

## **Pharmacy Student Self-Perceived Confidence and Readiness to Provide Diabetes Education and Counseling**

**Evan Young**, PharmD, BC-ADM

PGY-1 Community-Based Pharmacy Resident

Purdue University College of Pharmacy (West Lafayette, IN) and Mathes Diabetes Center (New Albany, IN)

**Nicole Olenik**, PharmD, CDCES, BC-ADM, LDE

Clinical Assistant Professor of Pharmacy Practice

Purdue University College of Pharmacy, (West Lafayette, IN)

Past Affiliation: Mathes Diabetes Center (New Albany, IN)

**Chelsea Baker**, PharmD, MBA, BCPS

Clinical Assistant Professor of Pharmacy Practice

Associate Director of Professional Skills Laboratories

Purdue University College of Pharmacy (West Lafayette, IN)

### **Corresponding Author:**

Evan Young, PharmD, BC-ADM

Young623@purdue.edu

1621 Charlestown Rd.

New Albany, IN 47150

**Author Contribution: Evan Young:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing- Original Draft, Funding Acquisition, **Nicole Olenik:** Conceptualization, Resources, Writing-

Review and Editing, **Chelsea Baker:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – Review and Editing

**Acknowledgements:** Investigators would like to thank the American Pharmacists Association (APhA) Foundation for providing grant funding for this project, as well as thank the Purdue Research Project Development Program Series under the leadership of Dr. Margie Snyder and Dr. Molly Nichols for their ongoing feedback and support.

**Funding:** This work was supported by the American Pharmacists Association (APhA) Foundation Incentive Grant, Washington D.C.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no relevant conflicts of interest or financial relationships.

**Previous Presentations:** American Pharmacists Association Annual Meeting Virtual Poster Gallery, March 2021

Great Lakes Regional Pharmacy Residency Conference, May 2021

**Abstract Word Count:** 297

**Manuscript Word Count:** 2135

**Number of Tables:** 2

**Number of Figures:**

**Number of Supplemental Online-only Files:**

**Key Points:**

What was already known:

- The need for pharmacists to be involved in disease state management grows as the American population becomes more riddled with chronic disease.
- Increasing student confidence regarding a knowledge set may increase their likelihood to partake in activities that draw upon said knowledge.

What this study adds:

- Impact of hybrid-style laboratory teaching composed of pre-recorded content and in-person activities on student confidence.
- Types of laboratory activities which students find most helpful in aiding their learning.

1 **Background:**

2 Pharmacists are uniquely qualified and positioned to provide impactful counseling and education to  
3 patients with diabetes. Many diabetes education programs have an emphasis on non-pharmacologic  
4 aspects not heavily addressed in many pharmacy school curriculums. The need for additional  
5 preparation is addressed at Purdue University through the Diabetes skills laboratory (DSL) session during  
6 students' second professional year. In addition to providing a hands-on chance to gain experience with  
7 injectable devices, this lab session seeks to equip students with tools to provide non-pharmacologic  
8 counseling regarding topics vital in diabetes management.

9

10 **Objectives:**

11 The primary objective of this study is to assess changes in students' self-confidence in providing both  
12 pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic counseling after completion of lab. Secondary objective is to  
13 identify common gaps in knowledge amongst the study population after participation in the DSL .

14

15 **Methods:**

16 Study data was collected via pre- and post-surveys delivered to students participating in the DSL . The  
17 survey utilized Likert scale items to assess student confidence in a variety of pharmacologic and non-  
18 pharmacologic diabetes education topics. Pre- and post-survey data was compared using Wilcoxon  
19 Signed Rank tests, and a data was analyzed using interquartile ranges of change in confidence, with p-  
20 values from Wilcoxon signed-rank non-parametric test for change.

21

22 **Results:**

1 121 second-year pharmacy students responded to both the pre- and post-surveys. Each area assessed  
2 showed a statistically significant increase in confidence after participation in the DSL. Additionally, there  
3 was a 100% pass rate on performance-based assessments (PBAs) addressing elements from the DSL.

