project was conducted but raises a few questions about how the process flows from step to step.	The methods section describes how the project was conducted but does not flow from step to step making it difficult for the audience to follow.	No methods are clearly defined.	
Results and Discussion	The results and discussion of the study are clearly presented using an appropriate format that is clearly understood by the audience.	The results and discussion of the study are presented but the results are misleading or inaccurate.	The results and discussion of the study are presented but the results are inaccurate and the discussion lacks clarity.	No results of the study are defined.	
Conclusions	The conclusion for the study is clearly stated and strongly supported by the results and/or background literature.	The conclusion for the study is stated but is not supported by the results and/or background literature.	The conclusion for the study is not stated nor is it supported by the results and/or background literature.	There is not conclusion section discernable.	
Bibliography	The bibliography showed the depth and	The bibliography contained citations	The bibliography showed a very narrow	No bibliography is present.	

	breadth of literature used in the project and followed the Uniform Requirements.	from unreliable, non-peer reviewed or all internet sources and somewhat followed the Uniform Requirements format.	search strategy and did not conform to the Uniform Requirements format.		
Citations	The body of the paper contained appropriately labeled citations from the literature and followed the given format.	The body of the paper contained citations from the literature but the format was not followed.	In the body of the paper, literature citations were made but were inappropriate and the formatting for the citations was not followed.	No citations from the literature are found.	
Total Points (maximum score = 40)					

Evaluator Comments:



School of Pharmacy

Capstone Project Rotation
Poster Assessment

Student:			Date:		
Capstone Project Title:					
Criteria	Excellent 4	Good 3	Needs Development 2	Unacceptable 0	Score
Communication:					
Spelling and grammar errors.	The poster is free of spelling and grammar errors.	The poster paper contains less than 3 spelling and/or grammar errors.	The poster paper contains more than 3 spelling and/or grammar errors.	The poster contains so many errors that the audience is confused.	
Appearance	The poster is visually appealing containing artistic elements that are subtle and do not distract from the research elements.	The poster contains artistic elements that dominate and distract from the research elements.	The poster research elements are difficult to follow and the artistic elements dominate the poster.	The poster is unorganized making it hard to read and there are no artistic elements present.	
Elements:					
Research elements	The poster contains all research design elements are clearly labeled and described.	The poster is missing one or two research design elements but the elements are clearly labeled and described.	The poster is missing more than two research design elements and is disorganized.	The poster is missing all research design elements and the poster is difficult to read and follow.	
Effectiveness	The poster provides the audience with a thorough understanding of the topic researched.	The poster provides the audience with an understanding of the topic researched.	The poster provides the audience with more questions than answers of the topic researched.	The poster leaves the audience confused as to the topic researched.	

Timing	A completed poster was turned in on time.	The poster was incomplete but turned in on time.	The poster was late.	No poster was turned in.	
Total Points (maximum score = 20)					

Evaluator Comments: