MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 14, 2019
TO: Sarah Mangelsdorf, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
FROM: Steven M. Swanson, Dean and Professor
RE: Final Summary of Review for:
  • Master’s – Social and Administrative Pharmacy
  • PhD – Social and Administrative Pharmacy

The Masters and Doctoral – Social and Administrative Pharmacy program review was completed by a review committee chaired by Jamie C. Barner, PhD, Professor and Head, Division of Health Outcomes, University of Texas at Austin with members Linsey Steege, PhD, Assistant Professor, School of Nursing; John Mullahy, PhD, Professor, Department of Population Health Sciences, SMPH; and John M. Pfotenhauer, PhD, Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering and GFEC representative. The review committee was charged with assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the program and providing recommendations for future directions. The School APC discussed and approved the review committee report on January 23, 2019 (see attached memo from the chair). Based on my review of their report and the APC response, I am providing the following executive summary of the program review.

Overview

The Review Committee made nine specific recommendations:

1. Convert seminar/course series to organized courses
2. Finalize student handbook
3. Create minimally acceptable progress
4. Require Individual Development Plans for students
5. Increase reviews to biennial for students as appropriate
6. Evaluate PVL for grad program coordinator
7. Develop seminar series focused on career development
8. Reexamine program assessment to develop meaningful learning objectives
9. Set goals for student recruitment (minority, UW pharmacy students)

Recommendations

Each of the recommendations listed above will be addressed by the Program. Details about the approaches to address each issue are detailed in the attached Program Response.

Attachments

Review Committee Report
Program Response
SoP APC approval memo
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SUMMARY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND MATERIALS REVIEWED
The committee received and reviewed the following documents: Committee Charge; 2018 Self Study (July 2018) and Appendices (see below). Dr. Pfotenhauer provided the committee with additional data from the Graduate School regarding Admission and Graduation (see Appendix 1 at the end of this document). The accuracy and comprehensiveness of the materials and self-study was appropriate.

A. SAS Graduate Program Self Study Report 2009
B. Report of the External Review Committee 2009
C. Response and Plan from SAS Graduate Program 2009
D. Online Guide to the SAS Graduate Program
E. SAS Graduate Program Assessment Plan submitted to the SOP Academic Planning Council
F. SAS PhD Assessment Report to the Graduate School 2018
G. SAS MS Assessment Report to the Graduate School 2018
H. SAS Graduate Student Annual Review Document
I. Graduate Programs Climate Survey
J. Graduate Student Orientation Schedule
K. SAS Exit Survey Summary
L. SAS Graduate Student Awards

The committee met with the following groups: junior faculty (Drs. Abraham, Ford, Look, Shiyanbola); senior faculty (Drs. Chewning, Chui, Mott); graduate program coordinator (Ken Niemeyer) and junior and senior graduate students.

EVALUATION OF STRENGTHS
The school is a well-respected program and the team was impressed with the superb quality of the faculty and graduate students as evidenced by extramural funding, high-quality publications, visibility at scientific conferences and honors/awards. The team was also very impressed with the leadership and trajectory for growth of the Sonderegger Center. The junior faculty, one of which has an engineering background, bring diverse perspectives, a spirit of collaboration and renewed energy to the program. Their achievements in research and scholarship are also notable. The division’s name change was a very positive and strategic decision that should increase visibility to non-pharmacy related constituents. The thoughtful selection of topics for the seminar cores has the propensity to strengthen the graduate program, as well as increase its visibility outside of the school. Graduate student TA and RA support is consistent and strong and the students expressed appreciation for freedom within the program to explore different topics.
EVALUATION OF WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM AND STRATEGIES

Time to graduation
Approximately 32% of the students take more than 6 years to graduate (see Appendix 1: Graduate School Time to Degree 2008-2017). Variability in time to graduation seems to be impacted by a multitude of factors including: nature of the project (primary vs. secondary data collection); advisor’s mentoring style (structured vs. unstructured); and perception of guaranteed funding (e.g. TA or RA) throughout the program. In some cases, extensions to graduation may have been impacted by part-time status and the timing of course offerings to complete requirements for preliminary examinations. Faculty should examine structural problems with consistency related to student progression and expectations for degree completion. Specific strategies are addressed below under Coursework and Policies and Procedures.

