



University of South Carolina College of Pharmacy Curricular Review Process

Course Review Process Overview:

The purpose of the course review process is to ensure continuous curriculum assessment and improvement as well as compliance with the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE) standards. Core curriculum courses are reviewed to ensure that the following are accomplished:

1. Courses are aligned with overall curricular goals.
2. Courses are designed to meet their intended objectives.
3. Course content is taught at a suitable breadth and depth for the entry level pharmacist.
4. Each course is well-positioned within the overall curriculum and course content delivered in a complementary manner across the curriculum.
5. Student learning is assessed effectively and student achievement of course goals is ensured.
6. Course coordinators have the opportunity to work as team members with the Curriculum Committee in the continuous quality improvement and development process.

Each P1-P3 core course and PHMY 999 within the Doctor of Pharmacy curriculum will undergo formal review by the College of Pharmacy Curriculum Committee no less than every 4 years. A course may be reviewed more frequently in the event of either of the following:

- a course pass rate below 85% for two consecutive years
- a student course experience survey (SCES) average score below 4.0 for two consecutive evaluations.

During the course review, each course will be evaluated in two primary areas, course design and assessment of student learning. Each of these areas are further broken down into domains as shown below. Each domain will be evaluated as "Meets" or "Does Not Meet".

1. Course Design
 - a. Student learning outcomes (SLOs) are aligned with overall curricular goals and mapping is complete and up to date
 - b. Course level SLOs are specific, measurable, and higher order as appropriate
 - c. Course level SLOs are covered by learners
 - d. Course description, instructional method, and credit hours listed within syllabus match that present within the College of Pharmacy bulletin and Student Information System (SIS)
 - e. Pedagogical strategies facilitate student learning
 - f. Course accessibility and student support resources are adequate
 - g. Course design and organization are conducive to learning
 - h. Course content is current and a plan for continuous updates and quality improvement exists
 - i. Course placement within overall curriculum is appropriate and course relevance is communicated

2. Assessment of student learning
 - a. Assessment expectations and grading criteria are clearly communicated
 - b. Assessments were appropriately discriminatory (when multiple choice exams used in course)
 - c. Assessments determine the mastery of SLOs
 - d. Assessments were adequate in number and are timed appropriately

The following data sources will be used for course evaluations:

- The two most recent SCES of the course generated within the past 4 years. The average score for selected questions will be utilized.
- Current course map, including evaluation of pedagogical strategies used in course
- Official course record information from SIS, including course's instructional methodology
- Course coordinator questionnaire (Appendix 1)
- Materials from the most recent course delivery:
 - Syllabus, including course SLOs, testing/grading procedures, and topical outline
 - Course coordinator contact information and/or office hours provided on learning management system (LMS) and/or in syllabus
 - Supporting materials posted on LMS such as outlines, handouts, slides, and other similar artifacts
 - Exams or other formal assessments utilized
 - Exam item analysis
 - Exam question or other assessment mapping to SLOs

Review Process Stepwise Guide:

1. At the end of the current academic year, the Curriculum Committee will determine which courses will be reviewed during the coming academic year based upon the course's placement in the four-year review cycle. In the event of course pass rate below 85% for two consecutive years and/or a student course experience survey (SCES) average score below 4.0 for two consecutive evaluations, a course will also be added to the list of those to be evaluated in the coming year.
2. Prior to the start of the next academic year, the Assessment Office will contact course coordinators for each course scheduled for review in the coming academic year and provide the course coordinator questionnaire for the coordinator's completion. The coordinator must return this completed questionnaire to the Assessment Office by the first day of class for the subsequent fall semester.
3. The Assessment Office will gather the following assessment data for each course scheduled for review in the coming academic year:
 - a. Most recent course syllabus
 - b. Two most recent course evaluations inclusive of comments and college average for use as benchmark comparator
 - c. Current course mapping information
 - d. Most recent major examinations and/or assessments in course
 - e. Most recent major examinations and/or assessment mapping
 - f. Most recent major examinations item analysis data with statistics
4. Committee members will be assigned as primary or secondary reviews based on teaching within current courses to be reviewed. Faculty workload will be taken into consideration for assignments.
5. Upon assignment of reviewer, the course review materials will be accessible to reviewers within an electronic platform (e.g. LMS, Teams). The reviewer will also be assigned to the course builder view within the most recent year's course LMS page.
6. The reviewer will evaluate the information provided and conduct a preliminary assessment of the course utilizing the course review rubric (Appendix 2). The reviewer will then meet with the course coordinator to review and discuss findings. Following this meeting, the reviewer's report will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee Chair.
7. The reviewer will present the course to the Curriculum Committee as scheduled by the Curriculum Committee Chair.

8. The Curriculum Committee will prepare a final report including areas of strength, areas which do not meet expectations, revision recommendations, and year of next review. This report will be shared with the course coordinator and course coordinator's department chair.
9. In the event a course receives required revisions, the course coordinator, in consultation with their department chair, will respond with a written plan for changes to remedy the issue or a rationale for why no change is required by the due date established by the Curriculum Committee.
10. Coordinators are responsible for providing updates throughout the upcoming year(s) based on assigned deadlines.

Curriculum Track Review Process Overview:

The purpose of the curriculum track review process is to ensure continuous track assessment and alignment with USC College of Pharmacy mission, vision, and strategic goals. Each curriculum track approved by the College of Pharmacy will undergo formal review by the College of Pharmacy Curriculum Committee no less than every 4 years.

During the track review, each curriculum track will be evaluated in two primary areas, track design and assessment of student achievement of program outcomes. Each of these areas are further broken down into domains as shown below. Each domain will be evaluated as "Meets" or "Does Not Meet".

1. Curriculum Track Design
 - a. Student learning outcomes are aligned with College of Pharmacy mission, vision and/or strategic goals
 - b. Track student learning outcomes are specific, measurable, and higher order as appropriate
 - c. Track level student learning outcomes are covered by learners
 - d. Track accessibility and student support resources are adequate
 - e. Track design and organization are conducive to learning
 - f. Track content is current and a plan for continuous updates and quality improvement exists
2. Student Achievement of Program Outcomes
 - a. Track expectations and participation criteria are clearly communicated
 - b. Achievement of track requirements and program completion

The following data sources will be used for course evaluations:

- The most recent curriculum track program guide or equivalent document
- 3 years of data to support participant engagement
 - Total number of applicants per year (recommend inclusion of reason for non-acceptance if applicable)
 - % completion of track requirements per student cohort enrolled over 3 years (or progress towards completion if no graduates yet)
- Measures of student achievement of program outcomes (as applicable for track)
- Track Coordinator survey response
 - Speak to successes and differential advantage offered by the program
 - Planned changes for track over next 4 years
 - Identify potential barriers and provide insight into why low completion if applicable
 - Feedback from track participants summarized and use of student feedback and actions taken to incorporate into programming

Appendix 1: Course Coordinator Questionnaire

Course Name:

Course Coordinator(s):

1. Describe how the course builds upon preceding courses (for P1 courses, this could be prerequisites), supports subsequent courses, and applies to the skills necessary for an entry-level pharmacist.
2. List any significant prerequisite learning deficits noted in students entering this course. Provide any steps taken to mitigate this issue to this point.
3. Describe how active learning methods and other activities are incorporated in order to facilitate student learning, achieve course goals, promote self-directed learning and accommodate diverse learning styles. Please provide representative examples (2-3) employed by faculty within the course which do any one or more of the following: actively engage learners; integrate and reinforce content across the curriculum; provide opportunity for mastery of skills; stimulate higher-order thinking, problem solving, and clinical-reasoning skills; and address/accommodate diverse learning styles.
4. Describe how suggestions from student course evaluations and/or the last formal course review have been incorporated (or planned for the future) to improve the course.
5. Describe the process for ensuring course content is up to date. Provide examples of topics that have been added, modified or removed since the last formal course review.
6. For team-taught courses, describe the process for ensuring consistency of teaching and assessment across multiple instructors.
7. Describe the primary strengths of this course.
8. Describe the primary weaknesses of this course. What changes should be made to overcome these weaknesses? What support do you need to effect these changes?
9. If applicable: Any requests coordinator has for curriculum committee assistance, professional development, etc.

Appendix 2: Course Review Rubric

Course Name:

Reviewer:

Course Coordinator(s):

Date:

Student Class Rank (ex: P1):

Course Design

A. Student learning outcomes (SLOs) are aligned with overall curricular goals and mapping is complete and up to date		
Course Materials Review: Syllabus for course level SLOs + curriculum map for individual course topic/session mapping		Comments
Meets ☐ Course SLOs are provided in syllabus ☐ Course SLOs are mapped to Educational Outcomes ☐ Individual course topic/session mapping is complete, updated, and is aligned with course SLOs (to include EPAs and PPCP for patient care and lab courses)	Does Not Meet ☐ Course SLOs are NOT provided in syllabus ☐ Course SLOs are NOT mapped to Educational Outcomes ☐ Individual course topic/session mapping is NOT complete, updated, and/or aligned with course SLOs (to include EPAs and PPCP for patient care and lab courses)	
B. Course level SLOs are specific, measurable, and higher order as appropriate		
Course Materials Review: Syllabus for course level SLOs + curriculum map		Comments
Meets ☐ Breadth of material covered is appropriate for educating an entry-level pharmacist ☐ Depth of material covered is appropriate for the student rank ☐ Course SLOs are written with specific, measurable action verbs ☐ Course SLOs promote higher-order thinking skills as appropriate	Does Not Meet ☐ Breadth of material covered is NOT appropriate for educating an entry-level pharmacist ☐ Depth of material covered is NOT appropriate for the student rank ☐ Course SLOs are NOT written with specific, measurable action verbs ☐ Course SLOs do NOT promote higher-order thinking skills	
C. Course level SLOs are covered by learners		
Course Materials Review: course learning outcomes + individual course topic/session objectives		Comments
Meets ☐ Course learning outcomes are clearly stated in the syllabus ☐ SLOs are clearly stated in the handouts, slides, and/or listed in LMS for each topic	Does Not Meet ☐ Course learning outcomes are NOT clearly stated in the syllabus ☐ SLOs are NOT clearly stated in the handouts, slides, and/or listed in LMS for each topic	
D. Course description, instructional method, and credit hours listed within syllabus match that present within the College of Pharmacy bulletin and student information system (SIS)		
Course Materials Review: Course syllabus + College of Pharmacy Academic Bulletin + SIS		Comments
Meets ☐ Course description in syllabus matches that found in official academic bulletin ☐ Credit hours listed in syllabus match that found in official academic bulletin and course meeting according to schedule ☐ Instructional method utilized matches that which is listed in SIS	Does Not Meet ☐ Course description in syllabus does NOT match that found in official academic bulletin ☐ Credit hours listed in syllabus do NOT match that found in official academic bulletin and course meeting according to schedule ☐ Instructional method utilized does not match that which is listed in SIS	

E. Pedagogical strategies facilitate student learning		
Course Materials Review: Student course experience survey (SCES) question "The instructional methods and learning activities were engaging"		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Scores ≥ 4	☐ Scores < 4	
Course Materials Review: Course coordinator questionnaire (question 3) + provided samples		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Pedagogical strategies employed facilitate student learning (should include active learning strategies, strategies that facilitate critical thinking, engagement with the material, etc.)	☐ Pedagogical strategies need improvement to facilitate student engagement with material	
F. Course accessibility and student support resources are adequate		
Course Materials Review: syllabus for preferred course communication methods+ learning management system (LMS) for supporting materials (ex: outlines, handouts, slides, etc.)		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Preferred course communication methods are provided for students within syllabus ☐ Content provided to students via LMS appears adequate to support learning ☐ Important dates are clearly highlighted (either within syllabus, on course calendar, and/or via communications) ☐ Assignments are easy to find within LMS	☐ Preferred course communication methods not provided within syllabus or stated communication method not utilized, not made available, or ineffectively utilized ☐ Insufficient/inadequate content provided to students via LMS to support their learning ☐ Important dates are NOT clearly highlighted ☐ Assignments are NOT easy to find within LMS	
G. Course design and organization are conducive to learning		
Course Materials Review: SCES question "The course materials were well organized and easy to access"		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Scores ≥ 4	☐ Scores < 4	
Course Materials Review: SCES question "Overall, the course was effective to my learning"		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Scores ≥ 4	☐ Scores < 4	
Course Materials Review: Course coordinator questionnaire (question X)		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Course workload is appropriate for credit hours and student level	☐ Course workload is NOT appropriate for credit hours and student level	
Course Materials Review: syllabus for format and schedule of topics + individual course session artifacts for further evaluation of course format		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Overall course format is optimal for student learning of this material (e.g. sufficient opportunity for practice or skills and discussion of concepts to facilitate learning) ☐ Topics are organized logically (e.g. material flows and/or builds between topics)	☐ Overall course format is NOT optimal for student learning of this material ☐ Topics are NOT organized logically	

