



Pharmacoeconomic Debate Competition
California Northstate University College of Pharmacy

Project Description

The Pharmacoeconomic Debate Competition requires teams of 3-6 pharmacy students who will be assigned a side of a controversial, on-going issue/topic. For example, students may debate on topics such as whether the United States should adopt or avoid universal health care. The team is responsible for submitting an outline, a final paper and presentation showcasing their argument, and also addressing any opposition that may be faced or provided by the countering team.

When teams generate their arguments, they must consider how each perspective of the situation has a different viewpoint about the impact and influence throughout all branches in the healthcare system. This begins at the drug manufacturer, goes through the payers, and ultimately reaches the patient. Due to the complexity of the task, they are assigned and in constant contact with a professional advisor who helps guide the team. Teams are able to develop a working relationship with their advisor and learn directly from their in-depth conversations what they may not learn from their pharmacy school curriculum.

Inception & Implementation

The inception of the idea was inspired by the absolute absence of outcomes research or pharmacoeconomic related activity on our campus. Our campus consistently participates in the P&T competition, however, there was no growth in other areas- areas where the healthcare industry was heading and emphasizing at the time. Our chapter felt the best way to expose students to pharmacoeconomics and outcomes research was to involve them; whether that be through a day-long seminar, a conference or a competition. After multiple brainstorm sessions, we decided to spearhead the creation of a competition. We also saw this competition as an innovative means to further develop our relationship with nearby pharmacy schools. There are three other schools in our region which are within a ninety-minute proximity from our campus: UCSF School of Pharmacy, Touro University College of Pharmacy, and University of the Pacific School of Pharmacy & Health Sciences. We were confident this was a great way to generate interest and network with other schools because we understood how under-addressed pharmacoeconomics is in pharmacy school curriculums and that no other similar competitions existed.

Before approaching other schools however, we had to solidify our plan to ease the adoption of the competition. We first began with a timeline of what participants will do and by when. Further development lead to the creation of milestone assignments such as the outline, final paper, and presentation. Once having built a better framework, we began searching for a topic for the debate competition. This required staying up to date with industry events and headlines in order to find the right topic. After some time, we proposed to have the topic be

on the importation of foreign medications into the US as this was of great controversy during the 2016 presidential election. After the topic was selected, we began formulating and aligning the project and rubric to emphasize what we felt is important for a student who may be participating in the competition. The final rubric showed that the projects would be graded on the basis of the following:

1. Quality of Sources
2. Presentation of Data
3. Cohesiveness to the Topic
4. Extent of Outsourcing
5. Consideration of Multiple Factors
6. Addressing the Opposition
7. Innovation/Creativity/Solutions
8. Incorporation of Outcomes Research

Once we felt all components of the competition were completed, all the information was to be presented and compiled on a website which would later be used to present the idea to the schools. In theory, at this point in time, the debate competition may have been ready to launch; however, we wanted to get through one last checkpoint before the idea reached the public. The last checkpoint was to consult professionals and alumni who work in the related fields and have great leadership experience. This last checkpoint served multiple purposes:

1. To learn from other's leadership experiences while embarking on this endeavor
2. To predict and foresee issues our team could not foresee due to lack of experience or lack of consideration of a certain situation
3. To perfect and fine tune the idea before launch
4. To build a supportive network and understand where to go for guidance throughout this project

This was the last step before we began exposing the debate competition to the public. We started contacting schools within our region to achieve regional implementation and launch of our debate competition. Conference calls included our board and the other school's AMCP student chapter board where we explained to them the idea, how our timeline and competition will be executed and how to properly market to their student body. If interested and willing to cooperate, we provided all resources necessary to be included in the competition.

Purpose

- Work directly with industry leaders and professionals to provide evidence-based arguments
- Identify economic trends and influences affecting multi-billion dollar market & understand decisions driven by unforeseen forces
- Study the cause-and-effect legislation has on decisions impacting healthcare
- Develop an outcomes research mindset to better understand the effects HEOR (Health Economics & Outcomes Research) has on healthcare
- Analyze and utilize data to predict future outcomes of the pharmaceutical industry
- Extract information from all branches of pharmacy to properly investigate the consequences or benefits gained

Budget
Prize Money- \$500 Big Check- \$50 Gifts for Judges- \$60 Food for Judges- \$20
Target Population
<p>We wanted to target pharmacy students from all years interested in non-traditional pharmacy with a curiosity for pharmacoconomics, outcomes research, and the influences into healthcare industry as a whole. Students that participated enjoyed experiencing and learning more about the intersection between healthcare, pharmacy and business. This competition also catered towards students who wanted to challenge themselves to go beyond their therapeutic knowledge provided to them by their pharmacy school curriculum.</p>
Who Was Involved
<p>Students: Participants</p> <p>AMCP Student Chapter Executive Board: Organized and launched this competition in addition to the other AMCP chapter executive boards who agreed to bring this competition to their campus and participate in this regional competition.</p> <p>Advisors: Professionals currently working in the field who helped guide teams as they work on their projects. Responsibilities included approving the outline to ensure the team is on the right track in addition to addressing any questions the team may have. Advisors provided a professional and experienced opinion which may be difficult to get from the usual pharmacy school curriculum.</p> <p>Judges: Professionals who helped judge the final paper, presentation and select the finalists who will be chosen to debate. In addition, they attended the actual debate competition and judged the debate to ultimately choose a winner.</p> <p>Consulted Professionals: These professionals were alumni who are now working in the related fields. They were consulted for many reasons, but consultation was necessary as this was a grand journey. Any advice was beneficial as this was a task foreign to everyone involved. From the consultation we were able to: learn from others leadership experiences while embarking on this endeavor, predict and foresee issues our team could not foresee due to lack of experience or lack of consideration of a certain situation, perfect and fine tune the idea before launch, and build a supportive network and understand where to go for guidance throughout this project.</p>

Materials

Website (<http://ispordebate.weebly.com>): Broadcast and centralize information to those who may need it. Also served as a portal to register and see examples of the assignments required for the competition.

Flyer: Circulated to advertise and provide quick information. Flyer included website address, “Benefits of the Competition” list, milestone assignment due dates, and award money information. The “Benefits of the Competition” was a marketing tactic to show exactly what the competitor will gain from this competition and also serve as a CV description for those who want to list the experience in their CV.

Words from the Wise Endorsement Videos: This video series essentially served as commercials which were videos by professionals working in the related fields explaining how the competition relates to working professionals and how the skills they gain are transferable to the workplace.

(https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=2&v=ozXQyD7G8XA)

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DvwD7WRvWE>)

Prize Money: Prize money was used as an incentive for students to participate. This was the first year this competition was held and due to the lack of a reputation for the competition, we felt there needed to be a greater incentive. Therefore, we fundraised to award the first place team prize money to be split amongst the team members.

Timeline & Execution

Date	Activity
February – March 2017	Building framework such as timeline, assignments, rules and requirements of the competition.
April 2017	Topic selection and rubric
May – August 2017	Topic presentation to professionals, consultations, and fine tuning project.
September 2017	Compose marketing materials such as flyer, website, and “Words from the Wise” videos.
October 2017	Presenting and meeting with other pharmacy schools to present the idea and encourage them to participate, begin advertising competition.
November 2017	Open registration and continue to advertise. As teams register, find advisors to connect the teams to.
January 2018	Close registration and release case! Begin fundraising for prize money.
February 2018	Outline with advisor approval is due.
March 2018	Final presentation and paper is due. Two finalists are chosen and invited to debate.
April 2018	Debate Day!

Project Evaluation & Reflection

Pros: Received lots of positive feedback on the idea, students enjoyed having an advisor accessible, students felt the timeline and milestone assignments reinforced a comfortable work pace even with a team effort, workload was not overwhelming, challenging, learned a great deal from the competition and potential employers in interviews enjoyed hearing about the experience

Cons: Topic may have been too broad and should stray away legislation that has been challenged and has actions already in place, topic question should be more clear and direct, and timeline of the competition has a strong overlap with P&T competition.

In conclusion, there was overwhelming support to continue this debate competition. Judges and advisors enjoyed participating and asked to participate in the following years to come. Students enjoyed this experience as the concept and content of the competition was abstract yet exciting. Although the first year was hosted at California Northstate University, UCSF proposed to host in the following year which helps further penetrate the region with this competition, but also brings two campuses closer together by increased collaboration and interaction.

FIRST ANNUAL ISPOR DEBATE

MILESTONE DUE DATES:

OUTLINE - FEB 23

PAPER - MARCH 23

FINAL PRESENTATION - 4/5

(LOCATION : CALIFORNIA NORTHSTATE
UNIVERSITY)

REGISTRATION:

Opens: 11/6

Closes: 1/25

1st Prize: \$500

Benefits

IDENTIFY ECONOMIC TRENDS AND
INFLUENCES AFFECTING THE MULTI-BILLION DOLLAR
MARKET

STUDY THE CAUSE-AND-EFFECT LEGISLATION HAS ON
DECISIONS MADE BY THE PHARMACEUTICAL
INDUSTRY

BE ABLE TO EXTRACT INFORMATION FROM ALL
BRANCHES OF PHARMACY TO PROPERLY
INVESTIGATE THE CONSEQUENCES OR BENEFITS
GAINED

DEVELOP AN 'OUTCOMES RESEARCH' MINDSET TO
BETTER UNDERSTAND THE EFFECTS HEOR HAS ON
THE WORLD OF PHARMACY

DESIGN AN OUTCOMES RESEARCH AND
PHARMACOECONOMICS ANALYSIS TO EVALUATE THE
CURRENT SITUATION OF THE PHARMACEUTICAL
INDUSTRY

WEBSITE:

ispordebate2017.weebly.com