

**Swansea University, Master of Pharmacy  
(MPharm) degree and MPharm degree with  
preparatory year Step 6 accreditation event  
report, June 2024**



# Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Event summary and conclusions</b> .....   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>Introduction</b> .....  | <b>3</b>  |
| Role of the GPhC.....  | 3         |
| Background.....  | 3         |
| Documentation.....   | 5         |
| Pre-event.....   | 5         |
| The event.....   | 5         |
| Declarations of interest .....   | 5         |
| Schedule .....   | 6         |
| Attendees .....  | 8         |
| <b>Key findings - Part 1 Learning outcomes</b> .....   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Key findings - Part 2 Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists</b> .....                           | <b>11</b> |
| Standard 1: Selection and admission .....  | 11        |
| Standard 2: Equality, diversity and fairness .....   | 12        |
| Standard 3: Resources and capacity.....  | 12        |
| Standard 4: Managing, developing and evaluating MPharm degrees .....   | 13        |
| Standard 5: Curriculum design and delivery .....   | 14        |
| Standard 6: Assessment.....  | 17        |
| Standard 7: Support and development for student pharmacists and everyone involved in the delivery of the MPharm degree ..... | 19        |
| Decision descriptors.....  | 22        |

## Event summary and conclusions

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Provider</b>              | Swansea University  |
| <b>Courses</b>               | Master of Pharmacy (MPharm) degree<br>Master of Pharmacy (MPharm) degree with preparatory year  |
| <b>Event type</b>            | Step 6 accreditation  |
| <b>Event date</b>            | 26-27 June 2024   |
| <b>Approval period</b>       | Working towards accreditation   |
| <b>Relevant requirements</b> | <a href="#">Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021</a>   |
| <b>Outcome</b>               | <p>Approval to progress to next step, with conditions.</p> <p>The accreditation team agreed to recommend to the Registrar of the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) that the proposed new MPharm degree and MPharm degree with preparatory year to be delivered by Swansea University should be permitted to move from step 6 to step 7 of the accreditation process for new MPharm degrees, subject to two conditions.</p>  |
| <b>Conditions</b>            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An appropriate standard-setting process must be used to set the pass criteria for all summative assessments, including MCQ and EMQ assessments, which must be in place from the 2024/25 academic year. This is to meet criterion 6.4.</li> <li>2. An additional process must be introduced to the marking of OSCEs which provides a fair and robust mechanism for review of any student actions which raise potential patient safety issues that fall outside of the pre-identified red flags within the mark scheme. This is because the current marking arrangements that have been presented have the potential to permit a student to pass the OSCE where they have met the pass mark and critical elements, but their actions have demonstrated unsafe practice. This process must be in place from the 2024/25 academic year for OSCEs in Years 2 to 4. This is to meet criteria 6.5 and 6.6.</li> </ol> <p>Evidence of how the conditions have been addressed must be sent to the GPhC, for approval by the accreditation team by 13 September 2024.</p> |
| <b>Standing conditions</b>   | The standing conditions of accreditation can be found <a href="#">here</a> .  |
| <b>Recommendations</b>       | No recommendations were made.   |

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Registrar decision</b>     | <p>Following the event, the provider submitted documentation to address the conditions and the accreditation team was satisfied that both conditions had been addressed satisfactorily and the related criteria were now met.</p> <p>The Registrar<sup>1</sup> accepted the team's recommendation and granted permission for the Swansea University MPharm degree to progress to step 7 of the accreditation process.</p>   |
| <b>Key contact (provider)</b> | <p>Professor Andrew Morris, Head of Pharmacy*</p> <p>Ms. Emma Westwood, Academic Quality and Programme Development Lead*</p>  |
| <b>Accreditation team</b>     | <p>Professor Chris Langley (Team leader), Professor of Pharmacy Law &amp; Practice and Deputy Dean of the College of Health and Life Sciences, Aston University*</p> <p>Dr Gemma Quinn (team member - academic), Head of School of Pharmacy and Medical Sciences, University of Bradford</p> <p>Ravi Savania (team member - academic), Associate Professor of Pharmacy Education, School Director of Teaching and Learning, University of Reading****</p> <p>Shahzad Ahmad (team member - pharmacist), Clinical Lead, NHS England Transformation Directorate</p> <p>Olivia Fisher (team member - pharmacist newly qualified), Specialist Medicines Information Pharmacist, John Radcliffe Hospital</p> <p>Katie Carter (team member - lay), Consultant in Healthcare Regulation and Education</p> |
| <b>GPhC representative</b>    | <p>Philippa McSimpson, Quality Assurance Manager (Education), General Pharmaceutical Council</p> <p>Damian Day, Head of Education, General Pharmaceutical Council**</p>   |
| <b>Rapporteur</b>             | <p>Ian Marshall, Proprietor, Caldarvan Research (Educational and Writing Services); Emeritus Professor of Pharmacology, University of Strathclyde</p>   |
| <b>Observer</b>               | <p>Roz Gittins, Chief Pharmaceutical Officer and Deputy Registrar, General Pharmaceutical Council***</p>  |

\*Attended pre-event meeting

\*\*Attended pre-event meeting only

\*\*\* Attended Day 1 only

---

<sup>1</sup> Or appointed delegate

\*\*\*\*Unable to attend, but submitted draft questions

## Introduction

### Role of the GPhC

The General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) is the statutory regulator for pharmacists and pharmacy technicians and is the accrediting body for pharmacy education in Great Britain. The GPhC is responsible for setting standards and approving education and training courses which form part of the pathway towards registration for pharmacists. The UK qualification required as part of the pathway to registration as a pharmacist is a GPhC-accredited Master of Pharmacy degree course (MPharm).

The GPhC's right to check the standards of pharmacy qualifications leading to annotation and registration as a pharmacist is the Pharmacy Order 2010. It requires the GPhC to 'approve' courses by appointing 'visitors' (accreditors) to report to the GPhC's Council on the 'nature, content and quality' of education as well as 'any other matters' the Council may require.

The powers and obligations of the GPhC in relation to the accreditation of pharmacy education are legislated in the Pharmacy Order 2010. For more information, visit:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/231/contents/made>

The GPhC's process for initial accreditation of a UK MPharm degree involves seven steps, each of which are normally completed in consecutive academic years. Step 1 involves an initial engagement meeting by an application institution to share their proposal and no formal decision on accreditation is made. For steps 2 to 7, the process requires a formal evaluation of the programme and the providers progress towards meeting the [Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021](#). Step accreditation events are held on-site at the provider's proposed delivery location and involve a full accreditation team.

Following successful completion of step 3, students may be accepted on to year 1 of the programme. Each accreditation step must be passed successfully in order to progress to the next. An MPharm degree holds provisional accreditation status until the provider has completed all seven steps successfully.

### Background

#### MPharm degree

Early in 2018, Swansea University Medical School approached the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) to accredit a new MPharm degree, the intention being to admit the first cohort of students in the 2020/2021 academic year. A Step 1 event occurred on 25 May 2018, following which the University was permitted to proceed to step 2 of the seven-step accreditation process. Following successful step 2 (September 2019) and step 3 (September 2020) events, the University was permitted to accept its first intake of student onto its new MPharm degree and to progress to step 4 subject to one condition; this required the University to remove the vacation optional module between years 2 and 3, because the team regarded this as potentially unfair to students who may not be able to engage with it. This condition was met

Steps 1-3 of the accreditation process for Swansea University had been to the GPhC 2011 'Future Pharmacists: Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists'. In January 2021 the

GPhC published updated Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists and required that all students starting on an MPharm degree in the 2021/22 academic year onwards must meet the requirements of the 2021 standards. The first cohort of Swansea University MPharm students started in the 2021/22 academic year and as such, this cohort, and all future cohorts, would be required to meet the requirements of the GPhC 2021 standards. It was agreed that Swansea University would be reviewed against the 2021 standards for the remaining steps of the accreditation process, with the accreditation team having regard for the transition between standards.

### **MPharm degree with preparatory year**

The GPhC began accrediting MPharm degrees with a preparatory year as a separate course to the MPharm degree in 2020/21. Prior to this, the accreditation of the MPharm degree component of the course was accepted to allow students entry to pre-registration training.

An MPharm degree with preparatory year is a single course that leads to a Master of Pharmacy award. It is recruited to separately from the accredited 4-year MPharm degree and is assigned a different UCAS code. For most schools this will be a 5-year course which includes a preparatory year followed by four further taught years that are the same as that of the accredited MPharm degree.

An MPharm with preparatory year must meet all of the GPhC's initial education and training standards for pharmacists in all years of the course. All teaching and assessment of the learning outcomes is expected to take place in taught years 2-5, with the first taught year being set aside for preparatory learning only. For the purpose of accreditation, it is assumed that the course content for the four taught years following the preparatory year will be identical for students on the MPharm degree and the MPharm degree with preparatory year.

During step 3 of the accreditation process at Swansea University, the University informed the GPhC that an 'MPharm with a Foundation Year' (henceforward referred to as MPharm with Preparatory Year), based on a similar programme for entry to the Medical School, was undergoing approval by the University; the approval was confirmed in December 2020. The programme includes two modules, one with a chemistry focus and the second with a focus on pharmacy practice. The pharmacy practice-focussed module will include an assessment that is similar to that used for the interview process for admission to the MPharm and will employ MMIs (see standard 1). The 'MPharm with Preparatory Year' will have its own UCAS code distinguishing it from the standard MPharm.

### **Steps 4 and 5**

The Step 4 event took place on 13-14 July 2022 at which time the accreditation team agreed to recommend that the MPharm degree and MPharm with preparatory year be accredited to proceed from step 4 to step 5 of the process for new MPharm degrees. This meant that the degrees were provisionally accredited for another year. The recommendation was subject to two recommendations that 1. in relation to criterion 1.7, consideration should be given to harmonising the approaches to admissions at the point of initial selection in both versions of the MPharm degree. In particular, the use of interactive components for admission to the five-year course; and 2. in relation to criteria 6.4, 6.6 and 6.7 further consideration should be given to the contemporary nature of the standard-setting methodologies used. The team recommended that the Pharmacy team sought advice from elsewhere in the Faculty of Medicine, Health and Life Science, where such methodologies are already embedded. This issue would be revisited in future step events.

The Step 5 event took place on 14-15 June 2023, when the accreditation team agreed to recommend that the MPharm degree and MPharm with preparatory year be accredited to proceed from step 5 to

step 6 subject to one condition, with the degrees provisionally accredited for another year. The condition was that that the School revisit and develop its standard-setting approach. This was because the team agreed that it was not coherent at present. Specifically, the condition was that a fully developed standard-setting policy be developed and be in place for the start of the 2023/2024 academic year, when the MPharm Third Year will be delivered. It must have a coherent overall rationale, which the current approach does not; and a rationale for using particular standard-setting methodologies for particular modes of assessment, which may vary between modes. This was to meet criterion 6.7. The team also recommended that the School clarify and justify its position in relation to failing critical OSCE stations and the School's resit policy in relation to OSCEs. In particular, the number of critical fails which would result in failure of the OSCE overall. This was a patient safety issue, in the team's view.

Following the Step 5 event, the Registrar of the GPhC accepted the accreditation team's recommendation and confirmed that Swansea University be permitted to move from step 5 to step 6 of the process for new MPharm degrees with the Step 6 accreditation taking place on-site in the 2023/24 academic year. This is the report of the Step 6 event.

## Documentation

Prior to the event, the provider submitted documentation to the GPhC in line with the agreed timescales. The documentation was reviewed by the accreditation team 'the team' and it was deemed to be satisfactory to provide a basis for discussion.

## Pre-event

In advance of the main event, a pre-event meeting took place via videoconference on 24 May 2024. The purpose of the pre-event meeting was to prepare for the event, allow the GPhC and the provider to ask any questions or seek clarification, and to finalise arrangements for the event. The provider was advised of areas that were likely to be explored further by the accreditation team during the event

## The event

The event was held on site on 26-27 June 2024 and comprised of a series of meetings between the GPhC accreditation team and representatives of the MPharm programme. The team also met with a group of students from four years of the programmes being taught.

## Declarations of interest

Professor Langley declared that he had co-supervised the PhD thesis of Dr Adam Turner, a member of the Pharmacy academic staff of Swansea University. It was agreed that this did not constitute a conflict of interest.

Professor Guirguis also declared that she had become an External Examiner for the MPharm at the University of Bradford where Dr. Quinn (Accreditation team, academic member) is the Head of School.

## Schedule

### Day 1: 26 June 2024

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | Private meeting of the accreditation team including break |
| <b>1. Welcome and introductions</b>   |   |
| -   |   |
| <b>Management and oversight of the MPharm degree</b>  |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Presentation from provider (maximum 25 minutes) covering updates since the last event, and developments and plans in relation to:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Resources (including facilities, staffing and placement capacity)</li><li>○ Management of risk</li><li>○ Selection and admissions</li><li>○ Monitoring, review and evaluation of the MPharm and MPharm with preparatory year</li><li>○ Collaboration with statutory education body and others</li><li>○ Any other high level updates</li><li>○ Specific areas of standards 1,2,3,4, and 7 as identified by the accreditation team (shared at pre-event meeting).</li></ul></li><li>• <b>Questions and discussions</b></li></ul> |   |
| This session will focus on:   |   |
| Standard 1: Selection and admission   |   |
| Standard 2: Equality, diversity and fairness (Systems policies and data monitoring aspects)   |   |
| Standard 3: Resources and capacity  |   |
| Standard 4: Managing, developing and evaluating MPharm degrees  |   |
| Standard 7: Support and development [...] everyone involved in the delivery of the MPharm degree  |   |
|   | Lunch break and private meeting of the accreditation team |
| <b>2. Meeting with students</b>   |   |
| Students in Years 0 (preparatory year), 1, 2 and 3  |   |
|   | Break   |
| <b>3. Teaching, learning, support and assessment part 1</b>   |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Presentation from provider (maximum 15 minutes) covering:</b></li></ul>  |   |



○ Delivery of the MPharm during the 2023/24 academic year:

- Year 0 (preparatory year)
- Year 1
- Year 2
- Year 3

● **Questions and discussion**

This session will focus on:

Standard 2: Equality diversity and fairness (curriculum and student support aspects)

Standard 5: Curriculum design and delivery

Standard 6: Assessment

Standard 7: Support and development for student pharmacists [...]

Private meeting of the accreditation team

**Day 2: 27 June 2024**

Private meeting of the accreditation team

**4. Teaching, learning, support and assessment part 2**

● **Presentation from provider (maximum 20 minutes) covering:**

- Plans for delivery of year 4 of the MPharm, including:
  - Experiential learning
  - Interprofessional learning
  - How the curriculum will increase in complexity and build upon students knowledge and skills gained from earlier years
  - Developing students' foundation of knowledge and core skills required for safe and effective prescribing.
  - Assessment at the 'does' level of competency
  - Preparing students for the Oriel application process
  - Preparing students for foundation training
  - Any specific areas of standards 2, 5, 6 and 7 as identified by the accreditation team (shared at pre-event meeting).

Private meeting of the accreditation team

**5. Teaching, learning, support and assessment - part 3:**

- A detailed look at the teaching, learning and assessment of a sample of learning outcomes selected by the accreditation team (As shared at the pre-event meeting)

Private meeting of the accreditation team

## 6. Deliver outcome to programme provider

## Attendees

### Course provider

The accreditation team met with the following representatives of the provider:

| Name                      | Designation at the time of accreditation event                       |
|---------------------------|--|
| Professor Andrew Morris*  | Head of Pharmacy / Drugs and Medicines Teaching Group Lead           |
| Emma Westwood*            | Academic Quality and Programme Development Lead                      |
| Professor Amira Guirguis* | MPharm Programme Director / Practice of Pharmacy Teaching Group Lead |
| Dr Adam Turner            | MPharm Year 0 & Year 1 Lead  |
| Dr Rhian Thomas           | MPharm Year 2 Lead   |
| Dr Michael McKeever       | MPharm Year 3 Lead / Pharmacy EDI Lead                               |
| Simon Wilkins             | Pharmacy Placements Lead   |
| Dr Salvatore Ferla        | Pharmacy Admissions Tutor  |
| Dr Zi Hong Mok            | Pharmacy Exams Officer   |
| Dr Suresh Mohankumar      | Health, Disease and Patients Teaching Group Lead                     |
| Dr Georgina Marsh         | MPharm Year 4 Lead / IPE Lead  |
| Dr Juman Dujaili          | Fitness to Practice Lead / Assessments Lead                          |
| Kate Spittle              | Associate Professor in Clinical Pharmacy                             |
| Professor Margaret Allen  | Pharmacy Dean, HEIW  |
| Laura Doyle               | Head of Undergraduate and Foundation Education, HEIW                 |
| Dr Melanie Healy          | Senior Tutor   |
| Sophie Croucher           | Teacher-Practitioner, Swansea Bay University Health Board            |
| Charlotte Waller          | Teacher Practitioner, Swansea Bay University Health Board            |
| Dr Gilda Padalino         | Lecturer   |
| Dr Gillian Phua           | Lecturer   |
| Dr Giulio Nannetti        | Academic Disability Coordinator                                      |
| Gwenno Williams           | Teacher-Practitioner, Hywel Dda University Health Board              |
| Dr Nia Davies             | Medical School Education Lead  |

\* attended the pre-event meeting

The accreditation team also met a group of MPharm students as below:

| <b>Current year of study</b> | <b>MPharm<br/>(4-year)</b> | <b>MPharm<br/>with<br/>preparatory<br/>year (5-year)</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------|
| Year 0                       |                            | 0  | 0            |
| Year 1                       | 4                          | 1  | 5            |
| Year 2                       | 4                          | 2  | 6            |
| Year 3                       | 4                          | N/A  | 4            |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>12</b>                  | <b>3</b>   | <b>15</b>    |

## Key findings - Part 1 Learning outcomes

The team reviewed the commentary in the submission to all 55 learning outcomes relating to the MPharm degrees. To gain additional assurance the team also tested a sample of **six** learning outcomes during the event, and was satisfied that **all 55 learning outcomes were likely to be met** to a level as required by the GPhC standards. The following learning outcomes were tested at the event: **9, 18, 28, 29, 35 and 38**. The team also agreed that a further tranche of GPhC learning outcomes be tested at the Step 7 event.

## Key findings - Part 2 Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists

### Standard 1: Selection and admission

Students must be selected for and admitted onto MPharm degrees on the basis that they are being prepared to practise as a pharmacist

|                   |       |   |                                  |
|-------------------|-------|---|----------------------------------|
| Criterion 1.1 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 1.2 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 1.3 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 1.4 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 1.5 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 1.6 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 1.7 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 1.8 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 1.9 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |

The submitted documentation indicated that the Step 5 commentary continued to reflect how the principles of equality, diversity and fairness are built into the selection processes. The MPharm and MPharm with a Preparatory (Foundation) Year course page links have been updated to include any change introduced in the admission process, for example, the introduction of interviews and an interactive component for the MPharm with a Preparatory Year. Meetings between HEIW and the Welsh MPharm providers have become more regular as the new Funded Pharmacy Undergraduate Placement Programme (FPUPP) has been formally rolled out.

Although the MMIs processes for the 4-year programme remain largely unchanged, some adjustments have been made to further enhance fairness and provide all applicants with an equal opportunity to demonstrate their best ability in all stations. A selection process has been implemented for the 5-year MPharm with a Preparatory Year degree, which consists of a one-to-one online interview that evaluates knowledge of the pharmacy profession, problem-solving and group-working, and ethics, all adapted to level 0 entry. The team was told that evaluation of numeracy skills has been moved to an online assessment to reduce stress for applicants. Bilingual interviews are an option, but so far only one applicant has opted for this. The aim is to have at least one fluent Welsh-speaking academic involved in every MMI. Student enrolments are broken down at the MPharm programme/year level by protected characteristics, Welsh fluency, and widening access. Small current cohort sizes mean that robust and statistically significant data is limited, but feedback from successful applicants has been used to improve the admissions processes and make adjustments to further enhance fairness. The MPharm programme pages continue to be updated regularly in both English and Welsh, including any required changes. MPharm students have been participants in all University Open Days, serving as student ambassadors, joining the presentations led by Pharmacy academic staff.

## Standard 2: Equality, diversity and fairness

MPharm degrees must be based on, and promote, the principles of equality, diversity and fairness; meet all relevant legal requirements; and be delivered in such a way that the diverse needs of all students are met

|                   |                              |   |                                  |
|-------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Criterion 2.1 is: | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 2.2 is: | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 2.3 is: | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 2.4 is: | Met <input type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met ✓                        | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 2.5 is: | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 2.6 is: | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |

The submission indicated that as of April 2024, the Pharmacy academic team remains gender-balanced. Of the 20 academic staff, 11 are female, nine are male. All new academic staff appointed since Step 5 have completed the University's Equality and Diversity in the Workplace and Unconscious Bias training. Data from the University's Data, Information and Insight team allows individual performance to be analysed at a module level by gender, ethnicity, religion and belief, sexual orientation, disability, marital status, age, widening access, low participation background, and entrance via Clearing. The Pharmacy EDI Group which reports to the Pharmacy Management Committee continues to meet regularly to discuss any patterns and potential issues that may arise, however the submission indicated that data is limited. Power BI tools, and analysis and discussions of data is predicted to be more beneficial in coming years as the student cohort size grows and more statistically significant data become available. The team was confident that the School would identify and consider expeditiously any issues that might arise.

The Integrated Case Studies continue to provide the opportunity to introduce diverse fictitious patients to students through Year 2 and Year 3. In addition, within Year 3 students had several weeks dedicated to addressing Special Cohorts where patients with protected characteristics were explored in more detail. Year 4 will include an EDI-focused component.

## Standard 3: Resources and capacity

Resources and capacity must be sufficient to deliver the learning outcomes in these standards

|                   |       |   |                                  |
|-------------------|-------|---|----------------------------------|
| Criterion 3.1 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 3.2 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 3.3 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |

The submission explained that the Step 5 commentary continues to describe the systems in place for the securing of resources to deliver the MPharm programmes. There are presently 11 members of the core pharmacy academic team who are GPhC-registered pharmacists and, of these, seven have

independent prescriber annotations. There are a further five colleagues who are pharmacists registered overseas, in Italy (two), India, Iraq, and Malaysia. The academic team can also draw upon specialist expertise from the wider Medical School and the growing pool of pharmacy honorary appointees and other visiting lecturers. The team learned that the University has been recruiting recently to four pharmacy academic positions. Three of these are new posts while the fourth is a like-for-like replacement. The team was told that the three new posts comprise one Senior Lecturer and one Associate Professor in pharmacy practice/clinical pharmacy, both of which have been offered to candidates, and a Research Chair in pharmacy which has been advertised. The last post will help to lead the development of pharmacy research following the establishment of the PhD in pharmacy in July 2023; there are currently three PhD students and a fourth MRes student who have pharmacy academics as their principal supervisors. The team was told that recruitment of staff was going to plan as the student numbers increase over the years, reaching a steady state in 2028, with a student:staff ratio in the region of 17:1.

The submission explained that the Swansea University Simulation (SUSiM) centre was opened in September 2023. Full audiovisual, scheduling management and assessment features have been installed throughout the facility, which will be employed to host pharmacy OSCEs from 2024/25 as the MPharm cohort size expands. The team was told that the SUSiM contained an immersive radiopharmacy facility along with other suites that could be used for OSCEs. To support some elements of physiology and pharmacology teaching, multidisciplinary dry laboratory space in the Margam Building has been completed and was in use during the 2023/24 academic year. The next phase of this project will see multidisciplinary wet laboratory space added to the same floor, and plans have also been drawn up for a new 90-seat laboratory on the first floor. As pharmacy-related research expands, space has also been allocated in the Grove Building research laboratory. The team agreed that the new facilities would be viewed at the Step 7 event in 2024-25.

## Standard 4: Managing, developing and evaluating MPharm degrees

The quality of the MPharm degree must be managed, developed and evaluated in a systematic way

|                   |       |   |                                  |
|-------------------|-------|---|----------------------------------|
| Criterion 4.1 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 4.2 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 4.3 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 4.4 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 4.5 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 4.6 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |

The programme-level Board of Studies (BoS) continues to provide QA oversight of the MPharm programmes. Students are constituent members of this Board alongside members of the academic and professional services teams. The bi-weekly Pharmacy Management Committee (PMC) meeting chaired by the Head of Pharmacy continues to provide a forum through which pharmacy academic and technical staff can interact and discuss all pharmacy-related matters, including MPharm development and delivery. Continuous curriculum review is based on feedback from students, stakeholders, service users, external examiners, regulators, and others. This has resulted in some redesign of the curriculum to enhance the inclusion of different delivery modes, including Entrustable

Professional Activities (EPAs), assessment to include standard-setting, professional competencies, EDI, module names, and the assessment matrix.

The submission explained that there is now a formal legal agreement in place between the University and HEIW covering the working arrangements, funding, and quality assurance of the Funded Pharmacy Undergraduate Placement Programme (FPUPP). FPUPP is in place for Year 2 and Year 3 of the MPharm as planned. In the 2023/24 academic year, Year 2 students have attended one full week of placements (37.5 hours) and Year 3 students have attended three full weeks of placement (112.5 hours). In the 2024/25 academic year, these placements will be expanded into Year 1 (one week - 37.5 hours) and Year 4 (five weeks – 187.5 hours). The number of placement provider partners with which the University works has expanded and another teacher-practitioner has been employed in Swansea Bay University Health Board with another from Cwm Taf Morgannwg UHB starting imminently. All students will be placed in HEIW quality-assured sites in the coming academic year in different sectors and varying geographic locations within Wales. Tripartite working with HEIW and Cardiff University continues regarding the FPUPP. The EPAs are under continuous review via the All Wales EPA Working Group with student and patient involvement.

The Faculty's Public and Patient Involvement (PPI) Volunteer Group ensures that the views of patients and the public are considered when designing and delivering MPharm degrees. The PPI volunteer group currently has 120 active members, and one of these volunteers remains a member of the Pharmacy BoS. PPI volunteers were involved in the evaluation of the Year 3 research project poster presentations. The Pharmacy BoS also continues to provide a mechanism through which the views of stakeholders are considered in MPharm design and delivery. Constituent members of the Board include pharmacy academics, MPharm students, a patient representative from the PPI Group, and the holders of other key School and Faculty roles. Feedback from student pharmacists is built into the monitoring, review, and evaluation processes.

The plan to provide 55 days of experiential learning during the programmes is on track following the successful rollout of the FPUPP to Year 2 and Year 3 MPharm students over the 2023/24 academic year. There is now a team of patient-facing pharmacy educators with clinical roles that contribute to the design and delivery of the MPharm. This includes currently three teacher-practitioners and eight honorary appointees. This team provides intelligence on clinically-relevant changes in practice, and teacher-practitioners and honorary appointees are encouraged to feed back on the relevance of the MPharm curriculum.

## Standard 5: Curriculum design and delivery

The MPharm degree curriculum must use a coherent teaching and learning strategy to develop the required skills, knowledge, understanding and professional behaviours to meet the outcomes in part 1 of these standards. The design and delivery of MPharm degrees must ensure that student pharmacists practise safely and effectively

|                   |       |   |                                  |
|-------------------|-------|---|----------------------------------|
| Criterion 5.1 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.2 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.3 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.4 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |



|                    |                              |   |                                  |
|--------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Criterion 5.5 is:  | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.6 is:  | Met <input type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met ✓                        | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.7 is:  | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.8 is:  | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.9 is:  | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.10 is: | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.11 is: | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.12 is: | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 5.13 is: | Met ✓                        | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |

Students on both MPharm programmes are informed of the academic regulations, curriculum design, delivery methods, assessment and award practices during a week-long induction. As indicated in the previous step reports, the MPharm curriculum continues to integrate pharmaceutical science and pharmacy practice in a body systems approach to allow achievement of the GPhC learning outcomes in the IETP standards 2021. Further, students are periodically reminded of the academic progression policies via personal tutors, year leads, and module leads. The learning activities required to develop the learner's pre-prescribing skills are embedded throughout the programme. Year 2 and Year 3 students undertook the FPUPP to practise and apply their clinical skills in a range of real-life situations developing their patient-facing and interprofessional skills. These practitioner-guided placements allow students to work on a variety of tasks demonstrating competence in community, hospitals and speciality centres. Alongside the Year 3 patient-centred learning modules and a research project, students are continuing their extended experiential learning through placements and further development of the EPA skill sets. These placements and the associated EPA activity will be rolled out to Year 1 students in the 2024/25 academic year. Each year of the programme contains a zero-credit “Pharmacist as a Professional” module.

Following the completion of the fundamental underpinning science and practice modules, patient-centred learning modules, and the research project module, learners are trained to analyse complex patient scenarios and develop therapeutic strategies and decisions tailored to individual patient needs. The team learned that topics for Year 4 delivery have been decided and that teaching is due to be allocated. Thus, the Year 4 modules have been designed to ensure that learners will achieve the skills as prescribed by the GPhC learning outcome and IETP standards. The two principal modules in Year 4 are “Emerging Therapies and Complex Patients” and “Preparation for Practice & Prescribing”. The Year 4 modules will require students to conduct themselves professionally as they expand their knowledge and understanding across a range of topics relevant to the practice of pharmacy. Students will be expected to implement such skills and knowledge across five weeks of the FPUPP in different practice settings.

Throughout 2023/24, all students continued to have practical experience of working with patients while engaging with their learning, although students in Years 1 and 2 told the team that they had had very limited contact with patients. Year 2 students had had the experience of meeting a patient with Parkinson’s disease in the classroom setting but Year 1 students had not had any classroom-based patient contact. Experiences on placement were complemented and contextualised by additional activities built into workshops. Furthermore, the introduction of a patient-led station as part of the

MPharm admissions multiple mini-interviews, was introduced to inculcate the ethos of learning from and with patients from the very outset. However, students told the team that they had had no or limited experience with carers, although teacher-practitioners told the team that it would be highly likely, but not guaranteed, that students would meet carers as the placement scheme expanded. In 2024/25 all four years of the MPharm degree will transition onto the HEIW-supported experiential learning plan. Taken together, this will contribute to students' exposure to patients in a variety of healthcare settings and will allow them to demonstrate their competence within these settings. In this context, the team was told that EPAs have been developed with HEIW and providers for students to perform in practice. Students will collect evidence for the 16 "does" EPAs, which are broad and have been mapped against the GPhC learning outcomes. The team was told that the academic staff considered that students can meet EPAs from Year 3, and that this will be enhanced by longer Year 3 placements next year plus 2-week placements for Year 2. The team learned that the EPAs form part of the portfolio, which also includes CPD entries and PDP discussion. Clinical competence as expressed in the portfolio is assessed on placement. Academic assessment is by School's academic team.

MPharm students have worked with other healthcare professionals and students from other disciplines in the newly developed Year 3 of the MPharm. The Year 3 curriculum was reviewed and some of the sessions initially proposed as IPE above were taught as dedicated workshops alongside students of Paramedic Science and Healthcare Science. The team was told that the theme of working with other healthcare professionals will continue into Year 4, particularly when students encounter complex patients. Year 4 students will be introduced to working with physician associates in sessions focused on polypharmacy, and community psychiatric nurses on the care home charter. This will culminate in a virtual IPE with multiple healthcare professions, requiring working as a member of the multi-disciplinary team (MDT) at various points across the journey of a complex patient with multi-morbidities.

The team wished to know how professionalism will be built upon through the teaching and learning activities planned for year 4 and was told that professionalism is built up from Year 1 onwards. Year 4 contains revalidation activities, including CPD and peer discussion. The EPAs include assessment on student behaviour/empathy with feedback from the placement supervisor. Simulation experiences provide formative feedback on professionalism, role models will be seen in practice on placement, along with supervised learning events that include professionalism. Any problems can be referred to a Health and Conduct Committee.

In relation to regulations, the team wished to clarify how many attempts a student has at each assessment and was told that students are allowed two attempts at each assessment. The team was told that the OSCE in Year 1, although summative, does not need to be passed as a standalone assessment, but rather is used to introduce students to this type of assessment. The team considered this carefully in relation to criterion 5.8 and on balance agreed that was acceptable. This was because it is in Year 1, and the OSCE is used as a learning experience for reflection. Undertaking the OSCE and experiencing it is summative, and a "must do" element of the coursework.

The team was pleased to learn that no MPharm student concerns have thus far progressed to a formal initiation of an investigation into a student's fitness to practise. Pharmacy has its own fitness to practise system based on the Faculty mechanism. With respect to fitness to practise concerns during placements, the team was told that there were no major concerns at the moment, only a few minor

issues, including one issue over attendance which had been dealt with informally to start. The School works closely with HEIW and placement providers if there is a quality issue at placement site. Students only go on placement to quality assured sites that have received training which includes reporting concerns. Placement providers can report issues directly to HEIW clinical placement supervisors. If there is a student issue HEIW will refer on to the University; if a site issue this will be dealt with by HEIW.

## Standard 6: Assessment

Higher-education institutions must demonstrate that they have a coherent assessment strategy which assesses the required skills, knowledge, understanding and behaviours to meet the learning outcomes in part 1 of these standards. The assessment strategy must assess whether a student pharmacist's practice is safe

|                    |   |  |   |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
| Criterion 6.1 is:  | Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.2 is:  | Met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.3 is:  | Met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.4 is:  | Met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 6.5 is:  | Met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 6.6 is:  | Met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 6.7 is:  | Met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.8 is:  | Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.9 is:  | Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.10 is: | Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.11 is: | Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.12 is: | Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.13 is: | Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Criterion 6.14 is: | Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>            | Not met <input type="checkbox"/>            |

The submission explained that from September 2024 all year groups will be assessed against Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs). This reflects the plan for the full roll-out of the FPUPP to Years 1-4.

The team was told that all assessments are reviewed and explained to students. There are competency-based assessments which must be passed, for example, OSCEs and calculations. Competency assessments use modified Angoff standard-setting or borderline regression (OSCEs) while final written examinations use the University standard pass mark of 40%, or 50% in year 4. All assessments in year 4 must be passed. In their portfolio students must include six EPAs, an attendance element, one CPD, peer discussion and PDP, all marked by academic staff.

In Year 4, to ensure that students have integrated all knowledge and skills required for prescribing practice, a Prescribing Assessment and Patient Enquiries (PAPE) assessment has been included. This will comprise a face-to-face summative assessment with students conducting a full consultation from start to end, including information gathering, conducting assessments or interpreting assessment

results, and patient examination, and prescription-writing. demonstrating the competencies of prescribing governance.

The submission explained that to ensure coherence, the assessment plan for Year 4 builds on the assessment methods from previous years but with increasing complexity. They include standard-set OSCEs, standard-set Prescribing Assessment and Patient Enquiries (PAPE), group work and individual coursework, standard-set pharmaceutical calculation tests, e-portfolios including EPAs, in-class tests and final examinations. All assessments in Year 4 are “must pass” assessments at the University standard pass mark of 50% or the equivalent standard-setting cut score. To ensure readiness for clinical practice, students must demonstrate and evidence the skills and behaviours required of a graduate pharmacist, meeting the 16 GPhC learning outcomes at achievement level of “Does” via the EPAs.

The submission stated that assessments across all academic years are designed to maintain robustness, validity, reliability, and relevance. Both OSCEs and PAPE have been reviewed, redesigned, and enhanced to ensure alignment with the desired learning outcomes to assess the skills and competencies necessary for prescribing and to support students in implementing EPAs on placements. The assessment plan and criteria are made transparent to students. Feedback is provided to students on their performance through Canvas, feedback sessions, one-on-one meetings with personal tutors and Head of Pharmacy workshops. Assessments are moderated by three external examiners. Provisional marks and feedback are typically released to students within a maximum of 15 working days from the date of submission/ completion. Assessments are continuously reviewed to ensure that they are directly aligned with the learning outcomes. Learning outcomes may be met several times through different assessment methods spirally through the degree.

Following the outcome of the Step 5 accreditation event the standard-setting approach has been revisited, with input from the Academic Quality and Programme Development Lead, Academic Quality & Assessment Manager, Head of Assessment for Graduate Entry Medicine, and the Faculty’s Associate Dean (Education). Thus, to ensure the potential safety of patients, several measures have been established, including the use of standard-setting methods such as the modified Angoff and borderline regression. To determine the minimum level of knowledge or skills required to pass, an expert panel defines the criteria of a borderline student for a given type of assessment. These standard-setters have been trained by the Head of Assessment for Graduate Entry Medicine, and the standard assessed to ensure it is as reproducible as possible by undertaking statistical analyses. The measurement error has been acknowledged and a rationale has been developed for standard-setting decisions and adjustments. After each standard-set examination, a sense check has been carried out on the outcomes. Standard-setting is currently being implemented only for pharmaceutical calculations, OSCEs and PAPE, as these competency- and performance-based assessments are deemed essential to safe and effective practice. The team agreed that there be a **condition** that an appropriate standard setting process must be used to set the pass criteria for all summative assessments, including MCQ and EMQ assessments, which must be in place from the 2024/25 academic year. This is to meet criterion 6.4.

The team was told that critical items within stations have been included in increasingly complex OSCEs as students progress. Thus, from Year 2 onwards OSCEs have increasing numbers of critical elements. The team was told that if students fail a critical item within a station then they will fail the station; which results in failure of the entire OSCE and the requirement to resit the entire OSCE during the supplementary exam period. The team also learned that if a station without a critical element is failed, the student can still pass if they meet the standard-set pass mark, that is they can compensate

for failure. The provider considered that this eventuality was unlikely to happen, but the marking scheme allows for the marker to flag where the student's behaviour or action is unsafe and this can be recorded. There is then a follow up-session after each OSCE. The team was told that there is no specific number of stations that can be failed without failing overall. Each station is standard-set for minimum competency and the overall pass mark is the average cut score across the total stations. The team noted that there was some inconsistency in the provider's responses to the question of whether or not such a student could pass the examination. The team agreed that it be a **condition** that an additional process must be introduced to the marking of OSCEs which provides a fair and robust mechanism for review of any student actions which raise potential patient safety issues that fall outside of the pre-identified red flags within the mark scheme. This is because the current marking arrangements that have been presented have the potential to permit a student to pass the OSCE where they have met the pass mark and critical elements, but their actions have demonstrated unsafe practice. This process must be in place from the 2024/25 academic year for OSCEs in Years 2 to 4. This is to meet criteria 6.5 and 6.6.

The team was told that students who perform poorly in the critical stations, or do not meet the passing standards will have to undertake a resit of OSCEs in the August supplementary exam period. Students were informed during induction sessions at the beginning of the academic year that the pass mark of these assessments would vary, instead of being pre-determined. Marking rubrics of all other coursework and assessed laboratory practical classes continue to be published and explained to students. Students interviewed confirmed that they had been informed of the methods to be used even if they did not understand completely how the methods worked.

During placements, for a student to be entrusted to perform an EPA at any level, they need to demonstrate their skills and knowledge to carry out the task without any compromise to patient safety. Students should be aware of their limitations and seek help where needed. The placement supervisor must have confidence in the student's competence and ability to perform the activity without causing harm to the patient; this requires the student to be "consciously competent" in performing the task safely. Placement supervisors will have attended a bespoke training session, delivered by the placements team from either Swansea or Cardiff Universities, to assess the above prior to any sign-off.

## Standard 7: Support and development for student pharmacists and everyone involved in the delivery of the MPharm degree

Student pharmacists must be supported in all learning and training environments to develop as learners and professionals during their MPharm degrees. Everyone involved in the delivery of the MPharm degree should be supported to develop in their professional role

### Support for student pharmacists

|                   |       |   |                                  |
|-------------------|-------|---|----------------------------------|
| Criterion 7.1 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 7.2 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 7.3 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 7.4 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |

### Support for everyone involved in the delivery of the MPharm degree

|                   |       |   |                                  |
|-------------------|-------|---|----------------------------------|
| Criterion 7.5 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------|-------|---|----------------------------------|

|                   |       |   |                                  |
|-------------------|-------|---|----------------------------------|
| Criterion 7.6 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 7.7 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criterion 7.8 is: | Met ✓ | Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/> | Not met <input type="checkbox"/> |

All students are allocated a personal tutor that is a member of the core Pharmacy academic team. The personal tutor acts as a key point of contact for students and meets with their tutees on a one-to-one basis at least once every Semester. Personal tutors guide and support students with academic, professional and personal development, helping with academic and personal support.

Although the documentation indicated that no significant changes have been made to the support provided for the wellbeing and welfare of students since the Step 5 accreditation event, there has been an enhancement in the range and availability of complimentary and pre-bookable courses, workshops, and one-on-one tutorials. These cover areas such as language proficiency, numerical skills, scientific writing, effective communication, statistical analysis, digital literacy, and career guidance. In May 2024, the School hosted external speakers for a Year 3 Oriel Day, to provide sector- and country-specific careers information, and to prepare Year 3 MPharm students for their Oriel applications and the subsequent selection process. Students interviewed greatly valued the Oriel Day. Students continue to receive support and guidance from external pharmacy professionals through guest lectures, seminars and as dissertation supervisors.

To facilitate student engagement and feedback the Head of Pharmacy conducts Head of Pharmacy workshops with each MPharm cohort every semester. During these sessions, students have the opportunity to provide anonymous feedback through Vevox or other digital audience engagement tools, as well as voice compliments or concerns regarding the course, academic and welfare support, or broader University-level matters.

Concerns related to student attendance are monitored both internally and through the University-level attendance monitoring system. Continued absences from teaching activities, whether detected through the automated swipe card system and register at timetabled face-to-face sessions, or course materials engagement on Canvas, trigger a non-engagement staged process after 7, 14 and 21 days. The team was told that students may raise concerns about placement sites or placement supervisors through either formal or informal routes They can also contact HEIW with support from the School. The outcome will depend on the nature of the placement; if the problem is extreme, they could be withdrawn from the placement. Pre-placement workshops are run before placements, informing students how to raise an issue/report a concern. HEIW captures feedback on placement sites from both Cardiff and Swansea students and follows its quality management processes which may result in the removal of a site and action plans being put in place.

The team wished to know about the performance of students entering year 1 of the MPharm degree from the preparatory route, compared to those on the 4-year direct entry route, as the first cohort of students on the Preparatory Year route should now be nearing the end of Year 2. It was told that around 75 percent of Preparatory Year students progress to Year 1. Only a small number came through from first cohort, this has increased for the 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort with 31 students having progressed to Year 1. There have been slight differences in performance in Year 1 modules compared to direct entry students, but statistical tests have not been applied. Data shows performance is around 4 percent less for Preparatory Year as a whole, but some individual students are performing highly. This element will

be revisited at the Step 7 event.

## Collaboration with the statutory education body and others

The submission indicated that the University continues to work closely with HEIW, placement providers, and other current (and future) MPharm providers in Wales. The transition to the new IETP Standards has been a catalyst for collaboration between pharmacy education and training stakeholders in Wales. Initially via the HEIW IETP Programme Stakeholder Advisory Group and the IETP Learning Outcomes Steering Group, these stakeholders have worked collaboratively on the transition to the new learning outcomes, for both MPharm undergraduates and trainee pharmacists.

Members of staff are members of the HEIW Pharmacy Advisory Board, the HEIW IETP Programme Stakeholder Advisory Group, the Pharmacy Integrated Workforce Plan Steering Group and monthly Pharmacy Education and Training meetings. As of the 2023/24 academic year, placements have transitioned to the 55-day plan developed in collaboration between HEIW, Swansea University, and Cardiff University. There is also an emerging collaboration between the MPharm student body and HEIW in that students can access HEIW training modules from the start of their degree.

Significant collaboration also exists between the University and HEIW in the areas of technology and simulation. The simulation centre management system CAE LearningSpace, which is installed in the Pharmacy Skills Suite, is built upon an existing relationship that saw a £452,000 investment, £226,000 of which came from an HEIW grant, in learning technology. HEIW funding also helped establish SUSiM which has been developed to offer all healthcare students the opportunity to fully utilise simulation in learning.

## Decision descriptors

| Decision         | Descriptor  |
|------------------|---|
| Met              | The accreditation team is assured after reviewing the available evidence that this criterion/learning outcome is met (or will be met at the point of delivery).   |
| Likely to be met | The progress to date, and any plans that have been set out, provide confidence that this criterion/learning outcome is likely to be met by step 7. However, the accreditation team does not have assurance after reviewing the available evidence that it is met at this point (or will be met at the point of delivery).   |
| Not met          | The accreditation team does not have assurance after reviewing the available evidence that this criterion or learning outcome is met. The evidence presented does not demonstrate sufficient progress towards meeting this criterion/outcome. Any plans presented either do not appear realistic or achievable or they lack detail or sufficient clarity to provide confidence that it will be met by step 7 without remedial measures (condition/s). |





