

Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain

Summary of an Independent Prescribing accreditation Report

Swansea University

1. Summary and Conclusions

1. As a result of the accreditation event on 13 May 2008, the panel agreed that in view of the nature and number of the conditions below, it will be a requirement that the Society receive the University's responses to these conditions prior to any recommendation to the Society's Education Committee. The course will not formally be accredited until any subsequent recommendations of the accreditation panel have been endorsed by the Society's Education Committee. This means that the course is not accredited until the conditions have been met and the recommendations addressed

The accreditation panel commended the University on the use of an interview process as part of the application process for the programme. The panel agreed that this represented good practice.

2. Conditions

There are 12 conditions associated with this report, which with the exception of condition 2a, must be met before the programme is recommended for accreditation.

- 2a. For quality assurance purposes, 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 evaluation report must then be forwarded to the Society. [this is a standard condition]
- 2b. That the University inform the Society of an appropriate identified pharmacist that will contribute to ongoing design and delivery of the programme [this relates to criterion 2.1.5].
- 2c. That the University provides the Society with 1) the University application form for entry, and 2) the dedicated admissions form that confirms the pharmacist's eligibility for enrolment [this relates to criteria 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4].
- 2d. That the University revise the Mentor Declaration to confirm that the Designated Medical Practitioner has training and experience appropriate to their role [this relates to criterion 2.2.5].
- 2e. That the University provides the Society with a mapping of the Society's learning outcomes for Independent Prescribing programmes against the University's learning outcomes, curriculum and assessment strategy [this relates the criteria 2.3.4 and 2.5.1].
- 2f. That the University provides Society representatives with short-term access to electronic learning resources to allow a review of the appropriateness of teaching material [this relates to criterion 2.3.5].

- 2g. That the University clarify the process by which pharmacists' application of learning to the conditions for which they will be prescribing is ensured, along with the relevant assessment strategy [this relates to criterion 2.3.6].
- 2h. That the University identify those elements of teaching which cover clinical examination skills and diagnosis as being essential for attendance and progression [this relates to criterion 2.3.10].
- 2i. That the University provides the Society with a copy of the learning in practice log which confirms that at least 12x7.5 hours of supervised practice has been undertaken by the pharmacist and signed off by the Designated Medical Practitioner [this relates to criterion 2.4.3].
- 2j. That the University provides the Society with a revised professional declaration from the Designated Medical Practitioner stating that "the pharmacist's practice as a prescriber is, in the opinion of the Designated Medical Practitioner, suitable for registration as an independent prescriber" [this relates to criterion 2.4.4].
- 2k. That the University provides the Society with a clear description of how the Designated Medical Practitioner ensures that the pharmacist has the clinical competence required to practise as a prescriber for the conditions for which they intend to prescribe [this relates to criterion 2.5.4].
- 2l. That the University provides the Society with the set of marking criteria for both levels 3 and M to ensure that marks awarded are consistent with safe and effective prescribing [this relates to criterion 2.5.5].

3. Recommendations

- 3a. That the table of teaching staff on p42 of the document entitled Non Medical Prescribing Student & Designated Supervising Medical Practitioner (DSMP) Information and Portfolio Guidelines include all staff members that provide academic input to the programme [this relates to criterion 2.1.2].
- 3b. That it be made clear that prospective pharmacist entrants to the Independent programme may study this programme at M-level, and that additional support for pharmacists studying at this level will be offered for the development of their critical appraisal and analysis skills [this relates to criterion 2.3.1].
- 3c. That the University may wish to review the credit rating for the M-level programme in line with sector norms of 40-45 credits [this relates to criterion 2.3.1].
- 3d. That the documentation be revised to ensure clear signposting to relevant support information for Designated Medical Practitioners [this relates to criteria 2.4.1 and 2.4.2].
- 3e. That the University consider the use of a competency framework that would allow the Designated Medical Practitioner to ensure that the pharmacist has acquired the appropriate competencies for practice as an independent prescriber [this relates to criterion 2.5.4].

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.