The 2000-2001 academic year saw an expansion of the role of the Chair of the Academic Sections Coordinating Committee (ASCC). In addition to the Chair’s traditional duties of assisting with plans for the Teachers’ Seminar and of liaising between AACP’s Academic Sections, Board of Directors and AACP Staff, the Chair undertook new responsibilities as a result of changes proposed by the AACP Academic Sections. These new activities included coordinating Annual Meeting programming plans between the various Academic Sections, Special Interest Groups (SIGs) and AACP members developing Special Sessions; increasing involvement in the review process of Annual Meeting Abstracts; and developing an evaluation form to be used after each programming session at the Annual Meeting. These activities are described in detail below, followed by summaries of the year’s activities by each of the Academic Sections.

ASCC COORDINATION OF ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAMMING

Starting early in the fall of 2000, Chairs-elect and Chairs of the Academic Sections and Special Interest Groups communicated with the ASCC Chair via e-mail regarding their programming plans for the Annual Meeting in Toronto. The ASCC Chair compiled preliminary program plans and e-distributed them to all ASCC members, repeating this process as updated program plans were received from Sections, SIGs or Special Session developers. The ASCC Chair usually received initial notification of proposed Special Sessions via AACP Staff.

AACP staff also forwarded programming queries/ideas from AACP members to the ASCC Chair, who in turn provided the inquirers with contact information for the appropriate Section/SIG Program Committee. The inquirers subsequently notified the ASCC Chair that they had successfully made contact, and that their ideas were indeed being incorporated into the programming plans.

Assessment: Although the outcomes from these coordination efforts cannot be fully evaluated until after the Toronto Annual Meeting, it indeed appears feasible for the ASCC Chair to efficiently coordinate Annual Meeting programming plans. Having a single person serve as the program planning “information clearinghouse” appears to be highly beneficial—all parties involved in program planning for the Annual Meeting know which individual to go to in order to receive information about activities planned by other Sections and SIGs. This process is even more effective when Sections/SIGs are timely in developing their program plans. The additional time required by the ASCC Chair for this activity in relation to the Chair’s other BOD responsibilities is reasonable. It is further noted that this type of large-scale coordination effort between the many people involved in planning the Annual Meeting would likely not have been cost-effective prior to the advent of e-mail.

REVIEW OF ANNUAL MEETING ABSTRACTS

At the request of several Academic Sections on behalf of their members, the Annual Meeting Abstract review process has been undergoing an evolutionary process over the past two years, with further changes introduced during the current reporting year. During 2000-2001, two new Abstract categories were initiated, “Work-in-Progress” and “Theoretical Models.” Abstracts in these two categories are subjected to a peer review process similar to abstracts describing completed research; however, results/conclusions are not considered in these new categories. Over several previous years, abstract review forms had been standardized across all Academic Sections and the ASCC (which reviews abstracts for the Annual Meeting that are non-discipline-specific in nature). Working with AACP Staff to continue the efforts of ASCC Immediate Past Chair James DeMuth (Wisconsin), the ASCC Chair assisted in modifying the existing Abstract Review forms to accommodate the new categories.

Table I summarizes the numbers of Annual Meeting abstracts received for review by each of AACP’s “review units” (Academic Sections and ASCC teams) during 2001. The Work-in-Progress and Theoretical Models categories were first implemented for the 2001 review cycle.

The Educational Strategies, Educational Research, and Administrative, Programmatic & Institutional categories were established several years ago to accommodate projects which were non-discipline-specific or interdisciplinary in nature. However, of the 61 abstracts submitted in the ES category this past year, more than one-third of the...
projects described clearly fell within the purview of a specific Academic Section, including Pharmaceutics which had no abstracts submitted in 2001.

Occasionally, the Chair of the ASCC is called upon by AACP Staff to cast a deciding vote where an abstract fails to garner a majority of reviewers’ votes in favor of either acceptance or rejection because the third reviewer abstains from casting a vote. During the past year this role was expanded to include arbitrating on abstracts where one reviewer would vote for acceptance of an abstract, one would vote for rejection, and the third reviewer would vote that the abstract be combined with a second abstract (from either the same author or a different author from the same school) essentially describing the same project. Four instances of this situation arose, involving five authors and eight of the 220 abstracts submitted.

Concern was expressed by a different AACP member about abstract reviewers being unaware of the identity of authors and authors’ schools. Traditionally, abstract reviewers have known the identity of abstract authors and their schools. Concern was also expressed that authors of abstracts not accepted for presentation were not receiving reviewer feedback regarding the abstracts. A mechanism indeed exists for providing this information to authors; however, current procedures require that the author contact AACP Staff to receive reviewers’ comments.

**Assessment:** The small numbers of abstracts received from many of the Academic Sections should raise concerns among ASCC members and will be a topic of discussion by the ASCC. The large percentage of abstracts designated by submitters as Work-in-Progress indicates either that this new category indeed addresses a previously unmet need among AACP members, or that AACP members are using this category inappropriately. The continued consideration of abstracts describing Work-in-Progress will be discussed by the ASCC. It is still too early to assess the impact of recommending that certain abstracts be combined with certain other abstracts. The frequency with which this occurred did not prove burdensome, and this arrangement will continue to be monitored by the ASCC. There exist advantages and disadvantages to both reviewers and submitters by having abstracts reviewed in a non-blinded fashion. The pros and cons of this practice will be discussed by the ASCC. Finally, submitters of abstracts must be notified more clearly that in the event their abstract is rejected, they must contact AACP Staff to obtain reviewers’ comments. The mechanism by which this feedback is provided will be discussed by the ASCC.

**Development of Annual Meeting Program Evaluations**

In consultation with the EBR SIG and AACP Staff, the ASCC Chair developed a generic verbal evaluation form which will be utilized by moderators of each program session at the 2001 Annual Meeting.

### ACADEMIC SECTION ACTIVITIES

The various Academic Sections of AACP enjoyed a busy and productive year. The activities of each of the Academic Sections are summarized below from reports received from the Chairs of the respective Sections. AACP is grateful to these volunteer leaders for their willingness to serve their Sections and for their commitment to improving pharmacy education.

**Biological Sciences** - submitted by Chair Ralph J. Altiere (Colorado). An ad hoc planning committee headed by the section chair was established following the 2000 Annual Meeting to explore opportunities to address the future of the Section and how it can best serve its membership and AACP. The traditional Section program at the 2001 Annual Meeting has been replaced with an open forum where the planning committee will present concepts it has generated and members will be able to express their views on the role and purpose of the Section. Information gathered at the open forum will be used by the planning committee to formulate specific recommendations for creating a vision for the future of the Section. This represents the first year of a multi-year process for this committee. As in past years, the Biological Sciences Section teamed up with the sections on Chemistry and Pharmaceutics to host a joint program on pharmacogenomics at the Annual Meeting which will be conducted via the Internet.

Section committees have been hard at work meeting the charges given to them after the San Diego Annual Meeting. The Curriculum Outcomes and Assessment Committee made significant progress on the Section’s efforts to develop educational outcomes for the biological sciences that align with and expand upon CAPE outcomes. By developing a list of biological sciences outcomes statements, this committee has set the stage for completion of this project in the year ahead. These outcomes will be distributed to AACP member schools to be used as a template for developing biological sciences educational outcomes.

**Chemistry** - submitted by Chair James Knittel (Cincinnati). The Chemistry section has been active in many areas this year with several committees involved in “ion-growing” projects. The Program Committee has developed a combined program with the Biology and Pharmaceutics Sections entitled “Pharmacogenomics: A Basis for Individualized Medicine.” The keynote speaker, David Flockhart from Georgetown University, will present via an Internet connection. A Chemistry Section Roundtable discussion will also be conducted to continue discussing how the chemical sciences should be taught in the new, entry level PharmD curriculum.

The Nominations Committee has slated candidates for the position of Chair-elect and Secretary. The Mentoring Committee developed a protégé survey which is currently being distributed. The Excellence in Teaching Committee is working to update the “Teaching Problem Solving in Medicinal Chemistry Courses” site on

---

**Table I. Numbers of annual meeting abstract submissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review unit</th>
<th>Y2K</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Work-in-progress</th>
<th>Theoretical models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy Practice</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Admin Sciences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Professional Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries/ER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Strategies</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Research</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin, Programm. &amp; Institutional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Non-discipline-specific categories reviewed by Academic Sections Coordinating Committee.
the Section web page. Updated problem sets and teaching methods are being solicited. Last year’s email survey to the section membership concerning promotion of teaching excellence at individual institutions, promotion of scholarship of teaching, and recognition of excellence in teaching at individual institutions is also being reviewed. The Membership Committee is currently following up on earlier recommendations concerning increasing membership in the section while concurrently dealing with a decline in the numbers of courses as well as faculty in the pharmaceutical sciences in colleges of pharmacy.

Continuing Professional Education -submitted by Chair Pamela Joyner (North Carolina). The Program Committee planned the CPE Section educational program for the 2001 Annual Meeting. “Assessment in CPE: Learning, Outcomes and Needs.” The Special Committee on Use of the Internet posted PowerPoint slides from the 2000 CPE Annual Meeting programming as well as the Spring 2001 CPE Newsletter. The Committee will work in conjunction with the Future Planning Committee to identify and post “best practices” to provide assistance to new CPE colleagues. The Future Planning Committee discussed implementing a mentoring process for new CPE members to work with the experienced members of the Section regarding collaborative research, administrative issues and preparing a self-assessment report for an ACPE approved provider. The Committee also proposes asking ACPE to provide the Committee with the names of recent “field reviewers,” who would be surveyed and asked to identify “best practices.” The Research Committee reviewed the history of the “Innovations in Continuing Professional Education Grant Program” in an attempt to re-establish this grant program, identify funding resources and if necessary, modify the criteria and process. Since a number of problems were reported with regard to the original program, the committee plans to submit a proposal to the full Section membership during the 2001 Annual Meeting. 

Section Newsletter. With the retirement of Richard Knoll, Steve Caiaola from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill accepted the position of Newsletter Editor for the CPE Section. Due to the transition, one edition of “In the News” was published during Spring 2001. The Program Committee combined with the Research Committee to review abstracts specific to the CPE Section. Seven abstracts were reviewed, all being accepted for presentation at the 2001 Annual Meeting.

Communication with ACPE. On behalf of the Section membership, the Section Chair wrote a letter to Peter Vlasses, Executive Director of ACPE, requesting that one of AACP’s three representative seats on the ACPE Board of Directors be reserved for a representative from the CPE Section or for a representative from the CE arena who works in continuing education on a daily basis. In turn, the Section heard from the AACP Board of Directors reiterating AACP’s official position regarding collaborative research, administrative issues and preparing a self-assessment report for an ACPE approved provider. The Committee also proposes asking ACPE to provide the Committee with the names of recent “field reviewers,” who would be surveyed and asked to identify “best practices.” The Research Committee reviewed the history of the “Innovations in Continuing Professional Education Grant Program” in an attempt to re-establish this grant program, identify funding resources and if necessary, modify the criteria and process. Since a number of problems were reported with regard to the original program, the committee plans to submit a proposal to the full Section membership during the 2001 Annual Meeting.

Libraries/Educational Resources -submitted by Chair Virginia Stone (Maryland). The Program Committee planned the section programming for the 2001 Annual Meeting. The Nominating Committee completed a slate of candidates for the positions of Chair-elect and Secretary. The Membership Committee verified that 24 schools of pharmacy, three of which are brand new, have not yet sent a librarian to an AACP meeting. Librarians at these schools were contacted about the availability of stipends to librarians who have never attended an AACP meeting and were invited to this year’s meeting. To date, five librarians have been awarded stipends and will attend the Toronto meeting. Fourteen schools that have had a librarian attend in the past, but who have not been represented within the past five years were also identified and contacted, informing these librarians that they also are now eligible for the stipends. The stipend program has been extremely successful since its inception in 1997, and the section is grateful to the donor for making it possible.

