November 2022

PharmD Bridging Report

Appendices

Prepared by Rosemary Killeen, Director, Lifelong Learning
PharmD Bridging Program Admission – Self-assessment questionnaire:

Before applying for readmission to the School of Pharmacy to participate in the PharmD Bridging program, you should be aware that this program includes some online courses and elements quite different from your BScPhm curriculum. High motivation and self-discipline can be very important determinants of your success and prior to applying you should assess your readiness for this type of program.

To help determine if online (distance) education is for you, please answer the following questions:

1. Are you strongly motivated to achieve your educational goals?
2. Are you good at time management and setting deadlines for yourself?
3. Are you comfortable working on courses with limited or no face-to-face interaction?
4. Can you devote an average of 8 to 10 hours per week per course to your school work?
5. Can you commit to completing the degree requirements within the 3 year time limit?
6. Will you have access to reliable technology throughout the duration of the program? The Centre for Extended Learning suggests the following system requirements - http://de.uwaterloo.ca/comp_req.html.
7. Do you find it easy to understand written instructions and complex material without direct explanation? Can you easily express your ideas in writing?
8. Can you work collaboratively, even when communication is via email or course discussion boards? You may not interact with your fellow students in person or in a "synchronous" conversation, but online learning requires good social skills and "netiquette."
9. Do you have a variety of documented post-BScPhm clinical experiences?

If you answered “yes” to most or all of these questions, then you may be a good candidate for the School of Pharmacy PharmD Bridging program.

If you answered “no” to 3 or more of these questions (or are unsure of any of your responses), we strongly advise you to contact Rosemary Killeen to discuss your specific situation prior to applying for readmission to the School of Pharmacy.

Mar 24, 2014
APPENDIX 2
PharmD Bridging Program Admissions Info - July 2014

The School of Pharmacy’s Admission Committee has confirmed the following steps for Waterloo Pharmacy alumni interested in applying for the PharmD Bridging Program:

1. Potential students will be asked to first complete a self-assessment questionnaire [link to questionnaire]
2. Interested students (alumni) will then apply for re-admission [link to application for readmission form] to the University of Waterloo (since you have previously been admitted to the University). Applications open September 2, 2014. There is no fee for applying for re-admission
3. All Waterloo School of Pharmacy alumni are eligible for the PharmD Bridging program, however, as initial class sizes are limited, some prioritization of registration may be required, depending on the number of applications received for any given term
4. The Admissions Committee will make any decisions regarding re-admission applications

Admissions Process – Frequently Asked Questions

1. How will I apply?
   b. Fill out page 1 completely; sign at the bottom of page 1. You will need your Waterloo student identification #. Please note that your intended plan is Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) Bridging Program – PHARMBR and that this is a part-time, online program.
   c. Fill out Section E on page 2, listing PHARM 495 and 496, in your order of preference for your first academic term (for our information); sign page 2
   d. Note the deadline of November 1, 2014 for the Winter 2015 term
   e. Return completed forms to Ken Potvin, Director of Admissions, Professional Relations and Undergraduate Affairs at kpotvin@uwaterloo.ca
   f. Send your registration or licensure details (province or state of registration and certificate #) to rosemary.killeen@uwaterloo.ca

2. When should I apply?
   Applications for the Winter 2015 term will be accepted from September 2, 2014 until November 1, 2014. The spring and fall term deadlines are noted on the application for readmission form.
3. **What happens if the number of applications received exceeds the number of places available for a given term?**

If applications exceed capacity for a particular term, the Admissions Committee will make decisions as to who is re-admitted as per the criteria outlined below (see #4) and a waiting list will be established for the remainder of applicants. Applicants will be notified of their status as soon as the Admissions Committee has completed their review. If there is insufficient capacity to accommodate all applicants, they will be placed in a queue for the following entry point (e.g., Spring 2015, if Winter 2015 is full). There is no need to submit a second application for readmission in this case.

4. **What factors will be considered by the Admissions Committee in making re-admission decisions** (in order of priority):
   a. Year of graduation (Rx 2011 having top priority and subsequent classes following in order, i.e. Rx 2011 > Rx 2012 > Rx 2013 > Rx 2014)
   b. Date of receipt of application
   c. Registered to practise in a North American jurisdiction [Registration information to be provided to Rosemary Killeen, Director, Distance Education and CPD at rosemary.killeen@uwaterloo.ca at the time of application]

5. **When will the tuition costs be available?**

As soon as these amounts are confirmed for the Winter 2015 term, we will advise all prospective students. As mentioned in a previous communication, the total estimated cost to complete the entire Bridging Program is $10,000 to $14,000. As Bridging students will be considered "part-time," they will have to pay only for the course they're registered for in a given term, e.g., when you register for one course per semester, that's all you have to pay for that term. **Reminder - all bridging students will be recommended to register for one (1) course at a time.**

6. **Will I be eligible for OSAP while taking courses in the PharmD Bridging Program?**

Once re-admitted to the University and enrolled in the Bridging Program, you will be considered a part-time student. You may be eligible for some financial assistance, but will have to contact the OSAP website – osap.gov.on.ca for further information. Students can also contact the University of Waterloo Student Awards and Financial Aid office - [https://uwaterloo.ca/student-awards-financial-aid/](https://uwaterloo.ca/student-awards-financial-aid/).

7. **When will the workshop be held in PHARM 496?**

The final date(s) has not yet been confirmed, but we anticipate the workshop will be held in late February or early March 2015.

8. **Where can I find more information about the courses in the Bridging Program?**

Check the PharmD Bridging section of the School’s website for more details.
PHARM 495 – Advanced topics in Patient-focused Care

Fall 2017

Syllabus Last Revised: June 2017

Course Description

This course will be similar to the IPFC sequence of courses in that it integrates concepts form the disciplines of Pharmacokinetics, Clinical Biochemistry, Pathophysiology, Pharmacology, Medicinal Chemistry, Toxicology and therapeutics. Students will also continue to develop their skills in evidence-based medicine and clinical decision-making. The goal for this course is to enable students to develop patient-specific care plans that address actual or potential health concerns in complicated patients.

PHARM 495 will be delivered using principles of Problem-based learning. Problem-based Learning (PBL) is an educational methodology in which a problem serves as the stimulus and guide for student learning. It was pioneered by the McMaster University School of Medicine, and has since been adopted by several other Faculties and Schools of medicine and Pharmacy.

How Problem-based Learning will be used in this course:

Students will be split into groups of between six and eight members. Each group will meet remotely every two weeks for three hours to: i) develop learning objectives for a clinical case that they are given; and, ii) discuss the learning objectives that they completed from the previous week. A pharmacist tutor
will be assigned to each group, and will monitor these tutorial sessions to ensure that students address the learning objectives in a detailed and accurate manner. After the learning objectives have been developed for the case, students will have the next two weeks for independent study to complete the objectives. It is important to note that while the sharing of an exceptionally pertinent resource between group members is permitted in between tutorials, the discussion of the case should not take place outside of the tutorial setting.

**Requisites:**

*Prerequisite* – Waterloo BScPhm graduate

**Learning Objectives**

Upon completion of PHARM 495, students will be able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objective</th>
<th>AFPC Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand, integrate and apply concepts from pharmacology/medicinal chemistry, clinical pharmacokinetics, clinical biochemistry/pathophysiology, and applied microbiology as related to specific clinical scenarios</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess patients with respect to the presence or risk for diseases and identify patient-specific characteristics that may influence treatment choices</td>
<td>1.2, 1.3, 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a systematic approach to solve clinical problems and develop care plans for patients with, or those who are at risk of developing, various medical conditions</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how patient values may alter treatment choices</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize critical appraisal skills to evaluate various sources of information</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make confident decisions regarding a patient’s care plan</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address controversies in various therapeutic areas</td>
<td>2.1, 2.3, 6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact Information**

*Course Coordinator:*

Laura Beattie, BScPhm, RPh
Email address: laura@brownbeattie.com

Office hours: By appointment

Special Instructions: Please allow 24 hours for response to an email request.

**Course Instructors:**

Available on LEARN

---

**Changes to Course Syllabus**

The topics addressed in this course, as well as the schedule of topics, may be revised as the course progresses. Any changes will be announced in class and posted on LEARN or on other online learning platforms. The assessment weights CANNOT be altered. There is one exception. When a student has been excused from completing a mandatory assessment (a midterm, for example), the decision about how and when this assessment will be completed is at the discretion of the course coordinator. In this instance, the coordinator may choose to alter assessment weights by re-allocating marks from a midterm to a final exam. See the Student Assessment section of this document for more information.

---

**Resources**

**Required Reading**

Provided with each case (available on LEARN)

**Supplemental Reading**

Provided with each case (on LEARN)

iClicker® will not be used in this course.

Top Hat® will not be used in this course.
Please note that course material will not be available on LEARN or on other online learning platforms after the end of the term, therefore, students need to download any information that they may require for reference purposes.

Lectures and tutorials may be audio or video recorded only if permission is granted by the lecturer. Any recordings as well as other class materials (either posted in LEARN, on online learning platforms or distributed in class) are to be used for review purposes only and should not be posted on websites, bulletin boards or distributed via other means without permission of the Course Coordinator and the lecturer if other than the Course Coordinator.

Plagiarism detection software (Turnitin) will be used to screen assignments in this course. This is being done to verify that use of all materials and sources in assignments is documented. Students will be given an option if they do not want to have their assignment screened by Turnitin. In the first week of the term, details will be provided about arrangements and alternatives for the use of Turnitin in this course.

**Course Topics**

A complete list of activities is available on LEARN or on other online learning platforms.

**Student Assessment**

A passing grade for this course is 60 %.

**A supplemental exam WILL NOT be offered to students who do not achieve a passing grade in this course.**

Group work accounts for 0 % of the total mark.
Assessment | Brief Description | Value/100
--- | --- | ---
Professionalism | Students are expected to demonstrate professionalism in this course and unprofessional behaviour will result in up to a 5% deduction from your final mark, at the discretion of the instructor. | Up to 5% deduction
Clinical application exercise | Short-answer and case-based questions | 40
Midterm tutorial participation | Participation in tutorials will be graded by the tutor and will include assessment of each student’s professional behaviour, contribution to group process and contribution to group content (assessed after second tutorial) | 20
Final tutorial participation | Participation in tutorials will be graded by the tutor and will include assessment of each student’s professional behaviour, contribution to group process and contribution to group content | 40

Assignment details will be posted on LEARN or on other online learning platforms.

In this course, there are activities that are graded, assignments that are mandatory but not graded or events for which the students’ presence is mandatory. Students are reminded that they should view these activities with the same professionalism as they would a job. Attendance and participation is expected and non-attendance, lack of participation or noncompletion of assignments will affect an individual student’s grade in this course.

