

Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain

Summary of an Independent Prescribing Accreditation Report

University of Bath

1. Summary and Conclusions

Following an accreditation event on 20 November 2007, the accreditation panel agreed that the overall quality of the programme presented for accreditation was very good. As a result of the accreditation event, the panel will recommend to the Society's Education Committee that the independent prescribing programme at the University of Bath is accredited for a maximum period of three years, subject to the conditions and recommendations detailed below.

The accreditation panel wished to particularly commend the team from the university on the quality of the following documents which they agreed were excellent:

- Guide to the preparation of the Practice-Based Learning Portfolio;
- The Summary Activities and Tasks for the Programme documents;
- The DMP Support Guides

2. Conditions.

(It is expected that conditions 2b to 2h inclusive will be satisfied before the programme commences)

- 2a. For quality assurance purposes, given the implications of independent prescribing and the additional responsibility on pharmacists, all Universities offering newly accredited Independent Prescribing Programmes will be expected to undertake an evaluation of the teaching provided to enable students to develop clinical examination skills, once the first cohort has completed the programme. The evaluation must include assessment results for this essential core element and feedback from students on the teaching provided. The report must be forwarded to the Society. [Standard condition]
- 2b. The application document for entry to the programme must also request an applicant PSNI registration number where appropriate. (This relates to criterion 2.2.1).
- 2c. The application document for entry to the programme should request the applicant's date of registration, not the date of qualification. (This related to criterion 2.2.2).
- 2d. The reference to supplementary prescribing must be removed from the employer reference which was included in Annex D of the supporting documentation submitted by the University. (This relates to criterion 2.2.3).
- 2e. The learning outcomes detailed in the Unit Description template included in Annex H of the supporting documentation submitted by the University should be mapped directly to the Society learning outcomes for independent prescribing training programmes. (This relates to criterion 2.3.4).
- 2f. The University is required to confirm with the Society its policy with regard to students who are absent from a face to face teaching day dealing with clinical skills. (This relates to criterion 2.3.10).

- 2g. The form included by the University as part of its supporting documentation headed “confirmation of suitability for registration as an independent prescriber” which is signed off by the DMP, needs to be amended to state 12 daysx7.5 days, not 12 days. (This relates to criteria 2.4.3 and 2.5.2).
- 2h. In relation to the above form, the wording “in my professional judgement” should be amended to “in my opinion”. (This relates to criterion 2.4.4).
- 2i. The Society’s learning outcomes should be mapped directly to the assessments. (This relates to criterion 2.5.1).

3. Recommendations

The accreditation panel wished to make the following recommendations to the University in respect of the programme:

- 3a. Annex J, paragraph 2.4.2.2 of the supporting documentation submitted by the University, refers to the role of the “pharmacist prescriber”. The panel advised the team that the term had no legal basis and recommended that the wording be revised to state “pharmacist independent prescriber”. (This relates to criterion 2.3.7).

The course will not formally be accredited until the accreditation panel’s recommendations have been endorsed by the Society’s Education Committee.

Following the above accreditation event satisfactory evidence was provided to meet the above conditions of accreditation (with the exception of the standard condition 2a which must be met on completion of the first cohort). The programme was subsequently approved for accreditation by the Society’s Education Committee for a period of three years.