The Basic Resources Committee has posted the 2001 Basic Resources for Pharmaceutical Education on the AACP Web site. Also being added to the web site is a preliminary list of publisher short forms and the current owners of merged companies. The Web Page Committee reported that the “Libraries/Educational Resources Section” web page is well under development, using a basic overall format similar to that of AACP’s Biological Sciences Section. Information which might be displayed includes: 1. Mission Statement & Goals; 2. List of Officers along with a short bio-sketch of each; 3. Minutes of the Annual Meetings; 4. Standing Committees—listing members & responsibilities; 5. Message from the Chair; 6. Committee minutes and reports; 7. AACP Basic Resources for Pharmaceutical Education (links to all access points). The web page is located at the following link, www.uh.edu/~libn/aacp.html. 

Pharmaceutics -submitted by Chair Gayle Brazeau (SUNY Bufalo). The two major focus areas of the Teachers of Pharmaceutics Section this year have been in the area of assessment and the development of a web page for graduate programs in Pharmaceutics or Pharmaceutical Sciences. The Pharmaceutics Assessment Committee has been working on collecting various assessment methodologies associated with pharmaceutics courses. The Pharmaceutics Graduate Programs Web Page Committee is in the process of developing a single web page that could be used for students to investigate various graduate programs in Pharmaceutics/Pharmaceutical Sciences. This page should be available on-line by the end of summer. The Membership, Publicity, Newsletter and WebPage Committee will be completing a Section newsletter. The Program Committee has developed a program for the Annual Meeting focusing on Course Resources for Teachers of Pharmaceutics. The session will include four roundtable discussions—Pharmacokinetics, Pharmaceutics, Calculations and laboratory—each moderated by a master teacher. 

Pharmacy Practice -submitted by Chair Terry Schwinghammer (Pittsburgh). The Pharmacy Practice Section has about 1160 members, making it the largest Section in AACP. During this past year, over 130 Section members have been involved in five standing committees, two ad hoc committees, and six task forces. The Section conducted its semi-annual business meeting at the ASHP Midyear Clinical Meeting in December 2000 in Las Vegas. In the fall of 2000, the Section Chair and AACP Staff member Ken Miller developed a special AACP program to encourage clinicians who are finishing their residencies to consider academia as a career. The program was conducted at the ASHP Midyear Meeting in December, and also provided information to existing practitioners about life in academia. Approximately 60 meeting attendees were present, and the program was well received.

The Program Committee developed and conducted a program at the ASHP Midyear Clinical Meeting in 2000, Applications of Hand-Held Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs) in Health Care. Section programs for the AACP 2001 Annual Meeting include (in conjunction with the EBIR SIG) Educational Technology Skills and Tools for Pharmacy Education and three hands-on workshops with limited attendance to allow one person per computer which will cover BlackBoard, Powerpoint and WebCT, respectively. Partnering with the PEP SIG, a program on Innovative Experiential Training Models will also be offered. A total of 1.2 CEUs are being sought for this programming. Finally, a program will be offered at the American College of Clinical Pharmacy (ACCP) Annual Meeting in November 2001, Teaching Evidence-Based Medicine to Health Professionals. This will be the Section’s first educational session at an ACCP Annual Meeting.

