**Exercise on the Self-Study Report**

**Read the directions and SSR excerpts. Answer the questions related to documentation of program self-assessment in a self-study report (SSR).**

**EXAMPLE #1**

**SSR Appendix 14C**

**Effectiveness of the Didactic Curriculum**

This appendix requires the program to submit data and analysis related to *effectiveness* of the didactic curriculum to include: student evaluation of didactic courses and instructors, the number of final didactic course grades at C or below, and student attrition\* and *remediation* in didactic courses.

\*For this appendix the program will reference Student Attrition data provided in Appendix 14, SSR.

**Analysis and Conclusions**

**In relation to the data identified in this appendix** (student evaluation of didactic courses and instructors, the number of final grades of C or below for didactic courses, and student attrition and *remediation* in didactic courses)**:**

1. **Does the program document how quantitative and qualitative data is collected?**
2. **Did the program include a description of the data collection tool or append a blank copy of the survey tool, if applicable?**
3. **Did the narrative include benchmarks used and address response rates as applicable?**
4. **Does the narrative reference appended data so it can easily be located in the SSR files or describe / list all the data in the narrative?**
5. **Does the program describe its approach to analysis of data?**

**Provide Narrative** describing the program’s approach to analysis of the quantitative data collected and displayed, including the benchmarks/thresholds (with rationale) used.

|  |
| --- |
| Student evaluations of courses and instructors are collected by the institution and the program. The institution distributes, collects data, and provides data reports to the program for analysis via the following assessment tools: 1) student course evaluation and 2) student instructor evaluation. The PA Program distributes, collects data and compiles reports via the student guest lecturer evaluation.  Each tool collects quantitative data via 5-point Likert-rated survey items with responses including 1 – Strongly Disagree to 5 – Strongly Agree or 1 -Poor to 5 – Excellent. The program benchmark (70%) for quantitative data on the 5-point Likert scale is 3.5 or higher with a threshold of greater than 4.5 (90%) used to identify potential strengths).  The student evaluation of courses includes eleven items as shown for courses falling below benchmark in the data table App 14C CourseBelowBenchmark.  The student evaluation of principal faculty instructors includes twelve items as shown for courses falling below benchmark in the data table App 14C InstructBelowBenchmark.  The program's approach to data analysis of student evaluation of course and instructor quantitative data is to apply the benchmark to the question on each survey addressing overall effectiveness of the courses and overall effectiveness of the instructor. In instances where the overall effectiveness falls below the program benchmark additional quantitative data including all survey items for the given evaluation are analyzed in conjunction with qualitative themes to establish the root cause for the overall effectiveness data findings and to form conclusions and action plans.  The program set a benchmark for collection of quantitative data was 50% student response rate for all student evaluations of courses and principal faculty instructors. The rationale for this benchmark was that a 50% response rate is consistent with a representative sampling and improves the validity of the data. |

**Provide Narrative** describing the program’s approach to analysis of the qualitative data collected and displayed, including the benchmarks/thresholds (with rationale) used.

*If the program did not collect qualitative data related to this appendix, please type N/A in the narrative box*.

|  |
| --- |
| Qualitative data is collected via student comments specific to the course and instructor from the surveys described above. Qualitative data is categorized to identify themes in student concerns that may require further analysis, as well as the development of conclusions and subsequent action plans. Theme identification includes a program benchmark of 10% of respondents (n=4 or greater) or a single comment that is egregious/serious and may represent a safety, legal, or professional violation.  Qualitative data is also categorized to identify themes that support analysis of quantitative data and the development of conclusions and subsequent action plans. |

1. **Does the program address courses and or faculty not meeting its benchmark and describe analysis of data as description above in its approach to analysis?**
2. **Does the narrative reference the appended data summaries used to support the narrative?**
3. **Does the narrative discuss how data is used to identify the cause for below benchmark ratings, including supporting qualitative data themes?**
4. **Are conclusions supported by other, related data (triangulation of data) or is other related data discussed, showing how relationships are or are not determined by analysis?**
5. **Are conclusions supported by program assessment of data?**
6. **Are actions (modifications and areas needing improvement) clearly documented to be the result of data analysis and conclusions?**
7. **Are modifications and or areas needing improvement documented in the narrative summarized in the appropriate tables within the appendix?**

**Provide Narrative** describing the *analysis* of all data collected and displayed. Include resulting conclusion(s) and application of the *analysis* to the program.

|  |
| --- |
| While most courses and program faculty not only met benchmarks, but also exceeded our 4.5 threshold for a potential strength, the Basic Sciences I, II, and III courses and PF-5 instructor for these courses fell below the program benchmark of 3.5 presenting a clear trend between course and instructor rating data.  The Basic Science Course series and PF-5 were further analyzed by reviewing the additional Likert rating quantitative data ratings presented in App 14C CourseBelowBenchmark and App 14C InstructBelowBenchmark. The course data demonstrates a clear trend for below benchmark ratings in the individual survey items of “The course had clearly stated objectives,” “I know what was expected of me in the course,” “I felt adequately prepared for this course,” delivery method of information in course. The instructor data demonstrates a clear trend for below benchmark ratings in the individual survey items of “The instructor provided clearly stated objectives,” “The instructor presents the course material in a way that is interesting and/or engaging,” and “The instructor provides helpful comments on written work.”  The qualitative data for the courses and instructor are presented in App14C QualDataBelowCourse and App14C QualDataBelowInstruct, respectively. Both qualitative data sources demonstrate a clear trend with coded themes of content/objective clarity, exam prep, and instructor feedback occurring consistently throughout the courses and instructor evaluations.  Additional data are available to triangulate with the findings of the course and instructor survey data. This includes Grades of C or Lower in Basic Science I, II and III and remediation activity. Grades of C or Lower presented in the template above reveal a total of one F in Basic Science I Class of 2023, one C in Basic Science II Class of 2022 and two Cs in Basic Science II Class of 2023. Remediation activity by course is presented in App14C CourseRemediation and most notably includes thirty-four instances of remediation in Basic Science II Class of 2022 that decreased to nine instances with the Class of 2023. The increased remediation activity may have contributed to limiting more than the two grades of C or lower are noted for Basic Science II Class of 2023. The Grades Lower than C data for Basic Science I, II, and III has not exceeded the greater than 10% threshold of students (n=4) within a given cohort.  Based on the data reviewed from course evaluations, instructor evaluations, Grades Lower than C and remediation activity the program concluded that course and instructor performance regarding student perspectives has not led to increased instances of Grades Lower than C and that clear themes exist related to course-related factors and instructor-related factors.  During the period since the first data were collected on the course series and instructor, the Program Director and Director of Didactic Education have met with the instructor to focus on course-related factors to improve objectives, focus content and lecture information to improve clarity of expectations and content delivery, and reviewing exam questions prior to administration. See the Areas of Needed Improvement Below for continued application of conclusions to action plans for the instructor-related factors. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Modifications** | **When modification Occurred**  **(mm/yyyy)** |
| Basic Science I, II and III - Program Director and Director of Didactic Education support for course delivery - ongoing with modification date being initiation of support. | 06/2020 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area Needing Improvement** | **Plans for Improvement** | **Expected Outcome** | **Person(s) Responsible** | **Completion timeline**  (mm/yyyy) |
| PF-5 | Instructor-related factors are supported by the College of Pharmacy Administration and led by Dr. CW in coordination with the Program Director and Dean. | Student evaluations of course and instructor will meet program benchmarks. | PD, Dean and College of Pharmacy Chair of Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences | 06/2022 |

**EXAMPLE #2:** See also appended *Example 2 Data*

**SSR Appendix 14F**

**PANCE Performance**

This appendix requires the program to submit data and *analysis* related to graduate *PANCE* performance.

1. **Does the program clearly define its benchmark(s), including a benchmark for strengths?**
2. **Does the narrative reference the appended data summaries used to support the narrative?**
3. **Is the program’s description of analysis logical and easy to follow? Did the program proofread the document for typos and consistency of content?**
4. **If the program determines there is or is not a relationship between data, does the narrative provide details of the analysis supporting this conclusion?**
5. **Are conclusions supported by analysis of other, related data (triangulation of data)?**
6. **Are conclusions drawn as a result of documented data analysis?**
7. **Are areas needing improvement the result of documented data analysis leading to conclusions?**
8. **Do listed plans logically address conclusions and areas needing improvement?**

**Provide Narrative** describing the program’s approach to *analysis* of the quantitative data collected and displayed, including the benchmarks/thresholds (with rationale) used.

|  |
| --- |
| The program analyzes the PANCE performance in four sections – cohort performance overall, cohort performance on the organ systems, cohort performance on the task areas, and then individual student performance…  The next step is to analyze the organ systems for student performance. The program has a benchmark for student performance on the organ systems and the task areas of2 below the national average because it is a new program and only one cohort has taken the exam to data.  The program evaluations the data by reviewing the difference from the national average for each organ system. The differences are more accurate than percentage scores because the national averages change annually. The program assesses high and low scoring organ systems, trends in the organ system data across the cohorts, and areas falling below the benchmark of 2.  The program also analyzes strengths for the PANCE. If an organ system or task area is consistently high scoring across multiple cohorts, then it is considered a strength of the program and will be further analyzed. Since only one cohort has taken the PANCE, the program will use the high scoring areas on the PANCE as a strength. |

**Provide Narrative** describing the *analysis* of the data collected and displayed within this appendix reflecting the program’s *analysis* of its PANCE outcomes as directed above.

Include resulting conclusion(s) and application of the *analysis* to the program.

|  |
| --- |
| Organ System Analysis  Next the program broke down the PANCE results by organ systems (Table 3). These were analyzed for High/Low Scoring-Organ Systems. For the Class of 2019 the High Scoring organ systems were Psychology and Neurology which were 5 and 3 points above the national average respectively. Low Scoring organ systems include GU and Hematology/Oncology which were both 8 below, EENT and Ortho/Rheum which were both 6 below, Renal which is 4 below, below national average. There are no upward or downward trends at this time as this is the first cohort to have taken the PANCE. Those organ systems (5) falling below the benchmark of 2 below national average were then further analyzed by evaluating data from other areas of the program for potential relationships.  **GU Organ System** (8 below -2 cohort 2019) Analysis The GU Organ System was 8 below the national average for the cohort of 2019. This is the only cohort who has taken the exam to date so no trends in the organ system are yet available.  The program reviewed data from other areas of the program to determine relationships in the data.  The Summative Exam was 82% for the 2019 cohort with a Program average of 81% for all systems (Table 4). For PACKRAT 1, student performance was 13 above for cohort 2019, 4 below 2020, and 15 below 2021 (Table 6). Cohort of 2019 performed the highest of any cohort for GU on the PACKRAT 1. For PACKRAT 2, student performance was found to be 1 above for 2019 and 6 above for 2020. There was no relationship between PANCE performance in GU with student performance in GU with the summative exam or PACKRAT 1 or 2.  Next the program assessed the program surveys for relationships. The Graduate Exit Survey for student preparation in GU demonstrated a score of 3.9, 3.9 – cohorts 2019, 2020 with a Program Average of 3.7 (Appendix E data). The faculty rated student preparation in GU at 3.7, 3.5 – 2020, 2021 (Program Average 3.6) for the Faculty Eval of Curriculum (Appendix E data). Both surveys were above benchmark (3.5) for the cohort of 2019. The Student End of Didactic Phase Survey was also reviewed; however, it was not implemented until the 2020 cohort. The results were 3.6, 3.5 -2020, 2021 (Program Average 3.3) (Appendix C data).  The program then reviewed the Clinical Medicine in which GU is taught. For the cohort of 2019, there were no grades of C or below (Appendix C data). Course percentage grades were – 92% (Appendix C data). The program also reviewed the instructional objectives and learning outcomes for GU content from the NCCPA blueprint for completeness. The program was appropriately covering the GU content topics. The students also completed a comprehensive exam at the end of the didactic curriculum and they scored the following for the cohorts (65%, 66%, 50% - 2019, 2020, 2021) with an overall average for the exam at 67% (Table 5). The cohort of 2019 did similar in performance to the 2020 cohort. In summary, there were no relationships found with student performance in other areas of the program related to GU content.  Conclusions  1… 3. GU organ system was below benchmark for 1 cohort (C19 – 8 below); and an area for improvement. |