4

5 **Conclusions:**

6 Data showed that despite changes to the DSL structure to accommodate COVID-19 restrictions, a  
7 significant increase in confidence was seen in every area assessed in the study. Ensuring adequate  
8 competence and confidence regarding disease state management is vital for preparing students to be  
9 effective members of the healthcare team as the pharmacist's role continues to advance.

1 **Background**

2 The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) states that 6-in-10 adults in the U.S. have a  
3 chronic disease, while 4-in-10 adults have two or more chronic disease.<sup>1</sup> Despite these alarming rates of  
4 disease, in one 2018 survey almost 90% of U.S. primary care physicians who responded indicated that  
5 they spend less than 25 minutes with each patient.<sup>2</sup> With the number of patients in need of chronic  
6 disease increasing, and the time available to spend with primary providers already shortened, where can  
7 patients be expected to receive disease management services? One might argue that the solution  
8 already exists within 5 miles of home for 90% of the American population.<sup>3</sup>

9

10 Community pharmacies are the most accessible healthcare setting for a majority of Americans and many  
11 of those pharmacies are staffed by pharmacists with clinical training, knowledge of disease  
12 management, and a desire to provide care to the communities they serve. Community pharmacies  
13 nationwide provide clinical services such as Medication Therapy Management (MTM) and  
14 immunizations and there is mounting evidence to support use of community pharmacists in chronic  
15 disease management.<sup>3</sup> The expansion of pharmacist-driven clinical services<sup>3</sup> meets the growing needs of  
16 patients while also advocating for the profession in the fight for fair reimbursement practices.<sup>4</sup> One such  
17 area of chronic disease for pharmacists to make an impact is in diabetes education and management.

18

19 As of 2018, over 34 million people in the United States were diagnosed with diabetes.<sup>5</sup> Pharmacists have  
20 the ability to assess patients with diabetes for medication treatment appropriateness and recommend  
21 changes based on patient and provider health goals.<sup>6</sup> As the diabetes medication treatment landscape  
22 evolves, the pharmacist must be knowledgeable about current medication treatment options.

23 Additionally, pharmacists must remain up-to-date on new medication devices (e.g. insulin pens, insulin  
24 pumps, and injectable glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists) and diabetes point-of-care

25 testing devices (e.g. glucometers, continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) devices). Both medication and  
26 point-of-care devices have product-specific counseling points for preparation and use that pharmacists  
27 should be comfortable communicating to patients.<sup>7</sup>

28

29 While pharmacologic management of diabetes is an important factor in the management of disease, in  
30 order for pharmacists to provide optimal care for their patients with diabetes they must be prepared to  
31 provide pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic diabetes education and counseling. The American  
32 Diabetes Association guidelines for diabetes care recognize “comprehensive lifestyle management” as a  
33 component of first-line therapy.<sup>8</sup> As such, student pharmacists should be comfortable discussing non-  
34 pharmacologic management of diabetes with patients they interact with.

35

36 The Purdue University College of Pharmacy provides students hands-on application of pharmacologic  
37 and nonpharmacologic diabetes management in the Diabetes Point of Care skills laboratory (DSL)  
38 delivered during the second-year of the PharmD curriculum. Students are introduced to medication and  
39 point-of-care devices (e.g. injectable medications, insulin pumps, glucometers), educated on non-  
40 pharmacologic management of diabetes (e.g. diet, exercise), and evaluated on their ability to  
41 appropriately counsel patients on diabetes medications and devices. Based on social-cognitive theory,  
42 increasing student confidence in their knowledge and skills may correlate with increased use of them in  
43 the future.<sup>5,6,7</sup> This study aims to assess student self-confidence and self-perceived readiness to provide  
44 diabetes education and counseling both before and after participation in the DSLDSL session. This  
45 information will be used to assess the effectiveness of the current DSLDSL structure as well as provide  
46 insight into best education practices.

47

48 **Objectives**

49 The primary study objective is to assess student confidence in their ability to provide diabetes education  
50 before and after participation in the DSL. The secondary study objectives are to identify DSL areas of  
51 diabetes management covered in the DSL which illicit lower relative increases in confidence, as well as  
52 identifying which activities students thought to be most helpful to their learning.

53

## 54 **Methods**

### 55 *Theoretical Framework*

56 This study is guided by the application of social-cognitive theory (SCT). SCT contends that a person's self-  
57 efficacy and behaviors are influenced by environmental factors personal/cognitive factors and  
58 behavioral factors. In theory the DSL should act as an environmental factor to provide observational  
59 learning opportunities and chances for reinforcement of ideas. These environmental factors would then  
60 feed into the individual students' personal/cognitive factors including knowledge and expectations of  
61 how counseling a patient may proceed. These personal/cognitive factors in turn feed into behavioral  
62 factors such as self-confidence in the ability to provide education and counseling. The end result would  
63 then, in theory, be an increased likelihood to participate in behaviors that draw upon the knowledge set  
64 forth during the lab session.

65

### 66 *Study Population*

67 The study population consisted of second year professional students within Purdue University College of  
68 Pharmacy who participated in the DSL.

69

### 70 *Study Design*

71 This study took place during Purdue's Pharmacy Professional Program Laboratory series. This lab series  
72 focuses on building students' confidence and abilities to apply pharmacy skills such as counseling,

73 compounding, and more. Students partake in this lab series each semester of their didactic PharmD  
74 education. This study, specifically, was based around participation in the Diabetes Skill Lab during the  
75 second year of the PharmD curriculum. Students were assigned a pre-survey preceding review of any lab  
76 materials. Students then viewed posted pre-lab materials and recorded slideshows before participating  
77 in the in-person portion of the lab. After completion of the in-person lab students were assigned a post-  
78 survey which asked many of the same questions asked during the pre-survey, as well as asked students  
79 to evaluate which activities in the lab were most helpful in their learning. Data was analyzed  
80 retrospectively.

81

82 This lab plays an important role in Purdue's PharmD curriculum by reinforcing the balance of  
83 pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic utilized to provide patients with optimal diabetes care.  
84 The conveyance of these ideas, however, faced a challenge as the DSL session underwent many changes  
85 for the Fall, 2020 semester due to restrictions and precautions put in place in light of the COVID-19  
86 pandemic. The first major hurdle to cross in planning for the Fall, 2020 DSL was social distancing. Instead  
87 of accommodating 35-plus students and facilitators during a single session, the lab space was restricted  
88 to no more than 16 students and two facilitators in the largest room at any given time. In order to  
89 maintain that each student would still have the opportunity for in-person lab time, the amount of in-  
90 person time had to be cut to 80 minutes. The reduction of in-person instructional time then led to a  
91 decision to adopt a hybrid model for the DSL, and discussions regarding which material traditionally  
92 covered in the lab may be best suited to shift to virtual content, and which material was vital to be  
93 continued in-person. While non-pharmacologic changes are vital in the management of diabetes, topics  
94 such as meal planning and exercise goals were deemed the most effective options to be shifted to a  
95 recorded, pre-lab format. The in-person lab time was comprised of four breakout sessions that  
96 consisted of (1) a medication and device showcase, (2) a discussion of insulin pump settings and

97 components, (3) an insulin self-injection simulation, and (4) a practice performance-based assessment  
98 (PBA) during which students were to practice counseling a facilitator on the use of an insulin pen,  
99 glucometer, or a GLP-1 receptor agonist medication device.

100 The pre-survey collected baseline demographic information. Both the pre- and post-survey presented  
101 participants with a number of statements related to pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic diabetes  
102 counseling and education commonly provided by pharmacists. Participants were asked to respond to  
103 those statements with the level of confidence in their current ability to accomplish each statement.  
104 Students were contacted approximately two weeks prior to participating in lab to allow ample time to  
105 complete the pre-survey. Similarly, students were allowed two weeks to complete the post-survey after  
106 participating in the DSL. Pre-lab results were then compared to post-lab data in order to assess changes  
107 in confidence after completing the skill laboratory session. Additionally, at the end of the post-survey  
108 students were asked to respond to Likert-scale items regarding how different activities from the skill  
109 laboratory session aided in their understanding of the material covered.

110

### 111 *Data Analysis*

112 Demographic data and primary and secondary outcomes were measured and reported as descriptive  
113 statistics garnered via multiple-choice and Likert-scale items. Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests for paired data  
114 were employed in order to assess changes in participant responses to Likert scale items at different  
115 points in time. A 5% significance level was used for all tests. Biostatisticians from Indiana University  
116 assisted with data analysis.

117

## 118 **Results**

### 119 *Demographics*

120 A total of 121 participants responded to both the pre- and post-survey. The majority of participants  
121 reported having community pharmacy experience, and nearly half of participants reported themselves  
122 or a close family member having been diagnosed with diabetes (Table 1).

123

#### 124 *Likert-Scale Confidence Results*

125 A statistically significant increase in confidence was shown for each domain assessed in the surveys  
126 (Table 2). The greatest change in confidence was seen regarding Glucagon-like \Peptide-1 Receptor  
127 agonists (GLP-1RA), basic insulin pump settings, and insulin administration using vial and syringe. The  
128 smallest increase in confidence was seen regarding dietary recommendations and exercise goals,  
129 although those increases were still statistically significant. This data is also shown graphically as medians  
130 of change (interquartile ranges) in Table 2.

131

#### 132 *Likert-Scale Activity/Understanding Results*

133 Students indicated that in-lab insulin injection simulations were the most helpful in aiding  
134 understanding of material, while pre-lab recorded presentations were least helpful. Full results can be  
135 seen in Table 2.

136

#### 137 **Discussion**

138 The purpose of this study was to assess student confidence in the topics covered during the DSL The  
139 topics and ideas built upon during the DSL are vital to ensuring that student pharmacists are competent  
140 and confidence enough to provide diabetes education and counseling to patients when they enter the  
141 practice setting- be it through experiential education or the workforce. By assessing student confidence  
142 regarding this knowledge set we are able to critically assess lab structure and the degree to which  
143 students feel comfortable in these areas. Other studies have evaluated lab activities and their impact on

144 student confidence<sup>12</sup> or applied SCT when assessing the effect of team-based learning on student  
145 confidence.<sup>13</sup> These previous studies, however, did not take place in learning situations that employed a  
146 hybrid of in-person and recorded lab materials or evaluate the topic of diabetes management.  
147 It was encouraging to observe an increase in confidence amongst the study population for each area  
148 assessed in the study. As was the theme for most of the year 2020, many changes were required to  
149 allow the DSL to proceed. Despite some of the diabetes management topics being shifted to pre-lab  
150 recordings as opposed to in-person, statistical significance was seen in each area. This finding justified  
151 difficult planning decisions that were made related to which topics could have their traditional place  
152 altered amidst the COVID restrictions.

153 . DSLDSL

154

155 While each of the areas assessed in the study showed a significant increase in confidence, each area did  
156 not see the same degree of increase. The largest increase was seen regarding topics covered during the  
157 in-person session, while the smallest increase was seen regarding topics only covered during pre-lab  
158 recordings. The degree of increase would be more effectively compared between topic if each had been  
159 presented in the same manner, but this was not able to be accomplished during this lab session due to  
160 COVID restrictions that were in place.

161

162 In addition to the increased confidence observed from topics covered in-person, these were the  
163 activities that students deemed the most impactful for their learning experience. The self-injection and  
164 practice counseling experience were each given a dedicated breakout session and students were able to  
165 experience these in small groups with only another student and a facilitator in the room with them.  
166 These smaller group exercises with more direct interaction from facilitators carried much more impact  
167 in the eyes of the students than pre-recorded lectures or other activities. Previous studies have

168 suggested that pharmacy students perform better and are more satisfied with their learning experience  
169 when participating in small-group learning.<sup>14</sup> In the case of the DSL these shifts to smaller-group sessions  
170 were put in place out of necessity to meet COVID protocols, but further use of this facilitation style  
171 could continue to be considered to aid in student learning in future iterations of the lab.

172

### 173 **Conclusion**

174 This study demonstrated that presenting students with pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic aspects  
175 of diabetes management in the skill laboratory setting resulted in significant increases in confidence  
176 regarding the material. By applying Social Cognitive Theory, it can be theorized that the increased  
177 confidence may correlate with an increased likelihood that students will partake in activities that draw  
178 upon the material covered in the lab session. Further, while all areas covered in the lab's various  
179 methods saw a significant increase in student confidence, a smaller increase was seen for material  
180 covered via pre-lab recordings. Because the role of the pharmacist in disease state management is likely  
181 to continue to grow it is important to instill confidence in students regarding topics such as diabetes  
182 hinge upon a mixture of pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic management.

183

184

185 **References**

- 186 1. Chronic Diseases in America. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.  
187 <https://www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease/resources/infographic/chronic-diseases.htm>. Published  
188 January 12, 2021.
- 189 2. Michas F. Time physicians spent with patient U.S. 2018. Statista.  
190 <https://www.statista.com/statistics/250219/us-physicians-opinion-about-their-compensation/>.  
191 Published August 9, 2019.
- 192 3. By the numbers: How community pharmacists measure up. National Association of Chain Drug  
193 Stores. [http://www.nacds.org/pdfs/RxImpact\\_March 2015.pdf](http://www.nacds.org/pdfs/RxImpact_March 2015.pdf). Published March 1, 2015
- 194 4. Mercadante AR, Yokota M, Hwang A, Hata M, Law AV. Choosing Evolution over Extinction:  
195 Integrating Direct Patient Care Services and Value-Based Payment Models into the Community-  
196 Based Pharmacy Setting. *Pharmacy*. 2020; 8(3):128. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy8030128>
- 197 5. National Diabetes Statistics Report, 2020. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.  
198 <https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/library/features/diabetes-stat-report.html#:~:text=New in 2020,>  
199 the report,1 in 3—have prediabetes. Published February 11, 2020. Accessed August 28, 2020.
- 200 6. The Pharmacists' Patient Care Process. JCPP. <https://jcpc.net/patient-care-process/>. Published  
201 October 26, 2018.
- 202 7. Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2021 *Diabetes Care* Jan 2021, 44 (Supplement 1) S1-  
203 S2; DOI: 10.2337/dc21-Sint
- 204 8. [https://care.diabetesjournals.org/content/44/Supplement\\_1/S111](https://care.diabetesjournals.org/content/44/Supplement_1/S111)
- 205 9. BC-ADM. Association of Diabetes Care & Education Specialists.  
206 [https://www.diabeteseducator.org/education/certification/bc\\_adm](https://www.diabeteseducator.org/education/certification/bc_adm).
- 207 10. National DPP Customer Service Center. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.  
208 <https://nationaldppcsc.cdc.gov/s/article/Summary-of-National-DPP-Pharmacy-Resources>.
- 209 11. Social Cognitive Learning Theory. Emergency Communication Preparedness Implementation Kit.  
210 <https://sbccimplementationkits.org/sbcc-in-emergencies/social-cognitive-learning-theory/>.  
211 Accessed August 25, 2020.
- 212 12. Donohoe KL, Raghavan A, Tran TT, Alotaibi FM, Powers KE, Frankart LM. A Laboratory Session to  
213 Prepare Pharmacy Students to Manage the Opioid Crisis Situation. *Am J Pharm Educ*.  
214 2019;83(7):6988. doi:10.5688/ajpe6988
- 215 13. Frame TR, Gryka R, Kiersma ME, Todt AL, Cailor SM, Chen AM. Student Perceptions of and  
216 Confidence in Self-Care Course Concepts Using Team-based Learning. *Am J Pharm Educ*.  
217 2016;80(3):46. doi:10.5688/ajpe80346
- 218 14. Ferreri SP, O'Connor SK. Redesign of a large lecture course into a small-group learning  
219 course. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2013;77(1):13. doi:10.5688/ajpe77113