Coursework
Currently, only 6 credit hours are taught in the division. Faculty may want to consider what other “core competencies” could be taught by division faculty. One opportunity is to convert the Core Seminar series to organized courses. The majority of the courses are taken outside of the division and the graduate students expressed some difficulty in identifying which courses to take and when they were offered. Faculty could help facilitate this process by offering a compendium of available courses by topic area and when they are taught. Faculty may also want to consider having students provide a formal evaluation of these ‘outside’ courses so that other students can use the information in making future course selections.

Specific Strategies:
Internal courses
- Convert seminar series courses to organized courses
  - Change to course status could increase non-pharmacy enrollment
- Cross list and advertise courses with other academic units (e.g., Nursing, Population Health, Engineering)
  - This will provide more visibility of the division and potentially the Center
- Review “Core Topics” annually to determine if revisions are needed
- Consider requiring all students to attend, including dissertators
  - Dissertators can provide unique perspectives because of their experiences
  - Dissertators could assume an instructor role for selected content, which could be enhance their teaching portfolios
  - Dissertators remain abreast of core issues
  - Since this is one of the few courses where all students are together, it could also promote more cohesion among students as well as foster an “identity” as a SAS graduate student vs. a mentor-related identity

Outside courses
- Include an organized (e.g., area, when taught) list of outside courses in the SAS Handbook
- Create an evaluation form for outside courses and have students evaluate them
Policies and Procedures
Discussion with faculty and graduate students overwhelmingly revealed a need to have more structure in SAS policies and procedures. Students commented that they “didn’t know where to find information.” When asked about various aspects related to the program, one prevalent response was “it depends on the advisor.” While the committee recognizes and endorses the purview of advisors, it seems to, at times, produce wide variations in program outcomes. Faculty are strongly encouraged to engage in consensus building regarding “adequate progress” and requirements for passing preliminary exams, proposal and final defenses. Two specific issues mentioned regarding preliminary examinations were how the timing depended heavily on advisors' assessment of readiness, and whether or not the student had an opportunity to provide “oral clarification” of their written responses.

Specific Strategies:
SAS Handbook
• The committee recommends that the graduate student handbook be revised so that it includes the following features:
  o A definition and timeline of minimally acceptable progress including separate milestones for the MS and PhD degrees (coursework, preliminary examinations, final defense)
    ▪ Consider both timeframe and quality and arrive at a consensus that minimizes wide variations in each
    ▪ Solicit examples of handbooks from peer institutions
    ▪ Review the graduate school’s template
    ▪ Consider including a process for students to change advisors.
      • The process should encourage faculty to maintain an openness to such change and acceptance of students' decision
  o A grievance process
• Make the handbook available online
• Review and update annually
• Ensure student review
  o Require a signature that the student has read and understands the information
  o Consider a fun “quiz” with prizes in seminar each fall to assess student understanding of key components of and/or changes to the handbook

Individual Development Plan
• Require students to conduct an annual individual development plan
  o Feedback was overwhelmingly positive from graduate students who were currently engaged in the process
  o Process may help decrease time to graduation because of goal setting and continual monitoring

Graduate Student Annual Reviews
• Continue annual reviews
• Consider increasing the frequency to biennial so that issues can be addressed earlier
  o The second annual review can be discussed among the faculty and only with the student if an issue arises
Graduate Program Coordinator
The Graduate Program Coordinator would be an asset to faculty in helping with administrative
duties, as well as serving as another main “touch point” for students regarding policies and
procedures. However, it appears that additional resources may be needed specifically to
support the SAS division. The Graduate Coordinator indicated approximately 15% of time was
devoted to SAS issues and the SAS Division Administrative personnel has assumed
responsibilities related to prospective students (e.g. recruitment, scheduling, acceptance
letters).
- Evaluate roles and responsibilities of the Graduate Program Coordinator and the SAS
  Administrative personnel
- Consider allocating additional time (FTE level to be determined by faculty and Dean) for
  a Graduate Program Coordinator to support the SAS division.
  o Coordinator could help with developing, reviewing and updating handbook
  o Coordinator could help address other student issues (international student
    issues, requirements, deadline reminders, etc.)

