



Evaluation of Residency Programs at a Large Academic Medical Center Using an Online Survey

Carolyn Orendorff, Pharm.D., Daniel M. Ashby, M.S., FASHP

- ASHP standard
 - Evaluate and monitor efficacy
- Historical program evaluations
 - Quality Improvement: mid point
 - Quality Improvement: end of year
 - Anecdotal post-residency feedback
 - Evolution without assessment of impact

Background

- Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education (CAHME)
 - Mission and Metrics
 - Evaluate extent to which students attain competencies
- Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education
 - Evaluation plan to assess achievement of mission and goals
 - Professional competencies and outcome expectations
 - Assessment of student learning / curriculum effectiveness
- University of Kentucky
 - AJHP 2005; 62:2283-8; Kelly Smith and Frank Romanelli

Background

- Consultations and additional investigation
 - ASHP Accreditation Services
 - Residency Program Directors and preceptors
 - Residency goals and objectives
 - Residency manual

- Target audience
 - How many might respond?
 - How far back should we go?

- Questions
 - Demographics
 - Current position - responsibilities
 - Perception of pharmacy practice residency
 - Perception of specialty residency

- Test run with current residents
 - Ease of use
 - Clear questions and
 - Consistent understanding / interpretation

- Online survey
 - 43 questions (~ 20 minutes)
 - Likert scale (included “n/a” and “unsure”)
 - Option to skip questions
- Invitation sent with link to survey
 - “Would you be so kind”
 - Strengthen program ...
 - Anonymous
- Survey deadline of 4 weeks
- Reminder communication after 2 weeks

Results - Demographics

- Response rate: 29/47 (61.7%)
 - Average age: 29 years (range: 26-36)
 - Gender: 69% female
- Residency at JHH (100%)
 - Pharmacy Practice: 21/28 (75%)
 - Specialty: 15/22 (68%)
- State of residence
 - MD: 5 (18%)
 - PA: 3 (11%)
 - FL, MA, NC, OH, TX: 2 (7.1% each)
 - GA, HI, IL, MI, MS, NJ, OR, TN, VA, WA: 1 (3.6% each)

Demographics

Degree

- Pharm.D.: 29/29 (100%)
- Bachelor of Science: 7/29 (24%)
- MPH or MBA: 3/29 (10%)

Certification

- Board Certified Pharmacy Specialist: 12/26 (46%)
- Board Certified Oncology Pharmacist: 6/26 (23%)

Employment Status

Current practice setting

- Hospital and/or Health-system 24/29 (83%)
- Academia 6/29 (21%)
- Ambulatory Care 4/29 (14%)

Size of institution

- > 601 beds 13/29 (45%)
- 301-600 beds 10/29 (35%)
- 1-300 beds 4/29 (14%)

Employment Status

- Patient care 26/28 (93%)
- Drug information 23/28 (82%)
- Student precepting, medication use evaluation, adverse drug reaction monitoring 21/28 (75%)
- Patient counseling 20/28 (71%)
- Education/staff development 18/28 (64%)
- Resident precepting 17/28 (61%)
- Drug policy/formulary management 16/28 (57%)
- Research, medication safety 14/28 (50%)

Residency Activities

- 80-100% were “very” or “somewhat satisfied with”:
 - Rotations offered, on-call, teaching experience, post-residency preparation, professional development, work environment, staffing area/requirements, research project, pharmacotherapy rounds

- 10-20% were “somewhat or very dissatisfied” with:
 - DUE project
 - Management seminar

Preceptor Perception

- 80% rated all components of satisfaction with preceptors as “very” or “somewhat satisfied”
 - Examples: Perception of resident’s needs, leadership, commitment, teaching abilities, adaptability, delegation, mentorship, feedback
- 10% rated “somewhat or very dissatisfied”
 - Sponsor/facilitator role as mentor
 - Delegates appropriately

Residency Perception

- Over 90% of responders agreed the program supported the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities in the following:
 - Acute care, multi-disciplinary collaboration, controlled substances handling, safety, drug information, drug policy development, leadership, medication use system, communication, practice management, primary care, research, teaching

- Over 20% responders thought the residency could improve in:
 - Reimbursement, medical writing, budget/ fiscal management, teaching skills, developing innovative services, drug policy development, drug information and information systems

Global Residency Perception

Over 90% of responders that thought:

- The residency met or surpassed expectations
- They were exposed to a variety of clinical problems/situations
- The program helps produce pharmacy leaders
- They would recommend this residency to others
- They were satisfied with the program
- They were satisfied with the leadership from the residency program director

Lessons Learned

- Importance of staying in touch
- Avoid questions that hinder the responder's anonymity
- Keep questions simple to answer and evaluate
- Focus on areas of interest and possible action
- Keep key players involved
- Value to a trial run on similar audience

Conclusion

- The online survey was an effective method of obtaining feedback from past residents
- Objectives of the programs are being achieved
- Survey identified opportunities for improvement
- Improvement opportunities may be of value to other programs
- Action plans should be developed and implemented by the Residency Preceptor Committee