220

221

Table 1: Respondent Demographics (n=122)

| Demographic   | # yes (%)  |
|---|------------|
| Gender  |            |
| --Female  | 79 (65.3%) |
| --Male  | 41 (33.9%) |
| --Prefer not to answer  | 1 (0.08%)  |
| Do you have community pharmacy experience?                            | 98 (81.0%) |
| Do you have other pharmacy experience?                                | 36 (29.8%) |
| Have you or a close family member been diagnosed with diabetes?       | 55 (45.5%) |
| Have you participated in any elective diabetes management activities? | 4 (3.3%)   |

222

223

Table 2: Survey Results – Changes in Confidence and Impact of Activities on Learning

| I feel confident in my ability to counsel a patient regarding: |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Prompt:  | Change as Medians (interquartile ranges) of change in Likert scale (range 1-5) | p-value (from Wilcoxon signed-rank non-parametric test for change) |
| GLP-1 Receptor Agonist Administration                          | 2 (1,3)  | < 0.0001   |
| Basic Insulin Pump Settings                                    | 2 (1,3)  | < 0.0001   |
| Insulin administration using vial and syringe                  | 2 (1,3)  | < 0.0001   |
| Troubleshooting glucometer issues                              | 1 (1,2)  | < 0.0001   |
| Proper glucometer technique                                    | 0 (0,1)  | < 0.0001   |
| Insulin administration using an insulin pen                    | 2 (1,2)  | < 0.0001   |
| When to recommend pharm. Vs non-pharm interventions            | 1 (0,2)  | < 0.0001   |
| Carbohydrate counting  | 1 (0,2)  | < 0.0001   |
| Effects of exercise on blood glucose                           | 0 (0,1)  | < 0.0001   |
| Exercise goals in diabetes                                     | 1 (0,2)  | < 0.0001   |
| Dietary recommendations  | 1 (0,1)  | < 0.0001   |
| _____ Activity aided in my understanding of lab material.      |  |  |
| Activity and Response  | Frequency (percentage)   |  |
| Pre-lab device demonstration                                   |  |  |
| Strongly agree   | 73 (60.3)  |  |
| Somewhat agree   | 42 (34.7)  |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree                                     | 5 (4.1)  |  |
| Somewhat disagree  | 0 (0)  |  |
| Strongly disagree  | 1 (0.8)  |  |
| Pre-lab recorded PowerPoint presentation                       |  |  |
| Strongly agree   | 40 (33.1)  |  |
| Somewhat agree   | 65 (53.7)  |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree                                     | 11 (9.1)   |  |
| Somewhat disagree  | 4 (3.3)  |  |
| Strongly disagree  | 1 (0.8)  |  |
| In-lab insulin injection simulation                            |  |  |
| Strongly agree   | 89 (73.6)  |  |

|                                   |           |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Somewhat agree                    | 29 (34.0) |
| Neither agree nor disagree        | 1 (0.8)   |
| Somewhat disagree                 | 1 (0.8)   |
| Strongly disagree                 | 1 (0.8)   |
| In-lab diabetes device counseling |           |
| Strongly agree                    | 80 (66.1) |
| Somewhat agree                    | 34 (28.1) |
| Neither agree nor disagree        | 4 (3.3)   |
| Somewhat disagree                 | 1 (0.8)   |
| Strongly disagree                 | 2 (1.7)   |
| In-lab diabetes device discussion |           |
| Strongly agree                    | 79 (65.3) |
| Somewhat agree                    | 29 (24.0) |
| Neither agree nor disagree        | 9 (7.4)   |
| Somewhat disagree                 | 3 (2.5)   |
| Strongly disagree                 | 1 (0.8)   |
| In-lab insulin pump discussion    |           |
| Strongly agree                    | 70 (57.9) |
| Somewhat agree                    | 35 (28.9) |
| Neither agree nor disagree        | 10 (8.3)  |
| Somewhat disagree                 | 5 (4.1)   |
| Strongly disagree                 | 1 (0.8)   |

225

226