



Research article

Where we are now: A 2015 snapshot of assessment personnel and practices in US Schools and Colleges of pharmacy

Matthew R. Dintzner, PhD^{a,*}, L. Douglas Ried, PhD^b

^a College of Pharmacy, Western New England University, Springfield, MA

^b Ben and Maytee Fisch College of Pharmacy, University of Texas at Tyler, Tyler, TX

Abstract

Purpose: To describe infrastructures and personnel of US schools and colleges of pharmacy (S/COPs) assigned to coordinate and administer programmatic and curricular assessment.

Methods: A web-based survey instrument consisting of 23 standardized questions was administered using *Qualtrics™*, Provo, Utah. An invitation to participate was sent to 128 deans via e-mail with an embedded link to the survey instrument. A follow-up e-mail reminder was sent to non-responders after two weeks, then weekly for another month. The survey was closed after two months.

Conclusions: The final response rate was 47% ($N = 60$), with respondents comprising a representative cross-section of US S/COPs. Most US S/COPs have a written plan of programmatic assessment, stand-alone assessment committees with representative membership, and either a dean-level or faculty administrator responsible for leading assessment activities. On a sliding scale from 0% to 100%, most respondents report their programs have achieved a culture of assessment in the 70–99% range. Considerable progress has been made in 15 years since assessment personnel in the US S/COPs were last formally documented.

© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Assessment; Personnel; Infrastructure

Introduction

In the last two decades, considerable effort has been dedicated to programmatic and curricular assessment in schools and colleges of pharmacy (S/COP). With regard to curricular assessment, the focus has been on improvement of student learning and the development of effective methods for measuring the extent to which students are achieving desired learning outcomes.¹ With regard to programmatic assessment, the standards and guidelines of the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE) have evolved to emphasize assessment of every facet of the program, from educational outcomes to structure and process.² As a result,

the literature has figuratively blossomed with new and innovative assessment strategies that have, in no small way, facilitated a paradigm shift in pharmacy education from topics-based to outcomes-based curricula.¹ Along the way, pharmacy programs across the country have established various systems for developing, implementing, and administering comprehensive assessment plans.³ This article focuses on the “other side” of assessment—how the human infrastructure that drives programmatic and curricular assessment has evolved and how it looks now in 2015.

In 2000, Bouldin and Wilkin presented a snapshot of programmatic curricular assessment in US schools and colleges of pharmacy based on a survey of Deans at Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.) programs ($n = 80$).⁴ While their survey included information about personnel directly involved in the assessment process at the time, their findings indicated that most programs were only in the early stages of establishing the types of comprehensive assessment plans that facilitate the

* Corresponding author: Matthew R. Dintzner, PhD, College of Pharmacy, Western New England University, 1215 Wilbraham Road, Springfield, MA 01109-2684.

E-mail: matthew.dintzner@wne.edu

development of a culture of assessment. In the same year, Boyce published a detailed guide for the development of a Pharm.D. programmatic assessment plan that included a general model for personnel considerations (administration and management of the plan).⁵ Boyce's report has been cited extensively in the literature, including by Abate et al.⁶ Abate's article highlights excellence in curriculum development and assessment and defines 12 principles and characteristics of effective program assessment practices, including one relating to personnel—"Assessment efforts should be directed by persons who are competent, motivated, and trustworthy to enhance the credibility and acceptance of the findings..."⁶ Since then, only a few other reports in the literature have included descriptions of assessment personnel, usually as part of larger reviews of curricular and programmatic assessment.^{1,7,8} Thus, in anticipation of the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education's Accreditation Standards and Key Elements for the Professional Program in Pharmacy Leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy Degree (ACPE Standards 2016),² we were interested in knowing what kinds of personnel infrastructures are in place for assessment in 2015 and how they have evolved since the start of the millennium.

Methods

A web-based survey instrument was developed in fall 2014 and approved by Western New England University's institutional review board (IRB). The survey, consisting of 23 standardized questions, was built and administered using *Qualtrics*TM, Provo, Utah. The majority of questions in the survey were adopted from Bouldin and Wilkin⁴ with the remainder developed by the authors. The survey questions were tested on a small number of faculty at one of the authors' college. An invitation to participate in the survey was sent to all of the 128 deans listed in the AACP online roster of S/COPs on October 15, 2014, via e-mail with an embedded link to the survey instrument. Follow-up e-mail reminders were sent to non-responders after two weeks, then weekly for another month. e-Mail reminders prompted the recipients (Deans) to forward the request if other(s) within their program were deemed more suitable to complete the survey. The survey was closed on December 11, 2014 and response data were downloaded to and processed in *Microsoft Excel for Mac 2011* (version 14.1.0). Chi-square analyses were conducted to examine differences between responses to questions in the Bouldin and Wilkin⁴ study and the current study regarding response rates from the schools or colleges, the proportion with assessment committees, college-level office of assessment, and full-time dedicated assessment staff personnel.

Results

Respondent demographics

The final response rate was 47% ($N = 60$), with over half of respondents being either deans or dean-level

Table 1

Total enrollment at responders' S/COPs ($N = 60$)

Position	Responses, no. (%)
<200	4 (7)
200–399	28 (47)
400–599	15 (25)
600–799	8 (13)
800–999	3 (5)
1000–1200	1 (2)
> 1200	1 (2)

administrators (assistant/associate deans). The remaining respondents were faculty members with administrative appointments focused on assessment (25%) or non-faculty professional staff hired primarily for assessment (10%). Although our response rate was low, our respondents comprised a representative sample of all US S/COPs, representing both private (55%) and public (45%) institutions of varying sizes (Table 1), and of varying levels of establishment, from programs that have existed only since the Bouldin report was published in 2000 (40%), to those that have been in existence for 50 years or more (27%).

Programmatic assessment plans and leadership

While Bouldin's report focused on curricular assessment, we were also interested in overall programmatic assessment, as the scope of assessment has undeniably grown since 2000. In 2000, less than half of responding S/COPs reported having a written plan of curricular assessment in place and of the plans in existence, approximately 65% of the plans were "formally adopted as policy."⁴ In our survey, we distinguished between programmatic assessment plans and curricular assessment plans. Nearly all of our respondents (93%) reported having programmatic assessment plans in place, all of which have been formally implemented. A similar number of respondents indicated having curricular assessment plans, either as a component of their overall programmatic assessment plan or as a stand-alone document. Assessment coordination and administration efforts at most programs are led by a dean-level administrator, faculty member with an assessment-focused administrative appointment, such as a Director of Assessment, or a non-faculty professional staff member (Table 2). Nearly 60% self-reported having formal training in programmatic or educational evaluation/assessment.

Curriculum assessment plans

Of those programs with formally established programmatic assessment plans, 97% also reported having a written plan of curricular assessment, either as a stand-alone document (31%) or as part of their programmatic assessment plan (66%). Conversely, 3% did not have a curriculum assessment plan.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/10313277>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/10313277>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)