Introduction

The pharmacist prescribing programme is a General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) accredited programme delivered at the University of Bath in the United Kingdom (UK). Mixed methods of assessment are used during the 7 month course which include 10% case presentation, 10% therapeutic medication review, 20% Observed Structured Clinical Exam (OSCE) and 60% portfolio. These portfolios have historically been paper based.

The portfolio assesses the knowledge based components of the course and their application to practice. It is also a record of the required 90 hours of clinical attendance and an assessment of developing competence using A Single Competency Framework for all Prescribers (NPC, 2012). The programme uses a team of markers who are geographically distant from the University and has relied on posting these large portfolios back to the University after marking for peer review before feedback was given to the students. The layout of the portfolios, although structured was also diverse. In 2012, the programme team decided to replace the paper based system with an electronic portfolio. Although the concept of e-portfolios is not new (JISC, 2012), the development of a wiki to support this has been less widely described. This poster describes how the team developed the University Confluence wiki into a bespoke e-portfolio and evaluated the views of the users of the product (students and markers), the process and the impact of digital literacy.

Development of the wiki

The 2012 cohort of students were set up with bespoke wiki pages which mirrored the assessment tasks in the programme. Students completed practice based activities and uploaded evidence of these in the form of structured tasks, attendance logs and reflection. They also uploaded records of their required 90 hours of clinical practice and feedback from their designated medical practitioner (DMP). This work was assessed remotely by experienced markers and then peer reviewed by two members of the programme team. The students and markers were surveyed for their experiences of using the wiki. The programme team, together with the university e-Learning team, then evaluated the impact of this new process of assessment in addition to issues of digital literacy. Figure 1 shows sample pages from the wiki.

Results from the student evaluation

Students self reported a range of digital literacies. They ranged from not at all skilled (n=1) to very skilled (n=4) with most in between. All students were familiar with the Internet but only 4 had used a Wiki before. Most students found the wiki easy to access and to navigate and were able to complete the online tasks and upload documents as requested. Only a few utilised the enhanced options and went beyond the set template to provide more innovative responses. All students felt the wiki was useful as an e-portfolio.

Students generally reported that it took a while to get used to the wiki. They were also learning about the course and the Virtual Learning Environment (Moodle) at the same time. Students who had used a paper based system previously were able to say that this system was preferable.

Discussion and suggestions for improvement

The programme team have demonstrated an enhanced level of Quality Assurance and an ability to deliver timely feedback on evidence of practice based activities. The level of digital literacy impacts on the ability of the student to present data. The feedback from the student and marker survey suggests the users of the e-portfolio found it easy to access and to navigate and demonstrated good engagement with this as a method of assessment and feedback. Other positive aspects include the speed of marking and feedback, reduced staff time and an enhanced peer review process. The external examiner was impressed with this new development.

Following the evaluation a number of suggestions to improve the wiki have been considered. The team are investigating a way to automatically register the clinical attendance hours and build this into the e-portfolio. The team are also looking at the process which underpins the portfolio and how the permissions and availability of the work are managed.

Results from the marker evaluation

All markers found the wiki easy to use and to navigate. They were easily able to find submitted assessments for marking and liked the ability to “view” the work within the wiki rather than download documents. All markers agreed that they were able to mark work faster than with the previous paper based system. All markers felt this was a useful way of engaging with technology to support learning.

The programme team were able to peer review the portfolios in a more timely manner than with the previous system. Two members of the team were able to review all the portfolios in a day. Previously portfolios were very large and needed to be posted from the markers back to the University. They were also in a less standardised format and therefore took much longer to review.

Discussion and suggestions for improvement

The programme team have demonstrated an enhanced level of Quality Assurance and an ability to deliver timely feedback on evidence of practice based activities. The level of digital literacy impacts on the ability of the student to present data. The feedback from the student and marker survey suggests the users of the e-portfolio found it easy to access and to navigate and demonstrated good engagement with this as a method of assessment and feedback. Other positive aspects include the speed of marking and feedback, reduced staff time and an enhanced peer review process. The external examiner was impressed with this new development.

Following the evaluation a number of suggestions to improve the wiki have been considered. The team are investigating a way to automatically register the clinical attendance hours and build this into the e-portfolio. The team are also looking at the process which underpins the portfolio and how the permissions and availability of the work are managed.
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Figure 1: Sample wiki pages showing uploaded tasks, consultation reports and reflection.