

University of Huddersfield Master of Pharmacy (MPharm) degree interim event report, May 2021



Contents

Event summary and conclusions	1
Introduction	2
Role of the GPhC.....	2
Background.....	3
Documentation.....	3
Pre-event.....	4
The event.....	4
Declarations of interest	4
Schedule	4
Attendees	5
Key findings	6
Standard 1: Patient and public safety	6
Standard 2: Monitoring, review and evaluation of initial education and training.....	6
Standard 3: Equality, diversity and fairness	7
Standard 4: Selection of students <i>and trainees</i>	7
Standard 5: Curriculum delivery and student experience	8
Standard 6: Support and development for students <i>and trainees</i>	9
Standard 7: Support and development for academic staff <i>and pre-registration tutors</i> ...	9
Standard 8: Management of initial education and training	10
Standard 9: Resources and capacity.....	10
Significant pedagogic developments.....	11

Event summary and conclusions

Provider	University of Huddersfield
Course	Master of Pharmacy (MPharm) degree
Event type	Interim
Event date	6 May 2021
Current accreditation period	2020/21 - 2022/23
Relevant standards	Future pharmacists Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, May 2011
Outcome	Continued accreditation confirmed The accreditation team agreed to recommend to the Registrar of the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) that the MPharm degree provided by the University of Huddersfield should continue to be approved until 2022/23, at which point the provision will be accredited against the Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists 2021.
Conditions	There were no conditions
Standing conditions	The standing conditions of accreditation can be found here .
Recommendations	No recommendations were made
Registrar decision	Following the event, the Registrar of the GPhC accepted the accreditation team's recommendation and approved the continued accreditation of the programme until 2022/23.
Key contact (provider)	Dr Alison Astles, Subject lead, Pharmacy
Accreditation team	Ahmed Aboo (Team Leader) Associate Professor in Pharmacy Practice, De Montfort University Professor Andy Husband (Team member-academic) Professor of Clinical Pharmacy and Head of School, Newcastle University Dr Katie Maddock (Team member-academic) Head of School of Pharmacy at Keele University Professor Anne Watson (Team member-pharmacist) Postgraduate Pharmacy Dean, NHS Education for Scotland

	<p>Sekemi Akinode (Team member-pharmacist recently registered) Relief Pharmacist, Boots</p> <p>Liz Harlaar (Team member-lay) Independent Business Consultant</p>
GPhC representative	Philippa McSimpson, Quality Assurance Manager, GPhC
Rapporteur	Dr Ian Marshall (rapporteur) Proprietor, Caldarvan Research (Educational and Writing Services); Emeritus Professor of Pharmacology, University of Strathclyde
Observers	<p>Mairead Conlon (observer - accreditation panel member in training) Representation Pharmacist for UCA-NI Ltd (Ulster Chemists' Association) and part-time Community Pharmacist</p> <p>Dr Marisa van der Merwe (observer - accreditation panel member in training) Associate Head Academic, Principal Lecturer in Pharmaceutics, University of Portsmouth</p> <p>Simon Roer (observer) Policy Manager (Education), GPhC</p>

Introduction

Role of the GPhC

The General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) is the statutory regulator for pharmacists and pharmacy technicians and registered pharmacies 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 interim event was carried out in accordance with the GPhC's 2011 *MPharm Accreditation Methodology* and the course was reviewed against the GPhC's 2011 education standards *Future Pharmacists: Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists*.

The GPhC's right to check the standards of pharmacy qualifications leading to annotation and registration as a pharmacist is the *Pharmacy Order 2010* (<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/231/contents/made>). 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

The MPharm programme at the University of Huddersfield is delivered by the Department of Pharmacy, one of four constituent departments of the School of Applied Sciences. The MPharm programme received full Step 7 accreditation in 2012, and was reaccredited for 6 years in 2014 with no conditions or recommendations. An interim event took place in 2017 at which continued accreditation of the MPharm degree was confirmed and the accreditation team agreed to recommend to the Registrar of the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) that the University of Huddersfield should continue to be accredited to provide an MPharm degree for the remainder of the accreditation period. The reaccreditation event scheduled for May 2020 was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic and replaced with a further interim event that took place on 5/6 May 2021; this is the report of that event.

Staff and students left the University for the first COVID-19 lockdown on 23 March 2020; the majority of the teaching had been completed, and changes were introduced to deliver May assessments online. Strategies for protection against academic misconduct were prioritised in the structure of online assessments, including large question banks for randomisation, randomisation of question order, 'no-return' settings to force sequential answering, and devising questions that used knowledge application rather than retrieval.

In the 2020-21 academic year, a blended approach to learning has been used, mixing campus and online activities. Campus activities were prioritised for Year 1 to integrate students into University culture and for Year 4. Online sessions were badged as asynchronous and synchronous on the students' timetable. Asynchronous activities included reading, watching and information-finding tasks. The synchronous sessions were interactive and designed to have students working together on tasks in smaller groups. Placement activity was not possible during 2020-21 and was replaced by a series of experiential learning opportunities. This included online interprofessional learning activities and the provision of online patient-facing opportunities for all years.

Documentation

Prior to the event, the provider submitted documentation to the GPhC in line with the agreed timescales.

Appendix 1: Admissions and interviewing policies

Appendix 2: Aggregate application and entry profiles

Appendix 3: Critical evaluation of the applications data and entry profiles

Appendix 4: Aggregate progression data by student characteristic

Appendix 5: Critical evaluation of the progression data in Appendix 4

Appendix 6 MPharm risk register

Appendix 7: Staff list

The documentation was reviewed by the accreditation 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 12 April 2021. The purpose of the pre-event meeting was to prepare for the event, allow the GPhC and the University to ask any questions or seek clarification, and to finalise arrangements for the event.

The event

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the GPhC modified the structure of the event so that it could be held remotely. The event was held via videoconference between the University of Huddersfield and the GPhC accreditation team on 6 May 2021 and comprised meetings between the GPhC accreditation team and representatives of the MPharm programme.

Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Schedule

Day 1 – 5 May 2021

Meeting number	Meeting	Time
1.	Accreditation team leader meeting with GPhC representative	13:30 – 13:50
2.	Private meeting of the accreditation team and GPhC representative	14:00 – 15:45

Day 2 – 6 May 2021

Meeting number	Meeting	Time
3.	Private meeting of the accreditation team	09:00 – 09:30
4.	Progress meeting including presentation (Focusing on Standards 1,2,7,8 and 9)	09:30 – 11:20
5.	Private meeting of the accreditation team	11:20 – 11:45
6.	Admission, progression, monitoring and support meeting (Focusing on Standards 3, 4, 5 and 6)	11:45 – 12:30
7.	Significant pedagogical developments presentation (Focusing on Standards 5 and 10) Including presentation	13:45 – 14:25
8.	Student meeting	14:45 – 15:25
9.	Private meeting of the accreditation team	15:45 – 16:30
10.	Delivery of outcome to programme provider	16:30 – 17:00

Attendees

Course provider

The team met with the following representatives of the University:

Name	Designation at the time of accreditation event	Meetings attended
Dr Rob Allen	Director of Teaching and Learning	4, 6, 7,
Dr Kofi Asare-Addo	Admissions Tutor	4, 6
Dr Alison Astles	Subject Lead Pharmacy	4, 6, 7, 10
Steve Bentley	Senior Technology Support Advisor	4, 6, 7
Professor Barbara Conway	Head of Pharmacy	4, 6, 7, 10
Professor Michael Ginger	Dean, School of Applied Sciences	4, 6
Dr Hayley Gorton	Senior Lecturer in Pharmacy Practice Y4	4, 6, 7
Liz Horncastle	Senior Lecturer in Pharmacy Practice Y2	4, 6
Sarah Khan	Senior Lecturer in Pharmacy Practice Y1	4, 6
Dr Mayo Olajide	Reader, Pharmacology and Research Skills Module lead	4, 6, 7
Professor Laura Waters	Module lead formulation	4, 6
Emma Clark-Smith	Course Administrator	4, 6

The team also met with a group of MPharm students, one from Year 2, one from Year 3 and two from Year 4.

Key findings

Standard 1: Patient and public safety

Standard continues to be met? Yes No

The University and Pharmacy Department processes for fitness to practise have been reviewed against the revised GPhC guidance on fitness to practise, although some of the system changes will take time to resource and embed at University level. Training from University Registry on fitness to practise procedures is in place and is being rolled out to relevant staff, with external practitioners included. The Flying Start extended induction programme for students introduces standards for pharmacy professionals, along with the fitness to practise process, as well as inculcating a sense of belonging for new students. The team was told that academic integrity matters are most likely to be considered by fitness to practise, and that health matters rarely need to be considered as they are dealt with normally by a personal learning support plan. The team was also told that there are robust systems in place to deal with student health and wellbeing problems, including central University services. A new strategy for OSCE provision has been developed to provide clarity on how to deal with issues of patient harm arising in all assessments, in addition to standardising OSCE station development; this has been to ensure consistency across the course and also to allow staff to manage unanticipated harm situations. The team learned that the personal academic tutor (PAT) role is concerned with student development rather than with academic matters, and that the PATs are issued with different guidance documents for each year of the programme as the students develop. Students meet with their PAT at least four times each year.

Standard 2: Monitoring, review and evaluation of initial education and training

Standard continues to be met? Yes No

There was a success rate of 87% for Huddersfield MPharm graduates in the 2019 GPhC registration assessment, compared to 78% in 2018; this performance was in line with the sector norm. The team noted that around 50 percent of A-level entrants to the programme did not meet the standard entry qualification of ABB and was told that all students are allocated tutors to discuss the required work and possible referral to academic skills tutors for remedial help. Entrants with a mixture of A-level and BTEC qualifications are also monitored. Formal review of delivery and outcomes takes place annually at the Course Committee; an example of changes progressed by this process is the review and refocusing of the Research Skills module (see pedagogic developments below). There has been a programme of audit in place over the last three years with topics identified from staff discussion, policy changes and consideration of student feedback. Recently a diversity audit of the curriculum has been undertaken and a review of feedback provision to students was completed by a member of University staff external to the School. The team was told that commuter status and deprivation also required to be audited to assess what worked or not in terms of learning and assessment. Monitoring of student completion rates of the academic integrity module has improved the completion data from 279 non-completions in November 2020 to 15 in March 2021. Another EDI audit is planned which approaches the curriculum in a 'sliced' manner, considering EDI issues in different learning strands. The University-wide Huddersfield Student Survey, issued annually to non-final year students, supports the National Student Survey and the team was told

that the perennial issue is feedback, with students often feeling that assessments are unfair and feedback of limited value. There is now a plan to standardise feedback in terms of quantity and style.

Standard 3: Equality, diversity and fairness

Standard continues to be met? Yes No

Staff members have been provided with access to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) data at course and module level, which has enabled exploration of EDI issues and concerns through a diversity audit, including attainment at module level by characteristic, and also by assessment type. This revealed equality and diversity issues beyond, but related to, protected characteristics. There is a plan in place to eradicate such differential outcomes by 2025. The large number of commuter students and students with caring responsibilities were identified as significant issues. There are high percentages of female (67%) and non-white students (72%). Female students outperformed males and white students outperformed non-white. The white male was recognised as an under-represented group with poor statistics for course completion; strategies to increase school and college engagement with white males from deprived areas are being developed, including choice of appropriate role model representatives. An action plan has been developed for improving the data monitoring and developing an 'at risk' marker for students, based on historical data patterns; new modules have a critical reader to ensure that appropriate inclusive language is being used. The team was told that during the COVID-19 pandemic the University has allowed students to borrow laptops and made booked library places available for quiet study. The MPharm curriculum incorporates aspects of cultural effectiveness teaching and this strand is being reinforced by curriculum mapping to the new IETS.

Standard 4: Selection of students *and trainees*

Standard continues to be met? Yes No

To manage applications in the COVID period, all applicants complete an online entry test/assessment, which comprises calculations, a picture station and a professional station. Applicants are asked their thoughts and feelings on the situation presented and then what they would do in the situation. Applicants that pass are invited to online interviews with academic members of staff. The team was told that BTEC and Access applicants are subject to the same entry processes as A-level applicants. The current A-level entry requirements are A-levels in Chemistry and at least one further science subject from Biology, Maths or Physics. Chemistry A Level is essential. The endorsement for practical work is an essential part of Science A-level study, and is a requirement for entry. Offers are based on 3 A-level subjects in the region of ABB and are influenced by subjects being studied, predicted grades and performance at a selection day. The team was told that applicant numbers had not decreased as a result of the COVID pandemic, and that there is no intention to increase student numbers. The team learned that in the past there has been a number, generally less than 10 per year, of EU students and that these numbers reduced during the pandemic, but overseas students are now being interviewed again. The team was told that the online entry test/assessment has helped to identify candidates who would be unsuitable for the course, and that the rejection rate is around 20% mainly due to failure of the assessment or failure to attend. There is a document available for all staff members involved in interviewing

candidates with key pointers to avoid bias, and the format and principles of the entrance process are the same for all applicants, including consideration of diversity matters.

Standard 5: Curriculum delivery and student experience

Standard continues to be met? Yes No

The curriculum and delivery are largely unchanged since the last accreditation visit, with minor developments and adaptations to circumstances. In response to feedback and attainment data, further developments include a reinforcement of aspects of the clinical teaching in Pharmacy Practice 3, to support the transition to Masters level in both Pharmacy Practice 4 and Applied Therapeutics. In addition, greater consideration of medicines reconciliation processes and more in-depth care planning, along with aligning clinical reasoning techniques have been included to those used in Year 4. Despite these developments, the provider indicated that there was a degree of uncertainty over the move to the 2021 IEPT Standards and that there would need to be a mapping of the existing curriculum to the standards. The third year research module, Research Methods and Skills, has undergone a thorough review, with a change of title from 'Research Project' and a shift of focus. This is conducted currently online with projects involving computational chemistry and biology which the provider intends to maintain in the future. Opportunities for communication practice and skills development have been extended in all years and verbal communication is assessed in OSCEs in all years of the course. The team was told that in an attempt to increase the level of integration in the course, there are now two 40-credit modules in each of the third and fourth year. In addition, integrated case studies are brought into Years 2 and 3. There is a consolidation test in January each year which tests material from all modules. The roll-out of the Global Professional Award (GPA) to all first year Huddersfield students aims to improve students' employability, global and commercial awareness and to develop graduate attributes and contributes actively to skills development for MPharm students. The team was told that the School was the first to use the University-wide Flying Start programme which had led to an improvement in all courses and was recognised as a positive development based on student feedback and performance. There have also been minor developments to the delivery of Standard 10, in response to attainment, and staff and student feedback. The team was told the MPharm students undertake interprofessional learning with students of podiatry in Year 2, and of nursing, with a session based on new emerging guidance during the pandemic, and medicine, from the Huddersfield and Calderdale Trust, in later years. There are also possibilities with optometry and social work students. The team learned that plans for experiential learning after the pandemic will be incorporated into plans for meeting the new IEPT standards, and that the teacher-practitioners will be central to ensuring that the context is appropriate; there are also strong links to the local PPI group. The team was told that OSCEs develop throughout the course from mainly knowledge-based scenarios at the outset to counselling on more complicated medicines as the course progresses and on to skills-based scenarios in Year 4. The OSCEs are vetted by multiple staff members and a patient safety panel. The provider spoke of some concerns over lack of communication skills in the online OSCEs during the pandemic with some students failing to interact with staff member examiners; this has led to some campus-based skills development sessions being initiated. The team was told that the academic integrity of online assessments was a current focus of attention as engagement and integrity had been significant issues which have been improved subsequently. Thus, assessments are time-limited with no return to previously-answered questions, with pharmacy practice examinations held on campus. The

University had decided not to invest in proctoring software but to concentrate on behavioural change through the use of academic integrity modules in each year of the course.

Standard 6: Support and development for students *and trainees*

Standard continues to be met? Yes No

The Brightspace virtual learning environment has contributed to student support, by increased monitoring of student engagement and better functionality for managing the personal academic tutor system. The School academic skills tutors and student support wellbeing officers provide learning skills help and pastoral support to students. A variety of experiences are on offer to students, to develop their sense of being a pharmacy professional. These include competitions, for example, PLEA essay competition, Thornton and Ross counselling competition, ambassador roles, including NICE, student participation in conferences such as BPSA, and local professional meetings. The team was told that it had been beyond the Department's capacity to continue the student peer support scheme this academic year, but it was the intention to restart in the future, most likely using a combination of face-to-face and online approaches. It had been expected that Year 1 students might struggle due their disrupted A-level studies and assessments, but they had adapted well to the transition to university.

Standard 7: Support and development for academic staff *and pre-registration tutors*

Standard continues to be met? Yes No

All MPharm teaching staff members are supported in completing a teaching qualification and all are FHEA or working towards this if they are recently appointed. The University provides the PGCHE through the School of Education and staff members who are not FHEA on appointment are required to complete the qualification. The team learned that weekly drop-in sessions on specific topics such as assessment are available. New staff members share offices with more experienced members of staff which enables immediate support to be provided on a day-to-day basis and peer support in providing advice to students. Peer observation of teaching takes place at least annually and has continued through the pandemic. For all new staff, the induction process is available on Sharepoint and has key requirements for stages from Day One through to the end of the first year. There is a School-wide workload model in which teaching loads are reduced for new staff members and early career staff to allow them time to develop their research and teaching and establish networks. Teaching loads are balanced according to the level of research activity and other commitments according to the workload model, but the team was told that it would be a challenge to make the model fit the current situation which was impacted by changes due to the pandemic. Non-pharmacists are offered shadowing experience with practising pharmacists to help them to contextualise their teaching. In addition, non-pharmacists work alongside pharmacists in the teaching team and have ready access to a range of pharmacists both inside and outside the School for any advice they need. Staff performance is recognised and rewarded through annual Personal Development and Performance Review (PDPR) meetings and internal conferment procedures. The team was told that there had been comprehensive support to staff via the mandatory Moving Your Module Online program that offered pedagogic guidance and allowed teaching staff to examine course material from a student's perspective. More staff have been brought in to support for the microbiology teaching which had been subject to student disruption resulting from lack of engagement in the large practical classes; these have moved online for the current academic year.

Standard 8: Management of initial education and training

Standard continues to be met? Yes No

The MPharm is delivered from within the School of Applied Sciences. The School has four departments, namely Chemical Sciences, Biological Science and Geography, Optometry, Biology and Pharmacy. The School of Applied Sciences is managed by the School Board and School Management Committee and Departments are the responsibility of Heads of Department who allocate responsibilities to their teams. The MPharm course is administered by the Course Committee which meets at least three times a year and agrees developmental changes. The MPharm course has an identified subject lead that is responsible for co-ordination of the course overall and for working with the module leaders for the course to ensure continued integration of material. The timetable is agreed between the module leaders and the subject lead with clear and accountable responsibility for delivering the teaching for specific areas. Module leaders are responsible for the setting and grading of all summative assessments, with internal moderation provided by members of the academic team. The University operates a strict attendance policy and attendance at all taught sessions is monitored by means of swipe card. The team was told that there had been initial concerns about student engagement as a result of the pandemic, particularly at Year 1 level, although the move from school to a more independent way of learning is emphasised from the start. As a result, campus activities were prioritised for Year 1 to integrate students into University culture, and for Year 4. Engagement has been monitored through the virtual learning environment, with lack of engagement being followed up by personal academic tutors. Engagement has been helped by splitting students into smaller groups than usual, although this involves repeat teaching.

Standard 9: Resources and capacity

Standard continues to be met? Yes No

The University operates a devolved revenue system whereby money is transferred to Schools as income as it is earned with a central top slice for services provided and estate. Income is directly related to student numbers plus that earned by innovation, research grants and by sale of services. There are no plans to extend numbers on the MPharm, currently a total of 370 students, and any growth in numbers and resources will be through postgraduate taught programmes. There has been a substantial turnover of staff members since the last accreditation event. There are currently 20.5 FTE staff members in the Department, plus 2.4 FTE part-time teacher-practitioners, along with teaching support from within the School of Applied Sciences. There is one staff vacancy in the budget but no other plans to increase the staff complement. The value of external speakers was emphasised by the provider. The Department is housed in the Joseph Priestley Building where the majority of the teaching takes place. The building contains lecture theatres and laboratories that have either been recently built or refurbished since the previous accreditation visits, to provide a modern environment with social and work spaces for individual and small group learning suitable for the MPharm, while new teaching laboratories provide for more flexible delivery of teaching to larger groups. On the basis of a video presentation, the team agreed that the facilities appeared suitable for purpose. A new Eye Clinic will give further opportunities for experiential and interprofessional learning. A major new laboratory teaching space contains dedicated laboratory spaces shared with the rest of the School and providing large spaces for the delivery of chemistry,

biology and physiology focussed activities. There are also two large additional laboratories for outreach and other laboratory teaching activities. The pharmacy practice teaching space, completed in 2017, is a purpose-built, multifunctional space for dispensing activities, aseptic training and counselling. Students interviewed particularly appreciated the new aseptic suite. Students have access to the virtual learning environment, Brightspace, which has been used as the learning system since the academic year 2018-2019 and has proved to be a useful, if unsophisticated, measure of student engagement. The team learned that the VLE had been well supported by technology colleagues and was highly regarded by students.