The Poster and Abstract Review Subcommittee of the Program Committee assigned 25 abstract reviewers to panels consisting of three members each. Each panel member reviewed approximately five abstracts, and the Chair collated and forwarded the results to AACP. The Resolutions Committee submitted no resolutions, but will propose wording changes to Section Standing Rules for both the Membership and Planning Commissions to become standing committees. The Nominating Committee prepared a slate of nominees for Section Chair-elect and Secretary. The Awards Committee provided input into the Lyman Award nomination process, and is planning to develop a database of potential nominees who can be referred in subsequent years and re-submitted if appropriate. The Planning Committee continues work on the Section’s strategic plan.
The Membership Committee has reviewed data from AACP indicating that membership continues to decline after the initial first year of free membership. That, coupled with the dearth of individuals entering academia, would seem to indicate that membership recruitment and retention will remain issues of continuing concern for the Pharmacy Practice Section as well as for AACP. The Membership Committee will be considered for change from an ad hoc committee to a standing committee of the Section at the 2001 Annual Meeting.

The Task Force on Quality Assurance in Experiential Education is in its second year and is completing a literature review of this topic, assessing the findings from a previous survey conducted by the Task Force, and preparing a White Paper with recommendations for quality assurance in experiential programs. The Task Force on Computer Technology in Pharmacy Practice Education has existed for several years and worked closely with the Electronic-based Instructional Resources SIG (EBIR-SIG) to develop joint educational programs with that group (see 2001 Annual Meeting program schedule). The Task Force on Entry-Level Practice Expectations was formed in September 1999 to identify resources beyond the CAPE Outcomes document and to determine whether professional organizations have published standards that can be reviewed. The task force recognized the need to differentiate the expectation and complexity of the skills of new graduates from those of postgraduate pharmacy residents. A draft document has been written and is in the process of being reviewed by task force members. The Task Force Subcommittee on Measuring Student Performance is preparing to develop model exams to measure student achievement during and at the end of the Advanced Practice Experiences. The subcommittee is awaiting a final list of competencies to be addressed. The Task Force on Evaluating Partnerships with Community Pharmacies has prepared an Interim Report and has developed an agenda for the Task Force to address in its second year. The report should be suitable for publication as a White Paper. The Task Force on Teaching and Practice Expectations of Clinical Faculty Members has compiled information on retention and promotion guidelines for clinical track pharmacy faculty with information on faculty profiles. These will be reviewed as part of the committee’s efforts to develop guidelines.

Social and Administrative Sciences - submitted by Chair Heidi Anderson-Harper (Auburn). The Section website has been revised to include several new areas including Announcements; Newsletters Section; Teaching Mentors; Teaching Topics; and slide presentations from the 2000 Annual Meeting. These pages may be accessed at http://www.aacp.org/memonly/sections/sadminsci/windex.html. The Program Committee has developed e-programming for the 2001 Annual Meeting which includes a presentation describing “E-education in the Classroom,” an update by Jean Paul Gagnon on some of the most recent trends in e-business, including the use of hand-held computers in pharmacy and health care, and a session by Phil Burgess providing a retail perspective of “e-pharmacy.”

The Curriculum Committee has begun to update the 1994 AACP SAS Handbooks for Teaching. The 1994 Handbook is now available on the Section Web page under “Teaching Activities.” The new 2001 Handbook will contain syllabi, topics, teaching methods, and learning assessment techniques for teaching communications, sociology, management, marketing & economics, and law & ethics and will be located in the SAS “members only” area. In addition, the 2000 SAS Model Curriculum (also on the web site) will be used to organize learning outcomes across all categories, such as problem-solving and self-directed learning. The Graduate Student Programming Committee will be offering, “Teaching Portfolios: Do’s, Don’ts, and Musts” at the Annual Meeting, which will focus on teaching portfolios. The Academic Careers Subcommittee of the Graduate Programs Standards Committee is finalizing the document “Graduate Student Teaching Skills Preparation” which will include topics about: designing instruction, teaching techniques, classroom policies, assessment techniques and teaching skills for graduate students.

The Ad-Hoc Committee on Mentoring has been working on two issues: 1) Developing guidelines to assist department chairs in establishing mentoring programs in their schools; 2) Investigating a nationwide matching program for mentors and mentees that might be kicked off at the upcoming AACP Annual Meeting and continued each year as a session at subsequent Annual Meetings.