

**University College London, Master of Pharmacy
(MPharm) degree reaccreditation Part 2 and
MPharm with integrated foundation training Step
3 event report, January 2025**



Contents

Event summary and conclusions	1
Introduction	2
Role of the GPhC.....	2
Background.....	3
Documentation.....	3
Pre-event.....	3
The event.....	4
Declarations of interest	4
Schedule	4
Attendees	5
Key findings - Part 1 Learning outcomes	7
Domain: Person-centred care and collaboration (learning outcomes 1 - 14)	8
Domain: Professional practice (learning outcomes 15 - 44).....	9
Domain: Leadership and management (learning outcomes 45 - 52)	12
Domain: Education and research (learning outcomes 53 - 55).....	13
Key findings - Part 2 Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists	13
Standard 1: Selection and admission	13
Standard 2: Equality, diversity and fairness	14
Standard 3: Resources and capacity	14
Standard 4: Managing, developing and evaluating MPharm degrees	14
Standard 5: Curriculum design and delivery	14
Standard 6: Assessment.....	15
Standard 7: Support and development for student pharmacists and everyone involved in the delivery of the MPharm degree	16
Decision descriptors.....	26

Event summary and conclusions

Provider	University College London
Courses	4-year Master of Pharmacy (MPharm) degree 5-year Master of Pharmacy (MPharm) degree with integrated foundation training
Event type	Reaccreditation (part 2) and accreditation of MPharm degree with integrated foundation training step 3
Event date	30-31 January 2025
Approval period	The 4-year MPharm degree 2023/24 – 2030/31. The 5-year integrated MPharm degree Step 4 Part 1 accreditation event will take place in the 2025/26.
Relevant requirements	Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021
Outcome	Approval The accreditation team agreed that the reaccreditation of the MPharm degree offered by University College London is confirmed, and that the MPharm degree with integrated foundation training offered by University College London should proceed from Step 3 to Step 4 of the accreditation process for new MPharm degrees with integrated foundation training. Reaccreditation of the 4-year MPharm degree is for a period of 6 years, with an interim event in 3 years' time. The Step 4 accreditation event for the MPharm with integrated foundation training will take place in the 2025/26 academic year.
Conditions	There were no conditions.
Standing conditions	The standing conditions of accreditation can be found here .
Recommendations	No recommendations were made.
Registrar decision	The 4-year MPharm degree – please see the Part 1 report. The 5-year integrated MPharm degree: The Registrar is satisfied that UCL is permitted to progress from Step 3 to Step 4 of the accreditation process for a new 5-year MPharm degree with integrated foundation training in line with the Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021.

Key contact (provider)	Dr John Malkinson, MPharm Programme Director
Accreditation team	<p>Professor Ruth Edwards (Team leader), Professor of Pharmacy Education, University of Wolverhampton *</p> <p>Professor Lyn Hanning (team member - academic) Professor of Pharmacy Education and Head of the Bath MPharm, University of Plymouth</p> <p>Dr Marisa van der Merwe (team member - academic) Associate Dean (Academic) Faculty of Science and Health, University of Portsmouth</p> <p>Mairead Conlon (team member – pharmacist) Foundation Training Year Lead at the Northern Ireland Centre for Pharmacy Learning and Development and part-time Community Pharmacist</p> <p>Ausaf Khan (team member – pharmacist newly qualified) Advanced Pharmacist – Neurosciences, Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust</p> <p>Fiona Barber (team member – lay) Independent Member, Standards Committee, Leicester City Council</p>
GPhC representatives	Chris McKendrick, Senior Quality Assurance Officer (Education) *
Rapporteur	Jane Smith, Chief Executive Officer, European Association for Cancer Research

*attended the pre-event meeting

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 (GB). The GPhC is responsible for setting standards and approving education and training courses which form part of the pathway towards registration for pharmacists. The GB qualification required as part of the pathway to registration as a pharmacist is a GPhC-accredited Master of Pharmacy degree course (MPharm).

This Part 2 reaccreditation event was carried out in accordance with the **Adapted methodology for reaccreditation of MPharm degrees to 2021 standards** and the programme was reviewed against the GPhC **Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021**.

The GPhC's process for initial accreditation of a an MPharm degree with integrated foundation training is a four-step process as the five-year integrated degree is usually built upon an established, accredited four-year programme. These Steps are reviewed against the GPhC **Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021**. Step 1 involves an initial engagement meeting by an application institution to share their proposal. Following successful completion of Step 1, students may be accepted on to year 1 of the MPharm degree with integrated foundation training programme. Steps 2, 3, and 4 normally taking place respectively in years 3, 4 and 5 of the

programme. The completion of the Step 4 process will require GPhC representatives to attend the examination board at the end of year 5. Following successful completion of the Step 4 process, graduates of the MPharm with integrated Foundation Training are permitted to apply to the GPhC pharmacist register subject to passing the GPhC registration assessment and meeting other registration requirements.

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.

Background

MPharm degree

The University College London (UCL) MPharm programme is delivered by the School of Pharmacy, which is a specialist institution within the Faculty of Life Sciences. A Part 1 reaccreditation event took place in June 2024, to the 2021 IETP standards where the team agreed to recommend to the Registrar of the General Pharmaceutical Council that the programme should be reaccredited for a full six-year period with no conditions or recommendations, subject to a successful Part 2 event. The Part 2 event was scheduled for January 2025 and the following is a report of that event.

MPharm with Integrated foundation training

The 5-year integrated iteration of the programme is targeted at non-EU students. The need for this iteration originally arose from changes in UK visa rules which reduced opportunities for overseas MPharm graduates to remain in the UK to undertake foundation training; the 5-year programme integrates foundation training with academic study, allowing students to remain in the country on student visas.

In view of the change in the integrated foundation year as a result of the introduction of the 2021 standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, the GPhC required the programme to undergo a repeat of Step 2 of the accreditation process which took place in June 2024. At that event, the team recommended to the GPhC's Registrar that that the MPharm degree with integrated foundation training should proceed from Step 2 to Step 3 of the accreditation process. There were no conditions or recommendations. The following is a report of the Step 3 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 10 January 2025. 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, and was told the learning outcomes that would be sampled.

The event

The event took place on site at the University on 30-31 January 2025 and comprised of a series of meetings between the GPhC accreditation team and representatives of the MPharm degree and a meeting with current students.

Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Schedule

30 January 2025

09:00 – 11:00	Private meeting of the accreditation team
11:00 – 12:30	Meeting with students
12:30 – 13:15	Lunch
13:15 – 15:15	Progress meeting 1 – management and oversight
15:15 – 15:30	Break
15:30 – 16:15	Meeting with experiential learning partners
16:15 – 17:00	Private meeting of the accreditation team

31 January 2025

09:00 – 09:30	Private meeting of the accreditation team
09:30 – 11:30	Progress meeting 2 – curriculum and assessment
11:30 – 11:45	Break
11:45 – 12:30	MPharm degree with integrated foundation training quality assurance and supervision
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch

13:30 – 14:30	Teaching, learning, support and assessment 5-year MPharm degree
14:30 – 16:30	Private meeting of the accreditation team
16:30 – 16:45	Deliver outcome to programme provider (2021 standards)

Attendees

Course provider

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

Name	Designation at the time of accreditation event
Anika Ahmad	Lecturer, Department of Practice and Policy
Professor Afia Ali	Professor, Department of Pharmacology, BAME Awarding Gap Lead for Faculty of Life Sciences, Module Lead PHAY0078
Sarah Al-Saad	Green Light Pharmacy Teacher Practitioner, Department of Practice and Policy
Professor Ian Bates	Professor of Pharmacy Education, Department of Practice and Policy
Raj Bhamra	Lecturer, Department of Practice and Policy
Scott Boyne	Faculty of Life Sciences Staffing and HR Manager
Maddie Bridge-Davies	Teaching & Learning Manager/Assessments & Programme Manager, School of Pharmacy
Professor Louise Brown	Professor of Pharmacy Education, Clinical Pharmacy Lead for MPharm programme, Module Lead PHAY0085
Stephanie-Eleise Brown	School of Pharmacy, Senior Clinical Skills Technician
Duncan Browne	Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological Chemistry
Nadia Bukhari	Associate Professor, Department of Policy and Practice, Admissions Tutor, Module Lead PHAY0001
Dr Steve Bunting, Matthew Calladine	School of Pharmacy Divisional Manager Technical Manager (Teaching Laboratories), School of Pharmacy
Dr Navila Chaudhry,	Lecturer, Department of Practice and Policy, Module Lead PHAY0072.
Jen Cockerell	Associate Professor, Department of Practice and Policy, School of Pharmacy, Careers Lead
Rachel Dickman	Lecturer, Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological Chemistry, Chair of MPharm Board of Examiners, Module Lead PHAY0079
Dr Sara Garfield	Lecturer, Department of Practice and Policy
Claire Grant	Teacher Practitioner, Day Lewis Pharmacy
Dr Seb Gurgul	Associate Lecturer, Department of Pharmaceutics
Neroli Harris	Training & Enquiry Support Librarian, School of Pharmacy

Professor Kirsten Harvey	Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Chair of Departmental Extenuating Circumstances Panel
Abi Heath	School of Pharmacy Library Manager
Dr Steve Hilton	Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological Chemistry
Michael Leech	Lecturer Teaching, Department of Practice and Policy
Professor Rebecca Lever *	Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Associate Director (Education), Year 4 Lead.
Clare Linkins	Teacher Practitioner Frimley Health NHS Trust
Dr John Malkinson *	Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological Chemistry, MPharm Programme Director, Year 1 Lead, Module Lead PHAY0002.
Dr Claudia Manzoni	Lecturer, Department of Pharmacology
Kirsty Martin *	Teaching & Learning Manager
Dr Audrey Mercer	Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Deputy MPharm Programme Director, Senior MPharm Academic Tutor, Year 2 Lead, Module Lead PHAY0077
Dr Chris Morris	Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutics, Module Lead PHAY0080
Dr Sudax Murdan	Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutics, Module Lead PHAY0004
Dr Selva Athi Narayanan	Learning Technologist, School of Pharmacy
Terry Ng	Associate Professor, Department of Practice and Policy, Year 3 Lead
Rebekah Nichols	Partnerships & Placements Manager, School of Pharmacy
Ade Olayide	Lecturer, Department of Policy & Practice
Mine Orlu	Professor, Department of Pharmaceutics, MPharm Interprofessional Education Lead & Athena Swan Lead
Dr Maryam Parhizkar	Lecturer, Department of Pharmaceutics
Dr Gary Parkinson	Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological Chemistry
Adam Phillips	Digital Education Manager, School of Pharmacy
Professor James Phillips	Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Module Lead PHAY0003
Oksana Pyzik	Lecturer, Department of Practice and Policy
Professor Ahad Rahim	Professor, Head of the Research Department of Pharmacology
Dr Arnaud Ruiz	Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Module Lead PHAY0060
Priya Sidhu	Admissions and Student Services Manager, School of Pharmacy
Dr Paul Stapleton	Lecturer, Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological Chemistry, Chair of MPharm Board of Examiners, Module Lead PHAY0079
Will Swain	Lecturer, Department of Practice and Policy, Associate Director (Clinical Education)

Professor Matt Todd	Professor, Head of the Research Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological Chemistry
Stavros Vlatakis	Associate Lecturer Teaching, Department of Practice and Policy
Dr Zoe Waller	Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological Chemistry
Lindsey Warner	Partnerships & Placements Administrator, School of Pharmacy
Professor Li Wei	Professor, Head of the Research Department of Practice and Policy
Dr Geoff Wells	Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological Chemistry, Chair of the PGT Board of Examiners
Lisa Weston	Study Abroad and Placements Administrator, School of Pharmacy
Professor Cate Whittlesea *	Professor, Director School of Pharmacy
Professor Gareth Williams	Professor, Head of the Research Department of Pharmaceutics

* attended the pre-event meeting

The accreditation team also met a group of 15 MPharm students (seven in Year 1, four in Year 2 and four in Year 3. Five of the 15 students were on the 5-year programme with integrated foundation training)

Key findings - Part 1 Learning outcomes

For the MPharm degree, during the Part 1 reaccreditation process the accreditation team reviewed the provider's proposed teaching and assessment of all 55 learning outcomes relating to the MPharm degree. To gain additional assurance the accreditation team had also tested a sample of six learning outcomes. During the Part 2 event, the accreditation team reviewed the provider's proposed teaching and assessment of any learning outcomes that were deemed as 'likely to be met' or had changed/been modified since the Part 1 process.

Having reviewed the learning outcomes at both the Part 1 and Part 2 reaccreditation events, the team agreed that **all 55 learning outcomes were met or would be met at the point of delivery**.

For the MPharm degree with integrated foundation training, accreditation process the accreditation team reviewed the provider's proposed teaching and assessment of all 55 learning outcomes relating to the MPharm degree with integrated foundation training. To gain additional assurance the accreditation team also tested a sample of **six** learning outcomes.

The following learning outcomes were explored further during the event: **Learning outcomes 2, 13, 17, 24, 28 and 36**. The team agreed that **some learning outcomes were met but a majority of foundation year learning outcomes were likely to be met by the Step 4 event, where more learning outcomes will be sampled**.

See the **decision descriptors** for an explanation of the ‘Met’ ‘Likely to be met’ and ‘not met’ decisions available to the accreditation team.

The learning outcomes are detailed within the **Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021**

Domain: Person-centred care and collaboration (learning outcomes 1 - 14)				
Learning outcome 1 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 2 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 3 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 4 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 5 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 6 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 7 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 8 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 9 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 10 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 11 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 12 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 13 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 14 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
MPharm with integrated foundation training Learning Outcomes:				

The team found that the following foundation training learning outcomes were likely to be met:

2 Work in partnership with people to support and empower them in shared decision-making about their health and wellbeing

4 Understand the variety of settings and adapt their communication accordingly

5 Proactively support people to make safe and effective use of their medicines and devices

8 Assess and respond to the person's particular health risks, taking account of individuals' protected characteristics and background

11 Take into consideration factors that affect people's behaviours in relation to health and wellbeing

12 Take an all-inclusive approach to ensure the most appropriate course of action based on clinical, legal and professional considerations

13 Recognise the psychological, physiological and physical impact of prescribing decisions on people

14 Work collaboratively and effectively with other members of the multi-disciplinary team to ensure high-quality, person-centred care, including continuity of care

The assessments enabling students to demonstrate achievement of these learning outcomes at the appropriate level are to be undertaken in the foundation training year and have therefore not yet been delivered. These eight outcomes will be reviewed again at the Step 4 event.

Domain: Professional practice (learning outcomes 15 - 44)

Learning outcome 15 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 16 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 17 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 18 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 19 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 20 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 21 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 22 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 23 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 24 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 25 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 26 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training

Learning outcome 27 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 28 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 29 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 30 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 31 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 32 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 33 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 34 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 35 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 36 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 37 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 38 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 39 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 40 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 41 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 42 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 43 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 44 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training

MPharm with integrated foundation training Learning Outcomes:

The team found that the following foundation training learning outcomes were likely to be met:

- 16 Apply professional judgement in all circumstances, taking legal and ethical reasoning into account**
- 17 Recognise and work within the limits of their knowledge and skills, and get support and refer to others when they need to**
- 18 Take responsibility for all aspects of pharmacy services, and make sure that the care and services provided are safe and accurate**
- 20 Act openly and honestly when things go wrong and raise concerns even when it is not easy to do so**
- 23 Recognise the technologies that are behind developing advanced therapeutic medicinal products and precision medicines, including the formulation, supply and quality assurance of these therapeutic agents**
- 24 Keep abreast of new technologies and use data and digital technologies to improve clinical outcomes and patient safety, keeping to information governance principles**
- 25. Apply pharmaceutical principles to the safe and effective formulation, preparation, packaging and disposal of medicines and products**
- 26 Consider the quality, safety and risks associated with medicines and products and take appropriate action when producing, supplying and prescribing them**
- 27 Take responsibility for the legal, safe and efficient supply, prescribing and administration of medicines and devices**
- 28 Demonstrate effective diagnostic skills, including physical examination, to decide the most appropriate course of action for the person**
- 29 Apply the principles of clinical therapeutics, pharmacology and genomics to make effective use of medicines for people, including in their prescribing practice**
- 30 Appraise the evidence base and apply clinical reasoning and professional judgement to make safe and logical decisions which minimise risk and optimise outcomes for the person**
- 31 Critically evaluate and use national guidelines and clinical evidence to support safe, rational and cost-effective procurement for the use, and prescribing of, medicines, devices and services**
- 32 Accurately perform calculations**
- 33 Effectively promote healthy lifestyles using evidence-based techniques**
- 34 Apply the principles of effective monitoring and management to improve health outcomes**
- 36 Apply relevant legislation and ethical decision-making related to prescribing, including remote prescribing**
- 37 Prescribe effectively within the relevant systems and frameworks for medicines use**
- 38 Understand clinical governance in relation to prescribing, while also considering that the prescriber may be in a position to supply the prescribed medicines to people**
- 39 Take responsibility for people's health records, including the legality, appropriateness, accuracy, security and confidentiality of personal data**

40 Understand and implement relevant safeguarding procedures, including local and national guidance in relation to each person

41 Effectively make use of local and national health and social care policies to improve health outcomes and public health, and to address health inequalities

42 Proactively participate in the promotion and protection of public health in their practice

43 Identify misuse of medicines and implement effective strategies to deal with this

44 Respond appropriately to medical emergencies, including the provision of first aid

The assessments enabling students to demonstrate achievement of these learning outcomes at the appropriate level are to be undertaken in the foundation training year and have therefore not yet been delivered. These 25 outcomes will be reviewed again at the Step 4 event.

Domain: Leadership and management (learning outcomes 45 - 52)

Learning outcome 45 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 46 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 47 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 48 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 49 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 50 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 51 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 52 is	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training

MPharm with integrated foundation training Learning Outcomes:

The team found that the following foundation training learning outcomes were likely to be met:

45 Demonstrate effective leadership and management skills as part of the multi-disciplinary team

46 Make use of the skills and knowledge of other members of the multi-disciplinary team to manage resources and priorities

47 Develop, lead and apply effective strategies to improve the quality of care and safe use of medicines

48 Actively take part in the management of risks and consider the impacts on people

49 Use tools and techniques to avoid medication errors associated with prescribing, supply and administration

50 Take appropriate actions to respond to complaints, incidents or errors in a timely manner and to prevent them happening again

51 Recognise when and how their performance or that of others could put people at risk and take appropriate actions

52 Demonstrate resilience and flexibility, and apply effective strategies to manage multiple priorities, uncertainty, complexity and change

The assessments enabling students to demonstrate achievement of these learning outcomes at the appropriate level are to be undertaken in the in the foundation training year and have therefore not yet been delivered. These eight outcomes will be reviewed again at the Step 4 event.

Domain: Education and research (learning outcomes 53 - 55)

Learning outcome 53:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 54:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
Learning outcome 55:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	MPharm degree
	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation training
MPharm with integrated foundation training Learning Outcomes:				

The team found that the following foundation training learning outcomes were likely to be met:

53 Reflect upon, identify, and proactively address their learning needs

54 Support the learning and development of others, including through mentoring

55 Take part in research activities, audit, service evaluation and quality improvement, and demonstrate how these are used to improve care and services

The assessments enabling students to demonstrate achievement of these learning outcomes at the appropriate level are to be undertaken in the in the foundation training year and have therefore not yet been delivered. These three outcomes will be reviewed again at the Step 4 event.

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

The criteria that sit beneath each standard are detailed within the [Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021](#).

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

Standard met? Yes No

This standard was explored in detail at the part 1 event and the accreditation team was satisfied that all criteria are met, or will be met, at the point of delivery.

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

Standard met? Yes No

This standard was explored in detail at the part 1 event and the accreditation team was satisfied that all criteria are met, or will be met, at the point of delivery.

Standard 3: Resources and capacity

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

Standard met? Yes No

This standard was explored in detail at the part 1 event and the accreditation team was satisfied that all criteria are met, or will be met, at the point of delivery.

The team asked for an update on recruitment to academic posts since the last event and was told that an offer had been made to a new Clinical Skills Technician. A grade 8/9 full time academic post was about to be advertised. Grade 9/10 post had been advertised and shortlisting prior to interview was currently taking place.

Standard 4: Managing, developing and evaluating MPharm degrees

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

Standard met? Yes No

This standard was explored in detail at the part 1 event and the accreditation team was satisfied that all criteria are met, or will be met, at the point of delivery.

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

Standard met? Yes No

The team agreed that all criteria in Standard 5 were met or would be met at the point of delivery.

The team noted significant progress in developing the placement element of the programme since the Part 1 event and was satisfied that placements increased in complexity throughout the course. Consequently, enabling students to work as part of the healthcare team and take responsibility for their activities in year 4, as well as dealing with patients with more complex needs, such as those in prison or with drug addictions. The provider was confident that its placement programme was scalable, so that all students would have an experience of working with people with complex needs.

The team asked about the availability of GP placements and was told that, in common with most Schools of Pharmacy, the provider has found these difficult to secure. In the current year, a two-day GP placement is available for any 4th year student who requests one. Work to expand the number of placements available is continuing on several fronts, with a plan to be able to offer one to all 4th year students next year, and an ambition to cascade these also to year 3 in the future. Notwithstanding these difficulties, there is a year 2 workshop written and led by a GP pharmacist introducing GP pharmacy. Student feedback on this workshop is positive.

The team noted that, at the Part 1 event, students had reported variability in their experiences during placements and shared their view they could be better structured. The team asked what changes have been made to address this feedback. The provider explained that they had taken the feedback on board. Information about placements is now given to students well in advance of the placement start date and the expectations in terms of logistics, such as travel times, are also made clear. Students are also given information about Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs) including which ones apply to each placement. This information is uploaded to Moodle.

The team asked what contingencies are in place if any of the placements cannot be delivered or if a student misses part of a placement through illness. In these cases, the provider will look for alternative timings with the same provider and if these are not available, then they will go out to other partners to find a suitable alternative. Students must achieve 70% attendance at the placements in order to progress.

The provider has monthly meetings with placement providers. The team met some placement providers who spoke positively of their involvement in the course and of the two-way channel of communication with the provider.

The team asked for an update on the IPE activities within the course and was told in addition to the current offering, new activities are planned with nursing, physiotherapy, and dietetics and nutrition students at another London university. Work to further expand the range of professions and the opportunities offered to students is ongoing.

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

Standard met? Yes No

The team agreed that all criteria in Standard 6 were met or would be met at the point of delivery.

The team asked the provider how they are assured that year 4 students are meeting the Does learning outcomes at the required level and was told that assurance is received via the daily logs, direct observation of practical skills (DOPS) and focused reflections completed in the periods of experiential learning. These are signed off by the practice supervisors using PebblePad and all submitted work is reviewed by the academic team. As far as possible, the supervisor sign-offs mirror the NHSE format, with the student summarising the task completed and the supervisor or observer noting whether this is at the required standard, with space for comments. The student tags the task against learning outcomes and the EPAs. The entries are all reviewed by the provider.

The team queried what the process will be if a supervisor finds that a learning outcome is not met at the required level. The provider stated that the student would be informed once the marks for the placement as a whole are released and would have to repeat the tasks associated with the learning outcome. The provider will ensure that all students are given the opportunity to repeat tasks as needed.

The team asked for details of how the daily diary entries are working and was told that students were finding them useful and not too onerous once they got into the habit of completing them. Formal feedback will be sought from students and supervisors (who are required to sign off each daily entry) at the end of the year. These entries are marked by the academic team against marking criteria. In the meeting with students, some students commented on the high number of reflective entries required on placements and thought this could be reduced; the provider should consider these comments alongside the formal feedback.

The team noted that portfolios are reviewed periodically by the provider and are marked at the end of the second term. Students can be graded fail, pass or excellent for each placement. Mark schemes are written for each element and are different for each placement. All year 4 elements are second-marked, with 10% second-marked in other years. All students have the opportunity for two attempts before the Exam Board. Any students needing to resit after the Exam Board will be supported to do so, including with time in the practice environment if needed.

The team had noted comments from two external examiners that high marks in assessments that combined multiple choice questions with short answer questions were allowing students to pass; they typically achieved higher marks in the latter element which compensated lower marks in the former. The team asked the provider to outline the changes being introduced to address this issue. The provider explained that the multiple-choice assessments are now standalone and have to be passed. The more discursive questions are now separate and test different learning outcomes.

Some of the students that the team met commented that the feedback they received on their work was often generic, cohort-based feedback which was not as helpful as more personal feedback. They also commented on the variability of the timeliness of feedback. Feedback deadlines should be communicated clearly to students.

Students were uncertain of the role of their placement supervisors in assessing their portfolio. The team noted the complexity of the e-portfolio assessment which the provider should keep under review.

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

Standard met? Yes No

The team agreed that all criteria in Standard 7 were met or would be met at the point of delivery.

The team asked if students are provided with formative feedback on their workplace-based assessments throughout the year, prior to the summative submission. The provider said that as the work submitted on placement is all summatively assessed, they cannot give formative feedback. However, teaching is aligned with placement activities so that students are practising the skills they will need on placement at an appropriate time. For example, in year 3 a medicines reconciliation simulation takes place at the University before being undertaken in the real world on placement. The team suggests that the provider considers introducing a formative review of the evidence submitted as part of the e-portfolio.

Overall, students said that they felt very supported by the provider. The central services and facilities are good and the personal tutor system works well, with regular contact points. Students also said that career support is provided to them at appropriate times.

Key findings - Part 3 Standards for foundation training

The criteria that sit beneath each standard are detailed within the [Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021](#).

Standard 1: Selection and admission

Trainees must be selected for and admitted onto the foundation training year 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"/>

This standard was explored in detail at the part 1 event and the accreditation team was satisfied that all criteria are met, or will be met, at the point of delivery.

Standard 2: Equality, diversity and fairness

The foundation training year 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 trainees 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 ✓	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>

This standard was explored in detail at the part 1 event and the accreditation team was satisfied that all criteria are met, or will be met, at the point of delivery.

The team asked the provider for details of its approach to reasonable adjustments in all types of assessment, particularly where competency standards are assessed. The provider explained that for placements, if the student has a Summary of Reasonable Adjustments (SORA), the provider meets with the student and requests permission to share the information from the SORA with the proposed placement provider. A decision will be taken in partnership about whether the placement is suitable for the student and whether any adjustments need to be made, including whether the assessments can be carried out on placement. If they cannot, then assessments will take place at the University.

The team noted that additional time in OSCEs is not allowed as a reasonable adjustment for students that are entitled to this for other examination type assessments, and asked for the provider's reasoning for this approach. The provider stated that the OSCEs must simulate the real world as far as possible, where students will be working in a time-pressured environment. However, the provider clarified that students are given reading time in advance of the OSCEs and this is extended for those students who have an additional time adjustment in their SORA.

The team asked to what extent the provider can drill down beyond the broad groupings of race and ethnicity to understand the experiences of students from minorities within the broad BAME group.

The provider said that the data dashboard does allow this more nuanced reporting, but that they have aggregated some of the data to avoid reporting on very small groups of one or two students.

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"/>

This standard was explored in detail at the part 1 event and the accreditation team was satisfied that all criteria are met, or will be met, at the point of delivery.

The team asked if there are any changes planned to staffing to support delivery of foundation year training from 2025 onwards and was told that that the plan was always that the fifth year would remain with the practice team. The Clinical Pharmacy Lead for MPharm programme (Prof Brown) would become the 5 year MPharm programme lead once step 3 was successfully completed.

Standard 4: Managing, developing and evaluating MPharm degrees

The quality of the foundation year 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"/>

This standard was explored in detail at the part 1 event and the accreditation team was satisfied that all criteria are met, or will be met, at the point of delivery.

Standard 5: Foundation year design and delivery

The programmes for the foundation training year must develop the required skills, knowledge, understanding and professional behaviours to meet the outcomes in part 1 of these standards by using a coherent training strategy. The design and delivery of the foundation training year must ensure that trainee 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met ✓	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 ✓	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>

The team asked how the balance of activities in each training sector is decided and how the provider ensures that the learning outcomes can be met at the correct level. The provider has mapped activities from the 2011 standards across to the new course and has worked with partners to map the rotations and assessments to the GPhC learning outcomes. It was noted that some learning outcomes carry across both sites; for example, dispensing is assessed in both settings.

The team asked for more details about the use of EPAs to support placement provision and was told that all students are given introduction to EPAs at the start of the training year. They are given a list of EPAs and told which ones will be the focus for each placement; this is agreed in advance with the providers. Agreements with each provider cover the training of staff and the need for them to also be aware of the EPAs.

There are meetings every 13-weeks between the student, supervisor and the provider to review the student's progress, and to ensure that tasks are increasing in complexity as the placements progress. At the 39-week review, the student will be approved to enter the GPhC registration assessment and there is a further review at 45 weeks to look at the learning outcomes and identify any gaps to be met. At the final 52-week review, the learning outcomes are reviewed again, along with a check that the requirement for 52-weeks in practice has been met. In both settings, 40 hours' time for self-directed learning is set aside to allow for any gaps to be filled.

The team met with foundation training providers who confirmed that they have, and continue to, work closely with the provider to plan and deliver the foundation training, as described above. The team was satisfied that criterion 5.4 (Everyone involved must work together to deliver the foundation training year) will be met, but as the training year has not yet been delivered in full, this criterion is likely to be met and will be reviewed at the Step 4 event.

Standard 6: Assessment

Everyone involved 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 trainee pharmacist's practice is safe

Criterion 6.1 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 6.2 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 6.5 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 6.6 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 6.7 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 6.8 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 6.9 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 6.10 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 6.11 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>

The provider confirmed that the foundation training year will be assessed on three components:

- E-portfolio, comprising of many individual elements, including prescribing and an audit project, all of which must be passed

- E-portfolio viva
- OSCEs, 10 stations including prescribing

The provider also confirmed that there will be 90 hours of Designated Prescribing Practitioner (DPP) supervision in each 26-week placement block. The first 90 hours is Preparing for Prescribing and the second 90 hours being Prescribing Under Supervision. The team considered that the student and DPP workload associated with 180 hours of supervised prescribing practice might prove to be too heavy. This will be reviewed at the Step 4 event.

The team asked how the DPP will feed into the individual training plans and learning agreements and was told that when the DPP is not the DS, they will work together with the DS and the student to develop the training plan. This has been discussed at the Employer Working Group. Placement partners are confident that this process will work, but it will be kept under review.

The team noted that supervision may be delegated to other members of the clinical placement teams and asked if these rotational supervisors are also involved in the assessment of trainee pharmacists. The provider confirmed that observations could be undertaken by these staff, with the DS and DPP being responsible for ensuring that they are competent to do so. These decisions are reviewed by the provider.

The team asked how the provider supports the transition from the first placement to the second and was told that this starts in year 4 with a panel discussion with pharmacists from all settings (including remote prescribing). Also in year 4 a 'Walking in Prescribing Shoes' workshop which again covers all sectors and uses patient actors. In year 5, the anchor days are used to prepare students for the transition, looking at how skills can be transferred and what to expect in the new setting.

The provider is taking an NHSE approach to scope of practice, being careful to emphasise to employers that students will be prescribing ready at completion and only then ready to build a scope of practice. They are also training students to be realistic and vocal about their competence.

The team requested details of how trainees will receive feedback from both their peers and patients to inform the assessment of their performance. The provider gave an example from Year 1 of a Practice of Pharmacy workshop, where students have a 15-minute consultation with a patient. The patients mark the students who are given immediate feedback which they must use to write a reflective account. The workshop follows introductory lectures on consultation models and communication skills. In Year 4 there is an advanced communication workshop using the Pendleton feedback model, again drawing on patient feedback and bringing in feedback from colleagues.

The team was satisfied with progress against this standard, but as the training year has not yet been delivered in full, the following criteria are likely to be met:

- 6.1 There must be an assessment plan for the foundation training year that leads to professional registration
- 6.3 Everyone involved must demonstrate that their assessment plan: a. is coherent, b. is fit for purpose, and c. ensure that assessment is robust, valid and reliable, and includes diagnostic, formative and summative assessment
- 6.4 Assessment plans for the foundation training year must assess the outcomes in part 1 of these standards. The methods of assessment used must: a. be appropriate to the learning outcomes, b. be in line with current and best practice, c. be routinely monitored, quality assured and developed, d. deliver consistency across all trainees, regardless of their

experience to date and e. consider the trainee’s evidence portfolio demonstrating their competence and how they meet the learning outcomes

- 6.5 Assessment must be fair and carried out against clear criteria. The standard expected of trainees in each area to be assessed must be clear; and trainees and everyone involved in assessment must be aware of this standard
- 6.8 Everyone involved must have effective management systems in place to plan, monitor and record the assessment of trainees
- 6.9 Everyone involved must support trainees to improve their performance by providing regular and timely feedback and by encouraging trainees to reflect on their practice
- 6.10 Assessment must make use of feedback collected from a variety of sources, which should include other members of the pharmacy team, peers and patients
- 6.11 Everyone involved must have the appropriate skills, experience and training to carry out the task of assessment

These eight criteria will be reviewed at the Step 4 event.

Standard 7: Support and development for trainee pharmacists and everyone involved in the delivery of the foundation training year

Trainee pharmacists must be supported in all learning and training environments to develop as learners and professionals during their initial education and training

Everyone involved in the delivery of the foundation training year should be supported to develop in their professional role

Support for trainee 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 foundation training year

Criterion 7.5 is:	Met ✓	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 7.6 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met ✓	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 7.7 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met ✓	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 7.8 is:	Met ✓	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>

The team asked for an update on the induction of new staff and was told that new staff are buddied with an existing member of the course team. The induction is tailored according to whether they are new to academia, but all staff new to teaching shadow existing staff before leading a class themselves and will have a more experienced member of staff present. Staff without a pharmacy background are given training in the context of pharmacy. A new member of staff within the meeting told the team that they felt welcomed and supported in the School.

Training for rotational supervisors is addressed as part of the process of accrediting a placement site. It is made clear that DSs must train rotation supervisors and this is set out in the placement agreement.

In terms of training for DPPs, especially those who may require upskilling of their clinical assessment skills, the provider is confident that, to a large extent the criteria for becoming a DPP ensure that they

have the appropriate skills: they must have been an Independent Prescriber in practice for 3-years and must have a patient-facing role. DPPs are invited to the training day with DSs which covers the assessments, most of which the DPPs will already be familiar.

The team was satisfied with progress against this standard, but as the training year has not yet been delivered in full, the following criteria are likely to be met:

- 7.6 Training must be provided for everyone involved in the delivery of the foundation training year.
- 7.7 Everyone involved in the delivery of the foundation training year must have: effective supervision, an appropriate and realistic workload, mentoring, time to learn, continuing professional development opportunities, and peer support

These criteria will be reviewed at the Step 4 event.

Standard 8: The foundation training year

The foundation training year must focus on the professional practice of pharmacists and must contribute to the delivery of the learning outcomes

Criterion 8.1 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 8.2 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 8.3 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 8.4 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>

The 52-week plan for the foundation training year was devised with the Employer Working Group, taking their feedback into consideration. The plan was developed to be adaptable to different settings within hospital and community pharmacies. Students are informed of the full 52-week plan as part of their induction (anchor day 1 in week 1), with clear instructions on the activities to be completed and when, and instructions on how to complete them.

The module consists of 2 × 26-week clinical placements in hospital and community pharmacy. The allocations throughout the module provide protected clinical time relating to prescribing activities. The first 26-week placement allows the development of consultation skills, and therapeutic and diagnostic skill sets. In the second 26-week placement these skills are used to manage a structured consultation and prescribe safely (including modifying existing prescriptions or deprescribing) while being supervised by their DPP.

The rotations within the hospital include induction, technical services, medicines information, dispensary, and clinical rotations (paediatrics, general adult, surgical, maternity, preparing for prescribing and prescribing under supervision) to support the student's clinical development. The rotations in community pharmacy include induction, over-the-counter responding to symptoms, dispensing and observing/undertaking under supervision clinical / public health activities with patients, clinical screening of prescriptions, and final checking of products, as well as time dedicated to mixed activities once the trainee is more confident and competent. The framework allows flexible time for students to complete any outstanding tasks, and protected time for their audit project and GPhC registration assessment preparation. Foundation training providers were clear about what is expected of students and commented on the collaborative approach taken by the provider to developing the course. There was less confidence from providers about the year 5 assessment tools and this will be revisited at the Step 4 event.

The team asked what contingency plans are in place if a student misses a significant part of one of the placements and how this is monitored. Students have access to annual leave and sickness forms on Moodle and the provider will monitor these forms and pick up at the next review if the missed time is significant. Missed time will be made up, with the provider addressing each case individually and liaising with training providers where needed.

As the training year has not yet been delivered in full, criterion 8.4 (Trainee pharmacists must follow a training plan or plans during periods of the foundation training year. This must have a clear purpose to enable trainees to meet the learning outcomes in part 1 of these standards) is likely to be met and will be reviewed at the Step 4 event.

Standard 9: Foundation training year supervision

Trainee pharmacists must be supervised by a designated supervisor and a designated prescribing practitioner during the foundation training year to help them meet the learning outcomes

Criterion 9.1 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 9.2 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 9.3 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 9.4 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 9.5 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 9.6 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 9.7 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 9.8 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 9.9 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>

The provider confirmed that they verify the self-declarations made by the DS and the DPP to ensure they meet the criteria to take on these roles. Only one DPP is needed for 2025/26 and has been secured. A meeting will take place with the Employer Working Group in March 2025 to confirm the numbers and plans for 2026/27. The DPP cannot delegate authority for signing off the student's prescribing activities.

The team asked the provider to describe how the transition between the two sectors is managed considering the changes in DS. The provider stated that anchor day 5 takes place after the 26-week review, so the documentation from that review is looked at then. The handover document, setting out what has been achieved and any gaps to be addressed, is passed from the first DS to second. This allows for any changes to the learning agreement to be made at this point. Providers and students commented on how useful they found this handover documentation. Both DSs can also access the student's portfolio on PebblePad.

Decisions about what tasks trainees carry out and judgements about whether they are competent to undertake these are made based on the learning needs analysis, the e-portfolio and tasks completed to date, all of which are available to the DS and the DPP as well as the provider.

If there are differences in assessment judgements between the DS, DPP and the University, then the provider stated that they would discuss the difference with all parties, look at balance of evidence and use the portfolio viva to clarify. The provider confirmed that, ultimately, assessment decisions rest with them.

As the training year has not yet been delivered in full, the following criteria are likely to be met:

- 9.2 Trainee pharmacists must have a designated supervisor, who, working with everyone involved, is responsible for co-ordinating their supervision, overseeing their progress and signing them off. The designated supervisor must be a pharmacist
- 9.3 During the period of learning in practice specifically relating to prescribing, the trainee must be supervised by a designated prescribing practitioner
- 9.5 All supervisors must be trained and appropriately experienced to act as supervisors. Everyone supporting trainees must take into account the GPhC's guidance. People carrying out assessments of the foundation training year or being involved in trainees' sign-off must be appropriately trained, qualified and competent to assess the competence of trainee pharmacists
- 9.6 The designated supervisor and the designated prescribing practitioner, or their delegates, must have regular developmental and documented meetings with a trainee pharmacist during the foundation training year
- 9.7 During the period of learning in practice, trainees must only carry out tasks at which they are competent, or are learning under supervision to be competent, so that patient safety is not compromised
- 9.9 Sign-off confirms that a trainee has achieved all the learning outcomes in part 1 of these standards. The decision to sign off a trainee must be made by more than one person and be based on evidence. As a minimum, if they are not the same person, the designated supervisor and the designated prescribing practitioner must both be involved in the decision to sign off a trainee. The designated prescribing practitioner must provide a formal confirmation once they are satisfied of the trainee's competence in prescribing. Other healthcare professionals involved in co-ordinating trainees' supervision, overseeing their progress, or in supervising them can be involved in signing them off. Agreed mechanisms for sign-off must be defined, including the roles and competences of those involved

These six criteria will be reviewed at the Step 4 event.

Teach out and transfer arrangements for the 4-year and 5-year MPharm degrees

14 students currently enrolled on the 4-year MPharm programme started the programme in 2020/21 – one currently in Year 2, four in Year 3 and nine in Year 4. All students have taken longer to progress to their current year of study due to repeating a year of study, or due to an interruption of studies for extenuating circumstances, or in order to complete deferred assessments. No currently enrolled students started the programme before 2020/21. All the students that started in 2020/21 have transferred to the new MPharm programme that launched in 2024/25, and for which reaccreditation against the 2021 standards is sought. All of these students have consequently undertaken all, or nearly all, of their studies since 2021/22, from which point changes to the MPharm as described in the Part 1 submission (legal and regulatory frameworks for independent prescribing; increased emphasis on anatomy, responding to symptoms, diagnostic skills and clinical decision-making; increased volume of experiential learning; increased emphasis on applied science) were introduced, fully equipping students for their subsequent studies on the new MPharm programme.

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 the end of the Step event process. 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 the part 2 event or Step event process without remedial measures (condition/s).