A student will be excused for a mandatory activity only under exceptional and unforeseen circumstances. While it is not possible to list all such circumstances, examples include: death of an immediate family member; significant illness of a family member; serious personal illness or injury requiring medical attention. Please note that student travel plans are not considered acceptable grounds for granting an alternative examination time or altering assignment deadlines.

If an event is missed due to illness, students must complete a Verification of Illness (VIF) form (available online [https://uwaterloo.ca/health-services/sites/ca.health-services/files/uploads/files/VIF-online.pdf](https://uwaterloo.ca/health-services/sites/ca.health-services/files/uploads/files/VIF-online.pdf)) and present it to the Pharmacy Undergraduate Office. Instructors will then be notified by email that a VIF has been received. In the event that a student unavoidably misses a mandatory activity, a make-up activity will be scheduled for that student at the sole discretion of the coordinator. In the case of a
missed exam, a new exam may be administered. This new exam may be the same as the original exam, may be a different exam, may be of a different format (e.g. an oral test), or may be of a different mix of questions (e.g. the percentage of specific topics on the new exam may differ from the original). In any case, the final decision of which exam format and date that it will be administered will rest solely with the course coordinator.

Students seeking permission to miss a mandatory activity must submit their request, via email, to the Course Coordinator a minimum of two weeks before the scheduled activity. The Course Coordinator will respond in email outlining whether the request will be granted and how the material from the missed activity will be addressed. If activities will be missed across multiple courses, contact Dr. Michael Beazely or Professor Elaine Lillie.

Students may receive a grade of Incomplete (INC) in a course where the student has been unable to complete course work because of verifiable illness or extenuating circumstances. These students must complete an Incomplete Grade Agreement Form. The Incomplete Grade Agreement Form is an agreement between the instructor and student and specifies how and by what date course work will be completed. Failure to complete work by the deadline indicated will result in the INC grade being changed to FTC (failure to complete). The course will be weighted as a grade of 32 for purposes of calculating the student’s average. A link to the Incomplete Grade Agreement Form follows: https://uwaterloo.ca/science/sites/ca.science/files/uploads/files/incomplete-grade-agreement-form.pdf

Assignments that are not submitted on time will have 20% of the assignment grade deducted per day that it is late.

Students that wish to have an assignment or exam re-graded must submit a written request that details why it should be re-graded. This written request must be delivered to the instructor within one month (see Appendix B of Policy #70) of the date that the grade was available, and must contain supporting evidence (e.g. from literature, textbooks, or other sources). Students should note that grades may stay the same, be increased or be decreased after re-grading. Depending upon the request, the instructor may decide to re-grade the whole assignment or test, and not just the question that is being challenged. Students should not mark in any way assignments or tests that they think may warrant a re-examination. Only assignments and tests that are completed in indelible ink are eligible for re-grading.

Unclaimed assignments, reports and tests will be retained for one year after term grades become official. After that time, they will be destroyed in compliance with UW’s confidential shredding procedures.
Note: Final Exams will be retained for one year from the date the examination was written.

**Expectation of Academic Integrity**

**Academic Integrity:**

In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo community are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. Please refer to: [http://www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/Students/index.html](http://www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/Students/index.html)

The Office of Academic Integrity has developed a tutorial that helps students recognize and avoid academic integrity offences [https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/basic-info](https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/basic-info).

**Discipline:**

Students are expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offenses, and to take responsibility for their actions. Students who are unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who need help in learning how to avoid offenses (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about ‘rules’ for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course instructor, academic advisor, or the Associate Dean of Science for Undergraduate Studies. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy #71, Student Discipline [http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm). For information on typical penalties, students should check Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties [https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/guidelines/guidelines-assessment-penalties](https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/guidelines/guidelines-assessment-penalties).

**Appeals:**

A decision or penalty imposed under Policy #33 (Ethical Behavior), Policy #70 (Student Petitions and Grievances) or Policy #71 (Student Discipline) may be appealed, if there is a ground. Students, who believe they have a ground for an appeal, should refer to Policy #72 (Student Appeals) [http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm).
**Student Grievances**

**Grievance:** A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of their university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy #70, Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4. [https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-70](https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-70) When in doubt, contact the Director of Admissions, Professional Relations & Undergraduate Affairs who will provide further assistance.

**Students with Disabilities**

AccessAbility Services ([https://uwaterloo.ca/disability-services/](https://uwaterloo.ca/disability-services/)), located in Needles Hall, room 1401, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with AccessAbility Services at the beginning of each academic term.
APPENDIX 4
Poster presentation at Lifelong Learning in Pharmacy conference, July 2016

The use of a course pilottion in the development of an online problem-based learning (PBL) therapeutics course in a post-professional PharmD program

Context
- The School of Pharmacy at the University of Waterloo created an innovative bridging program to allow graduates of the School to upgrade their Bachelor of Pharmacy degree to a Doctorate of Pharmacy degree via distance learning.

- Our preference was to utilize a Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach in the delivery of the Advanced Therapeutics in Practice module in first-year PharmD course (TherPh-401) (Fig. 1), but we recognized the need to incorporate significant modification to the traditional face-to-face PBL curriculum.

Objectives
1. Given the current set of online tools available in the University of Waterloo’s Learning Management System (LMS), our objective was to determine to what degree the traditional problem-based learning process could be transferred to a distance learning environment.
2. The next objective was to establish the degree to which participants were able to achieve the stated learning outcomes.
3. The third objective was to identify any barriers or facilitators that could impact usability and participant learning.
4. Given the current set of online tools available in the University of Waterloo’s LMS, we wanted to test if additional forms of support were required by participants and/or facilitators to facilitate participant success.

Results
Student and tutor feedback
- A deep learning curve with technology and nuances of delivering effective PBL across a distance was identified: the collaboration flow improved significantly in course tutorial.

Researcher and instructor observations
- The depth of context discussion during the online tutorial was similar to the equivalent discussions in face-to-face PBL courses, making it appear likely that students can achieve the same learning outcomes.

Barriers to, and facilitators of success
- Site adherence to the minimum technology requirements is crucial.
- Learners require a quiet space for the tutorial to minimize distractions.

Methods
- An online PBL environment was organized using experiences from a current face-to-face PBL course and a review of relevant literature.
- Initial course design considerations focused on optimizing the mapped approach based on the strengths and limitations of a fully online learning environment and possible synchronous communication tools.
- A post-pilot user experience study sought to further understand the underlying design assumptions prior to final course production. The study was based on Nielsen’s (1994) work suggesting that users will typically find 10% of usability problems.

Description of this pilot course
- A pilot online environment and sample PBL cases were developed.
- Eight pilot participants of the course were selected to pilot test the pilot PBL group.
- Participants were selected in a manner that allowed them to be from a variety of institutions.
- Participants were instructed to complete the online tutorial and then complete the online self-assessment module.
- Participants were invited to take part in a focus group to discuss their experience.
- The results were used to assess the feasibility of the study and to evaluate the relevance of the design.

Discussion and Recommendations
- To help students and future adopters to distinguish between online and face-to-face PBL sessions, the first tutor in PHARM-401 is presented formatively.
- The minimum technology requirements are made clear to students prior to course enrollment. Failure to meet these requirements can result in a probationary grace period.

Conclusion
- Conducting a course pilot study demonstrated that an online PBL course is feasible, and identified some considerations to facilitate success.

Literature cited

Acknowledgements
We thank Eric Bosch, PharmD, Assistant Dean & Professor, School of Pharmacy, University of Waterloo for his assistance.

Fig. 1. Sequence of courses and clinical rotations to complete PharmD.
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Pharm 496 – Advanced Professional Practice

Fall 2017

Syllabus Last Revised: June 2017

Course Description

This course will continue to build on existing professional practice knowledge and skills. As the key theme of the course is continuous professional development, students will apply their learning from previous pharmacy courses and practice-based experience to discussions of patient care and pharmacy practice issues.

Students will use foundational skills to further develop skills to support a variety of advanced pharmacist roles involving the full scope of practice, pharmacy management and an introduction to pharmacy practice-based research.

Course content will be delivered online through study modules which students can work through asynchronously. Weekly small-group, online discussion boards will offer the students the opportunity to discuss the material and patient case scenarios. Participation on these discussion boards will be monitored and evaluated.

In addition, attendance at a one-day face to face workshop will be required to demonstrate practice-based skills. Students will be required to demonstrate effective communication, patient assessment,
ethical decision making, and pharmacy practice management in addition to therapeutic problem solving related to the care of complex patients.

**Requisites:**

*Prerequisite* – Previous Waterloo BScPhm graduate

Choose an item. – Click here to enter text.

### Learning Objectives

Upon completion of PHARM 496, students will be able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objective</th>
<th>AFPC Outcome</th>
<th>NAPRA Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use clinical judgment to assess and implement patient-centred decisions</td>
<td>1.3, 1.7, 1.10, 2.1</td>
<td>1.1, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 3.1, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 7.2, 8.3, 8.4, 9.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ability to effectively and appropriately manage challenging communication situations.</td>
<td>7.4, 7.5</td>
<td>1.1, 1.4, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 5.3, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate decision making utilizing advanced scope of practice and describe legal implications for pharmacists.</td>
<td>4.3, 4.5</td>
<td>2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 8.2, 8.3, 5.3, 6.3, 7.2, 9.1, 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the influence of workflow and funding models on new pharmacy services.</td>
<td>5.1, 5.3</td>
<td>4.1, 5.3, 6.3, 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategies to promote patient and public health.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1, 5.2, 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategies to provide ethical and evidence based care.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.3, 2.5, 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strategy for a personalized continuing professional development plan</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.4, 6.3, 9.1, 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategies to manage change in pharmacy practice</td>
<td>4.3, 4.4</td>
<td>1.4, 4.1, 5.3, 6.3, 9.1, 9.2, 9.4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design practice-based research project to address a research question</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.1, 6.1, 6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contact Information

Course Coordinator:
Lisa Craig, BSc.Phm
Email address: lisarcraig@rogers.com
Office hours: Office hours: Virtual Office Hours & available by appointment
Special Instructions: Please put “waterloo pharm” in the subject line for any email correspondence. Thank you.

Course Instructors:
Available via LEARN

Changes to Course Syllabus

The topics addressed in this course, as well as the schedule of topics, may be revised as the course progresses. Any changes will be announced in class and posted on LEARN. The assessment weights CANNOT be altered. There is one exception. When a student has been excused from completing a mandatory assessment (a midterm, for example), the decision about how and when this assessment will be completed is at the discretion of the course coordinator. In this instance, the coordinator may choose to alter assessment weights by re-allocating marks from a midterm to a final exam. See the Student Assessment section of this document for more information.

Resources

Required Reading
No required textbook. Readings will be provided in weekly modules in LEARN

Supplemental Reading
Readings will be provided in weekly modules in LEARN

iClicker® will not be used in this course.

Top Hat® will not be used in this course.

Please note that course material will not be available on LEARN after the end of the term, therefore, students need to download any information that they may require for reference purposes.

Lectures and tutorials may be audio or video recorded only if permission is granted by the lecturer. Any recordings as well as other class materials (either posted in LEARN or distributed in class) are to be used for review purposes only and should not be posted on websites, bulletin boards or distributed via other means without permission of the Course Coordinator and the lecturer if other than the Course Coordinator.

Plagiarism detection software (Turnitin) will be used to screen assignments in this course. This is being done to verify that use of all materials and sources in assignments is documented. Students will be given an option if they do not want to have their assignment screened by Turnitin. In the first week of the term, details will be provided about arrangements and alternatives for the use of Turnitin in this course.

### Course Topics

A complete list of activities is available on LEARN.

### Student Assessment

A passing grade for this course is 60%.
A supplemental exam WILL NOT be offered to students who do not achieve a passing grade in this course.

Group work accounts for 0% of the total mark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Value/100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Engagement</td>
<td>Summary and reflection of discussion posts</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan</td>
<td>Development of professional development action plan</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Clinical skills demonstration and patient interactions</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Proposal</td>
<td>Development of brief research project plan based on course content</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Students are expected to demonstrate professionalism in this course and unprofessional behaviour will result in up to a 5% deduction from your final mark, at the discretion of the instructor.</td>
<td>Up to 5% deduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignment details will be posted on LEARN.

In this course, there are activities that are graded, assignments that are mandatory but not graded or events for which the students’ presence is mandatory. Students are reminded that they should view these activities with the same professionalism as they would a job. Attendance and participation is expected and non-attendance, lack of participation or noncompletion of assignments will affect an individual student’s grade in this course.

A student will be excused for a mandatory activity only under exceptional and unforeseen circumstances. While it is not possible to list all such circumstances, examples include: death of an immediate family member; significant illness of a family member; serious personal illness or injury requiring medical attention. Please note that student travel plans are not considered acceptable grounds for granting an alternative examination time or altering assignment deadlines.

If an event is missed due to illness, students must complete a Verification of Illness (VIF) form (available online https://uwaterloo.ca/health-services/sites/ca.health-services/files/uploads/files/VIF-online.pdf) and present it to the Pharmacy Undergraduate Office. Instructors will then be notified by email that a VIF has been received. In the event that a student unavoidably misses a mandatory activity, a make-up activity will be scheduled for that student at the sole discretion of the coordinator. In the case of a missed exam, a new exam may be administered. This new exam may be the same as the original exam,
may be a different exam, may be of a different format (e.g. an oral test), or may be of a different mix of questions (e.g. the percentage of specific topics on the new exam may differ from the original). In any case, the final decision of which exam format and date that it will be administered will rest solely with the course coordinator.

Students seeking permission to miss a mandatory activity must submit their request, via email, to the Course Coordinator a minimum of two weeks before the scheduled activity. The Course Coordinator will respond in email outlining whether the request will be granted and how the material from the missed activity will be addressed. If activities will be missed across multiple courses, contact Dr. Michael Beazely or Professor Elaine Lillie.

Students may receive a grade of Incomplete (INC) in a course where the student has been unable to complete course work because of verifiable illness or extenuating circumstances. These students must complete an Incomplete Grade Agreement Form. The Incomplete Grade Agreement Form is an agreement between the instructor and student and specifies how and by what date course work will be completed. Failure to complete work by the deadline indicated will result in the INC grade being changed to FTC (failure to complete). The course will be weighted as a grade of 32 for purposes of calculating the student's average. A link to the Incomplete Grade Agreement Form follows: https://uwaterloo.ca/science/sites/ca.science/files/uploads/files/incomplete-grade-agreement-form.pdf

Assignments that are not submitted on time will have 10% of the assignment grade deducted per day that it is late.

Students that wish to have an assignment or exam re-graded must submit a written request that details why it should be re-graded. This written request must be delivered to the instructor within one month (see Appendix B of Policy #70) of the date that the grade was available, and must contain supporting evidence (e.g. from literature, textbooks, or other sources). Students should note that grades may stay the same, be increased or be decreased after re-grading. Depending upon the request, the instructor may decide to re-grade the whole assignment or test, and not just the question that is being challenged. Students should not mark in any way assignments or tests that they think may warrant a re-examination. Only assignments and tests that are completed in indelible ink are eligible for re-grading.

Unclaimed assignments, reports and tests will be retained for 1 year after term grades become official. After that time, they will be destroyed in compliance with UW’s confidential shredding procedures.
Note: Final Exams will be retained for one year from the date the examination was written.

Expectation of Academic Integrity

Academic Integrity:

In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo community are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. Please refer to: http://www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/Students/index.html

The Office of Academic Integrity has developed a tutorial that helps students recognize and avoid academic integrity offences https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/basic-info).

Discipline:

Students are expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offenses, and to take responsibility for their actions. Students who are unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who need help in learning how to avoid offenses (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about ‘rules’ for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course instructor, academic advisor, or the Associate Dean of Science for Undergraduate Studies. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy #71, Student Discipline http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm. For information on typical penalties, students should check Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/guidelines/guidelines-assessment-penalties.

Appeals:

A decision or penalty imposed under Policy #33 (Ethical Behavior), Policy #70 (Student Petitions and Grievances) or Policy #71 (Student Discipline) may be appealed, if there is a ground. Students, who believe they have a ground for an appeal, should refer to Policy #72 (Student Appeals) http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm.

Student Grievances
Grievance: A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of their university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy #70, Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4. https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-70 When in doubt, contact the Director of Admissions, Professional Relations & Undergraduate Affairs who will provide further assistance.

Students with Disabilities

AccessAbility Services (https://uwaterloo.ca/disability-services/), located in Needles Hall, room 1401, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with AccessAbility Services at the beginning of each academic term.
The use of a course pilot in the development of an online problem-based learning (PBL) therapeutics course in a post-professional PharmD program

Context
- The School of Pharmacy at the University of Waterloo created an innovative bridging program to allow graduates of the School to upgrade their Bachelor of Pharmacy degree to a Doctorate of Pharmacy degree via distance learning.
- Our preference was to utilize a Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach in the delivery of the Advanced Topics in Patient Focused Care course (PhARM 495) (Fig 1), but we recognized this might require significant modification to the traditional face-to-face interactions in PBL courses.

Objectives
1. Given the current set of online tools available in the University of Waterloo’s Learning Management System (LMS), we wanted to determine to what degree the traditional problem-based learning process could be translated into a distance learning environment.
2. We sought to establish the degree to which participants were able to achieve the desired learning outcomes.
3. We wanted to identify any barriers or facilitators that could impact usability and participant learning.
4. Given the current set of online tools available in the University of Waterloo’s LMS, we wanted to see if additional forms of support were required by participants and/or facilitators to facilitate their success.

Results
Student and tutor feedback
- A steep learning curve with technology and nuances of carrying out PBL across distance was identified; the conversational flow improved significantly in second tutorial.

Researcher and instructor observations
- The depth of content discussion during the online tutorial was similar to that expected of students in face-to-face PBL courses, making it appear likely that students can achieve their learning outcomes.

Barriers to, and facilitators of success
- Strict adherence to the minimum technology requirements is crucial.
- Learners require a quiet space for the tutorial to minimize distractions.

Methods
- An online PBL environment was organized using experiences from a current face-to-face PBL course and a review of relevant literature.
- Initial course design considerations focused on optimizing the mapped approach based on the strengths and limitations of a fully online learning environment and possible synchronous communication tools.
- A post-pilot user experience study sought to further understand the underlying design assumptions prior to final course production. The study was based on Nielsen’s (1994) work suggesting 3 to 5 users will typically find 80% of usability problems.

Description of the pilot course
- A pilot online environment and sample PBL case were created.
- Eight alumni of the Bachelor of Pharmacy program, and one experienced tutor formed the pilot PBL group.
- The group met synchronously on two occasions using Blackboard Collaborate software to permit audio and visual interaction: the first time to develop learning objectives for the case, and the second time to discuss the learning objectives and case after two weeks of self-study.
- Tutorials were videotaped and analyzed by a researcher and the course instructor based primarily on a user experience framework.
- Participants completed satisfaction surveys after the pilot, and were invited to take part in a focus group to discuss their experience.
- Ethics approval was obtained for this study through the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Waterloo.

Discussion and Recommendations
- To help students and tutors adapt to the differences between online and face-to-face PBL sections, the first tutorial in PhARM 495 is accessed formatively.
- The minimum technology requirements are made clear to students prior to course enrolment; failure to adhere to these requirements can result in a professional grade deduction.

Conclusion
- Conducting a course pilot study demonstrated that an online PBL course is feasible, and identified some considerations to facilitate success.

If the poster presents a new approach or method, it might be beneficial to discuss the potential impact on the field of pharmacy education. This could include how the course can better prepare students for the challenges of modern pharmacy practice, as well as the implications for future research and educational innovations.
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APPENDIX 7
Poster Presentation at Canadian Pharmacists Association Conference 2014

Developing a Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) process for implementation in a PharmD bridging program

Rosemary M. Athan, BPharm; Eric F. Schneider, BScPharm; PharmD; Nancy M. Waddell, BScPharm, PharmD

Context
- While developing a bridging PharmD program, we identified a need to award academic credit for clinical competence acquired in graduates through a Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) process.

Methods
- We conducted informal interviews and attended the Canadian Association of Pharmacy Teachers’ Conference in November 2013. This provided background information on our literature search and RPL design.
- After conducting a review of existing Canadian and international resources, we prepared an evidence-based summary with review and recommendations.

Objectives
- As we were unable to find an existing RPL model for Canadian PharmD programs, an investigative process was used to gather evidence to inform the design of a new RPL process.
- We identified key factors to inform our design including time preference, academic rigor, consistency with undergraduate PharmD program requirements, accreditation standards, flexibility, quality assurance, and measures.

Results
- A self-assessment is often included as a requirement for entry into an RPL process.
- A range of valid RPL assessment methods exist and are often used in combination to determine the student’s competence.
- The guiding principles of assessment in RPL are reliability, validity, and fairness.
- Learning outcomes must be defined and appropriate assessment tools determined using clearly identified competencies and measurable criteria.
- The assessment criteria must be linked to the situation, e.g., describe duties only for appropriate courses or programs.
- An RPL process must not be used at the university level, where assessment must be reliable and valid.

Discussion and Recommendations
- A self-assessment questionnaire, determining suitability for a bridging program, should form part of the initial program application.
- A non-peer RPL process was recommended to establish the students’ level of clinical competence and eligibility to receive credit for prior learning.
- In part 2, students work up new patient cases, which are assessed on a non-credit basis using a problem-solving interview method and measured against a grading rubric. This allows for the assessment of competence, reflective learning related to actual clinical situations, and the assessment of performance in a simulated environment.
- In part 2, students will be asked to assemble an electronic clinical experience portfolio. They must check direct observation feedback from a supervisor(s) and will be reviewed and graded. This methodology provides significant self-reflection by the student and provides an opportunity to demonstrate a variety of skills and abilities.

Conclusion
- A valid, rigorous RPL process can be developed to gain academic credit for pharmacists prior learning at the PharmD level.

Appendix A: PharmD Bridging Program

Fig. 1. Sequence of course and clinical rotation to complete PharmD.
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Learning objectives

• Discuss basic concepts of recognition of prior learning (RPL)

• Interpret outcomes of a customized RPL process used in a PharmD bridging program for BScPhm graduates

• Assess applicability of specific assessment and training practices for your courses & programs
Waterloo PharmD Bridging

Admission into PharmD Bridging Program
Must have completed the BSc Pharmacy program at uWaterloo

PHARM 495
Advanced Topics in Patient Focused Care
0.5 credit / online

PHARM 496
Advanced Professional Practice
0.5 credit / online + workshop

PHARM 497
Bridging Program Clinical Rotation 1
Clinical Skills / Recognition of Prior Learning
2.5 credits

Level 1 Competence

Level 2 Competence

Level 3 Competence

PHARM 498
Bridging Program Clinical Rotation 2
2.5 credits

PHARM 498
Bridging Program Clinical Rotation 2
2.5 credits

PHARM 498
Transfer Credit
2.5 credits

PHARM 499
Bridging Program Clinical Rotation 3
2.5 credits

PHARM 499
Transfer Credit
2.5 credits

PHARM 499
Transfer Credit
2.5 credits

Program Complete

Maximum Time to Completion 3 Years from Enrollment
PHARM 497 - RPL

What?
- RPL is a process used to systemically validate skills, knowledge and abilities, whether acquired through work, life experience or formal training, giving credit for this learning or competency acquisition

Why?
- to award academic credit for clinical competencies acquired since graduation
Institutional Requirements/Concerns

- Administrative
- Equivalence
- Legal/Academic

How?

- key informant interviews, CAPLA conferences provided background information for literature search and RPL design
- prepared evidence summary, with review and recommendations\(^2\)
PHARM 497 - RPL

• CAPLA Guidelines\textsuperscript{3,4}
  - Canadian Association for Prior Learning Assessment launched Quality Assurance manual for RPL in Canada in 2015
  - Reference for assessments, ongoing CQI initiatives, recently launched post-graduation survey
  - CAPLA principles of assessment – validity, reliability, currency, sufficiency and authenticity
RPL Assessments

- Clinical experience portfolio
- Written case submissions
- Oral defense sessions

- Students are evaluated at a level consistent with the fourth year undergraduate PharmD (ELPD) students at the end of their third clinical rotation
RPL Assessors

Who?
- Registered clinician (Part A pharmacist or equivalent), at least 5 yrs experience
- Significant preceptor experience
- NOT Waterloo pharmacy graduate (avoid COI)

How many?
- Current total pool – 88
- W17 – 55 (for 34 students)
- Matching for practice site/therapeutic area
RPL Assessors

How are they trained?
- Written training materials, webinar and an in-person training session tailored to their particular assessment segment

How are they compensated?
- Flat rate

Enhanced role - Senior Assessors (3)
- Case 1 marking, adjudication of discrepancies, assist with assessor feedback, assist with CQI
Waterloo PharmD Bridging

Admission into PharmD Bridging Program
Must have completed the BSc Pharmacy program at uWaterloo

PHARM 495
Advanced Topics in Patient Focused Care
0.5 credit / online

PHARM 496
Advanced Professional Practice
0.5 credit / online + workshop

PHARM 497
Bridging Program Clinical Rotation 1
Clinical Skills / Recognition of Prior Learning
2.5 credits

Level 1 Competence

Level 2 Competence

Level 3 Competence

PHARM 498
Bridging Program Clinical Rotation 2
2.5 credits

PHARM 498
Bridging Program Clinical Rotation 2
2.5 credits

PHARM 498
Transfer Credit
2.5 credits

PHARM 499
Bridging Program Clinical Rotation 3
2.5 credits

PHARM 499
Transfer Credit
2.5 credits

PHARM 499
Transfer Credit
2.5 credits

Program Complete

Maximum Time to Completion 3 Years from Enrollment
PHARM 497 Successes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2017</th>
<th>n=117</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RPL Successes

- Great level of support, both internally and externally
- Overall, rewarding and interesting program
- Developed expertise in a unique area which is being promoted by provincial education ministry
- Feedback – from students and assessors
Biggest Challenges

Communicating the “nuts & bolts” of RPL

- It’s a point in time, indirect assessment
- Case submissions as an academic assignment
- Significant work load, particularly when combined with a FT practice

- Appropriate assessment level for generalist vs specialist assessors
- Expectations for academic program
“People need to be reminded more often than they need to be instructed.”

- Samuel Johnson
Challenges in RPL assessments

- Students practising in settings where we would be unlikely to place a fourth year student on a ELPD rotation
- Pharmacy is a small world
- Inter-rater reliability
- Difficult to provide a “sample” case
Student Feedback

“...I feel the work in this course accurately reflected my direct patient care skills.”

“Looking back, I like all the cases I wrote up – lots of variety! I am proud of them. I love the recognition of prior learning. It’s great!!!”

“I would have liked to have been able to submit some pharmaceutical opinions and Meds checks I’ve done. Some of my best work is based on those (with no labs)…”
“What I liked least about this course was the demanding work load. I believe the case template allows for an accurate assessment of clinical skills, however, to complete it effectively is very time consuming.”

“Regarding marks: we should know our marks before the end of the course: we need to plan our lives…” *

“There was absolutely nothing useful or enjoyable about this course.”
Assessor feedback

What do they like about the process?

- “Continuous learning opportunity”
- “…working with students & assessors”
- “Flexible hours / ability to work at home”
- “Opportunity to review interesting cases & contribute to development of clinical skills for PharmD students”
Assessor Feedback

Suggestions for improvement

- “Streamline the rubric(s)”
- “I think everything is well organized”
- “Webinar with other assessors to discuss experiences and future improvements”
RPL Lessons Learned

- Offer RPL as a option (CAPLA QA*)
- Balance between large assessor pool for variety of expertise vs consistency of assessment
- Ideal class size
- Development of internal & external expertise
- Implementation of QA process is key
- Keeping the big picture in mind
- Can never be enough communication
Future Directions

- Assessor refresher training session
- Increased automation, use of ExamSoft?
- Pursuing additional communication vehicles
- Research
Waterloo PharmD Bridging Program

The PharmD Bridging Program
By the Numbers

216 alumni admitted to the Bridging Program

% who have completed degree requirements or graduated: 40%

Rx2012 cohort with the highest number of completions

% who completed PHARM 497 RPL with Level 3 competence: 55%

April 2017
Challenges in RPL assessments

- Professionalism concerns, privacy breaches, lack of case complexity – deduction (consistent with ELPD)
  - All oral defense sessions are video recorded for QA and review/adjudication purposes
  - Portfolio documents – random sampling are validated by phone confirmation
- Difficult to provide an appropriate “sample” case to students
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Student Feedback

“I liked that I could practice in my present clinical area while taking the course. This enabled me to be more critical of my current practice and truly assess the literature for the common medical conditions seen in my current area of practice.”

“I did appreciate the detailed review of patient topics. The course coordinator and assessors were all very helpful and considerate.”
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USE OF RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING IN A PHARMD BRIDGING PROGRAM
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LEARNING OUTCOMES

- Discuss basics of assessment in recognition of prior learning (RPL)
- Assess applicability of specific high stakes assessment and training practices for your courses and programs
- Interpret interim results from a customized RPL program used in a PharmD bridging program for BScPhm graduates
- Determine if RPL can be successfully integrated into a course or program
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Available to 4 cohorts of UW BScPhm grads

Alternative path to Entry-Level PharmD (2 + 4 program with 3 X 8 week rotations in final year)

Desire for flexibility, suitability for working professionals
RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING (RPL)

- RPL is a process used to systematically validate skills, knowledge and abilities, whether acquired through work, life experience or formal training, giving credit for this learning or competency acquisition.

- Also/previously known as prior learning assessment and recognition (PLAR)
RPL – GOALS

- Identification of learning, wherever it has taken place
- Demonstration of validity and appropriateness of the learning
- Matching learning outcomes to those stated within a chosen accreditation or progression framework
- Assessment of evidence against pre-determined criteria to ensure validity of claimed learning
- Accreditation within an appropriate and recognized framework
RPL IN WATERLOO PHARMD BRIDGING PROGRAM

- Why?
  - to award academic credit for clinical competencies acquired since graduation
RPL IN WATERLOO PHARMD BRIDGING PROGRAM

- How?
  - Canadian Association of Prior Learning Assessment launched a new quality assurance manual for RPL in Canada in 2015
  - Reference for assessment methods, ongoing QA initiatives
  - Basis for much of our post-graduation survey
### ASSESSMENT IN RPL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle/Requirement</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Does assessment tool measure what it’s intended to measure? Does the learning/evidence relate to the learning outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>The consistency and repeatability of a measure. The likelihood of a candidate obtaining a similar result on same or equivalent assessment tool, regardless of assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>The absence of bias, equitability of treatment of applicants during testing process, equality of testing outcomes of subgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiency</td>
<td>Is this enough evidence to provide conclusive proof?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>Did the learner produce this work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency</td>
<td>Are knowledge and skills up to date?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSMENT IN RPL²

COMPETENCIES

Assessment must clearly define competencies, using measurable criteria

ASSESSORS

Content or subject matter experts, current in their own knowledge

EQUIVALENCY

Assessment must be at level of regular learners (shouldn’t expect higher standards)
RPL ASSESSMENTS IN PHARM 497

- Clinical experience portfolio
- Written case submissions
- Oral defense sessions
  - Students are evaluated at a level consistent with the fourth year undergraduate PharmD (Entry Level PharmD) students at the end of their third clinical rotation
- Other possible assessment methods not utilized: written examinations, OSCEs, skills demonstrations, workplace validations by supervisors, award evaluations$^2$
RPL ASSESSORS

- Registered clinician, at least 5 years practice experience
- Significant preceptor experience
- NOT a Waterloo Pharmacy graduate (to avoid conflict of interest)
- Mandatory training, both individual and group
- Paid – flat rate per assessment element graded

- Total pool – 88, including Senior Assessors
- Matching for practice site/therapeutic area focus
WATERLOO PHARMD BRIDGING PROGRAM

USE OF RPL IN A PHARMD BRIDGING PROGRAM
# PHARM 497 RESULTS TO APRIL 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2018</th>
<th>n=145</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (Highest)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>61*</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*compiled results from 8 terms of offer

*includes 8 students who achieved grade for Level 3 competence, but missing a site exposure
INTERIM STUDY RESULTS

- University of Waterloo Ethics Committee approved survey of students and stakeholders
- Mixed methods approach
- Measuring student and stakeholder understanding and satisfaction
  - RPL process
  - Communications
  - Career impact
### INTERIM STUDY RESULTS

- **Do you feel the RPL process adequately assessed student ability?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stakeholders n=29</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students n= 40</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would you have preferred 3 mandatory clinical rotations instead of RPL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students n=41</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERIM STUDY RESULTS (STUDENT QUOTES)

- “Looking back, I like all the cases I wrote up – lots of variety! I am proud of them. I love the recognition of prior learning. It’s great!!!”

- “The Bridging program was very comprehensive, detail-oriented, but also made us look at the ‘big picture’...I feel like I know even more than I did before, even though it involved proving what I already know, it does impact your practice. It improved my confidence and professional documentation...I was confident enough to apply for a hospital position and I am now working in hospital.”

- “It is a fair way to assess and recognize prior learning. I was skeptical, but the guideline for providing evidence and the assessment outcomes were provided and proved fair.”

- “There was absolutely nothing useful or enjoyable about this course.”
GENERAL CHALLENGES

Communicating the “nuts & bolts” of RPL

- It’s a point in time, indirect assessment
- Case submissions as an academic assignment
- Significant work load
- Appropriate assessment level
- Expectations (square peg/round hole)
“People need to be reminded more often than they need to be instructed.

- Samuel Johnson
CHALLENGES IN OUR RPL APPLICATION

- Students practising in setting where we would be unlikely to place a fourth year student on an Entry-Level PharmD rotation
- Pharmacy is a small world
- Inter-rater reliability
- Difficult to provide a “sample” case
- Resource-intensive process...expensive to administer
RPL SUCCESSES

- Extraordinary level of support, both internally and externally
- Overall, rewarding and interesting program
- Developed expertise in a unique area, which is now promoted by our provincial education ministry
- Average student has their work assessed by 13 different assessors
- Fantastic group of trained assessors
- Assessment training and process promoted as CPD for assessors
- Transferrable resources
- Positive feedback from students and assessors
DISCUSSION
LESSONS LEARNED

- Offer RPL as a option (CAPLA QA*)
- Balance between large assessor pool for variety of expertise vs consistency of assessment
- Define ideal class/group size
- Development of internal & external expertise
- Implementation of QA process is key
- Keep the big picture in mind
- Can never be enough communication
# OVERALL BRIDGING PROGRAM RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>N=244*/418 eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed after PHARM 497 (Level 3)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed after PHARM 498 (Level 2)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed after PHARM 499 (Level 1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete/withdrawn</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively enrolled</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extensions granted – 27

**Total degrees granted to date = 130**
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## APPENDIX 10

Details of PHARM 497 results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term (number of students enrolled)</th>
<th>Class Grade Average</th>
<th>Prof. or Late Deductions</th>
<th>Adjudications (difference in grade assigned over 10% between 2 original assessors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016 (n=26)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>31% of class</td>
<td>Different rubric used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2017 (n=34)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>59% of class</td>
<td>21% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017 (n=7)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86% of class</td>
<td>16% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017 (n=8)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>75% of class</td>
<td>10% of Case 2-10 submissions (new rubric and training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2018 (n=15)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>33% of class</td>
<td>19% of Case 2-10 submissions (most in lower grades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018 (n=8)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>63% of class</td>
<td>12.5% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018 (n=10)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>20% of class</td>
<td>18% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2019 (n=7)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>43% of class</td>
<td>15% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019 (n=4)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0% of class</td>
<td>22% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019 (n=2)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>50% of class</td>
<td>22% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2020 (n=2)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0% of class</td>
<td>0% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020 (n=2)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0% of class</td>
<td>0% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2021 (n=3)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0% of class</td>
<td>22% of Case 2-10 submissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHARM 498: Clinical Rotation 2: Direct Patient Care
Spring 2018

Contact Information

Course Co-ordinator: Kenneth Manson – Experiential Coordinator
                      Stacey Verhaeghe – Administrative Coordinator
Email: Kenneth.manson@uwaterloo.ca; Stacey.verhaeghe@uwaterloo.ca
Office Hours: M-F 8:30-4:30 or by appointment
Course Instructors: Kenneth Manson

Course Description

PHARM 498 is one of three advanced practice rotation courses in the PharmD Bridging Program where students provide direct patient care in either a primary care or institutional setting. The specific practice setting they will be assigned will depend on their results from the recognition of prior learning (RPL) process in PHARM 497, that is, fulfilment of any of the practice site exposure requirements (refer to the PHARM 497 syllabus for further details). This is a preceptor-led, unpaid, placement rotation and students cannot complete this course at their place of employment. This rotation course is mandatory for all Bridging Program students who have not earned a transfer credit for PHARM 498 via the RPL process.

Requisites

PHARM 497. Additionally, students are required to provide evidence of completion of the following pre-rotation requirements to the School of Pharmacy prior to their first Patient Care Rotation. Documents and forms are to be uploaded/completed on the School of Pharmacy’s experiential software system – RXpreceptor (CoreELMS): CPR/First Aid Certificate N95 Mask Fit Certificate Immunization form(s) as required by the School of Pharmacy WSIB Student Declaration of Understanding If required by practice site: Influenza and/or other immunizations Police records check Any further requirements specific to the practice site Note: students are responsible for maintaining active registration with the Ontario College of Pharmacists (OCP) throughout the duration of their rotations. As per OCP regulations such registration shall include personal professional liability insurance. Students will be required to update their place of practice within their OCP “My Account” at the start and finish of each Patient Care Rotation.

Learning Objectives*

Upon completion of this course students will be able to:
1. Apply core knowledge, skills and professional judgment to provide pharmaceutical care.
2. Communicate with diverse audiences, using a variety of strategies.
3. Collaborate with a full range of healthcare team members to provide effective, quality health care.
4. Manage the medication therapy of patients with common and complex medication therapy problems.
5. Advocate on behalf of the patient and the profession to advance healthcare models.
6. Honour their roles as self-regulated professionals through individual patient care and fulfilment of their professional obligations to the profession.

*See Appendix II for a detailed list of the learning objectives, AFPC outcomes, and NAPRA competencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Value/100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Students are expected to demonstrate professionalism in this course and unprofessional behaviour will result in up to a <strong>10%</strong> deduction from your final mark, at the discretion of the instructor.</td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Practice</td>
<td>Eight-Week Term (standard rotation) Week 2, preliminary evaluation: feedback only Week 4, midpoint evaluation: 25% of course grade Week 8, final evaluation: 60% of course grade ** or ** Sixteen-Week Term (concurrent rotations) Week 4, preliminary evaluation: feedback only Week 8, midpoint evaluation: 25% of course grade Week 16, final evaluation: 60% of course grade</td>
<td><strong>85%</strong> of course grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interprofessional Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong> of course grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of Practice Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong> of course grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Tools:** The Patient Care Rotation assessment tools to be used by preceptors and students are housed within CORE ELMS (previously RxPreceptor).

**Required Reading:**

It is expected that you will access and use the full range of primary, secondary and tertiary sources according to your rotation needs to support Patient Care Rotation activities. The University of Waterloo’s e-library is remotely accessible for students.


**Supplemental Reading:** As assigned by Course Instructor, Regional Clinical Coordinator and/or Preceptor.

A passing grade for this course is **70%**. **In order to pass this course, students must achieve an overall grade of 70% in the clinical practice component and the weighted average of their midpoint**
assessment and final assessment marks must be 70% or greater. In addition, they must meet confidentiality and professionalism criteria as outlined below and further in the Patient Care Rotations manual. Students are reminded that they should view these rotations as a course, not a co-op placement / job. Workload and tasks may differ depending on practice sites and students are expected to come prepared to practice while on site. In the event that the weighted assessment average is less than 70%, the final grade will be recorded as the average of the assessments without the inclusion of the IP or CoP assignment marks.

A supplemental exam will not be offered to students who do not achieve a passing grade in this course.

Group work accounts for 0% of the total mark.

As this course runs over an eight-week period, the Registrar’s Office has determined earlier action dates than usual for withdrawing from this course. The last date by which a student may withdraw from the course without academic penalty (WD) is **25 teaching days after its start date**. Withdrawals after that date will be assigned WF (Withdrawn/Failure), for which a grade of 32% will be assigned for the purposes of calculating any academic averages. Further details may be obtained from either Ken Potvin, or the Registrar’s Office.

**Changes to Course Outline**

The topics addressed in this course, as well as the schedule of topics, may be revised as the course progresses. Any changes will be announced in class and posted on LEARN or on other online learning platforms. The assessment weights CANNOT be altered. There is one exception. When a student has been excused from completing a mandatory assessment (a midterm, for example), the decision about how and when this assessment will be completed is at the discretion of the course coordinator. In this instance, the coordinator may choose to alter assessment weights by re-allocating marks from a midterm to a final exam. See the Student Assessment section of this document for more information.

**Course Topics**

The course consists of three major components:

1. **Clinical Practice**: each student is guided and assessed by a primary preceptor while providing direct patient care. Students will interview and assess patients, identify drug related needs, review alternatives, develop and implement care plans which address actual or potential health concerns, and collaborate with interprofessional colleagues to improve patient health outcomes.

**Two possible models for the rotation exist:**

**8-week (standard rotation)**

Students will fulfil the clinical practice objectives at a single site, working a minimum of 40 hours per week for the 8-week placement – with the exception of statutory holidays.
16-week (two concurrent course rotations)

If a valuable practice experience is presented, e.g., a family health team which cannot accommodate a student on a full time basis, two part-time placements can be undertaken at the same time. This would require the enrolment into two separate Patient Care Rotation courses at the same time. In this scenario, two rotations will run concurrently. Expectations with respect to working a minimum 40 hours per week will be maintained. The detailed schedule will be provided by the practice sites in collaboration with the Regional Clinical Coordinator (RCC) and/or EC.

**NOTE:** Students on 4th-year Patient Care Rotations are not permitted to self-arrange their own sites or preceptors.

2. **Interprofessional Evaluation:** where each student is assessed on their achievement of the interprofessional collaboration competencies (from the National Interprofessional Competency Framework). Students will be evaluated on these outcomes by a designated interprofessional evaluator.

3. **Community of Practice Assignment:** All students will complete an appropriate Community of Practice assignment. The exact format and content of this assignment will be determined in collaboration with the preceptor, but should be in response to needs expressed by the rotation’s practice environment and/or the regional Community of Practice. Examples include: continuing education presentation to local pharmacists, case discussions, interprofessional rounds, local research project, P & T committee submission, public forum or community service presentation.

Clinical cases will vary based on the demographics of the practice site. Students will be expected to have knowledge of common patient populations (e.g., geriatrics) and common diseases such as but not limited to asthma, COPD, diabetes, and hypertension. Some sites may have a more specialized focus; communication with the preceptor prior to the start of the Patient Care Rotation is encouraged to identify any useful pre-readings.

Similarly, topics for the community of practice assignment are to be determined by in collaboration with the preceptor. Assignments based on “real world” practice and local needs/demands are encouraged.

Assignment details will be communicated via direct email from the preceptor(s), Regional Clinical Coordinator, Experiential or Administrative Coordinator or on other online learning platforms such as, but not limited to, CORE ELMS (previously RxPreceptor).

In this course, there are activities that are graded, assignments that are mandatory but not graded or events for which the students’ presence is mandatory. Students are reminded that they should view these activities with the same professionalism as they would a job. Attendance and participation is expected and non-attendance, lack of participation or non-completion of assignments will affect an individual student’s grade in this course.

**Student Evaluation**
Students may receive a grade of Incomplete (INC) in a course where the student has been unable to complete course work because of verifiable illness or extenuating circumstances. These students must contact the course coordinator to formally request an INC for the course. Course coordinators will clearly define the outstanding course element(s) to be completed and will specify the final date when all outstanding course element(s) are to be received for grading. The onus is on the student to complete all outstanding course elements(s). An online INC Grade Form will then be submitted by the course coordinator no later than the grade submission deadline for the course. Failure to complete work by the deadline indicated will result in the INC grade being changed to FTC (failure to complete). The course will be weighted as a grade of 32 for purposes of calculating the student’s average.

It is expected that students will access the experiential software system CORE ELMS (previously RxPreceptor): https://www.academicsuiterx.com/experiential_login.php, throughout the term for self-assessments, assigned readings, regional details, and for other relevant course material. Submissions should be made directly to the experiential software system electronically.

**Attendance and Absences**

**Attendance at the practice site for the full duration of each Patient Care Rotations is mandatory.** This is inclusive of the first and last dates of the rotation as outlined in the calendar / schedule provided by the School. Planned absences require the prior permission of the Experiential Coordinator. Only once a request for absence is approved, it is the student’s responsibility to consult the preceptor as soon as possible to enable the site to plan around the absence and re-schedule the lost hours. It is expected that the student will be in attendance for the equivalent of five days per week (minimum 40 hours per week); however, it is understood that practice sites have varied hours of operation, hence preceptors and students must establish a schedule for the duration of the rotation. Deviations from that schedule would be considered planned absences. **Please note that student travel plans are not considered acceptable reasons for absence.**

In case of illness, students are expected to contact their preceptor(s) as soon as possible before the start of their clinical placement and provide a verification of illness form from the University of Waterloo’s health services website: https://uwaterloo.ca/campus-wellness/sites/ca.campus-wellness/files/uploads/files/VIF-online.pdf. The student must as well provide details to the School of Pharmacy about the illness as soon as possible.

A student will be excused for a mandatory activity only under exceptional and unforeseen circumstances. While it is not possible to list all such circumstances, examples include: death of an immediate family member; significant illness of a family member; serious personal illness or injury requiring medical attention. Please note that student travel plans are not considered acceptable grounds for granting an alternative examination time or altering assignment deadlines. Questions should be directed to the Associate Director, Curriculum, Dr. Michael Beazely.

Students must discuss the VIF-specified degree of incapacitation with their course coordinators so that their actions are not misinterpreted or viewed with suspicion. A “severe” incapacitation indicates students are unable to engage in any academic studies during the period indicated. If they attend
classes/labs, submit assignments/reports or write tests/exams during this period, they are at risk of being accused of “misrepresentation”; an academic offence, which carries a severe penalty that includes suspension. A “moderate” incapacitation could trigger a similar allegation, if students claim to be well enough to participate in some tests, while too ill to participate in others. Thus, in these cases it is important that students discuss their degree of incapacitation with their course coordinators so that their actions appear credible.

More information regarding VIFs can be found on the Faculty of Science’s website: https://uwaterloo.ca/science/current-undergraduate-students/frequently-asked-questions and the Undergraduate Calendar: http://ugradcalendar.uwaterloo.ca/page/Regulations-Accommodations.

Absence for approved regional activities such as the Community of Practice assignment with the Regional Clinical Coordinator is permitted, and the preceptor(s) should be given advance notice. One day for a preapproved professional activity such as a job interview or a conference may be granted. **Students must contact the Experiential Coordinator for prior approval.**

The process for all student requests for planned absences shall be as follows:

1. Student to send email request for absence to the Experiential Coordinator (EC) and copy the Regional Clinical Coordinator (RCC).
2. The EC will communicate to the student and RCC whether the request has been approved or denied.

If the request is approved, the RCC will communicate the decision to the preceptor. **Absences will only be approved for infrequent, short-term, practice related activities.** Note: there is no reading week in this course.

**Professionalism, Confidentiality, and Academic Integrity**

Students must take responsibility for acting professionally and demonstrate this in all interactions, behaviours and attitudes, in accordance with required standards. All professionals have a collective professional duty to assure appropriate professional behaviour, particularly in matters of privacy and confidentiality.

Consistent with University Policies #33 Ethical Behaviour and #71 Academic Student Discipline, all professional activities and interactions must be characterized by honesty, integrity, conscientiousness, responsibility and reliability. Recognizing that their involvement in the health care system may put them in positions of power with patients/clients, students must not take advantage of this position to advocate for the student’s personal gain, values or beliefs.

Students are expected to be familiar with and to adhere at all times to the policies, standards, guidelines and regulations set out within:

The Ontario College of Pharmacists (OCP) Code of Ethics for Members of the Ontario College of Pharmacists which can be found at: http://www.ocpinfo.com/regulations-standards/code-ethics/
1. OCP Professional Responsibility Principles which can be found at:  
   http://www.ocpinfo.com/about/key-initiatives/prof-respon/ 

2. Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA) which can be found at:  
   http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_04p03_e.htm 

3. Federal and provincial statutes and regulations which can be found at:  
   http://www.ocpinfo.com/regulations-standards/ 

4. Each rotation practice site’s corporate, institutional, department or practice documents pertaining to professionalism. 

Adherence to these standards is mandatory for students and will be assessed throughout each rotation. Students who anticipate problems in adhering to the policies as required must report this promptly to the EC. 

At the 2-, 4- and 8-week (4-, 8- and 16-week for 16-week rotations) evaluation, the primary preceptor will assess the following professional behaviours by indicating ‘Meets Expectations’ or ‘Does not meet expectations’ for each of the expectations of professionalism: 

- Accepts responsibility and accountability for own actions and decisions 
- Is respectful and cooperative with colleagues and others 
- Acknowledges, accepts and applies constructive feedback 
- Follows practice site policies and procedures (e.g., dresses in appropriate attire) 
- Is punctual and respectful of others’ time 

The Professional behaviours are not used in the initial grade calculation but repeated patterns of ‘Does not meet expectation’ behaviours will have an academic consequence. Inappropriate clinical behaviour should be brought to the student’s attention as soon as possible. 

Professionalism will be evaluated as follows: 

1. When the cumulative number of unacceptable evaluations (i.e., ‘Does not meet expectations’ responses on the evaluation form) reaches 2, the process below for unacceptable behavior shall be followed and the steps of progressive disciplinary approach (outlined in the Patient Care Rotations manual) will be initiated. 

2. When the cumulative number of unacceptable evaluations reaches 3, a second meeting is arranged, following the progressive disciplinary approach. In addition, there will be an assignment of an academic penalty by the EC, which shall be a 10% reduction in the course grade. 

3. If the cumulative number of unacceptable evaluations reaches 4, or repeated unacceptable behaviours have not been corrected, then a failing grade is assigned. 

A failing grade would result in a delay of graduation, or dismissal from the program. In addition, unacceptable professional behaviour may be reportable to and merit intervention by the Ontario
College of Pharmacists, discipline for breach of site (institution or practice) policy and/or prosecution or a lawsuit for damages as a result of a contravention of the Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA).

At the primary preceptor’s discretion, the preceptor and (or) RCC may contact the EC to discuss the situation and any remedial action necessary.

A student who exhibits behaviours that do not meet the expectations of professionalism at any point throughout their rotation will be subject to the progressive disciplinary approach outlined in the Patient Care Rotation manual.

The following outlined process will be followed if such unacceptable behaviour(s) are identified:

1. The RCC will meet with the preceptor and student to discuss the situation.
2. The RCC will contact the EC.
3. The EC will review with the student and /or preceptor the situation and enact the progressive disciplinary approach as deemed appropriate.

Additionally, students are expected to behave professionally not only while on their rotations, but also in interactions with School of Pharmacy faculty and staff. **At the discretion of the EC, up to 10% can be deducted from the final mark if professional behaviour is not demonstrated.**

If the student feels there is a threat to their personal safety or hardship while at the practice site, the student is contact the RCC and / or EC immediately. If leaving the practice is in the interest of personal safety, the student must contact RCC and / or EC as soon as possible. Failure to do so will result in academic consequences.

The University of Waterloo privacy and confidentiality training must be completed prior to the start of the Patient Care Rotations. Any digital devices used to facilitate patient care during these rotations must be properly encrypted to prevent unauthorized access.

**Discipline**

Students are expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offenses, and to take responsibility for their actions. Students who are unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who need help in learning how to avoid offenses (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about ‘rules’ for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course coordinator, academic advisor, or the Associate Dean of Science for Undergraduate Studies. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy #71, Student Discipline [http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm). For information on typical penalties, students should check Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties [https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/guidelines/guidelines-assessment-penalties](https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/guidelines/guidelines-assessment-penalties).

**Appeals**
A decision or penalty imposed under Policy #33 (Ethical Behaviour), Policy #70 (Student Petitions and Grievances) or Policy #71 (Student Discipline) may be appealed, if there is a ground. Students, who believe they have a ground for an appeal, should refer to Policy #72 (Student Appeals) http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm.

Student Grievances
Grievance: A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of their university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy #70, Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4. https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-70. When in doubt, contact the Director of Admissions, Professional Relations & Undergraduate Affairs who will provide further assistance.

Intellectual Property
Students should be aware that this course contains the intellectual property of their course coordinators, TA, and/or the University of Waterloo. Intellectual property includes items such as:

- Lecture content, spoken and written (and any audio/video recording thereof);
- Lecture handouts, presentations, and other materials prepared for the course (e.g., PowerPoint slides);
- Questions or solution sets from various types of assessments (e.g., assignments, quizzes, tests, final exams); and
- Work protected by copyright (e.g., any work authored by the course coordinator or TA or used by the course coordinator or TA with permission of the copyright owner).

Course materials and the intellectual property contained therein, are used to enhance a student’s educational experience. However, sharing this intellectual property without the intellectual property owner’s permission is a violation of intellectual property rights. For this reason, it is necessary to ask the course coordinator, TA and/or the University of Waterloo for permission before uploading and sharing the intellectual property of others online (e.g., to an online repository). Permission from a course coordinator, TA or the University is also necessary before sharing the intellectual property of others from completed courses with students taking the same/similar courses in subsequent terms/years. In many cases, course coordinators might be happy to allow distribution of certain materials. However, doing so without expressed permission is considered a violation of intellectual property rights.

Please alert the course coordinator if you become aware of intellectual property belonging to others (past or present) circulating, either through the student body or online. The intellectual property rights owner deserves to know (and may have already given their consent).

Students with Disabilities
AccessAbility Services (https://uwaterloo.ca/accessability-services/), located in Needles Hall, room 1401, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with
disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with AccessAbility Services at the beginning of each academic term.

Regional Details

Moving/accommodation: Patient Care Rotation practice sites are located throughout Ontario. Students should expect to be placed outside of the Waterloo Region and outside of the Greater Toronto Area, due to a limited number of sites in these areas. The School of Pharmacy is not responsible for arranging for students’ transportation, moving, or accommodations for Patient Care Rotations.

Regional Clinical Coordinator:

Each region in Ontario has its own Regional Clinical Coordinator (RCC) who will be identified when students are informed of their regional placements.

Preceptor(s):

Each student is guided and assessed by a primary site preceptor. In the event of a concurrent second site placement, a second preceptor will also assess the student.

Interprofessional Evaluator:

During each clinical rotation, the student will have 1 interprofessional evaluator (a non-pharmacist health care professional at or near the practice site) who will assist in guiding the student, and will also assess the student.

PHARM 498: Clinical Rotation 2: Direct Patient Care

Spring 2018

Learning Objectives and Associated AFPC Outcomes and NAPRA Competencies

Upon completion of this course students will be able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objective</th>
<th>AFPC Outcomes</th>
<th>NAPRA Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Apply core knowledge, skills and professional judgment to provide pharmaceutical care.</td>
<td>1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.8, 6.1</td>
<td>1.4; 2.2; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5; 2.8; 3.1; 5.1; 5.2; 5.3; 6.1; 6.3; 8.4; 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communicate with diverse audiences, using a variety of strategies.</td>
<td>1.7, 2.1, 2.3, 3.3</td>
<td>1.1; 1.4; 1.5; 2.5; 2.6; 2.8; 5.1; 5.2; 6.2; 6.3; 7.1; 7.2; 7.3; 8.1; 8.2; 8.3; 8.4; 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collaborate with a full range of healthcare team members to</td>
<td>1.5, 3.1, 3.2,</td>
<td>1.1; 1.2; 1.4; 1.5; 2.5; 2.8; 5.1; 5.2; 7.1; 8.1; 8.2; 8.3; 9.1; 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Manage the medication therapy of patients with common and complex medication therapy problems.</td>
<td>1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 6.2</td>
<td>1.4; 1.5; 2.1; 2.2; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5; 2.6; 2.8; 3.1; 5.1; 6.2; 6.3; 7.1; 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advocate on behalf of the patient and the profession to advance healthcare models.</td>
<td>5.2, 5.3, 6.4</td>
<td>3.1; 5.1; 5.2; 5.3; 6.1; 6.3; 7.1; 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Honour their roles as self-regulated professionals through individual patient care and fulfilment of their professional obligations to the profession.</td>
<td>7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5</td>
<td>1.1; 1.2; 1.3; 1.4; 2.1; 2.2; 2.3; 2.5; 5.3; 7.1; 8.3; 8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 12

### PharmD Rotations (4th year vs those in Bridging Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical rotation (4th year)</th>
<th>Bridging rotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring</strong> students</td>
<td><strong>Mentoring</strong> UW BScPhm alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor should be a clinically-focused pharmacist, licensed for a minimum of <strong>1 year</strong></td>
<td>Preceptor should be a clinically-focused pharmacist, licensed for a minimum of <strong>2 years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical, direct patient care</strong> focused, with possible exposure to distribution – as defined by School.</td>
<td><strong>Clinical, direct patient care</strong> focused – as defined by School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competitive placement</strong> of students (unpaid), to provide learning for a range of students in various Communities of Practice</td>
<td><strong>Non-competitive placement</strong> of alumni, to provide learning for alumni with a range of post-BScPhm experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site <strong>grades</strong> the student, and if warranted, can apply <strong>academic</strong> disciplinary measures</td>
<td>Site <strong>grades</strong> the alumnus, and if warranted, can apply <strong>academic</strong> disciplinary measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Based on the School’s syllabus</strong>, constituting an academic <strong>course</strong> (governed by UW <strong>academic policies</strong>)</td>
<td><strong>Based on the School’s syllabus</strong>, constituting an academic <strong>course</strong> (governed by UW <strong>academic policies</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University is responsible</strong> for WSIB (since students are unpaid).</td>
<td>University will ensure WSIB coverage is in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 weeks’ duration</strong>, full-time hours (<strong>40 hours per week</strong>; 3 consecutive rotations in total during 4th year)</td>
<td><strong>8 weeks’ duration</strong>, normally full-time hours (<strong>40 hours per week</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available during <strong>Winter (Jan-April), and Spring (May-August)</strong></td>
<td>Available <strong>all year round</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCCs arrange all sites, with computer allocation of students</strong></td>
<td>With approval, students may self-arrange site for PHARM 497. Other rotations arranged in consultation with School &amp; RCCs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PHARM 497 Feedback Sample from Fall 2019

View Report

report 1

1 attempts have been completed

Question 1

Please answer the following questions related to the COURSE COORDINATOR

(1 = unacceptable, 5 = excellent)

Rate your course coordinator’s ORGANIZATION and COHERENCE of the materials presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0 (0 %)</th>
<th>1 (100 %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rate your course coordinator’s WILLINGNESS and ABILITY to answer questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0 (0 %)</th>
<th>1 (100 %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rate your course coordinator’s ATTITUDE and PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0 (0 %)</th>
<th>1 (100 %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rate your course coordinator’s AVAILABILITY and APPROACHABILITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0 (0 %)</th>
<th>1 (100 %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Evaluate the overall EFFECTIVENESS of your course coordinator in guiding you through the course.

1  0 (0 %)
2  0 (0 %)
3  0 (0 %)
4  0 (0 %)
5  1 (100 %)

What is your overall rating of the course coordinator?

1  0 (0 %)
2  0 (0 %)
3  0 (0 %)
4  0 (0 %)
5  1 (100 %)

**Question 2**
Please add any comments/suggestions regarding the COURSE COORDINATOR

**Question 3**
Please answer the following questions pertaining to the ORAL DEFENSE ASSESSORS.
(1 = unacceptable, 5 = excellent)

Rate your assessors' ATTITUDE and PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT.

1  0 (0 %)
2  0 (0 %)
3  0 (0 %)
4  0 (0 %)
5  1 (100 %)

Rate your assessors' level of PREPARATION for the oral defense sessions.

1  0 (0 %)
2  0 (0 %)
3  0 (0 %)
4  0 (0 %)
5  1 (100 %)
Question 4

Please add any comments/suggestions regarding the COURSE ASSESSORS.

Question 5

Please answer the following questions related to the COURSE ASSESSMENT METHODS.
(1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree)

All students were graded SUFFICIENTLY OBJECTIVELY in this course.

1 0 (-)
2 0 (-)
3 0 (-)
4 0 (-)
5 0 (-)

The clinical experience portfolio allowed for an ACCURATE REFLECTION of your clinical knowledge, skills, and abilities.

1 0 (0 %)
2 0 (0 %)
3 0 (0 %)
4 0 (0 %)
5 1 (100 %)

The case submissions allowed for an ACCURATE REFLECTION of your clinical knowledge, skills, and abilities.

1 0 (0 %)
2 0 (0 %)
3 0 (0 %)
4 0 (0 %)
5 1 (100 %)
The oral defense allowed for an ACCURATE REFLECTION of your clinical knowledge, skills, and abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1 (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As a whole, all of the assessment methods together allowed for an ACCURATE REFLECTION of your clinical knowledge, skills, and abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1 (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The feedback received on case #1 was helpful in preparing cases #2 to #10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1 (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 6**

Are there any additional assessment methods that should be included to more accurately reflect your DIRECT patient care skills?

**Question 7**

Would you have preferred the option to take all three preceptor-led, placement rotations courses (i.e., not at your workplace) instead of undergoing the recognition of prior learning (RPL) process to potentially earn transfer credits for the last two rotation courses (i.e., PHARM 498 and PHARM 499)?

| Yes |   | 0 (0 %) |

| No  |   | 1 (100 %) |

**Question 8**

Would you recommend including an introductory workshop on preparing the clinical experience portfolio?

| Yes |   | 0 (0 %) |

| No  |   | 1 (100 %) |
Question 10

Please answer the following questions related to the COURSE.

Rate the RELATIVE DIFFICULTY of this course compared to other courses that you have taken.
(Ranking: 1 = least difficult, 5 = most difficult)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  1 (100 %)

Rate the WORKLOAD for this course.
(Ranking: 1 = lightest course, 5 = heaviest course)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  1 (100 %)

Rate the USEFULNESS of the reading material for helping understand the recognition of prior learning concepts.
(Ranking: 1 = not useful, 5 = very useful)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  1 (100 %)

Rate the degree to which assessments enhanced your UNDERSTANDING of the competencies covered.
(Ranking: 1 = unacceptable, 5 = excellent)

1  
2  
3  
4  1 (100 %)

5  0 (0 %)
What is your overall RATING of this course?
(Ranking: 1 = unacceptable, 5 = excellent)

1 0 (0 %)
2 0 (0 %)
3 0 (0 %)
4 1 (100 %)
5 0 (0 %)

Question 11
What did you like most about this course?

Question 12
What did you like least about the course?

Question 13
Would you recommend including an introductory video/videoconference session to explain the concepts of recognition of prior learning?
Yes 0 (0 %)
No 1 (100 %)

Question 14
What additional tools or support materials would have been valuable?
https://learn.uwaterloo.ca/leims/survey/reports/survey_report_frame.d2f?site=132118&provid=18&site=106718&stud=0&ouid=0&subct=0&subj=0&d=6&u=516...

Question 15
Please add any comments/suggestions related to the COURSE
Sr. Assessor 1:

- Students come from different background and experiences. The RPL component provided a standardized way of assessing the competencies of the candidates for the Bridging program. Overall, the Bridging Program was very well organized and managed by University of Waterloo. I had a great experience being in different roles as Portfolio Assessor, Case Assessor, and Senior Assessor.
- Was the RPL approach effective (e.g., time, cost) as compared to traditional requirement for clinical rotations?  
  - Yes
- Do you feel the RPL process adequately assessed student ability?  
  - Yes

Sr. Assessor 2:

What were your general thoughts about the RPL components of the PHARM 497 course?
- An advanced method of education recognizing demands of current practicing health professionals and respecting their skills & experiences

- Was the RPL approach effective (e.g., time, cost) as compared to traditional requirement for clinical rotations?
  - Yes
- Do you feel the RPL process adequately assessed student ability?  
  - Yes
- Do you have any additional comments about the RPL component of the Waterloo School of Pharmacy Bridging program?  
  Suggestion to consider: An emphasis that assessments are based on knowledge/skills gained from experience NOT experience (per se). Students, possibly assessors, might benefit from addition of such clarification to at least one common document.  
  Thank you for offering me opportunity to be part of this successful bridging program over last 5 years
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UW PharmD Bridging Program: Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Research Proposal

“Exit Survey” For Bridging Program Students

1. Introductory questions
   a. What year did you graduate from the BScPhm program at the University of Waterloo?
      - 2011
      - 2012
      - 2013
      - 2014

   b. When did you complete PHARM 497 Clinical Rotation 1 course?
      - Fall 2015
      - Winter 2016
      - Spring 2016
      - Fall 2016
      - I left the program before completing PHARM 497

   c. Did you earn your PharmD degree after:
      - The completion of PHARM 497 (Clinical Rotation 1)
      - The completion of PHARM 498 (Clinical Rotation 2)
      - The completion of PHARM 499 (Clinical Rotation 3)
      - I did not complete the program.

   d. What was the nature of your program exit? (Use of survey logic here – only show if selected “I did not complete the program” option above)
      - I actively withdrew from the program
      - I did not complete program requirements
      - Other: ____________

   e. At what stage did you leave? (Please select all that apply.) (Use of survey logic here – only show if selected “I did not complete the program” option above)
      - I did not enroll in PHARM 497, 498, or 499
      - I enrolled in PHARM 497 but did not complete it
      - I enrolled in PHARM 498 but did not complete it
      - I enrolled in PHARM 499 but did not complete it
      - The timeframe I had to complete the program expired
      - Other: ______

   f. Why did you decide to leave the program? (Use of survey logic here – only show if selected “I did not complete the program” option above)
      - Free text
2. Overall Satisfaction
   a. Why did you decide to enroll in the Bridging Program? (answer all that apply):
      - Upgrade my skill set
      - Position myself for better career opportunities
      - Encouraged by my employer
      - Concerned that I would be competing against new graduates who had the degree
      - Life long learning (like acquiring new knowledge and skills)
      - Other: ______
   b. How would you rate your general satisfaction with the program?
      - Very unsatisfied
      - Unsatisfied
      - Undecided
      - Satisfied
      - Very satisfied
   c. What changes have occurred in your practice as a result of what you've learned in the Bridging program?
      - Free text
   d. What changes do you intend to implement in your practice as a result of what you've learned in the Bridging program?
      - Free text

3. Questions specific to the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) model implemented in the PHARM 497 course.
   a. What does RPL mean to you?
      - Free text

---Page break (so that they don't see definition below while answering above questions)---

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) is defined as “a set of processes that allows individuals to identify, document, be assessed, and gain recognition for their prior learning. The focus is on the learning, rather than on where or how the learning occurred. Knowledge, skills, and abilities gained from life experiences may be formal, informal, or nonformal.” (Canadian Association for Prior Learning Assessment, 2015)

Please answer the following questions to help us assess our RPL process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Explaining the RPL process</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was the meaning of RPL clearly communicated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the rationale for using RPL clearly communicated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was each step of the RPL process (e.g., timelines) clearly described to you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was information on course requirements provided, e.g., details of individual assessment components?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Explaining assessment processes, methods, and criteria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Comments (optional)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the PharmD Bridging program RPL Process provide:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information to assist in identification of sources and/or strength of evidence of learning, or how to prove learning to the required competencies, standards or outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific information on the documentation, evidence collection, skill demonstration, interview, assessments, case studies expected? (will be separated into individual statements in Qualtrics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skill practice opportunities that simulate actual assessment situations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria as to how the evidence or proof will be assessed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance to students to learn how to present their knowledge, skills and abilities in the various assessment components?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d. Conduct assessment</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the PharmD Bridging program RPL process:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodate differences in learning styles and abilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in goal identification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer flexible assessment options?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e. Provide assessment results</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the PharmD Bridging program RPL Process:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate and explain assessment results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a report that includes detailed constructive feedback on both successes and areas where improvements are needed to the individual?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f. Provide advice for next steps</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the PharmD Bridging program RPL process extend an offer to meet with the individual after assessment to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review outcomes of assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify new goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll in education, training, mentoring program, independent study or other process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. What were your general thoughts about the RPL components of the PHARM 497 course?
   - free text

c. Was using the RPL process preferable, with respect to time and cost, as compared to completing three (3) clinical rotations?
   - Yes
   - No

d. Do you feel the RPL component fairly assessed your ability?
   - Yes
   - No

d. Would you have preferred 3 mandatory clinical rotations instead of RPL?
   - Yes
   - No

c. Do you have any additional comments about the School of Pharmacy Bridging program?
   - free text

3
4. **Demographic Questions**

a. What type of settings have you practiced in since graduating with your BScPhm?

   - Community: Independent (one owner up to 6 stores)
   - Community: Chain (more than 6 stores with one owner, e.g. PharmaPlus, Medical Pharmacy)
   - Community: Banner (e.g. IDA, Guardian, Pharmasave)
   - Community: Franchise (e.g. Shoppers Drug Mart, Medicine Shoppe)
   - Community: Mass merchandiser/Food store (e.g. Loblaws, Walmart)
   - Family Health Team/Community Health Centre
   - Home Care Pharmacist (Community Care Access Centre)
   - Physician's Office
   - Hospital: Inpatient
   - Hospital: Ambulatory Care Practice (outpatient clinic)
   - Hospital: Outpatient Pharmacy
   - Long Term Care (e.g., residential care or continuing care)
   - Academic or Teaching
   - Other (please describe): ________________

b. Check all that apply:

   - Male
   - Female
   - Other (e.g. transgender, genderqueer, two spirited)
UW PharmD Bridging Program: Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Research Proposal

Survey for Additional Bridging Program Stakeholders (i.e., faculty, course coordinators, university administrators, program assessors, course TAs, and preceptors)

1. Introductory questions
   a. What is/was your role with the program (please select all that apply)?
      - Faculty
      - Staff/administrator
      - Program assessor
      - Course TA
      - Course coordinator
      - Preceptor
   b. What does RPL mean to you?
      - Free text

2. Assessing Quality RPL

   (Page break (so that they don’t see definition below while answering above questions))

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) is defined as “a set of processes that allows individuals to identify, document, be assessed, and gain recognition for their prior learning. The focus is on the learning, rather than on where or how the learning occurred. Knowledge, skills, and abilities gained from life experiences may be formal, informal, or non-formal.” (Canadian Association for Prior Learning Assessment, 2015)

Please answer the following questions to help us assess our RPL process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Explain the RPL process</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In progress</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does our process:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide clear information in both print and digital media?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly describe each step of the RPL process (ex. costs, timelines, and responsibilities)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide clear information on standards, competencies, or learning outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide contact information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Provide information on expected requirements</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In progress</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the process:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for appropriate advisor and assessor training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide advisory services to individuals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in goal identification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide resources for self-reflection and self-assessment of learning and experiences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in identification and articulation of learning compared to competencies, course or program learning outcomes, or related goal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### c. Explain assessment processes, methods, and criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does our process:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In progress</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify specific learning required for PHARM 497 course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information to assist in identification of sources and strength of evidence of learning, or how to prove learning to the required competencies, standards or outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide specific information on documentation, evidence collection, skill demonstration, interview, assessments, case studies expected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide knowledge and skill practice opportunities that simulate actual assessment situations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide criteria as to how the evidence or proof will be assessed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance to students to learn how to present their knowledge, skills and abilities in the various assessment components?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### d. Conduct assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does our process:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In progress</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide appropriate assessor function training for evaluators, subject matter experts or supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodate differences in learning styles and abilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer flexible assessment options?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate authenticity of evidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate assessment results to ensure inter-rater reliability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### e. Provide assessment results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does our process:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In progress</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a report that includes detailed constructive feedback on both successes and areas where improvements are needed to the individual?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify individual of official assessment results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document successful RPL assessment results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report unsuccessful results along with an explanation of incomplete evidence, learning differences or gaps that are still needed to meet criteria?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### f. Provide advice for next steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does our process extend an offer to meet with the individual after assessment to:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In progress</th>
<th>Comments (optional)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review outcomes of assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify new goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrol in education, training, mentoring program, independent study or other process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. General Questions

a. What were your general thoughts about the RPL components of the PHARM 497 course?
   - free text

b. Was the RPL approach effective (e.g., time, cost) as compared to traditional requirement for clinical rotations?
   - Yes
   - No

c. Do you feel the RPL process adequately assessed student ability?
   - Yes
   - No (free text response regarding what it did not assess)

d. Do you have any additional comments about the RPL component of the Waterloo School of Pharmacy Bridging program?
   - free text