Graduate Student Engagement
Within SAS
While students overwhelming agree that there is an “open door” policy and that they feel
comfortable communicating with their peers, faculty and some students perceive the students
to be “mentor-centric”. Students seem to have opportunities with summer RAs to work with
other faculty members, but it is typically limited to the summer timeframe. Several strategies
could be employed to help students not only be identified by their mentor, but also as a
graduate student in the SAS program.
Specific Strategies:
- Encourage students to work with other faculty members and students on research
  projects
- Faculty members could work more collaboratively on projects and employ a diverse
  group of students to participate
- Encourage membership in student organizations (ISPOR, ISPE, AMCP) to foster
  collegiality among students

Within School
Students indicated minimal interaction with graduate pharmacy students outside of SAS.
Having once or twice a year contact with other graduate students from different disciplines
benefits students regardless of career choices. Students who have a global understanding of
various disciplines will be more competitive in the current highly collaborative biomedical
environment.
Specific Strategies:
- School could consider creating a Pharmacy Graduate Student Association. The group
could host joint seminars/poster presentations and socials on an annual/biennial basis.
  Dues could be used to support student travel to professional meeting(s).
• Consider a seminar series focused on career development with diverse speakers from academe and industry. Students could be paired from different divisions to work on case studies.
• Consider other areas that span across disciplines (ethics, communication) where students can engage and work collaboratively.

**Outside of School**
Students overwhelming voiced a desire to have more interaction with alumni and some expressed a desire to participate in internships. Engagement outside of the School typically leads to enhanced, more relevant and well-rounded instruction and research, as well as expanded career opportunities for students.

Specific Strategies:
• School should consider engaging alumni (academe and industry) to present in seminar or other courses. If funding is an issue, this can be accomplished via electronic means (e.g., WebEx, Skype)
• Faculty may want to utilize alumni to serve on student thesis and dissertation committees
• School may want to develop an External Advisory Board of diverse industry and academic partners, as well as key constituents (e.g., patients, practitioners)
• Faculty should consider reaching out to alumni in industry regarding graduate student internship opportunities

**Program Assessment**
Program assessment outcomes need to be expanded beyond just ethics training.

Specific Strategies:
• SAS should leverage the internal (School) program assessment faculty and Assessment Office to develop meaningful, measureable and specific learning objectives and outcomes for the SAS program.

**Student Recruitment**
Recruitment has been mentioned as a priority in the last 2 reviews; however, the faculty acknowledges little progress. Faculty have identified underrepresented minorities and domestic students as focus areas. Faculty should set actionable, measurable and attainable short (1 year) and long (5 year) term goals.

Specific Strategies:
Underrepresented minorities:
• Engage predominantly underrepresented minority groups (e.g. organizations such as SNPhA and historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs))
• Leverage African female faculty members in recruitment efforts
US-trained PharmD students:

- Hold post-graduate roundtable discussions with UW pharmacy students to share information about and opportunities in SAS MS and PhD programs. Utilize graduate students who serve as TAs to recruit selected students.
- Work with PharmD students on research and/or Honors projects. Consider including graduate students as part of the research team.
- Engage PharmD students who have poster presentations at national meetings.
Appendix 1

Admission and Graduation Graphs from the Graduate School (PhD and MS combined)  
([https://grad.wisc.edu/](https://grad.wisc.edu/) second block, “Our Academic Programs: Explore the Data”)

Graduate School Time to Degree: 2008-2017

Completion Rates: 2007-2015 Entrance Cohorts
January 21, 2019

TO: Mel DeVilliers, Vice Dean of the School of Pharmacy
FROM: Michelle Chui, Director of SAS Graduate Program
Re: Response to the SAS Graduate Program Review