H. Course content is current and a plan for continuous updates and quality improvement exists

Course Materials Review: Course coordinator questionnaire (questions 4, 5, 6)		Comments
Meets <i>Questionnaire describes each of the following adequately:</i> ☐ How suggestions from student course evaluations and/or the last formal course review have been incorporated to improve the course ☐ A process for ensuring course content is up to date ☐ A process for ensuring continuity and coordination between instructors (if a team-taught course)	Does Not Meet <i>Questionnaire does NOT describe each of the following adequately:</i> ☐ How suggestions from student course evaluations and/or the last formal course review have been incorporated to improve the course ☐ A process for ensuring course content is up to date ☐ A process for ensuring continuity and coordination between instructors (if a team-taught course)	

I. Course placement within overall curriculum is appropriate and course relevance is communicated

Course Materials Review: SCES question "The significance and relevance of the course topic(s) were made clear"		Comments
Meets ☐ Scores ≥ 4	Does Not Meet ☐ Scores < 4	
Course Materials Review: Course coordinator questionnaire (question 1) + review of course placement within overall curriculum		Comments
Meets <i>Course coordinator questionnaire describes each of the following adequately and answers supported by review of overall curriculum:</i> ☐ How the course builds upon preceding courses ☐ How the course supports subsequent courses ☐ How the course applies to the skills necessary for an entry-level pharmacist	Does Not Meet <i>Course coordinator questionnaire does NOT describe each of the following adequately and answers NOT supported by review of overall curriculum:</i> ☐ How the course builds upon preceding courses ☐ How the course supports subsequent courses ☐ How the course applies to the skills necessary for an entry-level pharmacist	

Assessment of Student Learning

A. Assessment expectations and grading criteria are clearly communicated

Course Materials Review: syllabus – grading policies		Comments
Meets ☐ Grading policy is clearly stated in the syllabus ☐ Grading scale is clearly stated in the syllabus and congruent with faculty approved grading scale as per Bulletin ☐ Rubrics are available (eg syllabus, LMS, etc) for major assignments used for course grade ☐ Grading assessment description(s) clearly explain assessment format, expectations, and what constitutes successful performance for each assessment ☐ Assessment mapping is included in syllabus showing which course learning outcomes and educational outcomes are assessed by each component	Does Not Meet ☐ Grading policy is NOT stated in the syllabus ☐ Grading scale is NOT stated in the syllabus or not congruent with faculty approved grading scale ☐ Rubrics are NOT provided for major assignments used for course grade ☐ Grading assessment description(s) do NOT clearly explain assessment format, expectations, and what constitutes successful performance for each assessment	

B. Assessments were appropriately discriminatory (when multiple choice exams used in course)

Course Materials Review: Item analysis (when multiple choice exams used in course) <i>☐ Check here if no multiple-choice assessments used in course/no item analysis data available for course</i>		Comments
Meets ☐ 75% or more of test questions had a high percent correct (i.e. 50% correct) ☐ 75% or more of test questions have good discriminatory value (i.e. point biserial ≥ 0.2)	Does Not Meet ☐ > 25% of test questions had low percent correct (below 50%) ☐ > 25% of test questions have point biserial < 0.2	
C. Assessments determine the mastery of SLOs		
Course Materials Review: Student course experience question "The course learning activities increased my knowledge and skills in the subject matter"		Comments
Meets ☐ Scores ≥ 4	Does Not Meet ☐ Scores < 4	
Course Materials Review: Exam questions (or any other major course assessment tool) are mapped to ACPE and CAPE competencies (or EPAs and PPCP in case of lab courses)		Comments
Meets <i>Exam questions (or other assessment tool) are:</i> ☐ Mapped to Educational Outcomes and other mapping as required ☐ Appropriate for level (introduce, reinforced, practiced) ☐ When applicable based on course assessments utilized, the course dashboard shows general alignment between % of session objectives and % of exam items	Does Not Meet <i>Exam questions (or other assessment tool) are:</i> ☐ NOT mapped to Educational Outcomes and/or other mapping as required ☐ NOT appropriate for level (introduce, reinforced, practiced) ☐ Discrepancy noted between % of session objectives and % of exam items	
D. Assessments were adequate in number and timed appropriately		
Course Materials Review: syllabus – topical outline; Assessments – number, number of questions, and time allotment		Comments
Meets ☐ Adequate evaluations of student learning included in course ☐ Adequate time between material presentation and the exam/assessment ☐ Students are provided appropriate time for each assessment based on length	Does Not Meet ☐ Inadequate evaluations of student learning included in course ☐ Inadequate time between material presentation and the exam/assessment ☐ Students are NOT provided appropriate time for each assessment based on length	

