

**University of East Anglia independent
prescribing course reaccreditation report,
May 2022**



Contents

Event summary and conclusions	1
Introduction	3
Role of the GPhC.....	3
Background.....	3
Documentation.....	3
The event.....	3
Declarations of interest	3
Schedule	4
Key findings - Part 1 - Learning outcomes	4
Domain: Person centred care (outcomes 1-6)	4
Domain: Professionalism (outcomes 7-15).....	4
Domain: Professional knowledge and skills (outcomes 16-26)	4
Domain: Collaboration (outcomes 27-32)	4
Key findings - Part 2 - Standards for pharmacist independent prescribing course providers	5
Standard 1: Selection and entry requirements	5
Standard 2: Equality, diversity and inclusion.....	5
Standard 3: Management, resources and capacity.....	6
Standard 4: Monitoring, review and evaluation	7
Standard 5: Course design and delivery	8
Standard 6: Learning in practice.....	9
Standard 7: Assessment.....	10
Standard 8: Support and the learning experience	12
Standard 9: Designated prescribing practitioners.....	13

Event summary and conclusions

Provider	University of East Anglia
Course	Independent prescribing course
Event type	Reaccreditation
Event date	19 May 2022
Approval period	July 2022 - July 2025
Relevant standards	GPhC education and training standards for pharmacist independent prescribers, January 2019
Outcome	<p>Approval with conditions</p> <p>The accreditation team agreed to recommend to the Registrar of the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) that pharmacist independent prescribing course provided by the University of East Anglia should be reaccredited for a further period of three years, subject to one condition.</p>
Condition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessments carried out in the workplace, particularly mini-Cex, must be quality assured by the course provider. This is because the accreditation team does not consider the current process to have sufficient oversight by the course team. This is to meet criterion 7.7.
Standing conditions	The standing conditions of accreditation can be found here .
Recommendations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To update the School risk register to formally document the risks that have been identified and mitigated relating to all aspects of this course, including learning in practice. This relates to criterion 3.1.
Minor amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To revise the application form to make clear that the required two years' experience must be patient-orientated and in a relevant UK practice setting. • The DPP handbook and other course materials should be reviewed to avoid confusion when addressing the reader in the first person. There is some inconsistent use of DPP/you and extracts from documentation that is addressed to the student.
Registrar decision	<p>Following the event, the provider submitted a response to the condition and accreditation team agreed it had been met satisfactorily.</p> <p>The Registrar of the GPhC accepted the accreditation team's recommendation and approved the reaccreditation of the course for a further three years.</p>

Maximum number of all students per cohort	40
Number of pharmacist students per cohort	40
Number of cohorts per academic year	3
Approved to use non-medical DPPs	Yes
Key contact (provider)	Gemma May, Director of Prescribing
Provider representatives	Gemma May, Director of Prescribing Dr Lindsay Morgan, Course Director Newly Qualified Pharmacist with Prescribing Amy Benterman, Course Director Independent Prescribing Dr James Desborough, Associate Professor in Pharmacy
Accreditation team	Professor Ruth Edwards (event Chair), Head of School of Pharmacy, University of Wolverhampton Mira Jivraj, Deputy Clinical Services Manager, Pharmacy Northwick Park Hospital Catherine Boyd, Chair of Fitness to Practise Panels HCPTS
GPhC representative	Philippa McSimpson, Quality Assurance Manager (Education), GPhC
Rapporteur	Rakesh Bhundia, Quality Assurance Officer (Education), GPhC

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 accreditation process is based on the GPhC's standards for the education and training of pharmacist independent prescribers, January 2019.

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

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

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

Background

The University of East Anglia 'the provider' was accredited by the GPhC in 2019 to provide a course to train pharmacist independent prescribers, for a period of 3 years. This was subject to one condition that the University must implement a valid and reliable quality assurance for the full range of assessments that will take place during the period of learning in practice.

In line with the standards for the education and training of pharmacist independent prescribers January 2019, an event was scheduled in May 2022 to review the course's suitability for reaccreditation.

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, and it was deemed to be satisfactory to provide a basis for discussion.

The event

The reaccreditation event was held remotely by videoconference on the 19 May 2022 and comprised of several meetings between the GPhC accreditation team and representatives of University of East Anglia prescribing course. Students who were currently undertaking the course, or who had completed it in the last three years, contributed to the event by completing a qualitative survey, responses to which were reviewed by the GPhC accreditation team.

Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interests.

Schedule

Meeting	Time
Private meeting of accreditation team and GPhC representatives, including break	09:30 - 11:00
Meeting with course provider representatives	11:00 - 13:00
Lunch	13:00 - 14:00
Learning outcomes testing session	14:00 - 14:30
Private meeting of the accreditation team and GPhC representatives	14:30 - 15:30
Deliver outcome to the provider	15:30 - 15:45

Key findings - Part 1 - Learning outcomes

The team reviewed all 32 learning outcomes relating to the independent prescribing course. To gain additional assurance the team also tested a sample of 7 learning outcomes during the event was satisfied that **all 32 learning outcomes are met** to a level as required by the GPhC standards.

The following learning outcomes were tested at the event: **2, 5, 9, 19, 24, 16, 28**

Domain: Person centred care (outcomes 1-6)

Learning outcomes met/will be met? Yes No

Domain: Professionalism (outcomes 7-15)

Learning outcomes met/will be met? Yes No

Domain: Professional knowledge and skills (outcomes 16-26)

Learning outcomes met/will be met? Yes No

Domain: Collaboration (outcomes 27-32)

Learning outcomes met/will be met? Yes No

Key findings - Part 2 - Standards for pharmacist independent prescribing course providers

Standard 1: Selection and entry requirements

Standard met/will be met? Yes No

The team was satisfied that all six criteria relating to the selection and entry requirements are met with one criterion requiring a minor amendment.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that pharmacists must be registered with the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) or the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland (PSNI) and must be in good standing with the GPhC or PSNI prior to enrolment. Applicants must provide a personal statement to describe their experience and preparation for the programme including evidence that they have the required minimum 2 years patient orientated experience in a relevant UK practice setting, as well as identifying an area of practice in which they will develop their independent prescribing. Applicants must also identify a designated prescribing practitioner (DPP) who has agreed to supervise their learning in practice and is appropriate to support within the area of practice. Guidance on the criteria is provided to prospective students on the University of East Anglia (UEA) website.

All applications are reviewed initially by the admissions team to confirm applicant registration and proof of identity and DPP registration. Applications are subsequently reviewed by either the Course Director or the Deputy Course Director. The Course Director or Deputy Course Director will have a telephone meeting with either the applicant or DPP if there are any concerns regarding the applicant's suitability for the course or where unclear or insufficient information has been provided on the application form. Unsuccessful applications are given feedback on the reasons for rejection so that the applicant can understand any professional development necessary prior to resubmission or application to an alternative course.

The accreditation team enquired how applicants are selected and prioritised in the event of the course becoming over-subscribed. The course provider explained that they operate a 'first come, first served' policy and those who do not get a place and who meet the course requirements are prioritised for the next cohort. This is documented on the providers website.

Standard 2: Equality, diversity and inclusion

Standard met/will be met? Yes No

The team was satisfied that all five criteria relating to the equality, diversity and inclusion are met.

It was noted that the principles of equality and diversity are embedded in and promoted throughout course design and delivery. All course staff members complete essential equality and diversity training every 2 years and all staff must follow the UEA code of practice for equality and diversity. Additional optional training sessions are provided through the Centre for Staff and Educational Development, such as 'Understanding Unconscious Bias' and 'Cultural Awareness'.

The accreditation team heard that the course is designed to meet the diverse learning requirements of students and a variety of teaching methods are used within the programme. Example patient scenarios used within the teaching have been designed to ensure they are compliant with equality, and diversity standards. Students are encouraged to engage with others and express their views within both the online and face to face teaching.

The accreditation team enquired how the course team has analysed and used equality and diversity data in designing the course and the overall learning experience. It was noted that due to low cohort numbers in the programme to date, they have been unable to draw conclusions from the analysis of the admissions profile and student performance by protected characteristics. The provider explained that internal data review processes are currently being reviewed at the UEA to obtain necessary data and subsequently there will be an ongoing annual review of admissions data and students' performance including failed and deferred students across all pharmacy programmes. This will be analysed by protected characteristics, such as gender, disability, ethnicity, and age as defined in the Equality Act 2010. Appropriate action will be taken if the analysis shows trends in either the admissions process or differences in course outcomes.

The accreditation team noted that students are encouraged to share any disabilities at the application stage to ensure that any support needs or necessary adjustments can be organised in advance of starting the programme. Students requiring additional support or adjustments will be signposted to the Dean of Students in the course induction. The provider explained that the course team will liaise and work with the Dean of Students to make any necessary reasonable adjustments for example, staggering deadlines, advocate for students at their workplace and work with employers to make reasonable adjustments were possible. It was noted that students can access funding support and have access to enhanced technology that can assist their learning.

The School of Pharmacy Equality and Diversity Committee ensures that staff and students are aware of developments, disseminate information and monitor the requirements to ensure the school is practising equality and in line with the UEA Policy on Placement Learning.

Standard 3: Management, resources and capacity

Standard met/will be met? Yes No

The team was satisfied that all six criteria relating to the management, resources and capacity will be met. One recommendation was made.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that the provider submitted a management and leadership structure that defines the course management plan for the learning, teaching and practice environment. During the learning in practice element of the programme the DPP takes overall responsibility for the students' learning in practice and assessment.

The accreditation team sought clarification on the processes the provider has in place for identifying and managing risks associated with the course. The provider explained that course risks such as applicant numbers and staffing form part of the school risk register. The team agreed that the management of risk associated within the programme could be further embedded in the School's risk processes and that the School would also benefit from considering a wider range of risks. As such the team made the following **recommendation**: To update the School risk register to formally document

the risks that have been identified and mitigated relating to all aspects of this course, including learning in practice. This relates to criterion 3.1.

It was noted as part of the submission documentation that at the start of the programme students and their DPP are required to sign an educational learning agreement that sets out the role and responsibilities of the course provider, the DPP and the student.

The programme is primarily delivered virtually and the face to face facilitated teaching sessions will be delivered at the UEA and at Harlow Education Consortium. Both sites have the required teaching facilities for delivering the study days including clinical examination skills.

The accreditation team sought further information from the provider on their plans to increase delivery from two to three cohorts per year with an increase from 28 to 40 students per cohort and how this increase would be resourced. The provider explained that they will have an additional 0.4 FTE teaching member of staff, additional associate tutor capacity and an increase in administrative support by 0.2 FTE. It was noted that the joint Course Director post is currently vacant, but this post is currently being advertised.

The accreditation team heard that all UEA employees have access to staff development training that includes face to face training.

Standard 4: Monitoring, review and evaluation

Standard met/will be met? Yes No

The team was satisfied that all six criteria relating to the monitoring, review and evaluation are met.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that the course has quality assurance processes to monitor, review and evaluate education provision. The School teaching committee manages all aspects of learning and teaching within the School, including both undergraduate and post graduate programmes with regards to internal quality assurance procedures for the quality of learning, teaching and assessment including course specification, approvals, and course review processes. The core course team meet regularly to review feedback from students, Course Management Committee (CMC) and DPPs to discuss operational delivery and implement any necessary changes as appropriate.

The accreditation team sought further clarification around the annual review process, and it was noted that the CMC meets biannually consisting of local stakeholders, educational leads and the course team. The CMC reviews module and programme feedback, external examiner comments, review of student progression and pass/failure rates, student and DPP feedback.

As part of the submission documentation and discussions with the accreditation team, it was noted that a Public and Patient Involvement Group has been established to meet biannually. The role of the group is to support the design and delivery of new courses, review existing programmes, advise, and contribute to the admissions and recruitment process. It was also noted that a Prescribing Pharmacist Involvement group has been established to meet biannually. The group consists of representatives from different sectors in practice and includes newly qualified pharmacists, pharmacists either due to undertake their prescribing qualification or currently enrolled in the programme and qualified

independent prescribers. The role of the group is to support with design and delivery of new courses, review existing programmes, advise, and contribute to the admissions and recruitment process.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that the quality of assessments is monitored by the external examiner system. External examiners are appointed for a period of 4 years. The external examiner reviews any assessments in advance and quality assures the assessment process at exam board level. It was noted that the course team consists of practicing clinical pharmacists in both primary and secondary care settings and that the core course team meets regularly. External influences, such as legislative changes or clinical advances that may impact on teaching content, method of delivery or assessment, are raised at the course management meeting. The views of the course management committee and the external examiner are sought on modifications to teaching material, delivery, or assessment.

The provider informed the accreditation team that this then feeds in to teaching and learning with university level processes and major changes are approved at Faculty level with final sign off if there are significant changes.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that face to face and online teaching sessions are peer-reviewed and individual study day feedback is also shared and discussed if appropriate with the study day facilitator. UEA also operates a staff appraisal scheme to regularly review the work, development needs and career aspirations of members of staff in relation to the requirements of their School, Faculty or Division and the University's plans and to take appropriate steps to realise their potential. The Centre for Staff and Educational Development (CSED) promotes and supports good practice in all aspects of developing the University's staff. CSED provides an extensive and varied programme of workshops and seminars to support the University's objectives.

It was confirmed by the provider that the module update and review process happens annually through an electronic process opening in July each year. This is approved through the school teaching committee and signed off by the Director of Teaching, followed by a final sign off from Faculty and University. The last review was in July 2021.

Standard 5: Course design and delivery

Standard met/will be met? Yes No

The team was satisfied that all ten criteria relating to the course design and delivery will be met.

It was noted that the UEA course team for the certificate in Independent in Prescribing programme consists of prescribing practice pharmacists with experience in both primary and secondary care. The development of teaching material and teaching is supported by expert active prescribing pharmacists. Clinical assessment skills are taught and assessed by advanced clinical practitioners with secondary care acute medicine expertise and specialist secondary care nurse practitioners.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that the provider adopts a blended learning approach, using e-learning, self-directed learning, virtual learning, and face to face learning to ensure a student-centred approach to teaching and learning. The provider recognises that there will be variability in the students existing knowledge and experience and teaching is designed to expand on their existing knowledge but more specifically develop a range of transferrable skills to support students in developing the principles of safe prescribing sessions. The course is continuously

reviewed, evaluated and developed by the course team in light of student feedback and updates in clinical practice. These changes are implemented, if necessary, before the subsequent cohort. Any changes in either course delivery or assessment will be raised with the course management committee, external examiner and GPhC as appropriate. If any significant changes in practice occur that require the current cohort teaching to be amended or reviewed, this will be undertaken by the course team prior to the timetabled teaching, students will be updated in any changes in practice either during the teaching session or through the VLE.

The accreditation team sought clarification on the mechanisms that are used in practise to ensure that safe person-centred care is delivered at all times. The provider explained that they set work-based assessments for students to complete with their DPP such as, case-based discussions, clinical case studies, mini-Cexs and other consultation tools.

The UEA General Regulations for Students provides guidance that fitness to practice can involve issues which arise outside of professional or clinical performance, but which may impact on their professional suitability. Raising concerns about a pharmacist independent prescriber in training is covered as part of the DPP induction and the fitness to practise process is detailed in the DPP handbook. DPP's are given support on how to manage failing students during the programme by the course management team.

It was noted as part of discussions with the accreditation team that fitness to practise mechanisms are reviewed and documented annually but the team were provided with a version from 2015. The team advised the course provider that students must have the most up to date documentation.

Standard 6: Learning in practice

Standard met/will be met? Yes No

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

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that at the point of application, the student is required to upload a DPP competency statement completed and signed by the DPP to confirm that they are an appropriate person to undertake the role and meet the requirements of the DPP role. DPPs are also asked to confirm at the application stage that they will provide an appropriate level of teaching, support, and assessment to the student to meet the requirements of the programme. DPPs are also required to declare if there are any conditions on their ability to practice as a prescriber so that their suitability to act as a DPP can be determined in the case of restrictions. The admissions team confirm that the DPP competency statement has been uploaded during the application process. The student application and the DPP competency statement is then reviewed by a member of the course team

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that the requirements of learning in practice hours is detailed to both pharmacist independent prescribers in training and DPPs at the admission stage, induction and in the student and DPP handbook. At the point of application, the DPP and student must have the employer's agreement to support the student to undertake the programme and the DPP to undertake the role. At the start of the programme, students and their DPP are

required to sign an educational agreement outlining the roles and responsibilities of the student, DPP and the UEA course team.

The accreditation team enquired if there had been any difficulties with students meeting the learning in practice hours requirements during the pandemic and the provider advised that they have had some students who were experiencing difficulties completing the required 90 hours, but the provider did not find out until the end of the course. As a result, the provider has changed their processes and now requires students to submit logs earlier in the course so that students who may be struggling can be identified and assisted with any necessary extra support.

The accreditation team sought clarification from the course provider on supervision by other healthcare professional during the student's time in practice. The provider explained that they make it clear to students and DPPs that the DPP holds overall responsibility, and while some activities can be delegated to an appropriate healthcare professional the majority of hours must be spent with the DPP and that the DPP has to approve the healthcare professional in advance. It was noted that DPPs are required to sign every entry in the clinical practice log and the final competency sign off. The DPP statement of competency must be included in the student's portfolio and that non-submission will result in failure of the portfolio.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that during the supervised learning in practice, pharmacist independent prescribers in training can make prescribing decisions under the supervision of a DPP but must not independently prescribe until successful completion of the course and annotation with the regulatory body. Within the reflective case studies students are required to submit a copy of their prescription for the patient. The provider confirmed that students are reminded that the prescription must not contain any identifiable data of patients and healthcare professionals.

Standard 7: Assessment

Standard met/will be met? Yes No

The team was satisfied all eleven criteria relating to the assessment will be met subject to a condition. Relating to criterion 7.7

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that provider submitted an assessment strategy. Learning and teaching methods are varied but there is a strong emphasis on self-directed and self-managed learning. The course is delivered using the virtual learning environment to host preparative material and formative assessments, with both face to face and online study days used to develop clinical therapeutics, advanced consultation skills and clinical decision-making. The programme's learning and teaching strategy ensures that the practitioners can develop the ability to apply knowledge in the clinical setting and demonstrate appropriate clinical judgement and reasoning skills related to their defined area of practice. The course ensures that the practitioners have both appropriate learning opportunities to develop their learning in practice and to share examples of good practice with their fellow trainees.

If students have any concerns regarding a DPPs performance, they are advised to discuss these with a member of the course team, their UEA academic advisor or their workplace educational supervisor. If necessary, these will be escalated and investigated by the course director or a member of the course

team. Any additional support and training as identified by the course team will be provided and discussed with the DPP and DPPs employer. The educational supervisor and DPP will also be provided with a named liaison for any ongoing support with any queries or difficulties experienced by the DPP or student during the course. The course team will be able to support the educational supervisor or DPP with an ongoing action plan for the student including any agreed areas for development and how these will be addressed. If required, ongoing progress meetings can be organised between the DPP, student and a member of the course team. If the student fails to achieve an adequate level of competence despite the ongoing supportive measures, the course director will discuss potential options with the student and the student's employer if appropriate.

The accreditation team enquired whether the provider had any instances of where a student failed to achieve an adequate level of competence, the provider explained that although they did not have any students who have failed the course overall, they did have some students who needed to go through reassessment and that they worked with the student to identify any learning needs and develop a learning plan for meeting these needs. Feedback from a student recently indicated that they had not appreciated the workload of the course, the course team fed this back to current cohorts.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that an induction is available on the virtual learning environment and access is monitored to ensure that DPPs engage with this essential information at the start of the course. The DPP handbook details the roles and responsibilities of the DPP in relation to supporting the student's learning in practice, with reference to the personal development plan and learning needs assessment and the clinical practice log. At the start of the course programme, the student and the DPP are required to agree to and sign an educational agreement detailing the student, DPP and the UEA roles and responsibilities. The DPP must complete the mandatory online training induction before undertaking the role of DPP, training is provided on the Patient Orientated Consultation Assessment Tool (POCAT) and Mini-Cex assessment tool.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that at the start of the course programme, students are required to complete a learning needs assessment (LNA) and a personal development plan (PDP) and discuss this with their DPP. The DPP will provide initial feedback on these and formative feedback will also be provided by a member of the course team to both the learner and the DPP. The student must review and revise their PDP at midpoint in the course and formative feedback will be given by the students DPP.

It was noted that students must pass all assessment components of the portfolio. If a student fails a component, they are required to re-sit that component and they must pass the re-sit using the same criteria as the first assessment. Students can only re-sit once, and if they do not pass at their re-sit, they are not awarded the Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing. The student's portfolio is reviewed by a panel of assessors, a member of the UEA course team and a practicing independent prescriber. If a student demonstrates unsafe practice that could cause patient harm or breaks patient confidentiality that was identified through their assessment by an assessor, this would be checked by a second or even third assessor if necessary. Resits are not permitted, the student would automatically fail the programme. The accreditation team highlighted to the provider that failure of the entire course due to patient safety concern demonstrated during assessment is no longer a GPhC requirement, but the provider may want to retain this policy should they wish.

All failed students are reviewed independently by the external examiner prior to the exam board meeting. The external examiner is provided with recordings of the simulated patient assessment and the case-based discussion assessment, as part of the review process the external examiner also reviews a sample of other student's portfolios.

The team sought further information of the summative assessment carried out in the practice environment by the DPP and other health professionals and concluded that the processes for quality assurance of these assessment was not in line with the usual moderation and oversight of summative assessments delivered and assessed by the course team. As such the team set a **condition** to address this: Assessments carried out in the workplace, particularly mini-Cex must be quality assured by the course provider. This is because the accreditation team does not consider the current process to have sufficient oversight by the course team. This is to meet criterion 7.7.

Standard 8: Support and the learning experience

Standard met/will be met? Yes No

The team was satisfied that all four criteria relating the support and the learning experience will be met.

Students will be expected to attend the online course induction. Prior to induction students will be provided with a timetable for both self-directed learning, face to face contact days, the assessment deadlines for both formative and summative submission and the student handbook. The student course induction will provide further information on the course learning outcomes, teaching, assessments, formative and summative submission dates, the learning in practice hours and the role of the DPP. As part of the learning in practice (90 hours) the student must complete a Learning Needs Assessment (LNA) and produce a baseline Personal Development Plan (PDP) with their DPP to ensure that the 90 hours are tailored to the students' learning needs based on previous knowledge and experience in their proposed area of clinical practice.

The accreditation team sought clarification on whether there are minimum requirements for the frequency of meetings with the DPP. The provider explained that the student and DPP meet at the beginning of the course to develop the students PDP and LNA and that this is then reviewed at the midpoint and endpoint of the course. The accreditation team learned that there are no minimum requirements for interim reviews, but that student feedback will support frequency of the reviews.

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that all students will be assigned a personal academic advisor at their induction. The personal academic advisor will support the student with advice about the programme, any additional academic support they may require and support the wellbeing of students during their time at the UEA. Throughout the course programme there will be regular drop-in sessions for the trainee pharmacist prescriber to discuss with a member of the course team any concerns or further support they may need. Students concerns and ideas for development will be obtained through the Staff and Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) throughout the course and the post course evaluation after the programme. Any immediate relevant feedback or support will be either fed back to the cohort by the course team through blackboard or during a contact study day. Any generic cohort feedback will be provided to the CMC and employers.

Standard 9: Designated prescribing practitioners

Standard met/will be met? Yes No

The team was satisfied that all five criteria relating to the designated prescribing practitioners will be met, with one criterion requiring a minor amendment

As part of the submission documentation, it was noted that the admissions team will check that the DPP meets the necessary regulatory requirements and that they are registered with their professional regulator and the necessary annotations for a prescriber. All applications are reviewed by the course team and any concerns or further evidence needed in respect to the experience of the DPP will then be followed up with the DPP and employer by a member of the course team. The DPP must provide evidence that they meet the competency statements of the RPS (2019) A Competency Framework for Designated Prescribing Practitioners. As part of the application process, the DPP must include evidence that they have a minimum of 3 years' recent prescribing experience and that they can independently consult, assess, and diagnose a patient and that they have previously supported and supervised other healthcare professionals and have the ability to assess patient facing and clinical diagnostic skills. This evidence must be confirmed by their employers. The course team will also confirm that the DPP has the support of their employer to undertake the role.

It was noted in the submission that the DPP must complete the mandatory online DPP training module if this is their first time acting as a DPP for the UEA course, or if their previous student has failed to meet the criteria for competence. DPP's that have acted as a DPP for another independent prescribing programme are recommended to complete all parts of the online training programme.

The accreditation team asked the provider if they have had any instances of DPP's being proposed but who did not have the appropriate skills and experience or support from their employers, the provider explained that had an instance of a DPP working in a different clinical area to what a student was proposing as their scope of practice. The student was advised to source an alternative DPP.

It was noted that the provider has only used DMPs thus far. The accreditation team enquired if they have considered any additional or variation in training or support that may be required by non-medical DPPs. The provider explained that they are working on this with relevant stakeholders to establish any additional training and support needed, including supervision in the workplace and that they are developing this in the induction and training for DPPs. The provider explained that due to lack of prescribing pharmacists to meet demand, they are looking outside of pharmacy for example, nurses and paramedics.

