

ALFP DEBATE: PHARMACY PRACTICE NEEDS PHARMACY SCHOOLS TO DRIVE INNOVATION IN THE PROFESSION

KAREN SMITH, PhD, RPH, CRYSTAL BURKHARDT, PharmD, MBA, BCGP, FCCP, CHRISSA KIOUSSI, PhD., JINGYANG FAN, PharmD, BCPS, SWATI BETHARIA, PhD, MEREDITH HOWARD, PharmD, BCPS, JULIANNA FERNANDEZ, PharmD, JENNIFER M. MALINOWSKI, PharmD, KARUNYA KANDIMALLA, PhD, NATHANIEL M. RICKLES, PharmD, PhD, BCPP, FAPhA, JUSTIN TOLMAN, PharmD, PhD, JOSEPH SWANSON, PharmD, FCCM, FCCP, DENNIS PARKER, PharmD, DANIEL HANSEN, PharmD, ANNE LIN, Pharm.D., FNAP

OBJECTIVE

To describe the pros and cons surrounding "pharmacy practice needs pharmacy schools to drive innovation in the profession."

BACKGROUND

Within AACP, the Academic Leadership Fellows Program (ALFP) contributes to developing leaders in the Academy. The ALFP Fellows participate in a debate on current topics in academic pharmacy that are AACP priorities.

- The Mission of AACP is to advance pharmacy education, research, scholarship, practice and service in partnership with members and stakeholders, to improve health for all.
- The Academy recognizes that the healthcare environment is continually changing and pharmacists must be prepared for such changes.
- AACP publishes a 3-year Strategic Plan¹ with the latest theme: Preparing Pharmacists and the Academy to Thrive in Challenging Times. The Strategic Plan calls for:
 - Ensuring pharmacy education and training are fully recognized, utilized and integrated into the health care system.
and:
 - Fostering a pharmacy workforce that embraces, leads and sustains a professional culture of change, transformation and continued professional development.

It remains unclear whether Pharmacy Schools or Pharmacy Practice should drive innovation in the profession

METHODS

Seven members of ALFP Cohort 19 were assigned to the Pro side of the debate, and seven assigned to the Con side.

Debate rules describing the roles of each team member were described during ALFP conference sessions. Speaker 1 provides an opening statement and identifies three strong supporting points, Speaker 2 refutes the opening statement, Speaker 3 responds to the refutation, Speaker 4 fields audience questions, Speaker 5 responds to refutation and audience questions, Speaker 6 responds to the audience tabletop discussion, and Speaker 7 provides the closing argument.

The Pro- and Con-Teams of the "innovation" debate separately conducted literature searches including terms "innovation, pharmacy/clinical practice, drivers," and accessed information from multiple national pharmacy organizations, along with expert opinion from faculty, association members, and practitioners.

RESULTS

Pro Team: Pharmacy Practice Need Pharmacy Schools

1. Pharmacy schools prepare future pharmacists to be life-long learners and change-agents.
2. Pharmacy schools have resources/expertise to engage in innovation.
3. Seminal partnerships such as the Academia-CPESN Transformation Pharmacy Collaborative, are crucial for innovations to be successful. Other examples of academia and pharmacy practice collaborations driven by Pharmacy Schools include: Pharmacists included in patient rounds at University of Iowa, The University of Kentucky's first formal Drug Information Center in 1962, the Ninth Floor Pharmacy Project in 1965, and the Washington State Immunization Program spearheaded by University of Washington in 1994.²



Figure 1. Pro Team Debaters

Con Team: Pharmacy Practice Drives Innovation

1. Successful and usable practice innovations are a response to real-world practice experiences and needs which must be grounded in a sound business model to ensure the innovation is feasible and sustainable for practice adoption.
2. ACPE 2016 standards suggest pharmacy schools are facilitators of innovation, not drivers, because they are not expected to train students to develop innovative practices.
3. Pharmacy schools are often reactive to practice, not proactive. Innovative topics are rarely taught in schools due to lack of academic experts, heavy workloads, and other challenges.



Figure 2. Pro & Con team speakers fielding audience questions.



Figure 3. Con Team Debaters

RESULTS, CONT.

Pro Team Refutation

1. Proof of concept and idea dissemination are the Schools' responsibility, not sustainability.
2. ACPE Accreditation Standards require schools to train graduates with an innovative mindset (Standard 4).³
3. Faculty are uniquely suited to develop and teach innovative topics informed by their scholarship.

Con Team Refutation

1. Pharmacy schools cannot be credited with their graduates' resulting practice innovation.
2. Current academic appointment models do not support adequate time for practice site faculty to lead innovative and sustainable practice research due to their diverse responsibilities within schools.
3. Such examples of research innovation were developed by pharmacists in their practice roles and facilitated by partnerships with the schools, associations, and health systems.

CONCLUSION

Pharmacy schools and practice do not operate independently nor innovate separately. The first priority of AACP's Strategic Plan is to lead pharmacy practice transformation. Representatives of practice and academia must work together to foster this culture of transformation by seeking, developing, implementing, and evaluating progressive, contemporary, and innovative ideas and practices that reflect shared perspectives of both entities.

REFERENCES