Appendix 3: Curriculum Track Review Rubric

Track Name:

Reviewer:

Track Coordinator(s):

Date:

Track Design

A. Student learning outcomes are aligned with College of pharmacy mission, vision and/or strategic goals		
Track Materials Review: Program guide for SLOs		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Track SLOs are provided in program guide ☐ Track SLOs are aligned with COP mission, vision and/or strategic plan	☐ Track SLOs are NOT provided in program guide ☐ Track SLOs are NOT aligned with COP mission, vision and/or strategic plan	
B. Track student learning outcomes are specific, measurable, and higher order as appropriate		
Track Materials Review: Program guide for track SLOs		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Track SLOs are written with specific, measurable action verbs ☐ Track SLOs promote higher-order thinking skills as appropriate	☐ Track SLOs are NOT written with specific, measurable action verbs ☐ Track SLOs do NOT promote higher-order thinking skills	
C. Track level SLOs are covered by learners		
Track Materials Review: Program guide for track SLOs		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Track learning outcomes are clearly stated in the program guide ☐ Track learning outcomes are achievable through participation in required and/or elective experiences	☐ Track learning outcomes are NOT clearly stated in the program guide ☐ Track learning outcomes are NOT achievable through participation in required and/or elective experiences	
D. Track accessibility and student support resources are adequate		
Track Materials Review: Program guide for track SLOs + online descriptions		Comments
Meets	Does Not Meet	
☐ Track description provided in program guide ☐ Preferred course communication methods are provided for students within program guide ☐ Content provided to students via LMS appears adequate to support learning ☐ Important dates are clearly highlighted (either within program guide, on track calendar, and/or via communications)	☐ Track description NOT provided in program guide ☐ Preferred course communication methods NOT provided within program guide or stated communication method not utilized, not made available, or ineffectively utilized ☐ Insufficient/inadequate content provided to students via LMS to support their learning ☐ Important dates are NOT clearly highlighted	
E. Track design and organization are conducive to learning		
Track Materials Review: Program guide		Comments

Meets ☐ Track workload is appropriate in anticipated time frame for completion ☐ Overall track format is optimal for student achievement of this material (e.g. sufficient opportunity for practice or skills and discussion of concepts to facilitate learning)	Does Not Meet ☐ Track workload is NOT appropriate in anticipated time frame for completion ☐ Overall track format is NOT optimal for student achievement of this material	
---	--	--

F. Track content is current and a plan for continuous updates and quality improvement exists

Track Materials Review: Program guide + Track coordinator survey		Comments
Meets <i>Questionnaire describes each of the following adequately:</i> ☐ How suggestions from student track evaluations and/or the last formal track review have been incorporated to improve the track ☐ A process for ensuring track content is up to date ☐ A process for ensuring overall track continuity and coordination	Does Not Meet <i>Questionnaire does NOT describe each of the following adequately:</i> ☐ How suggestions from student track evaluations and/or the last formal track review have been incorporated to improve the course ☐ A process for ensuring track content is up to date ☐ A process for ensuring overall track continuity and coordination	

2. Student Achievement of Program Outcomes

A. Track expectations and participation criteria are clearly communicated

Track Materials Review: Program guide		Comments
Meets ☐ Attendance or participation criteria are clearly defined in the program guide or LMS	Does Not Meet ☐ Attendance or participation criteria are NOT clearly defined in the program guide or LMS	

B. Achievement of track requirements and program completion

Track coordinator survey + Additional data as needed to support participant engagement		Comments
Meets ☐ The track's defined metric of success is described ☐ Achievement of the track's defined metric of success is reported for each of the prior three cohorts	Does Not Meet ☐ The track's defined metric of success is described ☐ Achievement of the track's defined metric of success is NOT reported for each of the prior three cohorts	