

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA MONROE

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY



SELF STUDY REPORT

MARCH 13, 2008

Summary of the Self-Study Process

In October 2005, the University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM) College of Pharmacy (COP) began its self-study by reviewing the self-study process. A two-day faculty retreat was held on October 6 & 7 of 2005 during which time the process was discussed by the entire faculty. After the retreat, a College self-study web site was established and the College's Deans Council began the committee planning process. In November of 2005, the Dean, the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean of Operations, Technology and Assessment (now the Associate Dean of Operations, Technology and Graduate Studies) established committees consisting of faculty, students, alumni and preceptors for each of the six areas of the standards. ([Appendix I-1](#)) Committees were organized to allow representation from as many areas of the college as possible. Student, alumni and preceptor committee members were identified by the group of Deans and asked to serve on the committees by the Dean. The Self-Study Steering Committee consisted of the chairperson of each standard committee and the two associate deans. Self-study sub-committees were given the previous ACPE standards with instruction to begin gathering data but informed that the new 2007 standards would be published in early 2006 and that the new standards would be used for the current self-study. At this time, most self-study committees assigned smaller subcommittees to address individual standards and guidelines.

The Steering Committee spent much of 2006 developing a template for the self-study as well as constructing faculty, student and alumni surveys for data collection. Prior to final implementation of these instruments, ACPE published a template for use with 2007 standards, and AACP unveiled new Faculty, Student, Alumni and Preceptor surveys. In anticipation of ACPE requiring these standardized surveys to allow national benchmarking and year-to-year comparisons, the Self-Study Steering Committee voted to utilize the new AACP Surveys. AACP graciously provided the surveys, which were administered electronically from March 5 through March 30, 2007, (Faculty and Students) or April 15, 2007 (Alumni and Preceptors). Introductory letters asking for participation were mailed prior to initiating the surveys. A follow-up reminder was mailed midway through the survey period.

During 2006 and early 2007, data were collected by each committee. The committees then wrote sections of the self-study report related to their assigned standards with a goal for providing first drafts by July of 2007. Updates were provided to faculty at various meetings and to students via mandatory convocations. As data collection and evaluation evolved, sub-committees began

implementing quality improvements identified as a part of the self-study process. A new College strategic plan and assessment plan were subsequently developed.

Once first drafts were submitted, the associate deans edited each faculty sub-committee standard for length, clarity, and redundancy. Information (e.g. number of faculty, financial resources, etc.) was updated where needed and supporting evidence provided by faculty was organized and linked to the text. The edited report was then sent to a consultant to ensure appropriate use of language and verbiage. The completed self-study report was provided to the faculty on January 11, 2008 after the Spring semester faculty retreat. Faculty met six times from January 18, 2008 through February 22, 2008 for a total of 18 hours to discuss the content of and changes to the self-study document and to vote on guideline evaluations. The report draft was provided to students during a mandatory student convocation on January 23, 2008 with feedback requested by January 31, 2008. Final edits were made to the report through February 18, 2008 with the final report going back to faculty on February 18, 2008. Faculty unanimously ratified the final self-study report on February 22, 2008 with minor edits completed February 25 through 29, 2008, and the final version of the report was mailed to ACPE on March 14, 2008. A link to the final report was mailed to all preceptors on March 5, 2008.

The ULM College of Pharmacy wishes to thank the Ohio State University College of Pharmacy, the University Of Mississippi School Of Pharmacy, and the Auburn University Harrison School of Pharmacy for their advice and counsel during our self-study process.

Overall Organization and Clarity of the Self-Study Report

Please evaluate the program's self-study report to assist in improving the quality of future reports.

	Commendable	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement
Participation in the Self-Study Process	The self-study report was written and reviewed with broad-based input from students, faculty, preceptors, staff, administrators and a range of other stakeholders, such as patients, practitioners, and employers. Commend <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The self-study report was written and reviewed with broad-based input from students, faculty, preceptors, staff and administrators. Meets <input type="checkbox"/>	The self-study report was written by a small number who did not seek broad input from students, faculty, preceptors, staff, and administrators. Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge of the Self-Study Report	Students, faculty, preceptors, and staff are conversant in the major themes of the report and how the program intends to address any deficiencies. Commend <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Students, faculty, preceptors, and staff are aware of the report and its contents. Meets <input type="checkbox"/>	Students, faculty, preceptors, and staff have little or no knowledge of the content of the self-study report or its impact on the program. Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/>
Completeness and Transparency of the Self-Study Report	All narratives and supporting documentation are thorough, clear and concise. The content appears thoughtful and honest. Interviews match the self-study findings. Commend <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All narratives and supporting documentation are present. The content is organized and logical. Meets <input type="checkbox"/>	Information is missing or written in a dismissive, uninformative or disorganized manner. Portions of the content appear biased or deceptive. Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevance of Supporting Documentation	Supporting documentation of activities is informative and used judiciously. Commend <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Supporting documentation is present when needed. Meets <input type="checkbox"/>	Additional documentation is missing, irrelevant, redundant, or uninformative. Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence of Continuous-Quality Improvement	The program presents thoughtful, viable plans to not only address areas of deficiency, but also to further advance the quality of the program beyond the requirements of the Standards. Commend <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The program proactively presents plans to address areas where the program is in need of improvement. Meets <input type="checkbox"/>	No plans are presented or plans do not appear adequate or viable given the issues and the context of the program. Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/>
Organization of the Self-Study Report	All sections of the report are complete and organized or hyper-linked to facilitate finding information, e.g., pages are numbered and sections have labeled or tabbed dividers. Commend <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The reviewer is able to locate a response for each standard and the supporting documentation with minimal difficulty. Meets <input type="checkbox"/>	Information appears to be missing or is difficult to find. Sections are not well labeled. Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide additional comments on the Self-Study Report to assist in quality improvement:

Summary of the Evaluation of All Standards

Please complete this summary (●) after evaluating the individual standards using the Program Evaluation Form.

Standards	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet
<i>MISSION, PLANNING, AND EVALUATION</i>			
1. College or school Mission and Goals	●	○	○
2. Strategic Plan	●	○	○
3. Evaluation of Achievement of Mission and Goals	●	○	○
<i>ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION</i>			
4. Institutional Accreditation	●	○	○
5. College or school and University Relationship	●	○	○
6. College or school and other Administrative Relationships	●	○	○
7. College or school Organization and Governance	●	○	○
8. Qualifications and Responsibilities of the Dean	●	○	○
<i>CURRICULUM</i>			
9. The Goal of the Curriculum	●	○	○
10. Curricular Development, Delivery, and Improvement	●	○	○
11. Teaching and Learning Methods	○	●	○
12. Professional Competencies and Outcome Expectations	●	○	○
13. Curricular Core—Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Values	●	○	○
14. Curricular Core—Pharmacy Practice Experiences	●	○	○
15. Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning and Curricular Effectiveness	●	○	○
<i>STUDENTS</i>			
16. Organization of Student Services	●	○	○
17. Admission Criteria, Policies, and Procedures	●	○	○
18. Transfer of Credits and Waiver of Requisites for Admission with Advanced Standing	●	○	○
19. Progression of Students	●	○	○
20. Student Complaints Policy	●	○	○
21. Program Information	●	○	○
22. Student Representation and Perspectives	●	○	○
23. Professional Behavior and Harmonious Relationships	●	○	○
<i>FACULTY AND STAFF</i>			
24. Faculty and Staff—Quantitative Factors	●	○	○
25. Faculty and Staff—Qualitative Factors	●	○	○
26. Faculty and Staff Continuing Professional Development and Performance Review	○	●	○
<i>FACILITIES AND RESOURCES</i>			
27. Physical Facilities	●	○	○
28. Practice Facilities	●	○	○
29. Library and Educational Resources	○	●	○
30. Financial Resources	●	○	○

Progress and Changes

Following a November 2006 interim site visit, the ACPE board of Directors identified eight specific issues for follow-up and further reporting. This Progress and Changes Report focuses primarily on addressing progress and changes related to these specific issues.

1. Mission Planning and Evaluation: Implementation of the Strategic Plan: The College made significant strides in implementing its 2004 strategic plan to the point that it initiated a new strategic planning process. The 2004 strategic plan was administratively driven due to the crisis situation present at the College in 2004. Specific actions on each goal of the 2004 strategic plan are in [Appendix I-2](#). The initial framework of the new 2007 Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis and strategic plan was initially developed by the College Deans Council and chairs of the Mission, Planning and Evaluation Self-Study Committee and the Faculty Budget Steering Committee in November of 2006. The Mission, Planning and Evaluation Self-Study Committee and the Faculty Budget Steering Committee then developed the first draft of the new SWOT analysis and strategic plan during the first seven months of 2007. The SWOT analysis and strategic plan were then presented to faculty for input during August and subsequently discussed during the August 2007 faculty retreat and the November 2007 faculty meeting. The faculty unanimously approved the 2007 strategic plan at the conclusion of the November 9, 2007 faculty meeting. The College's 2007 strategic plan ([Appendix I-3](#)) will be in effect by the April 2008 accreditation visit.

2. Organization and Administration: An Evaluation of the New Organizational Structure of the College of Pharmacy: The new [organizational structure](#) in the College of Pharmacy has allowed administration and faculty to continually assess and improve the professional pharmacy and graduate programs. The Assistant Deans of the Shreveport and Baton Rouge satellite campuses sit on the College Administrative Council (CAC) and participate as equal partners in administrative discussions and decisions. In addition, the Assistant Deans are also a part of the Department of Clinical and Administrative Sciences administrative team that provides guidance for the Department. Administrative communication within and between the campuses has flowed well. Barriers have been limited. Due to problems in developing an agreeable lease for the Baton Rouge campus, the building for the satellite campus in Baton Rouge was not obtained and occupied until October of 2007. An Assistant Dean for the Baton Rouge campus has been named. A full evaluation of the effectiveness

of these operations and evaluation of overall communication among campuses needs to be completed on a continual basis.

Since the November 2006 ACPE focused visit, the College added an Associate Dean of Assessment and Outcomes Research in July 2007 whose job is to direct and assist in assessment implementation. In August 2007, a Program Assessment Analyst for development of assessment databases was hired. In addition, the College has added an Assistant Accounting Coordinator in the Business Office, three new administrative assistants for the Associate Deans, and an Information Technology Specialist dedicated to the College of Pharmacy. Infrastructural enhancements in these areas have made operations in the College more effective and efficient.

3. Curriculum: Quality and quantity of practice sites and preceptors..., *Post-Hurricane*

Resources: The College implemented a biannual Preceptor Training Conference ([Appendix I-5](#)) and placed its preceptor training program online. ([Appendix I-6](#)) In addition, the College provides free continuing education to all preceptors who have successfully completed the preceptor-training program. The programs are successful in educating preceptors and the preceptor reviews are overwhelmingly positive. At the most recent preceptor conference, continuing education programs on drug information resources and retrieval, new drugs, complimentary medicine in oncology and insulin use in diabetes were provided for all participants, and breakout sessions allowing the sharing of best educational practices were held. The Office of Experiential Education (OEE) developed a process for documentation of all preceptor training and developed a policy on expected preceptor training activities. ([Appendix I-7](#)) In addition, the OEE faculty and staff along with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs are currently assessing resources related to oversight of introductory and advanced practice experiences with respect to current enrollment, potential enrollment increase, and potential use of multiple campus sites earlier in the program. This evaluation will determine whether more staffing is needed to ensure appropriate oversight of the experiential program and to ensure quality student practice experiences for the future.

Service-learning projects were added to the curriculum. These experiences focus on the provision of community-based health care and educational needs. Service learning projects completed by students include point-of-care lipid testing with cardiovascular risk assessment, point-of-care glucose testing, nutritional education to middle school students (5th grade), and a program similar to the Vial of Life program that provides community residents and emergency personnel with easily accessible

personal medical information in the case of an emergency. Students are required to provide a written reflection on their learning experiences. Based upon ACPE's clarification of the statement that Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experiences (APPEs) should comprise at least 25% of the curriculum, the College evaluated its current APPE structure of eight one-month experiences and found that a change was necessary. Beginning with 2008-2009 APPE calendar, students graduating in 2009, 2010, and 2011 are required to complete six six-week experiences. Students graduating in 2012 and later are required to complete seven six-week experiences. Both of these scenarios meet all ACPE guidelines for required and elective experiences. The quantity and quality of practice experiences appear adequate for the program, and there appears to be no significant post-hurricane effects on the experiential program ([Appendix I-8](#)).

Despite the fact that the curriculum changed significantly in response to various accreditation mandates over the years, perceived deficiencies and other influences led to significant redesign of content and structure of the curriculum. The faculty began an in-depth curricular re-evaluation program in February 2005. In August 2006, the College adopted a new set of educational outcomes encompassing new ACPE standards (including appendixes B and C) and CAPE outcomes. As a part of this restructuring, pre-professional coursework was enhanced to include more biological sciences as well as opportunities to develop written and oral communication skills. As a result, the pre-pharmacy curriculum was extended to a 3-year course of study. Students entering in the fall of 2009 are required to have completed these enhanced requirements. Based on the new desired outcomes and the enhanced background expected of entering students, the College Curriculum Committee and Faculty have been working towards development of a new professional curriculum for implementation in fall 2009. It is anticipated that the curriculum will be approved by the Faculty in summer 2008 with University approval in the fall 2008. The Curriculum Committee anticipates progression issues to arise in the curricular conversion and is working with the Academic Standards Committee to provide appropriate remediation and progression procedures during the transition. In addition to curricular redesign, the curriculum was enhanced by an ethics in pharmacy practice course, reengineering of pharmacotherapy forum to include evaluation of written communication skills, addition of ten new elective courses ([Appendix I-9](#)), and re-structuring of the advanced pharmacy practice experiences.

4. Students: Enrollment Management, Post-Hurricane Resources: In the fall of 2006, 90 new P1 students were admitted and enrolled into the professional program. Of these students, seven were dismissed or have withdrawn. Three students were dismissed after the first year due to poor academic performance; two withdrew due to lack of interest in the profession; one withdrew due to medical problems, and one withdrew to attend seminary. In 2007, qualified applications decreased compared to previous years. The decrease may be the result of increased qualification requirements, a greater focus on in-state applicants, and residual effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Formal recruitment programs are being initiated. One hundred and four new P1 students were admitted to the professional program in the fall of 2007. This increase in enrollment was approved by ACPE based on progress in the area of resources and enhanced infrastructure within the College. Of these 104 students, six withdrew within the first semester. One withdrew due to the academic rigor of the program; two withdrew due to lack of interest in the program; three withdrew due to personal or family medical conditions.

Monitoring of student progression in the program has been enhanced, and students with progression problems have been asked to voluntarily sign monitoring contracts that reinforce mandatory class attendance and require evaluation sessions with the COP counselor. While there have been several successes with this program, further efforts are needed to continue to identify reasons for non-progression. "Roadblock" courses have been identified and referred to the Assessment Committee for review and evaluation.

In the past, students were asked to attend three convocations per semester for communication and education purposes. In response to a recommendation from the Pharmacy Student Senate, convocations have been limited to a single mandatory session at the beginning of the semester. To replace the educational component of convocation, students are now required to attend two professional development seminars of their choice each semester. The Dean's Student Advisory Council was created to assist in communicating student issues to the COP administration. Student response to these changes has been very positive.

5. Faculty and Staff: Faculty Resources..., Post-Hurricane Resources: There has been one faculty resignation since the focused site visit. The resignation was a faculty member uprooted by Hurricane Katrina who had a personal need to return to New Orleans. Since that time, the College has added seven faculty members, two faculty in the Department of Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences,

one in the Department of Toxicology, and four in the Department of Clinical and Administrative Sciences (two in administrative sciences and two in clinical sciences). In addition, four new clinical faculty positions were created from increased state funding and student fees.

Initiatives in the area of faculty development have been limited but successful. The College provided a yearlong faculty development course focusing on research design. All faculty completing the course presented research at national meetings. In addition, the COP purchased a site license for *Education Scholar* and associated reference resources for all three campuses. Faculty are strongly encouraged to take part in this program. In the past four years, a renewed emphasis has been placed on scholarship, and faculty are responding to the challenge ([Appendix I-10](#)). Scholarship is now an integral component of all faculty performance planning and evaluation.

Faculty mentoring programs have been established in both the Department of Clinical and Administrative Sciences and the Department of Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences. Although both programs have similar goals, they are structured somewhat differently and have differing degrees of success. There was a lag time between development and implementation of the faculty mentoring program in the Department of Clinical and Administrative Sciences, and it has only recently been implemented.

6. Facilities and Resources: Quality and Quantity of Practice Sites, Distance Education Technology, Enrollment Management Long-Term Adequacy and Stability of Financial Resources... Post-hurricane resources:

Facilities have significantly improved over the last year with the initial occupancy of the Bienville building (new COP building in Monroe) and the lease and occupancy of new facilities in Shreveport and Baton Rouge. The State provided the \$1 million installment needed to increase the COP's recurring funding by \$4 million over the 2005 funding level. In addition, the third installment of a \$1,000 per year increase in student professional fees provided an additional \$400,000 in recurring funds. Unfortunately, due to budget cuts from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita (\$285,000), decreased university enrollment (\$157,000), and an overall decrease in COP student enrollment due to enrollment management (\$297,000), the COP did not realize its full budget this year. In addition, increasing expenditures for Bienville building infrastructure including utility bills, lawn maintenance, janitorial services, fees paid by the College for state insurance premiums, etc., continue to significantly impact the budget. In addition to the recurring funding provided, the State provided \$4.5 million to assist with Phase II renovation costs of the Bienville Building (\$1.5 million)

and to build a new vivarium at the Bienville sight (\$3 million). Phase I renovation of the building was complete in December 2006, and Phase II renovation is expected to be complete by May 2008. The vivarium is expected to be completed by April 2009.

In addition to new buildings, significant resources have been expended to provide wireless connectivity and state of the art distance education equipment in all three campus buildings. The Bienville Building has three permanently equipped distance-learning classrooms (with a fourth scheduled for completion as part of Phase II) and two portable distance education carts to be used for meetings, small classes and instructor interactions. Sufficient distance education equipment has been acquired to allow two transmissions to originate simultaneous at either of the distance campuses. Transmission quality is still an issue at times; however, the problem appears to be localized to the Bienville site and should be corrected by spring 2008. The College relies on its Technology Manager, Information Technology specialist and faculty to troubleshoot when problems arise. Only one person on campus is fully trained to manipulate programs required to run the system, and it is anticipated that the COP information technology specialist will be fully trained in this area in the near future.

Library resources were enhanced since the last site visit. The COP created its own virtual library by subscribing to the Iowa Drug Information Service, International Pharmaceutical Abstracts, Micromedex, Facts and Comparison On-line, and Lexi-Comp On-line as well as updating its subscription to OVID to include all faculty and students. These resources are available by password from any computer on or off campus.

1) Rate the college or school on its progress or changes in the six areas of the Standards since the last accreditation visit by indicating "Ok" or "N.I." (needs improvement) on the checklist below:

	Ok	N.I.
The college or school has progressed in each area since ACPE's last comprehensive visit.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The college or school has addressed any concerns previously raised by ACPE.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The college or school has adhered to the reporting guidelines, limiting the total summary to no more than 6 pages of double-spaced, 12-point text.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2) If N.I. (needs improvement) is noted above, please explain: