

**Swansea University, Master of Pharmacy  
(MPharm) degree and MPharm degree with  
preparatory year accreditation, step 4 event  
report, July 2022**



# Contents

<b>Event summary and conclusions</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Role of the GPhC.....	3
Background.....	3
Documentation.....	4
Pre-event.....	4
The event.....	5
Declarations of interest .....	5
Schedule .....	5
Attendees .....	6
<b>Key findings - Part 1 Learning outcomes</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Key findings - Part 2 Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists</b> .....	<b>7</b>
Standard 1: Selection and admission .....	7
Standard 2: Equality, diversity and fairness .....	8
Standard 3: Resources and capacity.....	10
Standard 4: Managing, developing and evaluating MPharm degrees .....	11
Standard 5: Curriculum design and delivery .....	13
Standard 6: Assessment.....	16
Standard 7: Support and development for student pharmacists and everyone involved in the delivery of the MPharm degree .....	19
Decision descriptors.....	23

## Event summary and conclusions

<b>Provider</b>	Swansea University
<b>Courses</b>	Master of Pharmacy (MPharm) degree Master of Pharmacy (MPharm) degree with preparatory year
<b>Event type</b>	Step 4 accreditation
<b>Event date</b>	13-14 July 2022
<b>Approval period</b>	Working towards accreditation
<b>Relevant requirements</b>	<a href="#">Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists, January 2021</a>
<b>Outcome</b>	Approval  The accreditation team agreed to recommend to the Registrar of the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) that the MPharm degree and MPharm with preparatory year offered by Swansea University/Prifysgol Abertawe are accredited to proceed from step 4 to step 5 of the process for new MPharm degrees. This means that the Swansea/Abertawe degrees are provisionally accredited for another year.
<b>Conditions</b>	There were no conditions.
<b>Standing conditions</b>	The standing conditions of accreditation can be found <a href="#">here</a> .
<b>Recommendations</b>	There are two recommendations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. that in relation to criterion 1.7, consideration should be given to harmonising the approaches to admissions at the point of initial selection in both versions of the MPharm degree. In particular, the use of interactive components for admission to the five-year course; and</li> <li>2. that in relation to criteria 6.4, 6.6 and 6.7 further consideration should be given to the contemporary nature of the standard setting methodologies used. The team recommends that the Department of Pharmacy seeks advice from elsewhere in the Faculty, where such methodologies are already embedded. This issue will be revisited in future step events.</li> </ol>
<b>Registrar decision</b>	Following the event, the Registrar of the GPhC accepted the accreditation team's recommendation and confirmed Swansea University is permitted to move from step 4 to step 5 of the of the process for new MPharm degrees. The step 5 accreditation will take place on-site, 2022/23 academic year.

<b>Key contacts (provider)</b>	Professor Andrew Morris, Head of Pharmacy Ms Emma Westwood, Academic Quality and Programme Development Lead
<b>Accreditation team</b>	*Professor Chris Langley (Team leader) Professor of Pharmacy Law & Practice and Deputy Dean of the College of Health and Life Sciences, Aston University Daniel Grant (team member - pharmacy academic) Associate Professor in Clinical Pharmacy and Pharmacy Education, University of Reading Rav Savania (team member - pharmacy academic) Director of Teaching and Learning, Lecturer in Pharmacy Practice, University of Reading Lesley Johnson (team member - pharmacist) Director of Education and Training, Communications International Group Alastair Paterson (team member - pharmacist - recently qualified) Clinical Pharmacist, Northumberland Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust Susan Bradford (team member - lay) Lay Commissioner, Commission on Human Medicines
<b>GPhC representative</b>	*Damian Day, Head of Education, General Pharmaceutical Council Philippa McSimpson, Quality Assurance Manager (Education) General Pharmaceutical Council ( <i>attending day 2 only from 09:00 - 13:00</i> )
<b>Rapporteur</b>	Professor Brian Furman, Emeritus Professor of Pharmacology, University of Strathclyde
<b>Observers</b>	Charles Odiase (Observer - new panel member in training) Consultant Pharmacist Primary Care and Diabetes (Lead Clinical Pharmacist) Dacorum GP Federation, Hertfordshire UK Shahzad Ahmad (Observer - new panel member in training) Clinical Safety Officer and Pharmacy Consultant

\*Attended the pre-event meeting on 28 June 2022.

## Introduction

### Role of the GPhC

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

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

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

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

### Background

#### MPharm degree

Early in 2018, Swansea University Medical School approached the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) with a view to entering the process for accrediting a new MPharm degree, the intention being to admit the first cohort of students in the 2020/2021 academic year. A Step 1 event was convened on 25 May 2018, following which the University was permitted to proceed to step 2 of the seven-step accreditation process. Following successful step 2 (September 2019) and step 3 (September 2020) events, the University was permitted to accept its first intake of student onto its new MPharm degree and to progress to step 4 subject to one condition; this required the University to remove the vacation optional module between years 2 and 3, because the team regarded this as potentially unfair to students who may not be able to engage with it for personal, family, or other reasons. This condition was met, and a step 4 event was scheduled for July 2022.

Steps 1-3 of the accreditation process for Swansea University had been to the GPhC 2011 'Future Pharmacists: Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists'. In January 2021 the GPhC published updated **Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists** and required that all students starting on an MPharm degree in the 2021-22 academic year onwards must meet the requirements of the 2021 standards. The first cohort of Swansea University MPharm students started in the 2021-22 academic year and as such, this cohort, and all future cohorts, will be required to meet the requirements of the GPhC 2021 standards. It was agreed therefore that Swansea University would be reviewed against the 2021 standards for the remaining steps of the accreditation process, with the accreditation team having regard for the transition between standards.

As a pilot, some of the elements of the adapted methodology for reaccreditation of MPharm degrees to the 2021 standards were also applied to the step 4 event, particularly the use of 'met', 'likely to be

met' and 'not met' decisions available to the accreditation team. It is intended this will help shape the focus of future step events and submission documentation as the provider moves through the step process. For step events, a 'likely to be met' decision means that the accreditation team is confident that the criterion or learning outcome will be met in full by step 7. It is anticipated that most learning outcomes will be 'likely to be met' until step 7, however the GPhC recognises that some criterion within the standards could be 'met' at earlier steps. See [decision descriptors](#) for further information.

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

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

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

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

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

## **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 28 June 2022. The purpose of the pre-event meeting was to prepare for the event, allow the GPhC and the provider to ask any questions or seek clarification, and to finalise arrangements for the event. The provider was advised of areas that were likely to be explored further by the accreditation team during the event.

## The event

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 on 13 - 14 June 2022 and comprised of a series of meetings between the GPhC accreditation team and representatives of the MPharm course and a meeting with students.

## Declarations of interest

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

## Schedule

### Day 1: 13 July 2022

	<b>09.30 – 11:00</b>	Private meeting of the accreditation team including break
<b>1.</b>	<b>11:00 – 11:30</b>	Management and oversight of the MPharm degree - part 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Presentation from provider</li></ul>
	<b>11:30 – 11:45</b>	Private meeting of accreditation team
<b>2.</b>	<b>11:45 – 13:15</b>	Management and oversight of the MPharm degree - part 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Questions and discussions</li></ul>
	<b>13:15 – 14:00</b>	Lunch break
	<b>14:00 – 14:30</b>	Private meeting of accreditation team
<b>3.</b>	<b>14:30 – 15:30</b>	Student meeting
	<b>15:30 – 16:00</b>	Private meeting of accreditation team

### Day 2: 14 July 2022

	<b>09:00 – 09:30</b>	Private meeting of accreditation team
<b>4.</b>	<b>09:30 – 10:30</b>	Teaching, learning, support and assessment - part 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Presentation from provider</li><li>• Questions and discussion</li></ul>
	<b>10:30 – 11:00</b>	Break and private meeting of accreditation team
<b>5.</b>	<b>11:00 – 13:00</b>	Teaching, learning, support and assessment - part 2

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation from provider</li> <li>• Questions and discussion</li> </ul>
	<b>13:00 – 13:45</b>	Lunch break
	<b>13:45 – 16:15</b>	Private meeting of the accreditation team
<b>6.</b>	<b>16:15 – 16:30</b>	Delivery of outcome to the University

## Attendees

### Course provider

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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation at the time of the event</b>
Al-Dujaili, Dr Juman	Senior Lecturer
Allen, Professor Margaret	HEIW Pharmacy Dean
Croucher, Sophie	Teacher Practitioner
Davies, Gareth	Head of Education and Student Experience
Doyle, Laura	HEIW Head of Undergraduate and Foundation Pharmacist
Dudley, Dr Ed	Medical School Education Lead
Ferla, Dr Salvatore	Admissions Tutor
Fletcher, Dr Jessica	Medical School Foundation Director
Healy, Dr Melanie	Senior Lecturer
Guirguis, Dr Amira*	MPharm Programme Director
McKeever, Dr Michael	EDI Lead
Mohankumar, Dr Suresh	Teaching Group Coordinator
Mok, Dr Zi Hong	Exams Officer
Morris, Professor Andrew*	Head of Pharmacy
Nanetti, Dr Giulio	Academic Disability Coordinator
Pritchard, Helen	Teaching Support Technician
Rees, Nicola	Academic Quality and Programme Development Lead
Thomas, Dr Rhian	MPharm Year 2 Lead
Thornton, Professor Cathy	Head of Medical School
Turner, Dr Adam*	MPharm Year 1 Lead
Westwood, Emma*	Academic Quality and Programme Development Lead
Wilkins, Simon	Teaching Group Coordinator
Williams, Gwenno	Teacher Practitioner

\*Attended the pre-event meeting on 28 June 2022.

The accreditation team also met a group of MPharm students comprising two from the preparatory year and seven from year 1.

## Key findings - Part 1 Learning outcomes

During this step 4 process the accreditation team did not review the provider's proposed teaching and assessment of the learning outcomes relating to the MPharm degree. However, based on the submitted documentation, the team agreed in principle that all 55 learning outcomes are likely to be met by Step 7. At steps 6 and 7 of the process the accreditation team will gain assurance by testing a sample of learning outcomes during a dedicated meeting.

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

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

### Standard 1: Selection and admission

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

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

Course information, including all entry requirements, the requirement for health and good character checks, and the concept of fitness to practise, is provided to applicants via different sources including the undergraduate prospectus and the MPharm course page on the website. Open Days provide prospective students with an opportunity to discuss the MPharm course with members of Pharmacy academic staff. In view of the University's commitment to the Welsh language, prospective students may apply for a place and elect to receive communications in either English or Welsh.

The usual offer for the MPharm is ABB-BBB at A-level which must include chemistry and at least one other STEM subject (biology, physics, mathematics, and psychology). Students involved in the 'Step Up to Swansea' programme, receive an offer based on BBB at A-level. This programme, which is part of a general widening participation agenda, and which requires a high level of commitment and the submission of coursework, is aimed at Year 12 students completing the first year of a level 3 qualification in a school or college in Southwest Wales. The staff told the team that offers during

clearing had gone as low as BBC, but no lower for direct entry to year 1. Entry offers for the MPharm with preparatory year will be BCC-CCD. All offers, based on grades and the applicants' personal statements, are subject to the satisfactory completion of an online interview. Candidates undertake four individual multiple mini-interview (MMI) stations covering patient ethical dilemmas, problem solving, the profession of pharmacy and numeracy. Communication skills are considered at all of these and a fifth station is based on a group exercise. Applicants are scored on these stations and those applicants scoring at or above the threshold score are offered a place, unless 'red flags' are noted, which results in rejection. Those achieving scores below the threshold are considered further and may be offered a place on the MPharm with preparatory year. A similar process is used during clearing, although the group task is replaced by appropriate questions. Asking about HEIW's (Health Education Improvement Wales) involvement in the admissions process, the team learned that the University has engaged with this organisation from the beginning; HEIW is integrally involved in the course development and is represented on the Advisory Board, where the entire admission process was discussed and agreed. In response to the team's wish to learn why applicants for the MPharm with preparatory year do not undergo the same interactive MMIs, the staff explained that such interviews are included as part of the assessment in the mandatory 'Foundations in Pharmacy' module in year 0; if they fail this, they cannot progress. Moreover, as well as having their personal statements considered, applicants for this programme undergo the same fitness to practise scrutiny as those applying for direct entry to year 1. The team, however, recommended (see recommendation 1) that the University should consider harmonising the approaches to admissions at the point of initial selection in both versions of the MPharm degree; in particular, this relates to criterion 1.7, which requires the use of interactive components for admission to MPharm programmes.

All staff members involved in the admissions process, including the interviews, complete the Swansea University Diversity and Equal Opportunities training module. This familiarises them with equality legislation and gives them an understanding of the broader issues around equality and diversity. In response to the team's wish to learn about the profile of students admitted to the programme, the staff described how, despite the relatively small cohort size, the Department had looked at the students' protected characteristics. This analysis showed that the male to female split was around 50%, about 10% had a disability, and there was a high percentage (47.5%) of students from a BAME background; 11.8% were Welsh speakers.

## Standard 2: Equality, diversity and fairness

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

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

The University is committed to equality, diversity and inclusion across the institution, and the Equality Annual Report is used to inform priorities in these areas. Student data, including performance and attainment by protected characteristics at an institutional level, are made publicly available each year in the Equality Annual Report. Annual progression reports for the MPharm programmes will be filterable by protected characteristics. These data will be produced following the Examination Board and subsequently reviewed by a subset of the Pharmacy academic staff, which will include the MPharm Programme Director and the Pharmacy EDI Lead.

The Pharmacy Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Lead, who works with the Medical School EDI Lead, promotes equal opportunities for all within the Pharmacy Team, supporting the Faculty's strategic aims to build a supportive, inclusive and highly motivated staff and student community, adhering to the principles of inclusivity, widening participation and openness, where all staff and students are free from discrimination. All other members of academic staff have important EDI roles to play in their roles as academic mentors and involvement in the admissions process as MMI interviewers. Students who disclose disabilities and provide relevant medical evidence are eligible to receive tailored reasonable teaching and assessment adjustments according to their specific individual needs.

All core Pharmacy academic staff have been trained in Equality and Diversity in the Workplace and in Unconscious Bias; such training is mandatory for all new staff members. Swansea Academy of Learning and Teaching (SALT) has created an optional, online course designed to help all teaching and support staff to develop a more inclusive approach to their role. Academic staff are also encouraged to engage with Swansea Academy of Inclusivity and Learner Success (SAILS); SAILS works with colleagues across the University to ensure that inclusive learning, teaching, and assessment is accessible to all. An EDI learning needs analysis is being undertaken across Pharmacy to identify any new training needs.

Lectures, simulated case studies and assessments help students to learn about the Equality Act 2010, and about how to make a difference to patients and the public through demonstrating high standards of practice and being aware of culturally sensitive matters. The MPharm programme has a strategy focussed on delivering equality, enhancing diversity, and promoting inclusion through teaching and training. The curriculum has been designed proactively to improve attainment gaps between BAME students and their counterparts, building an ethos of a fair culture through ethics learning for example on religion, values, and beliefs, and enhancing students' knowledge of 'cultural competence'. The use of diverse simulated patients in case studies, as well as in assessments such as OSCEs, improves students' feeling of belonging and brings learning to relatable experiences. The staff illustrated inclusivity in teaching using the example of showing skin conditions on different skin tones. Moreover, the team learned that case studies, which will cover all nine protected characteristics, will include a variety of patients of different backgrounds from all sectors of society including impoverished areas, and prisoners: students will need to address solutions to the unique problems presented by these patients. MPharm students undertake mandatory training prior to attending any placements. This training ensures that students understand their legal responsibilities under equality and human rights legislation and that they understand communities and cultures. In response to the team's wish to learn how placement providers receive training in EDI, and how EDI in the workplace is monitored and evaluated, the staff described how most providers are accredited via HEIW and all are fully trained; the Department can provide training for those who need it. Monitoring of EDI in the workplace is undertaken using the Pharmacy Portal, through which students can provide feedback. Funding for placements is available only if the provider has been approved via HEIW which quality

assures placement sites; this ensures consistency across all aspects including EDI.

Noting the University's statutory requirements under the Welsh Language Standards, for example, the use of the Welsh language on the website, the team learned of the ambition to deliver the programme in both English and Welsh where possible and a Welsh speaking member of staff has been appointed. Help is available for Welsh-speaking students to adapt to English Language medium education. Placements will be offered in Welsh-speaking areas. Welsh speaking staff members are available in central University services to provide pastoral support.

### 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met ✓	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 3.3 is:	Met ✓	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>

Pharmacy sits as a separate budgetary unit within the Medical School, which is one of three Schools within the Faculty of Medicine, Health and Life Science. The Head of Pharmacy sits on the Medical School's Management Board and has full control over the Pharmacy budget. A detailed business plan was produced for the MPharm programme; this was based on student and staff numbers, income, and expenditure. This plan was approved by the Faculty Finance Manager and incorporated into the Faculty Business Plan, which was subsequently approved by the University's central planning department. Pump-priming for Pharmacy was initially approved by the University's Senior Leadership Team in January 2018 and has been carried forward unaltered at further business planning rounds each year. The team learned that the University had exceeded its 2021 student intake targets for both MPharm programmes. The staff told the team that the budget had been maintained and that the support from the University had been very good. Everything that was budgeted for had been obtained and the Department was allowed to carry over unspent money into the next year. No additional resources had been required but there was flexibility in the business plan, allowing an appointment to be brought forward to support the administration of placements. Funding to support placements has been allocated but HEIW funding may free some of that resource to provide other support where required.

