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Sharing Success: Expansion of a Tutor-Run Assessment Method to Multiple Courses and Colleges

Abstract
Objectives: In 2014, data were presented on a successful pilot program using quizzes written by tutors in a single course at Wegmans School of Pharmacy. The objective of this study was to use the methods from the pilot to expand the program to other pharmacology courses at Wegmans School of Pharmacy as well as the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences College of Pharmacy.

Methods: Methods from the previous study were replicated, whereby tutors wrote weekly quizzes administered using ExamSoft®. The optional quizzes were openly accessible to students in preparation for course exams. Performance data were collected from students in one course at each institution and compared to the pilot study. Performance data collected included quiz and course exam scores. All students that utilized quizzes, as well as tutors, were surveyed to assess perceptions of the method.

Results: The use and impact of quizzes was similar to the results in the pilot study. However, the magnitude of improvements was slightly lower than what was observed initially. Exam scores were significantly higher than quiz scores on 6/10 exams measured, compared to 5/5 exams in the pilot. Students who utilized the quizzes performed significantly better than those that did not on 3/10 exams (3/5 in the pilot), and earned significantly higher course averages. Student (n=155) and peer instructor (n=13) feedback remained positive after expansion of the program.

Implications: This method is a tool that can be translated to different courses and different institutions with a valuable impact on student performance.
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Objective: data were presented on a successful pilot program using quizzes written by tutors in a single course at Wegmans School of Pharmacy (manuscript currently in press at Am J Pharm Educ). The objective of this study was to use the methods from the pilot to expand the program to other pharmacology courses at Wegmans School of Pharmacy (WSoP) as well as the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences College of Pharmacy (UAMS CoP).

Methods: Methods from the previous study were replicated, whereby student tutors wrote weekly quizzes administered using ExamSoft®. The optional quizzes were openly accessible to students in preparation for course exams. Performance data (quiz and course exam scores) were collected administered using ExamSoft®. The optional quizzes were openly accessible to students in preparation for course exams. Performance data (quiz and course exam scores) were collected.

Results: The use and impact of quizzes was similar to the results in the pilot study. However, the magnitude of improvements was slightly lower than what was observed initially. Exam scores were significantly higher than quiz scores on 5/10 exams measured, compared to 5/5 in the pilot. Students who utilized the quizzes performed significantly better than those that did not on 3/10 exams (3/5 in the pilot), and earned significantly higher course averages. Student (n=155) and peer instructor (n=13) feedback remained positive after expansion of the program.

Implications: This method is a tool that can be translated to different courses and different institutions with a valuable impact on student performance.

Assessment Workflow

- Tutor training in test database and exam writing
- Tutor writes questions weekly, including answer rationales
- Instructor reviews questions for accuracy and potential exam overlap
- If desired, student downloads and takes quiz a second time
- Tutor takes quiz
- Student downloads quiz anytime before exam
- Student reviews answers and rationales for questions

Quiz and Exam Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WSoP</th>
<th>UAMS CoP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Quizzes</td>
<td>Exam Average</td>
<td>Exam Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score (%) ± SD</td>
<td>83.1 ± 5.6</td>
<td>76.7 ± 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # Students Taking Each Assessment ± SD (% of class)</td>
<td>45.4 ± 5 (57 ± 6%)</td>
<td>80.0 ± 0 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Perceptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>WSoP (n=11)</th>
<th>UAMS CoP (n=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score out of 5 ± SD % SA/A</td>
<td>Online Tutoring quizzes were a valuable resource</td>
<td>4.45 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The tutoring quizzes influenced the way that I studied for the exams</td>
<td>4.27 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score out of 5 ± SD % SA/A</td>
<td>I feel that the tutoring quizzes increased my confidence going into the exam</td>
<td>4.27 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that taking the tutoring quizzes increased my performance on the exam</td>
<td>3.99 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on a Likert Scale of 1-5 (1= Strongly Disagree; 5= Strongly Agree; SA= Strongly Agree; A= Agree; SD = Standard Deviation

Exam Scores in Quiz Takers versus Non-Quiz Takers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WSoP</th>
<th>UAMS CoP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiz Takers</td>
<td>Exam Average</td>
<td>Exam Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score (%) ± SD</td>
<td>83.9 ± 7.6</td>
<td>86.1 ± 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score (%) ± SD</td>
<td>Non-Quiz Takers</td>
<td>Exam Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score (%) ± SD</td>
<td>83.9 ± 7.6</td>
<td>86.1 ± 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score (%) ± SD</td>
<td>83.9 ± 7.6</td>
<td>86.1 ± 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score (%) ± SD</td>
<td>83.9 ± 7.6</td>
<td>86.1 ± 5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * * *