



Master of Pharmacy
degree (MPharm)

University of Wolverhampton
Report of an interim event
February 2017

Event summary and conclusions

Provider	University of Wolverhampton
Course	Masters of Pharmacy degree (MPharm)
Event type	Interim event
Event date	09-10 February 2017
Accreditation period	2014 - 2020
Outcome	The accreditation team agreed to recommend to the Registrar of the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) that the University of Wolverhampton should continue to be accredited to provide an MPharm degree for the remainder of the accreditation period.
Conditions	There were no conditions.
Standing conditions	Please refer to Appendix 2
Recommendations	No recommendations were made.
Registrar decision	The Registrar of the GPhC accepted the accreditation team's recommendation and approved the continued accreditation of the programme for the remainder of the accreditation period
Key contact (provider)	Professor Stephen Britland, Head of School.
Accreditation team	Professor Ian Marshall (Team leader), Emeritus Professor of Pharmacology, University of Strathclyde, Proprietor, Caldarvan Research (Educational and Writing Services) Mrs Gail Curphey (Pharmacist), Pharmacy consultant Professor Larry Gifford (Academic), Emeritus Professor, Keele University, School of Pharmacy Dr Adam Todd (Academic), Senior lecturer in Pharmacy Practice, Durham University
GPhC representative	Ms Joanne Martin, Quality Assurance Manager, GPhC
Rapporteur	Professor Brian Furman, Emeritus Professor of Pharmacology, University of Strathclyde

Summary of key findings

The accreditation team advised the School that the team's conclusions from this event were based on what team members had been told, what they had observed, and documents that they had read over the course of the visit and the satellite visits. The purpose of this interim event was to monitor the progress made with delivering the MPharm degree since the 2014 reaccreditation, and to observe a range of educational activities that related to practice and the standard 10 outcomes. Interim events cover selected topics and not all standards are discussed; thus, standards 1 and 3 were not addressed at this event.

A presentation by senior members of staff built on the information provided in the submission and gave an update on progress since the last visit in 2014. Points raised in the presentation, as well as other matters, were discussed with students and the staff, and the following narrative incorporates those discussions.

Progress since last event

Standard 1: Patient and public safety

The team was satisfied that all criteria relating to this standard continue to be met.

This standard was not discussed during the interim visit.

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

The team was satisfied that all criteria relating to this standard continue to be met.

The content and delivery are reviewed regularly and changes are discussed; these reviews provide a good indication of how things have gone and what changes need to be implemented. The reviews incorporate feedback from students and from service users. Processes are in place at both University and School level for quality assurance of both the programme and its assessments, with input from the external examiners. As this is a new programme, only the first three years of which have been run, it was acknowledged by teaching staff that in the longer term the School will need to reflect on the success of the programme in terms of employability of its graduates, and how they perform in the GPhC registration examination.

Standard 3: Equality, diversity and fairness

The team was satisfied that both criteria relating to this standard continue to be met.

Equality, diversity and fairness were not discussed during the interim visit.

Standard 4: Selection of students

The team was satisfied that all criteria relating to this standard continue to be met.

In addition to accepting students with A-levels, the School now accepts students with BTEC qualifications, as well as students from the Science & Engineering Foundation Year; high standards were expected of applicants with such qualifications. The School's experience indicated that although BTEC students initially require more support, they cope well with the rigorous nature of the MPharm programme and students from the Foundation Year are highly motivated and perform very well.

Standard 5: Curriculum delivery and student experience

The new programme that commenced in 2014 has a strong clinical emphasis and patient-focus, with increased integration based on single, 120-credit modules in each year with three overarching themes of 'Drugs and Medicine', 'Patients and Population' and 'Professional Practice'. The single module in each year

comprises two to four thematically titled strands, depending on the year. Within the curriculum, material is re-visited each year with complexity increasing year-on-year. Although standard educational methods such as lectures are still used, there has been a major shift in the delivery of the curriculum to active, enquiry-based learning with extensive use of team-based (TBL) and case-based learning (CBL). These methods were explored in detail during this interim visit and abundant evidence for their effectiveness was demonstrated. Throughout the programme the students encounter and interact with other healthcare professionals, especially nursing students, and with patients, for example, during their hospital and community pharmacy placements. Students were well-prepared for these encounters, for example, by role-play, so that they felt confident in speaking both to patients and other healthcare professionals. Further inter-professional learning is under development, so that students will also work with physiotherapy, mental health nursing and paramedic students. Student learning is assessed in a number of ways, including tests within the TBL sessions and integrated final examinations, the latter covering all material.

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

The team was satisfied that the one criterion relating to this standard continue to be met.

Students are well-supported by the staff who provide them with regular feedback on their performance. There is a personal tutor system and students can also contact lecturers at any time; they meet lecturers frequently in the TBL and CBL sessions. A mentoring scheme also operates, whereby third year students mentor those in the second year.

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

The team was satisfied that all criteria relating to this standard continue to be met.

Support is available for all staff members. This includes training for TBL by an external expert, enabling staff members to learn how to facilitate these sessions. New staff members have the opportunity to shadow those with more experience and quickly become comfortable with TBL and CBL. While the TBL/CBL approach is difficult and labour-intensive, especially initially, it is acknowledged by all members of staff as a very good, efficient teaching method, which, because of the small size of the student groups, also enables the staff to readily identify students who are struggling.

Standard 8: Management of initial education and training

The team was satisfied that both criteria relating to this standard continue to be met.

Management of the 120-credit modules is achieved through a year tutor for each year of study. There are also leaders for each of the thematic strands and for each of the TBL/CBL learning cycles within the strands. Learning outcomes and assessments sit outside and across the strands, and the learning materials are developed by multidisciplinary teams, which work to assemble the study packs that form the basis of TBL, as well as the assessments, which are integrated. There are contributions from both the strand and cycle teams to decide what material from other TBL and CBL cycles/strands should be incorporated into the assessments, including material from previous years; this requires extensive communication among staff members which is facilitated by their co-location in cross-disciplinary offices.

Standard 9: Resources and capacity

The team was satisfied that all criteria relating to this standard continue to be met.

Although MPharm student numbers have declined in recent years, the School is in a good financial position, and runs several other programmes that contribute to its sustainability. Applications were a little down from last year but were the same as two years' ago and the overall trend is rising. The School is undertaking proactive marketing, actively working on converting offers of MPharm places to firm acceptances through 'applicant days' (rather than open days), during which applicants meet the staff and hear about the course

both from staff and current students, as well as gaining experience of the course through participating in a TBL 'taster'. Since the 2014 reaccreditation event, there had been substantial investment in the School, including the opening of the Rosalind Franklin Building, refurbishment of the pharmacy practice teaching laboratory, and the reconfiguration and refurbishment of previous laboratory space to create an impressive, dedicated team-based learning (TBL) room.

Standard 10: Outcomes

The team was satisfied that all 58 outcomes relating to Standard 10 continue to be delivered at the appropriate level.

This conclusion was based on the discussions with staff and students, as well as the team's observation of student activities.

Observation of student activities

A list of the activities that were observed during both the satellite visits and the main visit is given in Appendix 1. The following summarises comments made by those team members who observed the activities.

The team observed 12 activities covering inter-professional learning with nursing students on ethical aspects, community and hospital pharmacy placements, team-based and case-based learning (TBL and CBL), including a contextualisation session for TBL, and a session in which students questioned a number of patients who had long-term conditions. In all of these activities, the students were clearly well-prepared and demonstrated a high level of engagement. The sessions contributed to meeting the standard 10 learning outcomes as indicated by the School and the students showed that their learning had effectively integrated various aspects of science with practice and patient care.

Conclusions

The range of activities observed, including case-based and team-based learning, a session with patients and service users, and IPE with nursing students, gave the team an insight into opportunities available to the Wolverhampton students to develop their skills. The team noted that students were fully engaged and were developing skills to prepare them for practice. There was clear linkage of the activities to what is being delivered and taught in the curriculum, with the students identifying these links, and making regular reference to previous learning. The students clearly articulated how they are developing as integrative learners, which is strongly supported by the teaching team and the integrated curriculum through the team-based learning (TBL) model, which students described as giving them the knowledge, skills, confidence and professional attributes to equip them for practice; the students clearly recognise the value of TBL approach. The team welcomes plans to introduce more professions into the inter-professional education strategy. The students commented positively on their patient engagement activities and clearly valued these interactions, which helped them to develop empathy. They described the placement experience as being invaluable, and told the team that they feel confident in talking and communicating with patients and other healthcare professionals, and are fully prepared for the practice-based learning, linking this to what they learn within the curriculum. The students presented themselves as intelligent, articulate and mature in their engagement and clearly appreciated the support they receive from the School staff.

Appendix 1 - Activities

Observed activities

Satellite visits

In advance of the main visit seven satellite visits took place to allow team members to observe the following off-site activities:

Activity Number	Location	Activity type	Year
1.	University	IPL session	3
2.	J Docter Pharmacy	Community placement	2
3.	New Cross Hospital	Hospital Placement	3
4.	University	TBL workshop	1
5.	University	Case-based learning tutorial	3
6.	New Cross Hospital	Hospital Placement	2
7.	University	Service User/Carer involvement session	2

Activities observed during the visit

The accreditation team observed the following activities within the University as part of the interim event:

Activity number	Activity	Year/Level
8.	IPE Ethical Framework workshop	2
9.	Endocrine TBL tutorial	3
10.	Optimisation/medicines reconciliation/medicines review	2
11.	Introduction to drugs and medicines workshop	1
12.	CBL tutorial	3

Appendix 2 - 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 produce and submit to the GPhC on an annual basis:
 - a. requested data on student numbers and progression and degree awards;
 - b. requested information about the extent of human and physical resources it enjoys for the delivery and support of the degree course.
5. The provider must make students and potential students aware that successful completion of an accredited course is not a guarantee of a placement for a pre-registration year or of future employment as a pharmacist.
6. 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.
7. 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 3 – Standards

GPhC standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists

The standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists can be downloaded from the GPhC website at:

<http://www.pharmacyregulation.org/standards>

Or by clicking on the following link:

https://www.pharmacyregulation.org/sites/default/files/GPhC_Future_Pharmacists.pdf