The plan for the phased recruitment of 24.5 full-time equivalent academic staff members for teaching the MPharm programmes will deliver a final student/staff ratio of 16.7:1. The phasing ensures the timely appointment of sufficient pharmacy academic staff to plan, write and deliver the degree. These posts cover all the required subject areas with academic staff being recruited to all three groups ('Practice of Pharmacy', 'Drugs and Medicines', and 'Health, Disease, and Patients'). Seven of the first 14 academic staff appointed to the Pharmacy Team are GPhC-registered pharmacists, and a further three are pharmacists registered overseas. It is anticipated that ultimately approximately one third of the Pharmacy Team will be practising UK pharmacists. In response to the team's wish to learn how the staffing plans were being rolled out and if the plan had needed any modifications, the staff explained that the only problem had been the appointment of a bilingual (Welsh/English) lecturer. The post has now been changed to that of a teacher practitioner at 0.8 FTE; this broadened the possibilities, and the Department was optimistic about making this appointment. In response to the team's wish to

learn of the key priorities in preparing to deliver year 2 and beyond, the staff described the main challenge as the increase in the number of cohorts and size of each cohort. However, the Department meets regularly with HR to ensure the correct timings of appointments to maintain the SSR at a manageable level. Timetables are planned to address staff load. There is sufficient resource for the additional cohorts, including sufficient space, and the facilities can cope, although there will need to be an investment in resources for clinical facilities, which will be shared across the Faculty.

The MPharm programme is supported administratively by the Faculty Education and Student Experience structure. The Pharmacy Business Plan makes provisions for the recruitment of 5.5 additional members of staff to support the extra workload involved in administering the new programme and a further 5.2 technician posts.

Capital funding (£2.1 million) provided by the University allowed the establishment of a dedicated core Pharmacy area at the heart of the Medical School in the Grove Building, allowing the co-location of students of pharmacy and medicine, along with Physician Associate students. These facilities, completed in September 2021, incorporate a Pharmacy Skills Suite (PSS), four large consultation rooms equipped with recording apparatus, offices for Pharmacy academic staff and technicians, meeting rooms, and the social learning space (the Myddfai room) for Pharmacy students. The Pharmacy Skills Suite houses clinical diagnostic equipment, a dispensing area, a simulated community pharmacy environment, and technology for simulation using computerised mannequins. A simulation centre management system is used to capture simulated clinical experiences in teaching or summative assessment. This can be used to record, debrief, and assess performance. A virtual tour demonstrated the suitability of these facilities to the team. Moreover, the students told the team that they were very pleased with these facilities, which they used extensively, including during the Covid-19 pandemic. The Myddfai room offered quiet, comfortable space that was exclusively for pharmacy students from both programmes. The library also provided bookable quiet study spaces and there was adequate access to computing facilities. The Canvas virtual learning environment (VLE) was used to provide all learning materials, as well as feedback. The students reported no problems with accessing the learning materials and no IT issues.

The Medical School also has input into the development of the new £15 million Swansea Wellness Centre in the centre of the city. The Wellness Centre will contain a GP practice, pharmacy, and dental surgery, as well as physiotherapy and podiatry services. There will also be space for education and training purposes to which the University will have access.

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

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

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

Because the MPharm is new to the University, its introduction has been overseen by a Project Board, comprising the Pharmacy teaching team, the Head of Pharmacy, and the MPharm Project Manager, together with representatives from Human Resources, Estates, Academic Services, Information Services and the Marketing, Recruitment & International department. The Project Board has met every six weeks between September 2019 and December 2021 to review the major achievements for the previous and forthcoming periods. This Board will undertake a benefits realisation review in October 2022.

In response to the team's wish to learn more about the Pharmacy Board of Studies, the staff confirmed that this is part of the formal governance structure, providing oversight of quality assurance. Thus, the Board oversees annual programme and module review, where student feedback, provided via the Student Forum, is also considered. Annual Programme Review is a key element in the monitoring of the academic standards of awards and the quality of learning. This considers a range of data including external examiners' reports, student feedback, enrolments, progression and completion, assessment results, degree outcomes and employability. The Board is supported by the Faculty of Medicine, Health and Life Science Academic Quality team and is chaired by the Head of Pharmacy, with all members of the Pharmacy team being members; there are also student and patient representatives. The only significant changes overseen by the Board have been those made to year 2 of the programme to allow progress towards meeting the GPhC's 2021 standards.

The University actively promotes, supports, and uses effective student representation at all levels of decision making. The student voice and representation are delivered by both the student representative system and other mechanisms such as module feedback, placement feedback, Staff Student Forums, and informal feedback received during teaching sessions. Students are also encouraged to complete the institutional Student Experience Survey (SES) based upon questions used in the National Student Survey (NSS). Pharmacy Student Staff Forums, chaired by the Medical School's Student Engagement and Partnership Lead, allow student representatives from both the MPharm and MPharm with Preparatory Year to discuss the course with a small number of Pharmacy academics. These student representatives are also invited to a Medical School Staff Student Forum. The team learned that the SES results ranked the MPharm highly among courses in the University in terms of teaching, learning opportunities, assessment and feedback, academic support, the learning community, and the student voice. In their meeting with the team, the students confirmed this high degree of satisfaction and how they provided feedback through their representatives on the Board of Study, as well as through module questionnaires and speaking directly to their mentors and other staff members. They told the team how any complaints or concerns were dealt with promptly.

Engagement with stakeholders from across the profession and the wider community is a critical element of course development and delivery. This engagement is achieved through the Pharmacy External Advisory Board and several focused stakeholder groups, these being 'Patients and the Public', 'Practice and Inter-professional Education', 'Research and Industrial Engagement', and 'Students and Recent Graduates'. The External Advisory Board representation includes HEIW, Community Pharmacy Wales, the Welsh Pharmacy Board, Swansea Bay University Health Board, the Royal Pharmaceutical Society, the Welsh Pharmaceutical Committee and the ABPI; there are also representatives of patients and the public. The currency and validity of the course is ensured as many of the team are practising pharmacists. Honorary contracts are in place for key placement personnel; all Placement Leads are practising pharmacists and influence programme design and modification through their membership

of the Pharmacy Board of Study. Responding to the team’s wish to learn how stakeholders had been involved in the delivery of year 1 of the programme, the staff described how external experts, including eight pharmacists from different sectors, are involved in delivery on the campus. They are also heavily involved in developing the spiral curriculum through developing more complex case studies in year 2. Discussions are underway with the ‘patients and the public’ group concerning their role in year 2 workshops.

In response to the team’s wish to learn more about the developing relationship with HEIW, the health boards and placement providers, the staff described how the strong relationship with all health boards, especially Swansea Bay University Health Board (SBUHB) and Hywel Dda University Health Board (HDUHB), has led to joint appointments between these boards and the University through both Medicine and Pharmacy; the University is represented on appointment panels for teacher practitioners. There is a close working relationship with HEIW through Pharmacy and Medicine and at Faculty level, and regular consultation with HEIW also takes place via several forums. HEIW is heavily involved in ensuring that the new GPhC IETP 2021 standards are met, and in ensuring that learning outcomes are achieved at the right level, as well as in developing the ‘entrustable professional activities’ (EPAs) (see standard 5). There is a clear agreement between the University and HEIW which defines respective responsibilities for the quality of placements. Allocation of funding between sectors (hospital, community pharmacy and GP practices) is fair and equitable, and there is a good spread across those sectors, which provide the opportunities for students to learn. Annual planning with HEIW addresses the number of placements to be made available; this involves consultation with stakeholders across the sectors. Capacity is being built and HEIW developed the business case for increasing the number of placements. There is a quality assurance cycle in which placement providers are looked at annually to determine whether improvements are required; this incorporates undergraduate feedback. If improvements are required, an action plan is produced and failure to improve would result in the placement site being removed from the approved list. In response to the team’s wish to know how a student would report a bad experience on a placement, and how this would be dealt with, the staff explained that currently this would be identified through the feedback that students are required to provide. There is also a mechanism for reporting concerns. In the future, the process will be similar to that used during the Foundation Training Year, where concerns could be raised through the Clinical Placement Facilitator. There is a process for escalation as required; this could result in monitoring or further investigation with various outcomes. The students confirmed to the team that they were required to leave feedback on each placement via the Pharmacy Portal.

## Standard 5: Curriculum design and delivery

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

Criterion 5.1 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 5.2 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 5.3 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 5.4 is:	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>
Criterion 5.5 is:	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Likely to be met <input type="checkbox"/>	Not met <input type="checkbox"/>

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

The MPharm progressively integrates science and practice across the years. The curriculum introduces fundamental sciences underpinning the design, synthesis, formulation and administration of medicines and therapeutic agents, along with the normal structure, function, and behaviour of physiological systems. This progresses to abnormal diseased systems and the role of pathology in informing drug design and development. Complexity increases across the years, enabling students to develop into therapeutic practitioners with clinical and behavioural pre-prescribing skills, able to develop therapeutic strategies and decisions to manage complex patients. The modules covering the fundamentals of pharmacy in Year 1 introduce the seven learning themes ('pharmaceutics', 'pharmaceutical chemistry', 'cellular & molecular biosciences', 'human biology', 'pharmacology & therapeutics', 'clinical pharmacy' and 'pharmacy practice') which run horizontally within Year 1 and as vertical themes in Years 2 and 3. Year 4 addresses more complex patients, considering, for example, advanced therapies such as cell and gene therapies. Students will apply their knowledge using case studies related to a community of known patients who will reappear throughout the course. Starting with stable patients with one disease, the cases will increase in complexity as patients progress in age and disease and develop multiple co-morbidities. By the fourth year, students will apply their knowledge in highly complex simulated environments, such as running a community pharmacy that offers essential and advanced services. In Year 3, students will undertake a research project. There is a zero-credit, pass/fail module in each year; these address professionalism, competence, patient safety and ethics. Responding to the team's wish to learn of their experience of integrated teaching in year 1, and how this will impact on delivery of year 2, as well as how material from year 1 will feed into year 2, the staff described how integration was co-planned co-designed and co-delivered, with staff being trained through curriculum meetings. A light touch was applied to integration in year 1, with continuous communication with the students to clarify how science and practice were integrated in each session. Session-level integration was highlighted by lecturers from two different disciplines delivering joint lectures/workshops. Full integration in years 2 and 3 will be achieved through the integrated study units (ISUs). These focus on the patient, covering the underpinning science along with integrated workshops, placements, and patient case studies, with input from expert pharmacists. Material will become progressively more complex as students progress from year 1 to year 2, which comprises two patient-centred modules and the second, zero-rated 'Pharmacist as a Professional' module. Year 2 delivery will be similar to that of year 1, where, despite Covid, 90% was delivered face-to-face. Students had generally adapted well to this blended approach, which utilised a mixture of face-to-face, live streaming, and recorded material. The staff described to the team the strategy for incorporating prescribing skills into the curriculum. This strategy outlined the prescribing competencies that will be incorporated covering patient assessment, evidence-based management, communication skills, professional and ethical decision making, safe prescribing, patient follow-up and team working. As part of implementing this strategy, 'professional patients' will discuss their

conditions with students and will be used to help students to develop their consultations skills.

Year 0 of the MPharm with Preparatory Year comprises eight modules, four per semester, covering chemistry, cell physiology, molecular biology, and microbiology. Two additional modules delivered solely by the Pharmacy Team, 'Fundamentals of Organic Chemistry' and 'Foundations in Pharmacy', have been specifically developed to prepare the Year 0 MPharm students for the transition into Year 1 of the degree. The students confirmed these modules and told the team that semester 2 had been directed more towards Pharmacy through the Foundations in Pharmacy and Fundamentals of Organic Chemistry modules and that professionalism had been emphasised. They felt well-prepared to progress to year 1 of the MPharm, because they were familiar with the Pharmacy teaching staff and with the University.

