



Independent
prescribing
programme

University of Central Lancashire (School of
Pharmacy)

Report of a monitoring event

August 2018

Event summary and conclusions

Provider	University of Central Lancashire (School of Pharmacy)
Course	Independent prescribing programme
Event type	Monitoring event
Event date	24 August 2018
Accreditation period	September 2017 - September 2020
Outcome	<p>Full accreditation confirmed with conditions.</p> <p>The accreditation team agreed to recommend to the Registrar of the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) that the University of Central Lancashire (School of Pharmacy) should be fully accredited as a provider of a pharmacist independent prescribing programme for the remainder of the accreditation period, subject to 1 condition.</p>
Conditions	<p>1. The University must provide written confirmation of the staffing resource for the programme following recent staff changes. This is to ensure criteria 1.2 and 1.3 continue to be met.</p>
Standing conditions	Please refer to Appendix 1
Recommendations	No recommendations were made.
Registrar decision	<p>Following the event, the provider submitted a response to the condition of accreditation, and the accreditation team agreed it had been met satisfactorily.</p> <p>The Registrar of the GPhC accepted the team's recommendation and approved full accreditation of the programme for the remainder of the accreditation period.</p>
Key contact (provider)	Professor Paul Rutter
Accreditation team	<p>Mr Mike Pettit (event Chair), Senior Lecturer in Pharmacy Practice, University of Sussex</p> <p>Dr Ruth Edwards, Head of Pharmacy Practice, Aston Pharmacy School</p>
GPhC representative	Chris McKendrick, Quality Assurance Officer, GPhC
Rapporteur	Chris McKendrick, Quality Assurance Officer, GPhC

Key findings

Section 1: The programme provider

The team was satisfied that two of the four criteria relating to the pre-requisites for entry continue to be met with two criteria subject to a condition.

The accreditation team was informed by the university representatives that the first cohort of four students had successfully finished and passed the independent prescribing programme. The exam board ratified the pass list on 27 June 2018 and the GPhC was notified on 4 July 2018.

The team questioned the sustainability and planned resourcing of the programme given the lower number of students than originally projected. It was noted that there would be a number of changes to staff members delivering the programme, changes to contracts affecting time associated to the programme, and changes to existing staff members responsibilities. Given the number of changes to staffing of the programme, the accreditation team made it a **condition** that the University must provide written confirmation of the staffing resource for the programme following recent staff changes.

It was noted that the delivery of the clinical skills teaching was moved from the university City Campus to the Burnley Campus, whilst the Practice Suite is being refurbished. Refurbishment will be complete for the third intake starting September 2018. This was confirmed as acceptable as a temporary minor change by the GPhC.

Section 2: Pre-requisites for entry

The team was satisfied that all six of the six criteria relating to the pre-requisites for entry continue to be met.

There has been no changed made to the programme application process since the initial accreditation.

Section 3: The programme

The team was satisfied that all eight of the eight criteria relating to the programme continue to be met.

The accreditation team enquired as to what had went well on the programme so far. The university representatives felt that the clinical skills days, collaboration with the university medical school, and SSR were all beneficial to students on the programme. This was reflected through student feedback to the accreditation team. The students complemented the programme on its ability to teach what is normal and abnormal, understanding the variance in what is considered normal to understand what is abnormal. Positive feedback was also given about the programmes teaching on consultation skills. It was noted that a GP and nurse practitioner provided a consultation skills session which embedded inter-professional learning prospective on the consultations.

The accreditation team was informed by the university representatives that there had been some issues with the validation of the programme. Originally the programme was recognised by the university as a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) course. As soon as the programme realised this oversight, it approached the university validations team and has undertaken the validation process again. The programme is now a full university scrutinised programme. The accreditation team was satisfied with the university representatives' explanation regarding the programme validation. However, the team **requested** that a copy of the new validation report is sent to the GPhC to review.

Section 4: Learning in Practice

The team was satisfied that all five of the five criteria relating to learning in practice continue to be met.

All students spoken to from the first cohort of the programme felt prepared for independent prescribing practice. The e-learning platform for the programme (Blackboard) has been well received by both students and staff. The external examiner report highlighted that the course material on Blackboard, and assessment method, reflect issues relevant to independent prescribing.

Section 5: Assessment

The team was satisfied that all four of the four criteria relating to assessment continue to be met.

The accreditation team asked about feedback mechanisms employed on the programme. The university representatives informed the team that written feedback is given on all assessments undertaken by students. Verbal and written feedback is given after practice sessions and OSCEs. Feedback has meant that a mock is going to be introduced earlier into the programme cycle to enable student to feel better prepared for stations. Feedback from the DMPs have been positive.

The OSCEs that were undertaken for the first cohort went well and the university representatives believed that scenarios were fair; there were eight stations in total. It was suggested by the university representatives that instead of using staff members for the OSCEs, they may use mannequins.

Section 6: Details of Award

The team was satisfied that both of the two criteria relating to details of the award continue to be met.

Appendix 1 - Standing conditions

The following are standing conditions of accreditation and apply to all providers:

1. The record and report include other comments from the team, and providers are required to take all comments into account as part of the accreditation process. The provider must confirm to the GPhC that required amendments have been made.
2. The provider must respond to the definitive version of the record and report within three months of receipt. The summary report, along with the provider's response, will be published on the GPhC's website for the duration of the accreditation period.
3. The provider must seek approval from the GPhC for any substantial change (or proposed change) which is, or has the potential to be, material to the delivery of an accredited course. This includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. the content, structure or delivery of the accredited programme;
 - b. ownership or management structure of the institution;
 - c. resources and/or funding;
 - d. student numbers and/or admissions policy;
 - e. any existing partnership, licensing or franchise agreement;
 - f. staff associated with the programme.
4. The provider must make students and potential students aware that successful completion of an accredited course is not a guarantee of annotation or of future employment as a pharmacist independent prescriber.
5. The provider must make students and potential students aware of the existence and website address where they can view the GPhC's accreditation reports and the timescales for future accreditations.
6. Whenever required to do so by the GPhC, providers must give such information and assistance as the GPhC may reasonably require in connection with the exercise of its functions. Any information in relation to fulfilment of these standing conditions must be provided in a proactive and timely manner.

Appendix 2 – Accreditation criteria, learning outcomes and indicative content

GPhC accreditation criteria, learning outcomes and indicative content for pharmacist independent prescribing programmes

The accreditation criteria, learning outcomes and indicative content for pharmacist independent prescribing programmes can be downloaded from the GPhC website at:

<http://www.pharmacyregulation.org/education/approval-courses/accreditation-guidance>