

RESEARCH ARTICLE

What do pharmacy students need to know about biochemistry?

Kevin R Kearney1 [iiiiI](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2342-8101) , Melany P Puglisi2 [IIII](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2823-9932) , Esther P Black 3 ***, Pramod B Mahajan4

1MCPHS University, Massachusetts, USA. 2Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois, USA. ³University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, USA. *ADes Moines, Iowa, USA.*

Keywords

Assessment Biochemistry Course Design

Correspondence

Kevin R Kearney **MCPHS University** 19 Foster Street **Worcester** Massachusetts USA *kevin.kearney@mcphs.edu*

Abstract

Objective: The goal of this study was to determine what students need to know about biochemistry in order to practice pharmacy. **Methods**: With reference to a list of learning objectives, educators interviewed students during their advanced clinical rotations, asking if they had used each item in practice. Each item was then rated according to the number and strength of affirmative responses. The ratings were used to identify the elements of biochemistry most strongly recognised as relevant to clinical practice. **Results:** All of the learning objectives received affirmative responses, indicating that each was recalled or used by some respondent(s). The most highly rated objectives indicate aspects of biochemistry most closely related to clinical practice. **Conclusion:** The results provide guidance to educators for designing biochemistry courses, highlighting recognisable connections between biochemistry and clinical practice, and areas where relevance may need to be made clearer or re-evaluated.

Introduction

In recent years, pharmacy practice has changed to accommodate an expanding healthcare system and clinical expectations of those pharmacists. As such, many colleges and schools of pharmacy have re-envisioned their curricula to prepare students for the growing role of a pharmacist in a healthcare team (Romanelli, 2018). Biochemistry has long been accepted as the foundation for pharmacology, therapeutics and other content in the pharmacy curriculum, and therefore, directly or indirectly, for the actual practice of pharmacy (Lewis, 1947; Bauer, 1947; Woster, 2003; Broedel-Zaugg et al., 2008; Harrold & McFalls, 2010; Rose, 2011; Van Winkle et al., 2013; Goyal *et al.*, 2014; Osheroff *et al.*, 2015; Dirks-Naylor *et al.*, 2015; Georgiev et al., 2016; Sánchez-Pozo, 2017; Gryka et al. 2017; Niederhoffer *et al.*, 2017; Okubo *et al.*, 2017). As such, biochemistry is typically taught early in the

pharmacy curriculum, or it is a prerequisite for entry into some professional pharmacy programmes. Because of its foundational role, educators need to structure biochemistry course(s) so that they cover all of the competencies required of pharmacists, as thoroughly and concisely as possible. Further, the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE), in the Standards 2016, underscore that pharmacists must 'employ evidencebased practice' and be able to 'apply foundational sciences to the provision of patient-centred care' (ACPE, 2016).

While pharmacy educators understand that biochemistry is an important area of the foundational sciences for pharmacy students, an agreement on necessary competencies related to practice is rarely discussed in the literature. A 2007-2008 study, for example, reported that two-thirds of a sample of administrators agreed that a

course in biochemistry should be required for admission to the professional pharmacy curriculum. The report indicated that a relatively small number of schools actually do require biochemistry for admission, but many schools include biochemistry in their curricula rather than having it as a prerequisite for admission (Broedel-Zaugg *et al.*, 2008). A white paper prepared by the Biological Sciences Section of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) included a section on the 'Biochemistry Core Knowledge and Skills' (competencies) that pharmacy school graduates need to possess (Personal Communication, Dr. Arbi Nazarian, Chair, Committee of Sections, AACP, 2014). Further, at the 2015 Conference of the Association of Biochemistry Course Directors (ABCD; since renamed the Association of Biochemistry Educators [ABE]), a panel of pharmacy educators presented and discussed a proposed list of biochemistry learning objectives for pharmacy education (Osheroff *et al.*, 2015), aligned with the AACP Biological Sciences Section 'Biochemistry Core Knowledge and Skills' competencies. In this report, the authors will refer to this as the AACP/ABE list. The list included 131 learning objectives. Most recently, Das and colleagues speculated that the growing healthcare enterprise will lean heavily on pharmacists for medication management services, requiring both basic and clinical science knowledge, and sought to improve the relationship of pharmaceutical sciences to the clinical arena by providing students with case-based practice activities that focus on the tenets of medicinal chemistry (Das *et al.*, 2018).

Biochemistry educators have the knowledge, skills and experience necessary to develop courses in their area of expertise. However, feedback from practitioners, including student pharmacists engaged in clinical training, may be helpful in the design of courses to allow for relevance without unnecessarily expanding content. Advanced pharmacy students are able to, for example, reflect on which elements of biochemistry they utilise in their clinical practice. The authors reasoned this as one way of verifying the relevance of biochemistry for the practice of pharmacy. Such reflections can also help educators fine-tune their courses, highlighting areas on which they should focus, and providing first-hand feedback which may be used to explain the relevance of biochemistry in providing evidence-based, patientcentred care to their students.

The goal of the present study was to gather feedback from advanced pharmacy students about what biochemistry knowledge and understanding they are using in their clinical practice. This feedback will enable educators to better understand what concepts of biochemistry

pharmacy students use and need to know in order to function as high-level pharmacy practitioners and will allow for re-tooling of the learning objectives associated with the courses that present the fundamental aspects of biochemistry.

Methods

Since 2015, a group of biochemistry educators in seven schools of pharmacy have conducted interviews with advanced students (students doing their Advanced Professional Practice Experience [APPE] rotations) to determine what information, from the AACP/ABE list of learning objectives, these students have used in their clinical practice education. The original study group included educators from 17 institutions and all were invited to conduct interviews, but only seven actually did so. The institutions where the interviews were conducted were: MCPHS University, School of Pharmacy, Worcester, MA; St. Louis College of Pharmacy (STLCOP), St. Louis, MO; University of Kentucky (UK), College of Pharmacy, Lexington, KY; Chicago State University (CSU), College of Pharmacy, Chicago, IL; Samford University (SU), McWhorter School of Pharmacy, Birmingham, AL; Drake University (DU) College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, Des Moines, IA; Presbyterian College School of Pharmacy (PCSP), Clinton, South Carolina. Approval for conducting this study was sought and obtained from the Institutional Review Boards of these institutions.

Over the course of two academic years (2015-2017), the educators interviewed 70 APPE students. A preliminary report on this project, based on the first 32 interviews (a pilot study), was presented at the 2017 Conference of the Association of Biochemistry Educators (Niederhoffer et al., 2017).

Students who agreed to participate in the study were interviewed individually, orally, and in-person. Each interviewee received, reviewed, and signed an Informed Consent document, indicating her/his willingness to participate in the study. This document explained the purpose of the study, that participation in the study was voluntary, how the interview would be conducted, and the confidential nature of the study. Each interviewee was assigned a participant ID number, and all remaining documents included that number, but no participant name. Participants completed a registration form, including demographic information, and information about their educational background.

For each interview, the interviewer went through the AACP/ABE list, asking the interviewee, with regard to each

learning objective, to cite a clinical situation during APPE rotations wherein she/he had used that piece of knowledge/information. The interview questions were pre-formulated so that each student was asked the same questions. Each interviewer recorded and took notes on the interviews, and entered notes summarising each participant's comments about each learning objective in a spreadsheet. After all of the interviews had been conducted, the interviewers' spreadsheets were submitted to the study co-directors, who merged all reported comments into a master spreadsheet.

In accord with best practices for conducting qualitative research (Patton, 1999; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2015; O'Sullivan, 2017; O'Sullivan, 2018), the study co-directors analysed the collected data as follows.

Since interviewees were asked to cite a clinical situation during APPE rotations wherein she/he had used that piece of knowledge/information, the initial analysis involved categorising each response as either affirmative (if a clinical application was cited) or negative (for any other response). Upon further review of the responses, however, it became clear that a more nuanced analysis was called for. Based on a review of all of the recorded responses, a rating system was therefore devised, assigning a number of points to each response, as follows:

- 3 points if the interviewee cited a clinical application (e.g., a disease state, such as diabetes) or a specific rotation during which the topic was relevant
- 2 points if the interviewee/interviewer indicated clearly that the topic was important (using words such as 'Yes 'or 'Good', or elaborating on the topic to illustrate understanding) but did not explicitly indicate a clinical application
- 1 point if the interviewee/interviewer indicated some connection to the topic, using a word such as 'Weak' or 'Basic', but no clinical application
- 0 points if there was a negative response (No) or no response at all (blank), or if the comment had nothing to do with the specific learning objective

For each of the 131 items, one of the study co-directors rated each response. The numbers of 3, 2, 1, and 0 ratings for each item were then tabulated.

When categorising or rating qualitative responses, it is possible that a rater may be biased - for example, tending to rate responses relatively high in order to make the clinical relevance of items appear strong. In order to establish the credibility and validity of ratings, it is therefore important to test for rater bias by having two or more raters categorise responses.

Additionally, if the definitions of the categories of responses are not clear and unambiguous, it is possible that different observers will rate responses differently. In order to demonstrate the validity of the rating system it is important to demonstrate that independent raters will categorise responses similarly.

As a way of establishing the validity of ratings, by checking for bias and making sure that independent raters categorise responses similarly, Merriam (2009) and Patton (1999; 2015) suggest 'analyst triangulation', having two or more persons independently analyse data and compare their results. To do this for the present study, the study director initially rated all responses, and then two of the co-authors, without seeing the initial ratings, each rated all 70 reported responses to two-thirds of the items. With this system, every item was rated by the primary rater and one or two independent secondary raters. To assess inter-rater agreement, Cohen's kappa (Cohen, 1960) was calculated for each secondary-primary rater pair.

Results

Seventy APPE students from seven colleges of pharmacy in the United States of America (USA) (Table I), were interviewed for this study. Participants included 20 students from MCPHS University, 15 from CSU, 14 from DU, 11 from UK, 5 from PCSP, 4 from SU, and 1 from STLCOP. The majority of the participants (78.6%, n=55) attended four-year degree programmes at CSU, UK, PCSP and SU, or a three-year accelerated programme at MCPHS, while the remaining students were enrolled in the six-year degree programmes at DU and STLCOP. With the exception of one student enrolled in STLCOP, all students completed biochemistry in their first year of the pharmacy curriculum. Students attending MCPHS, CSU and UK completed a two-semester biochemistry course sequence, while students from PCSP, DU and SU completed a one semester course.

The majority of the participants were female (65.7%; n=46). Most student participants fell within the age ranges of 21-27 (n=51). The most diversity was observed in students from CSU, DU and MCPHS (Table I). A slight majority of the participants (n=37, 52.9%) obtained a B.A./B.S. prior to entering pharmacy school, while 31.4% participants reported completing some college (n=22). A little more than 50% of students (n=36) reported completing a separate biochemistry course prior to entering the Pharm.D. programme (Table I). An equal number of participants reported receiving an A or B $(44.3\%$, n=31) while the remaining reported earning a C in their pharmacy biochemistry courses (Table I).

Table I: Demographic information of student participants

Table II: Number of rotations required for each programme

The APPE rotation requirement for graduation varied from six to nine modules at the universities participating in the study (Table II). The length of the rotations varied from four to six weeks. On average, participants completed six $(SD±1.4)$ rotations prior to participating in the study. The majority of the participants had completed the core rotations in Ambulatory care (n=58), Community Pharmacy (n=59), Hospital/Institutional (n=62) and Medicine (n=52) (Table III). Among the electives, Critical Care and Infectious Disease were reported most frequently by student participants (Table III).

Table III: Completed rotations reported by student **participants**

Table IV: Examples of reported comments to illustrate ratings

The compiled ratings of the learning objectives can be found in Appendix A. Table IV shows a sample of reported comments, to illustrate ratings assigned to those comments.

Table V: Number of items receiving specified number of **ratings of 3**

How to read the table: Seventy [70] interviewees commented on each of the 131 *items. The study director rated each of the comments on each item on a scale of 0-3. Example: 35 of the 131 items received 10-19 ratings of 3.*

Highlights of the ratings are as follows: the number of respondents indicating that they had used a given piece of information in a clinical situation (a rating of 3) ranged from 0 to 52. The descriptions of the ratings can be found in the Methods section above, and that a rating of 3 indicated that the interviewee had cited a clinical application e.g., a disease state, such as diabetes or a specific rotation during which the topic was relevant. Table V shows the number of items receiving ratings of 3.

Table VI: Most highly rated learning objectives

Check for inter-rater agreement: as detailed in the Methods section above, after one of the study co-directors (the 'primary rater') had rated each response to the 131 items, each of two of the co-authors (the 'secondary raters'), without seeing those ratings, did the same for approximately two-thirds of the items, so that every item was rated by two independent observers. Their ratings were then compared to the primary ratings, and

Cohen's kappa (κ) was calculated for each primarysecondary pair (Cohen, 1960). The values of κ for the two pairs were 0.87 and 0.81. There is no general agreement as to what magnitude of k reflects adequate agreement, but Landis & Koch (1977) suggested guidelines that authors often reference: κ values of 0.41-0.60 represent 'moderate agreement', values of 0.61-0.80 represent 'substantial agreement', and values of 0.81-1.00 represent 'almost perfect agreement' (Woster, 2003).

Among the learning objectives that were most highly rated (Appendix A), with the highest number of 3 ratings were those related to the following topics:

- vitamins, cofactors, and their role in metabolism (L.O. #120, 121)
- haemoglobin and its role in transport (L.O. #26)
- pH, pKa, and the dissociation constant, Kd (L.O. $\#1$)
- carbohydrate metabolism, its regulation, and the connection to disease states such as diabetes (L.O. #60, 65, 68, 74, 118)
- enzyme inhibition, and the connection to drugs that are inhibitors (L.O. #40, 41)
- lipids and their metabolism, including cholesterol; the role of HMG-CoA reductase, and the action of statins: lipoproteins; ketone bodies (L.O. #16, 18, 93, 94, 95, 98)
- DNA and DNA processes, and antibacterial and anticancer drugs that affect these processes (L.O. #57, 58)
- pharmacogenomics (L.O. #131)

Interviewees indicated that they had used information related to the above topics during their APPE rotations (rating of 3) or that they understood the importance of the topic (rating of 2).

Discussions and Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that all of the aspects of biochemistry covered by the 131 learning objectives were recalled by students, and many were recognised as relevant during the students' APPE rotations.

One might expect that in a perfectly aligned curriculum, everything taught in didactic course would be applied in experiential education. This might lead to an expectation that students interviewed for this study would report using almost every one of the 131 biochemistry learning objectives during their APPE rotations. The authors submit, however, that there are many possible reasons to explain why not every student reported using every piece of information in a clinical setting:

In order for a student to indicate that she/he had used, in a clinical setting, a specific piece of information from a biochemistry course two or more years earlier, the student would have to have almost perfect memory remembering all patient cases from all rotations, and remembering and understanding everything that was taught in the biochemistry course. If a student did not recall all of this, that student would not remember all of the pieces of biochemistry information that she/he drew on in clinical situations. Because of this imperfect recall, it is likely that students drew on biochemistry information more often than they remembered. For this reason, the authors submit that the relative number of acknowledged connections probably indicates the relative importance of the items (learning objectives) to clinical practice, but that the number of actual connections is probably much greater than the number of remembered connection.

Students were interviewed at different times during their final year in pharmacy school, during which they would complete a total of six-nine rotations. Students who participated in the study had not yet completed all of their rotations at the time of their interviews, so they had not yet had clinical experiences related to some of the biochemistry they had learned. For example, 17% had not yet completed the required Ambulatory Care rotation, 16% had not yet completed the required Community Pharmacy rotation, 11% had not yet completed the required Hospital/Institutional rotation, and 26% had not yet completed the required Medicine rotation (Table III).

Some students may not consciously recognise that they are applying biochemistry in their APPE rotations. This could be because a significant amount of time had passed since they had taken a biochemistry course, because they had forgotten the biochemical underpinnings of other subjects they had studied (e.g., pharmacology), or because of a host of other reasons. It could be that biochemistry, or a biochemical way of thinking, could be embedded in their thinking at a subconscious level.

Some of the learning objectives may be so granular that interviewees replied that they never applied the objectives during their clinical experiences, even though there was important general information in the objectives. For example, students may never have had to 'apply the Henderson-Hasselbalch equation to solve pH problems', but they may have had to understand how pH can affect the charge on molecules, such as various drugs.

It was clear from comments made by interviewees that different preceptors emphasised different topics, and

different sites offered different learning opportunities. For example, one preceptor might highlight amino acids as part of Total Parenteral Nutrition, while another might not. This certainly accounts for some of the variability in responses about clinical application of biochemistry.

Beyond these possible reasons for low ratings, it is nevertheless important to include some biochemistry in a course even if not every student absolutely needs to know it in order to successfully complete every APPE rotation. Whether or not students realise it, they need to know some parts of biochemistry as prerequisites for courses they will take subsequently (e.g., medicinal chemistry), and they may need to know some things that they will not apply in their APPE rotations but which they may apply over the course of their professional practice, such as the growing field of pharmacogenomics (Weitzel et al., 2016).

The reliability of the ratings in this study is important. This was assessed by comparing the ratings, carried out independently, of the primary study director and two co-directors. The fact that independent assessors rated the responses very similarly (kappas of 0.87 and 0.81) suggests that the rating rubrics were clear, and that the ratings were not substantially affected by rater bias.

While the low ratings for some learning objectives may be concerning, lack of high ratings for every item is understandable, especially in view of the limitations discussed above. Instead of focusing on absolute numbers, the authors submit that what is important to focus on is the relative ratings of the items. Specifically, the results of this study provide guidance to educators as they design biochemistry courses in pharmacy curricula. Relatively highly-rated learning objectives appear to have high clinical relevance, and biochemistry educators would do well to highlight this in their teaching. When teaching material related to objectives with lower ratings, educators may need to provide extra information to make their practice relevance clear. In some cases, though, it may be that these objectives are less important for pharmacy students, or that they are more specific than they need to be. The authors submit that a revised list of learning objectives should include less-specific (and therefore less limiting) items, highlighting broader but critically important information. The criteria for including items should be that they are essential for progressing to subsequent courses in the curriculum, and essential for pharmacists to competently practice their profession, upon graduation and licensure, and over their entire career.

The focus of the present study was on pharmacy education in the USA. The referenced competencies and learning objectives were from sub-groups of, respectively, the AACP and the ABE, both of which are primarily USA-based organisations. This means that the study is most relevant for USA-based educators, but the competencies and learning objectives are probably similar for educators world-wide. Having said that, it would certainly be worthwhile to carry out similar studies in the future about teaching biochemistry in pharmacy programmes in countries other than the USA.

The approach of the present study could also be extended to the teaching of biochemistry to students in other healthcare professions (e.g., medicine, physician assistant, dentistry). The ABE includes educators from schools of medicine and dentistry and may be interested in such studies. Comparative analyses of such results would be valuable for further improving basic sciences curricula in pharmacy as well as other healthcare professions. Finally, it would be interesting to explore the effectiveness of various methods for teaching biochemistry (and other subjects), some of which have been necessitated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

This study may also inspire faculty in undergraduate Allied Health Sciences' courses to conduct similar studies for their students. For example, they may wish to explore what organic or analytical chemistry students need to know in order to succeed in other courses in a pharmaceutical sciences curriculum.

As noted in the Introduction, educators generally agree about the importance of biochemistry in the education of pharmacists, and biochemistry competencies have been proposed (Nazarian *et al.*, 2014). What the present study adds to the literature is practice-based evidence of the relevance and importance of specific elements of biochemistry that underlie the practice of pharmacy. In addition to providing course-design guidance to educators, this also highlights the advantage of including biochemistry in the pharmacy curriculum, rather than just as a prerequisite for admission, because pharmacy educators can make explicit connections between biochemistry and the practice of pharmacy.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the following colleagues who conducted interviews at their institutions: Paul Juang (Pharm.D.), St. Louis College of Pharmacy; Danielle Cruthirds (Ph.D.), Samford University, McWhorter School of Pharmacy; and David Eagerton (Ph.D.), Presbyterian College School of Pharmacy (now at Campbell University, College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences).

References

ACPE [Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education]. (2016). Standards 2016 Accreditation Standards And Key Elements For The Professional Program In Pharmacy Leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy Degree: Chicago, IL 2015. Available at: https://www. [acpe-accredit.org/pdf/Standards2016FINAL.pdf](https://www.acpe-accredit.org/pdf/Standards2016FINAL.pdf)

Bauer, C.W. (1947). Biochemistry in the pharmacy curriculum. *American Journal of Pharmacy Education*, **11**(1), 125-131

Broedel-Zaugg, K., Buring, S.M., Shankar, N. Soltis, R.. Stamatakis. M.K., Zaiken, K., & Bradberry, J.C. (2008). Academic pharmacy administrators' perceptions of core requirements for entry into professional pharmacy programs. American Journal of Pharmacy *Education*, **72**(3), 52.<https://doi.org/10.5688/aj720352>

Cohen J.A. (1960). Coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, **20**(1), 37-46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104>

Das, J., Fernandez, J., Shah, D., Williams, L. & Zagaar, M. (2018). Case-based studies in teaching medicinal chemistry in PharmD curriculum: Perspectives of students, faculty, and pharmacists from academia. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, **10**(1), 85-8[9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2017.09.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2017.09.004)

Dirks-Naylor, A.J., Wright, N.J.D., & Alston, G.L. (2015). Development and Assessment of a Horizontally Integrated Biological Sciences Course Sequence for Pharmacy Education. *American Journal of Pharmacy Education*, **79**(6), 89. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe79689) [org/10.5688/ajpe79689](https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe79689)

Georgiev, A.M., Krajnović, D., Manojlović, J., Ignjatović, S., & Majkić Singh, N. (2016). Seventy Years of Biochemical Subjects' Development in Pharmacy Curricula: Experience from Serbia. *Journal of Medical Biochemistry*, **35**(1), 69-79. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1515/jomb-2015-0018) [1515/jomb-2015-0018](https://doi.org/10.1515/jomb-2015-0018)

Goyal, R.K., Bhise, S.B., Srinivasan, B.P., Rao, C.M, Sen, T., & Koneri, R. (2014). Curriculum for pharmacology in pharmacy institutions in India: Opportunities and challenges. *Indian Journal of Pharmacology*, **46**(3), 241-245. https://doi.org/10.4103/0253 -7613.132149

Gryka, R., Kiersma, M.E., Frame, T.R., Cailor, S.M., & Chen, A.MH. (2017). Comparison of student confidence and perceptions of biochemistry concepts using a team-based learning versus traditional lecture-based format. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, **9**(2), 302-310.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2016.11.020>

Harrold, M.W., & McFalls, M.A. (2010). A Pharmacy Practice Laboratory Exercise to Apply Biochemistry Concepts. American *Journal of Pharmacy Education*, **74**(8), 144. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.5688/aj7408144) [5688/aj7408144](https://doi.org/10.5688/aj7408144)

Landis, J.R., & Koch, G.G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, **33**(1), 159-174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>

Lewis, H.B. (1947). Biochemistry in the pharmacy curriculum; optional or required subject. American Journal of Pharmacy *Education*, **11**(1), 119-125

Merriam, S.B. (2009). Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation. 2nd ed, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, California

Nazarian, A., Bloom, T.J., Oliveira, M., Zavod, R., Harrold, M., Mobley, C., & White, C. (2014). Roles of the Pharmaceutical Sciences in Pharmacy Education and Practice- A White Paper by the Biological Sciences Section of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy

Niederhoffer, E.C., Cline, S.D., Osheroff, N., Simmons, J.M., Diekman, A.B., Franklin, D.S., et al. (2017). Teaching Biochemistry and Genetics to Students of Dentistry, Medicine, and Pharmacy 6th International Conference of the Association of Biochemistry Educators (ABE) Clearwater Beach, FL, USA, May 7-1. *Medical Science Education*, **27**(4), 855-859. [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-017-0441-1) [s40670-017-0441-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-017-0441-1)

Okubo, M., Takahashi, Y., Yamashita, J., Takahashi, H., Miyata, O., Suzuki, T., & Ishii, I. (2017). In Practical Training, a Questionnaire Survey and Analysis to Pharmacy Students of the Utilization Situation of the Course Contents of Pharmacy School. *Yakugaku Zasshi*, **137**(6), 745-755.<https://doi.org/10.1248/yakushi.16-00256>

Osheroff, N., Niederhoffer, E.C., Sabina, R.L., Cline, S.D., Wimmer, M.J., Franklin, D.S., Diekman, A.B., et al. (2015). Teaching Biochemistry to Students of Medicine, Pharmacy & Dentistry: 5th International Conference of the Association of Biochemistry Course Directors (ABCD) Santa Fe, NM, USA, May 3-7, 2015. *Medical Science Education*, **25**(4), 473-477. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-015-0160-4) [1007/s40670-015-0160-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-015-0160-4)

O'Sullivan, T.A., Sy, E., & Bacci, J. (2017). A qualitative study designed to build an experiential education curriculum for practice-ready community pharmacy-bound students. American *Journal of Pharmacy Education*, **81**(10), 6055. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe6055) [10.5688/ajpe6055](https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe6055)

O'Sullivan, T.A., & Sy, E. (2018). A qualitative study identifying kev components to standardize across inpatient general medicine advanced pharmacy practice experiences. American Journal of *Pharmacy Education*, 82(2), 6215. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe 6215

Patton, M.Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Services Research*, 34(5 part 2), 1189-1208

Patton, M.Q. (2015). Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods. 4th ed, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Romanelli, F. (2018). To Boldly Go. American Journal of Pharmacy *Education*, **82**(4), 7085. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7085>

Rose, T.M. (2011). A board game to assist pharmacy students in learning metabolic pathways. American Journal of Pharmacy *Education*, 75(9), 183.<https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe759183>

Sánchez-Pozo, A. (2017). A Comparison of Competences for Healthcare Professions in Europe. *Pharmacy* (Basel), **5**(1), 8 pii: E8. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy5010008>

Van Winkle, L.J., Cornell, S., Fjortoft, N., Bjork, B.C., Chandar, N., Green, J.M., La Salle, S., Viselli, S.M., Burdick, P., & Lynch, S.M. (2013). Critical thinking and reflection exercises in a biochemistry course to improve prospective health professions students' attitudes toward physician-pharmacist collaboration. American *Journal of Pharmacy Education*, **77**(8), 169. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe778169) [5688/ajpe778169](https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe778169)

Weitzel, K.W., Aquilante, C.L., Johnson, S., Kisor, D.F., & Empey, P.E. (2016). Educational strategies to enable expansion of pharmacogenomics-based care. American Journal of *Health-System Pharmacy*, **73**(23), 1986-1998. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.2146/ajhp160104) [2146/ajhp160104](https://doi.org/10.2146/ajhp160104)

Woster, P.M. (2003). Maintaining Basic Science Content Throughout The PharmD Curriculum. *American Journal of Pharmacy Education*, **67**(3), 99.<https://doi.org/10.5688/aj670399>

Appendix A

6