Interactions with patients, carers and the wider healthcare team will take place during placements as well as on campus, for example, in the Pharmacy Skills Suite, and during assessments such as OSCEs. Off-campus placements take place across a breadth of sectors including community and hospital pharmacy, industry, care homes, and GP practices. From the beginning of the 2023/24 academic year, the time spent in placements will increase steadily, ultimately providing 55 days across the course. Placements will then incorporate various 'Entrustable Professional Activities' (EPAs) to prepare students for future clinical roles, including prescribing. The team learned that EPAs comprise specific tasks or responsibilities that trainees are entrusted to perform without direct supervision once they have attained sufficient competence: they include history taking, medicines reconciliation and pharmaceutical care planning. Each placement is supported by a Placement Workbook, which details the relevant activities and learning outcomes. Placements in year 1 were largely observational, transitioning to longer, participatory placements in year 2, where activities will include history-taking in preparation for EPAs. In response to the team's wish to know of the balance between real and simulated patient work in years 1 and 2, the staff described how role play is used in learning communication skills in year 1. Students then meet real patients during placements, where in semester 2 they visit hospital wards as well as community pharmacies where they speak to patients. In year 2, they will initially participate in 'Simulated Pharmacy Experience' (SPE) sessions. These aim to simulate a real pharmacy working environment on campus; they allow students to practise skills, such as consultation and history-taking, on peers and professional patients in a safe, protected environment and receive feedback to reflect upon prior to placement attendance; professional patients are trained to engage with students. There will also be placements in both semesters. The students confirmed their participation in hospital and community pharmacy placements, where they could speak to patients, for example about their medications. They also told the team about their SPE sessions which took place in the Pharmacy Skills Suite; they described how these sessions enabled them to apply their knowledge and how they offered good practice for OSCEs.

Practical experience is also gained through interprofessional education (IPE) activities with students of other healthcare professions including medicine, physician associate, nursing, and paramedic science. Activities include workshops, case studies, public health campaigns, and debates. Year 1 provided opportunities to learn about the roles of the pharmacist/pharmacy teams, and other healthcare professionals; here, students learned basic life support alongside midwifery and paramedic science students, as well as working with medical students on calculations and discussing ethics with nursing students; the students confirmed these IPE activities to the team. IPE activities are planned for years 2, 3 and 4 with a variety of healthcare profession students covering topics such as pharmaceutical

calculations, managing emergencies, and consultation skills; these will become more complex across the years and will require students to collaborate to complete a task. Feedback from year 1 students was very positive.

The programme has been designed to engender professionalism within students from the start. During their induction week, new MPharm students on both programmes are introduced to the GPhC Standards for Pharmacy Professionals and fitness to practise procedures; the staff described to the team the details of the School and University fitness to practise processes, along with the possible outcomes if concerns are raised about a student. The importance of professionalism is emphasised to students in the preparatory year who must sign the code of practice, and who undergo the same occupational health and DBS checks as those entering year 1 directly. Once in year 0, students are subject to the usual MPharm health and conduct processes and are subject to MPharm fitness to practise and engagement requirements. In relation to professionalism while on placements, students are aware of their responsibilities and are well prepared. The staff told the team that the only professionalism issues in year 1 had been attendance at mandatory sessions; these had not impacted on students' fitness to practise. Students complete an annual declaration stating that they meet the GPhC's Standards for pharmacy professionals and are aware that they must declare all ongoing investigations, cautions or convictions. Concerns about pharmacy students' conduct or health can be raised, where appropriate, by university staff, NHS/placement staff, pharmacy staff, clinical teachers, placement supervisors, fellow students, patients and their families and carers. Such concerns are initially addressed through the Pharmacy Progress and Professionalism Board and escalated where required. Patient safety is a priority and the School will take immediate steps to address any concerns raised about a student whose behaviour has the potential to harm patients. The students told the team that they knew how to raise concerns via their mentors, the Head of Pharmacy, the Programme Lead or their placement supervisors. They also confirmed that they had been introduced to the GPhC's standards and fitness to practise, as well as being informed about the fitness to practise process and given examples of fitness to practise and the actions taken.

## Standard 6: Assessment

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

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

Assessments are designed to determine whether students have met the GPhC's learning outcomes. The nature of assessments changes as the course progresses, enabling the testing of higher-level skills requiring problem-solving and critical evaluation. As well as discipline-based assessments, students will also undergo integrated assessments; these are designed to assess students' ability to assimilate and integrate information from different disciplines. Assessments include written examinations, course work, laboratory reports, oral and poster presentations, and objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). In Year 3, students undertake a research project, where the assessment is based on their dissertation, poster presentation and engagement with the project. There is a pass/fail zero-credit module in each year dealing with professional competences, patient safety and ethics; assessment of these modules is based on an e-portfolio. During each academic year, students are examined on pharmaceutical calculations; these are integrated into in-class tests, OSCEs, and final examinations, as well as being examined separately with a 40 question calculations examination. Students must pass the calculations examination to progress. Responding to the team's wish to know how assessments in year 2 will build on those used in year 1, the staff described how they will become more complex according to the nature of the spiral curriculum. OSCEs will cover knowledge, skills, and competences, addressing patient-centred care and incorporating critical stations, where students will fail if they put patients at risk; OSCEs will cover all themes including prescribing and patient enquiries.

Responding to the team's wish to learn how the Department monitors assessment in practical settings in the workplace, the staff explained that there are no such assessments in year 1. The only contribution of placement supervisors to assessments in year 2 will be to sign-off the students' placement workbooks through the e-portfolio. However, as entrustable professional activities (EPAs) are rolled out, the University will quality control these assessments, while HEIW will quality manage the training of assessors. EPAs will initially feed into the assessment of the zero credit 'Pharmacist as a Professional' modules in each year, although eventually they will sit within the clinical modules. There will be crossover with campus-based assessments, including the preparatory assessments for placements and OSCEs, as well as students' reflections in their e-portfolios. HEIW representatives told the team that the overall framework for assessment in the workplace will be based on that used for the Foundation Year using similar assessments with which assessors are already familiar. Discussions are in progress and pilots are underway to determine how EPAs will be undertaken and how these will be signed off before students interact with real patients.

All modules must be passed to progress from one year to the next and to graduate. To progress to Year 1, students in Year 0 of the MPharm with Preparatory Year must pass all modules with an overall average of at least 60%, with a minimum of 60% in each of 'Fundamentals of Organic Chemistry' and 'Foundations in Pharmacy'. As described under standard 1, the Foundations in Pharmacy module assessment incorporates MMIs similar to those used for applicants to the four-year MPharm; here, students are assessed on numeracy, ethics, pharmacy as a profession and teamwork through a group task.

To ensure safe and effective practice, there are pass/fail elements within the modules. These include

each station in OSCEs, each activity in entrustable professional activities (EPAs), and calculation tests. Students will fail any summative assessment in which they consistently demonstrate unsafe practice which could put patients and/or the public in danger. A decision on what constitutes unsafe practice will be made by the module coordinators. Any red flag issues will be determined and raised within the module team. An example of a red flag issue is one that has serious clinical or legal implications and therefore the potential to cause patient harm. Failure to identify a red flag could lead to the student failing the assessment or that element of the assessment. Red flags will be highlighted in assessment details that are sent to the external examiners. Responding to the team's wish for further information about red flag assessments in year 1, the staff explained that these related to anything concerning incorrect doses, conduct or professionalism. Cameras and recording are used during OSCEs so that the staff can review each station for each student after the examination.

In response to the team's wish to learn about the expectation relating to students' attendance, the staff explained that while there is no minimum requirement for lecture attendance, students will be required to attend at least 75% of mandatory sessions, including placements, practical classes, and SPE sessions. Students are expected to report absences via Canvas if they cannot attend; if they miss with valid explanations, alternative sessions can be provided to ensure meeting of learning outcomes. Students can apply for extenuating circumstances around, for example, finance, caring responsibilities, and health and there is a sickness policy, for example, relating to Covid; students are made aware of these through Canvas and via the teaching staff.

Students are provided with comprehensive feedback on coursework and assignments within three weeks (15 working days) of submission unless previously agreed with student representatives and the Programme Director. Feedback is given for formative assessments held prior to the relevant summative assessments to facilitate improvement in students' learning and confidence. Students receive individual as well as group feedback. Academic mentors provide feedback on students' e-portfolios, which comprise continuing professional development (CPD) entries, reflective accounts following placements, and personal development plans. The students told the team that feedback was useful, constructive, and timely, and was normally received two-three weeks after submission. Feedback was provided via the Canvas VLE directly and comprised both individual feedback as well as generic feedback to the whole year. Some feedback was provided through workshops covering, for example, essay writing, referencing and plagiarism. Feedback on their placement performance was available from placement mentors via the Pharmacy Portal.

Moderation of marking ensures that marks are fair, valid, and reliable, and that assessment criteria have been applied consistently. At least 10% of the cohort submission is moderated by another academic member within the core module. All fail marks and borderline marks are moderated. All module marks are also reviewed at the Pharmacy Examination Board. External examiners oversee the marking and moderation process and review a sample of all marked and moderated work to ensure consistency and fairness of marking. They submit annual reports, covering assessment practice, the quality and standards of the programme and administrative arrangements; these reports are reviewed at University level and then considered in detail within the Faculty and at the Pharmacy Board of Studies. Wishing to learn about the standard setting methodologies employed, the staff explained that the draft of every assessment undergoes moderation and that there is a clear marking rubric for each assessment, including OSCEs, with all assessments mapped against the GPhC's 2021 learning outcomes; students are told of the marking rubric in advance. Rubrics for OSCEs are reviewed

and moderated, with marks awarded for certain points such as doses, and students cannot pass if they miss particular outcomes. High stakes assessments are approved by the external examiners and a detailed quality assurance process is in place, with analysis of results followed by appropriate actions such as removal of ambiguous questions. In accord with University regulations, which include bespoke clauses for Pharmacy, the pass mark in years 1-3 is 40%, although it is 50% in year 4 and 70% for calculations assessments; although the pass mark in year 0 is 40%, as described above, progression marks are higher. The staff explained that the choice of 70% for calculations assessment was based on that used in the GPhC's registration assessment: the team commented that the GPhC no longer used a fixed pass mark. The staff stated that most programmes have fixed pass marks and that using other standard setting methods must be in the assessment regulations from the start. While a light touch with fixed pass marks had been used initially, the staff acknowledged that they should consider standard setting at later points in the course. The Department could benefit from wider experience available across the Faculty, especially in the Medical School. Considering the lack of a current, clear standard setting methodology, the team recommended (see recommendation 2) that, in relation to criteria 6.4, 6.6 and 6.7, further consideration should be given to the contemporary nature of the standard setting methodologies used. The team recommended that the Department of Pharmacy seeks advice from elsewhere in the Faculty, where such methodologies are already embedded. This issue will be revisited in future step events.

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

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

### Support for student pharmacists

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

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

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

MPharm and MPharm with preparatory year students attend a comprehensive induction week; this introduces them to the course as well as to the broader Medical School and University-wide communities. Students participate in sessions to facilitate their transition into higher education and introduce them to some basic concepts and support packages.

Each student is assigned an academic mentor with whom they meet throughout the year in a series of compulsory individual and group sessions. Students typically retain the same academic mentor

throughout the duration of their MPharm degree to enable an effective mentor-mentee relationship to be built. Welsh speaking students may request a mentor whose first language is Welsh. Academic mentors are the primary point of academic contact for students and provide support, development, and guidance on a range of academic and non-academic matters that may affect students' wellbeing, attendance, and educational progress. They may also signpost them to welfare and other support services, such as the University's Student Services, which cover, for example, welfare, finance, the Disability Office, and Wellbeing Services. These services can be accessed via the University website and two physical centres at the Singleton and Bay campuses. The University's Centre for Academic Success provides students with help in developing academic skills such as academic writing and mathematics. The students told the team that they had received very good support from the staff and their mentors, who were easy to access and who always responded rapidly to requests for help for both academic and pastoral matters. They had met their mentors at least once per month. There had been very good communication throughout the Covid-19 pandemic; this had been provided in person, by e-mail or via the Canvas VLE, as well as through Head of Pharmacy workshops, which were held every six to eight weeks. Workshops had offered good preparation in advance of placements. In general, the students expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the course; they told the team that the course was very professionally run, the staff had been very helpful, and the course materials were of a high standard.

In response to the team's wish to learn about any requests for reasonable adjustments that have been made for students in relation to teaching learning and assessment and during the admissions process, the staff explained that teaching and assessment are inclusive and there is a mentor for students who disclose disabilities or long-term health conditions. Reasonable adjustments can be made whenever required, and the Department liaises with the University disability scheme. Students complete a questionnaire, providing any necessary medical evidence, and are guided through the process. Five requests have been made and adjustments made according to students' requirements, including liaison with the Examinations Office. The same adjustments will apply in placements as on campus; where possible, the need for these adjustments will be disclosed to the placement supervisors. Regarding the admissions process, the MMIs are normally limited to five minutes per station and additional time can be provided for applicants who disclose problems.

Wishing to know about the support provided for students who are undergoing investigation for fitness to practise, the team learned that the primary point of contact for the student is the academic mentor who would be copied in on all correspondence. Support would be provided at several levels including the Department, the Student Union (SU), the Faculty and the wider University. The SU is experienced in dealing with these matters and can provide impartial advice. The Faculty Student Information and Experience Team would provide support through staff members trained in the provision of mental health first aid. The University offers its own counselling services as well as access to external services. The Department would ensure that the student has the understanding and support of friends and family.

Students receive career advice throughout the course including from their academic mentors. The University's Employability Academic Team also provides career advice, as well as running courses and workshops that stimulate the development of complementary tailored soft skills. Throughout the course, including Year 0 of the MPharm with Preparatory year, students have regular access to pharmacy professionals who act as role models and provide professional support and guidance; many

staff members are GPhC-registered pharmacists. Placement supervisors also act as professional role models.

In response to the team's request to know how many students in year 0 of the MPharm with preparatory year may not progress and how the Department will support these students, the staff described how nine of the 17 have passed and can progress to year 1. The others can be reassessed in August so their progress will not be known until after the September Examination Board. They will receive 1:1 feedback on their performance and will be supported through their mentors and by the provision of additional sessions to work through course material and mock examination papers.

All new members of academic staff, undertake a thorough induction during the first month of their new role. This enables them to engage with University policies and procedures, as well as to become familiar with University services. During induction, every new member of staff undertakes statutory professional training to address legal obligations such as information and data protection, equality and diversity, and health and safety.

New staff members who do not have UK-recognised teaching qualifications in HE must take a PG Cert course to gain Fellowship of HEA (FHEA) or equivalent; courses are also available to help senior staff members to attain Senior Fellowship (SFHEA) and Principal Fellowship (PFHEA). Many members of academic staff are already Fellows of the Higher Education Academy (HEA), all are committed to continuously developing new skills and acquiring competencies in learning and teaching. The University provides many opportunities to sustain the professional growth of all the members involved in the delivery and planning of the MPharm degree. Development and Training Services and the Swansea Academy of Learning and Teaching (SALT) offer a wide range of courses to promote staff development. All newly appointed staff members are assigned an experienced academic colleague as a mentor; the mentors offer collegial support and provide useful information to assist the development of their professional role. To ensure their participation in the MPharm delivery and development, all members of academic staff meet fortnightly via the Pharmacy Management Committee and MPharm Curriculum meetings to discuss relevant aspects of the course and share good practice. In response to the team's request for examples of how University staff and placement providers sought support during the first year of delivery, the staff described how peer mentoring was used and help and training were provided in using the technologies needed for online teaching, lecture recording, the use of the Canvas VLE, and streaming; support was available through SALT. The Department has a collegiate, mutually supportive team with a wide range of experience, so that experienced staff members could help those with less experience; moreover, curriculum meetings provide opportunities for shared training. Placement providers also have access to the University support mechanisms, as well as being supported by HEIW. The School has regular contact with community pharmacy, hospitals and GP practices and undertakes site visits.

All members of academic staff have a line manager as well as a mentor; for new staff members, this is typically also their probation supervisor. An annual Professional Development Review (PDR) system allows staff members and their line managers to reflect on what has been achieved over the previous 12 months and to look forward and make plans for the coming year; an interim PDR is held halfway through the year to monitor progress. Workload, agreed between staff members and their line managers, includes time for continuing professional development (CPD); the University's online booking system for training courses links to personal PDR forms, providing updated CPD information

for career and promotion discussions and enabling reflection on the effectiveness of completed training.

Mechanisms are available for students and staff to raise concerns for example, regarding patient safety, fitness to practise, or about placements. Information is provided via the student guidance handbook, as well as through the MPharm Hub on the Canvas virtual learning environment. In response to the team's wish to learn about any student concerns, the staff told the team that no real no concerns had been raised beyond the usual feedback. Students can raise concerns with their mentors or any staff members at any time. Academic staff would receive advice on how to manage serious concerns. Students have required guidance on how to study and have received support in relation to sitting examinations through formative assessments, drop-in sessions and mentoring provided along with pastoral support from the Faculty and the wider University.

## Decision descriptors

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

