

Academic Pharmacy Group Consultation Seminar on New Education Standards

Aberdeen, Wednesday 21st October 2009-10-23

Comments raised by those attending

Discussion of

- definition of 'adequate' (8.2.b)
- Issue of 'pharmacists' - ?acting in a 'professional' capacity rather than as e.g. pharmaceutical scientist
- ?right experts to teach the right subject
- M level project not a requirement of MPharm (8.2.c)
- Individuals CPD – up to date for individual's own practice
- Clarity on slides – extensions add to 8 year rule
- ?students need to know they don't have the right to register as a pharmacist by entering an MPharm degree
- Disclosure (CRB) at point of admission
- (9 – context) – 'science' wording – is it enough?
- 'patient' missing from 9 i-iv
- Clinical (?pharmaceutical care) missing from 9 i-iv – omission since sociology & public health explicit
- Questioning about science during accreditation visits
- Integration of practice/science – better sideways communication between staff in different disciplines needed
- Recruitment of pharmacist academics
- Patient safety matching up with disability/equality – ensure no 'misuse' of the patient safety argument
- Proper teaching and learning strategy – useful?
- Benefit of maintaining indicative syllabus
 - Risk if not is that people will retain old one
 - Feedback on shape/structure/what's wrong with current one
- LO1 can a student demonstrate expectations of a pharmacy professional?
 - Student can be 'pharmacy professional' if not a 'pharmacist professional'
- Some concerns expressed about certain LO shows how/does statements
- Be explicit that LOs should be achieved by end of year 4 and year 5 i.e. all LOs don't need to be assessed in year 4
- Document very good – supplement with guidance on indicative syllabus (possibly with standard 9 i-iv as headings)
- Explicit mention of application of scientific principles missing from LOs – implicit
- Can degree be done in less than 4 years? No – EU Directive still applies