On November 14, 2018, I received the final report from the SAS Graduate Program External Review Committee. I immediately forwarded the report to program faculty for their review. On January 10, 2019, the program faculty met for two hours to discuss the report and to begin to develop a plan to respond to key recommendations. Below, I have summarized the recommendations and a brief description of ways in which we are going to approach each recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERC Recommendations</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Convert seminar/course series to organized courses in order to make core competencies explicit and to allow cross-listing) | We have already begun to discuss the conversion of our seminar/course series into organized courses. We currently have two 3-credit courses:  
  • 711 – Quantitative Methods  
  • 715 – Theory  
  We propose the following four 2-credit stand-alone courses (that will be convert from our current 911 seminar):  
  • Dissemination and Implementation (offered Spring 2019-2020)  
  • Grant Writing (offered Spring 2018-2019)  
  • Community and Stakeholder Engagement (offered Fall 2019-2020)  
  • Mixed Methods (offered Fall 2018-2019)  
  We are also developing a no-credit colloquium that will require attendance from all faculty and graduate students (including dissertators), which will be used to alumni speakers, career development, student presentations, and other topics. |
| Work on finalizing handbook (including list of outside courses w/ eval form), process for students to be co-advised, grievance process | We are slowly working on our handbook. This has been a difficult task for us, because we do not want to contradict the graduate school which has several policies and procedures in development. However, we are making some headway on some of the ERC recommendations.  
  **Co-advising model:** We will adopt a co-advising model in which students have the option to select a primary and secondary advisor. We are also working on a streamline way for students to evaluate outside courses, and to provide an updated list to students so that they can more easily select courses each semester. |
| Create minimally acceptable progress (including milestones for MS/PhD and PhD)      | Last year, we created a table that provides guidelines for typical milestones for the MS/PhD and PhD programs. Students will be asked to self-evaluate their progress at their annual review. Students that are not making the recommended progress will be reviewed again by the entire graduate faculty biennially (instead of annually) |
| Require IDP                                                                         | We currently have an annual graduate student review at the end of the Spring semester. Starting this Spring 2019, we have agreed to ask all graduate students (whether they have NIH funding or not) to fill out an IDP to inform their annual review. |
We will also include an introduction of the IDP during the orientation for new students, so that students can be better prepared for their initial faculty interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase reviews to biennial for students as appropriate</th>
<th>In addition to implementing a biennial review for students who are not making typical progress, we will track the potential barriers for students having difficulty making progress.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate PVL for grad program coordinator</td>
<td>We are planning to conduct a full inventory of how our graduate program coordinator assists us, as well as the other graduate programs that he supports. We are also doing an inventory of how our SAS administrative assistant assists us, as it pertains to the graduate program. This will help us think about how our graduate program coordinator could assist us more efficiently and effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop seminar series focused on career development</td>
<td>We have begun to develop the seminar series. One alum is scheduled for next month, and the second one will probably be scheduled for May of this year. Our plan is to invite 2-3 alumni to provide a short research talk, followed by Q&amp;A about career development each academic year. We have funding to reimburse travel expenses for alumni that can drive to visit us, and can provide a small honorarium as well. We would also like to engage the AIHP Board, the SoP Board of Visitors, the Citation of Merit awardees as well as we expand the seminar series. Lastly, we are brainstorming the value of a graduate student retreat which might include an alumni panel for career counseling, industry and non-traditional roles, career development skills such as jobs, writing, interviewing, elevator speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reexamine program assessment to develop meaningful learning objectives</td>
<td>We will use our summer retreat time to think through our school program assessment objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set goals for student recruitment (minority, UW pharmacy students)</td>
<td>We recently received a $25,000 award to assist us with graduate student recruitment and retention. We would like to explore multi-media to market our program (check with Alyson Kim), and to determine if visits to pharmacy schools with high minority populations and no graduate programs would be effective. To improve student recruitment within the UW pharmacy school, we would like to expand the “Research Path of Distinction” so pharmacy students can receive recognition for research electives, explore summer funding for PharmD students, and to develop a YouTube video of students who have had research experiences with us.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-ERC Recommendations**

| Remove terminal master’s degree option in admissions system, add STEM designation | Our graduate school application is confusing. In order to reduce confusion, we will initiate a request from the graduate school to remove the masters degree from the application website. We will keep the masters degree “on the books” so that we may still confer masters degrees to students. We would also like to explore a change to our designation to a STEM designation, so that our degree accurately reflects the quantitative nature of the program, and so our international students may have additional time to find domestic employment. |

If there are any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Cc: Charles Lauhon PhD, Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies  
Ken Niemeyer, Graduate Programs Coordinator  
Beth Janetski, PhD, Director of Assessment  
Dave Mott PhD, Chair of the SAS Division  
Steve Swanson PhD, Dean of SoP
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 1/30/2019

TO: Steven Swanson, PhD (Dean), School of Pharmacy, University of Wisconsin Madison.

FROM: Melgardt de Villiers, PhD (Chair Academic Planning Council), Associate Dean Academic Affairs, School of Pharmacy, University of Wisconsin Madison

RE: 10 Year Program Review Graduate Programs Social and Administrative Sciences

The Academic Planning Council of the School of Pharmacy at the University of Wisconsin Madison met on 1/23/2019 and unanimously approved the report and recommendations of the program review for the Graduate Programs in Social and Administrative Sciences.

Sincerely

[Signature]