Significant pedagogic developments

Example 1

Pedagogic case study: SHP3003

Objective:

Module SHP3003 Research Project was reviewed in 2019-20 (for September 2020 implementation) to achieve several objectives:

- To shift the focus of the module for students from the 'project' to 'skills' development
- To integrate research skills more actively into practice, in order to more clearly demonstrate the relevance of research skills to students
- To ensure a more comprehensive overview of research skills applicable to all areas of pharmacy practice

Underpinning pedagogy and policy considerations:

The module is in part intended to deliver learning outcome *10.2.1.g : Contribute to research and development activities to improve health outcomes* in the GPhC standards. The changes made are intended to give greater emphasis than previously to the second phrase '*improve health outcomes*' by enhancing the links with practice activities.

The changes also support the Royal Pharmaceutical Society's approach that '*all pharmacy professionals should engage, support and lead research*'. Students engage with topics more fully when they relate to their future practice, so it was felt important to emphasise the concept of research being a skill applicable to all pharmacists, not just those in academia. Examples of these links to research within the wider curriculum are exploration of pharmacy service commissioning and pharmaceutical public health (Y2), more in-depth evidence-based practice (Y3) and pharmacy as part of broader healthcare and society (Y4). It is recognised that students are being prepared for careers in pharmacy practice, industry, research (academic and industrial), and drug regulation. There is a balance to be achieved across the varied research skills requirements in these sectors.

Design:

The name of the module was changed from 'Research Project' to 'Research Methods and Skills'. This is intended to focus the student on the learning and development, rather than the output of the project.

Previously, the module had a strongly quantitative, positivist approach to research and did not significantly address other paradigms. Teaching on alternative approaches such as qualitative

techniques was included within the module. To accommodate this, the previous significant quantity of statistics teaching and assessment was reduced. The changes are documented in the minutes of the School Accreditation and Validation Panel committee meeting of November 20 2019.

Results:

The new-design module was initiated in September 2020 and will be fully reviewed at the next Course Committee. Due to COVID, all projects were designed so that they could be delivered remotely, without any campus or face-to-face data collection, but this has not distorted the intention of the module review. Anecdotally, at February 2021, an increased number of qualitative projects have been started, compared to previous years. During late 2019/early 2020, consultation with local Trust pharmacists took place to canvass for data sources or data collection opportunities for students, but this was downplayed this year due to COVID.

At the Course Committee, the following data will be considered:

- Module review feedback data from students
- Nature of projects undertaken (qual/quant) compared to previous years

Conclusion:

This module review has given a broader focus to research skills and enabled integration with other teaching across all years of the course. It has heightened the relevance of research skills to all sectors of pharmacy practice, amongst both students and staff. Full review at the next Course Committee 2021 after a full year-cycle is completed will allow more detailed analysis to take place.

Further developments planned for this module are to increase support to supervising staff around two areas: project administration (to ensure consistency of the student experience) and to highlight areas of integration with the curriculum (to ensure consistency of student learning about the importance of research skills). This will be delivered by two sessions for staff, in October and January, as strategic points in the delivery of the module. In addition post-pandemic, we will re-establish our relationships with local external partners on utilising the student body for research opportunities that meet our learning outcomes.

Example 2

Pedagogic Case Study: Academic Integrity (AI) Support for Students

Objective:

The aim of this initiative was to ensure all students were well-prepared for delivering work that maintained principles of academic integrity. This was achieved by:

- Implementation of an AI training module
- Monitoring of completion of the module with follow-up of students

Pedagogic and policy underpinning:

Part of management of academic integrity and misconduct is ensuring that all students have a full understanding of the issue and are well-prepared to maintain AI principles in their work. It is

known that cultural factors can play a part in AI breach and also that the transition from school or college to university often exposes a difference in approach by staff to AI. To help achieve this, the University has developed a module for students entitled 'Academic Integrity'.

It is hoped that improving students' understanding of AI principles will reduce the number of cases of AI breach that are reported by staff.

Design:

All students are required to complete the AI module at the start of every year of their course. This is highlighted during Flying Start (Year 1) and induction (Years 2-4). Early meeting with personal academic tutors (PATs) also emphasises the importance of completion. The majority of students complete the module successfully in the first few weeks of semester 1. However, there is a group of students, despite repeated general reminders, that fails to complete the module.

This initiative relied upon the ability to produce reports at course and year level from Brightspace about the number and names of students who had not completed the module. These data were reviewed by the course lead and names distributed at monthly intervals during Semester One to PATs. PATs were required to contact the student via the usual PAT meetings to discuss the lack of completion. Prior to this, these data would have been difficult for PATs to access readily.

Results:

The number of students who had not completed the AI module is shown below, from November 2020 when the data was initially shared, to date. The PAT intervention took place after November 3 2020.

Nov 3 2020:	279 students not completed
First PAT intervention took place	
Nov 20 2020:	139 students not completed
Jan and Feb 2021:	17 students not completed
Mar 2021:	15 not completed (may include withdrawn students)

Conclusion:

The system of regular tracking of module completion and feedback of the data to PATs has enabled the staff team to ensure that nearly all students have completed the module in 2020-21.

The team aimed to determine if achieving nearly total completion of the module would have any impact on the number of AI cases brought to the School. However, the impact of COVID-19 and changes to delivery methods for learning and assessment mean that comparisons with other years are not valid. The goal of informing students of AI principles is a valid achievement, however and will be continued in future years in the same way.

The team asked what happens if a student fails the module and was told that some students withdrew from the course leaving only a small number not passing with the required 100% mark. It was emphasised that although it had been considered that failure of the module would lead to failure to progress, the module was designed to change behaviour and that the possible consequences of transgression were considered as part of the module.

Example 3

Pedagogic Case Study: Nursing and pharmacy interprofessional education on COVID-19 vaccine

Introduction

This case study describes a collaborative project between the Schools of Applied Sciences and Human and Health Sciences, to deliver an interprofessional education (IPE) session online between pharmacy and nursing students. Such IPE activities have been a regular part of the curriculum, but due to COVID, a novel way of delivering the session had to be devised. The national roll-out of the COVID-19 vaccination programme provided a timely subject for the collaboration. The project was awarded a grant to deliver an evaluation from the School of Human and Health Sciences.

Pedagogic and policy underpinning:

IPE is a key element of the GPhC Standards and of Nursing and Midwifery Council standards. It is also promoted by Health Education England. Within the MPharm, it is aimed to widen students' perceptions of themselves as part of a wider healthcare team, which comes particularly into focus in Year Four. This session was devised around a multidisciplinary activity (vaccination) with key elements which both professional groups could bring to the scenario. In this way, effective multiprofessional working, bringing different but complementary skills, could be explored and demonstrated by the students.

Design:

SMP4001 Pharmacy Practice 4 is a final year module that has a focus on preparing for practice. Prior to the session, students were provided with reading material about the Pfizer-BioTech COVID-19 vaccine and roll-out programme. A worksheet (developed jointly between the Schools) was provided for teams of nursing and pharmacy students to complete together. Questions on the sheet included for example, the legal basis of administration, dealing with patient concerns, consent and advocacy, safe administration, and pharmacovigilance. The session was delivered by MSTeams and students had the opportunity to work in small groups, convening for a plenary session at the end. Tutors were able to visit the groups to support the work.

Results:

The evaluation of the session is currently being analysed and prepared for publication. In brief, forty-four students completed a pre- and post-session evaluation and rated the session highly. There was no difference in evaluation between the pharmacy and nursing students. A focus group was held with staff involved in the session which yielded satisfaction with the event and ideas for increasing student engagement.

Conclusion:

Delivery of experiential learning has been challenging during the last year, but a strong commitment to providing rich experiences for students has been maintained during the pandemic. This case study demonstrates how a current (January 2021) topic has been taken and delivered as an online activity that was enjoyed and valued by students. Whilst a return to face-t-face activities will be welcomed in the future, the success of the online delivery may offer additional opportunities going forward.