| **Area Needing Improvement** | **Plans for Improvement** | **Expected Outcome** | **Person(s) Responsible** | **Completion timeline**  (mm/yyyy) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. GU organ system was below benchmark for 1 cohort (C19 – 8 below); area for improvement | a. To improve performance on the GU organ system content, the program will change the instructors for this module of Clinical Medicine and after review of the GU Content and Blueprint topics for GU reorganize the body system modules to allow more focus and time on this topic. This, in effect, takes GU out of renal leaving men’s GU and reproductive module and a separate women’s GU and reproductive module. This will allow more time with both modules and also more effectively assess student comprehension of the topics. The program will continue to analyze student success in this area. | 1. New instructor 2. Reorganized body system modules 3. Better assessment of student comprehension | Director of Academic Education | 9/2021 |

**EXAMPLE #3**

**SSR Appendix 14D**

**Effectiveness of the Clinical Curriculum**

This appendix requires the program to submit data and analysis related to *effectiveness* of the clinical curriculum to include student evaluation of clinical *rotations* and *preceptors*, the number of final clinical *rotation* grades of C or below, and student attrition\* and *remediation* in clinical *rotations.*

\*For this appendix the program will reference Student Attrition data provided in Appendix 14, SSR.

1. **Does the program document how qualitative data is collected?**
2. **Does the program document how qualitative data is used in its analysis?**
3. **Did the program document analysis of qualitative data, resulting in logical conclusions?**
4. **Were actions taken (modifications or plans to address areas needing improvement) as a result of analysis of qualitative data?**

**Provide Narrative** describing the program’s approach to analysis of the qualitative data collected and displayed, including the benchmarks/thresholds (with rationale) used.

*If the program did not collect qualitative data related to this appendix, please type N/A in the narrative box*.

|  |
| --- |
| Approach to Analysis of Qualitative Data The program analyses qualitative data for the clinical curriculum. The qualitative data is collected on typhon for each clinical rotation. The program uses the student comments to determine themes in the data. The benchmark for a theme 2-3 comments per course depending on the cohort and the rationale is that it is 10% of the cohort. The cohort of 2019 has 24 students (2.4 which equals 2 student comments), 2020 has 31 students (3 student comments), and 2021 cohort has 30 students (3 student comments). After themes are identified, the program reviews the courses for the number of themes. Trends in the themes are also assessed across the cohorts. In addition, the program uses the themes in the analysis of the courses not meeting benchmark. The qualitative themes are used in conjugation with the quantitative data in the analysis. |

**Provide Narrative** describing the *analysis* of all data collected and displayed. Include resulting conclusion(s) and application of the *analysis* to the program.

|  |
| --- |
| **Analysis of Student Evaluation of the Preceptor**  The student evaluation of preceptor data was collected using a 5-point Likert scale as described above. The response rates were the same as the clinical site data, as it was collected in the same survey instrument, but the survey items were unique to the preceptor…  The results of the student evaluations of the preceptor program averages were above benchmark with cohort average of C19: 4.5, C20: 4.8, C21: 4.8 (based on 4 rotations) with a program average of 4.7 (Table 6)…  The program then analyzed the qualitative data for the student evaluation of the preceptor (Table 7). Again, the benchmark is greater than 2 comments for 2019 and 3 comments for 2020 and 2021. Cohort of 2019 had 14 themes emerge in the data, while cohort 2020 had 6 themes and 2021 had no themes. A dramatic decrease in the number of themes across the cohorts was noted. The course with the most themes was Women’s Health for 2019 with 5 total themes. The program reviewed the themes for trends across the cohorts and three trends were demonstrated. These included Behavioral Health – More student participation (9, 7 – 2019, 2020) and Women’s Health with Primarily Observation (5,4 – 2019, 2020), More student participation (4, 5 – 2019, 2020). |

| **Modifications** | **When modification Occurred**  **(mm/yyyy)** |
| --- | --- |
| NONE | Date |

| **Area Needing Improvement** | **Plans for Improvement** | **Expected Outcome** | **Person(s) Responsible** | **Completion timeline**  (mm/yyyy) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NONE | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. | Date |