

Joint Programmes Boards Coordinating Committee (JPBCC)

**Conference Room, Advanced Pharmacy Studies Centre (School of Pharmacy)
21 Russell Square, London**

Tuesday 5th April 2011 at 11.00 am to 12.30pm

Attended

David Webb (chair), Professor Graham Davies, Professor Anthony Smith, Professor Peter Hylands, Mike Gray, Professor John Smart, Dr Jane Portlock, Stuart Sample, Gail Fleming and Chetan Shah

1. Apologies

Bhulesh Vadher, John Quinn, Susan Sanders, Margaret Stone, Dr Paul Grassby, Jane Giles.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

Susan Sanders emailed comments related to the following:

- Item 4(a) should state East of England, not Eastern
- Item 4(b) MPC, workforce planning in conjunction (not through) the CfWI
- Item 6 action should be circulation of documents to regional boards for comment

The minutes were otherwise accepted as an accurate record of the meeting held on October 11, 2010.

3. Matters arising

a) Review of actions

All action had been completed.

b) South East Commissioning proposal

A total of 42 places had been commissioned by SEMMED per year to take effect from September 2011 for a 3 year cycle. HEI bids were to be adjudicated by mid-April.

Action: Gail Fleming (GF) to confirm successful bid in due course.

4. Items for report

a) Update on postgraduate HEFCE funding

Professor Smith (AS) reported that HEFCE cuts for postgraduate taught programmes were likely to mirror those for the undergraduate courses. This might mean reductions for 2011-12 of 9%, with further reduction in subsequent years which may have implications for programme delivery by each locality; for example, employers may choose to

prioritise participation if cost rise significantly. This will require a review of the content, delivery and target audiences for the programmes and the value of linking to academic credits.

Action: Local JPBs to discuss and bring key issues to the next JPBC meeting.

b) HIEC/AHSC activity

No further information was available, except from the South London HIEC. The latter viewed investment in the up-skilling of community pharmacists as important to meet the public health agenda and had already committed some resource to support this.

There was uncertainty in relation to the configuration of Local Skills Networks and especially their relationship with community pharmacy. GF had met with community pharmacy organizations as part of the response to *Developing the Healthcare Workforce* consultation.

c) MPC WS1

Professor Smith reported that MEE had endorsed the proposal for the reform of undergraduate pharmacist education and that the proposal would now go forward to the Secretary of State for consideration. AS suggested that aspects of the JPB model could inform the plans for undergraduate provision, particularly in relation to the proposed Deanery function. It was agreed that the journey and achievements in establishing the JPB should be captured so that it could be available to inform any future MPC discussions. The committee offered their congratulations to Professor Smith and Rob Darracott for the progress of MPC workstream 1.

Action: GD and DW to coordinate activity and functions from 4 existing boards to form a brief overview document.

d) MPC WS2

DW reported that 4 groups had been established to review post-registration development. The groups were: pharmacists in patient facing roles, academia, pharmacy technicians and science and technology (DW was facilitating the latter group). A wide ranging stakeholder engagement process was envisaged.

e) CARG

J

GD reported on the outputs from the CARG March held on the 17th March. The key issues discussed were:

- Need for a common JPB internet portal to outline the main features of the collaboration and to signpost to local JPBs and the associated HEI programmes. There was discussion on whether SoP or SEMMED could host this portal.

Action: GD to discuss options with GF.

- NHS membership of CARG had been raised. There was a need to ensure each JPB Board had input into the curricula and assessments, but without adding unnecessarily to the size of the committee.

Action: Each Board to identify liaison persons to cover the relevant curricula. Specialist Pharmacy Services to coordinate broad annual review of these curricula areas to include the liaison persons from the 4 Boards.

- An Assessment Design Group had been established to review MCQ, OSCEs and other assessments tools. The discussion highlighted that the workplace assessment tools used as part of this programme were entirely formative (unlike FY1 in medicine) and were presented as part of the portfolio of evidence.
- The accreditation process and documentation were undergoing review in line with the new GPhC Education Standards. This work had temporarily paused to await the final standards, which were thought to be available soon after the period of consultation. GF indicated that the SEC process would be linked to that adopted by the Deanery but that some commonality in evidence would be welcomed.

Action: GD to circulate both the old accreditation document and the draft re-accreditation document.

5. Items for decision

- a) Adoption DEPS terminology for practice tutors

GF provided a brief overview of the work relating to the standardization of terminology, which was now being rolled-out across SEC. London and EoE both agreed in principle to a standardisation of terminology and needed to work through the implications locally. JP reported that SC was taking this initiative forward.

- b) NHS members for CARG

This was discussed under the CARG report (item 4).

- c) Standardisation of statements of completion of training

There was general agreement that a common approach across the NHS for issuing Statement of Completion of Training would be a positive outcome.

Action: All to discuss at local Boards so that the document and process could be fully reviewed at the next JPBCC meeting.

6. Devolved arrangements: verbal reports from each Board

a) SEC Report

Documents on how to construct a DAP experience were helpful; GF to share with Barry Jubraj. A survey of which DAPs were being undertaken was due to be carried out to determine alignment with service need. A standard student evaluation from (online) had been developed, which students must complete as part of the course requirements. The e-process was being tested and experience would be shared with others who may be interested in adopting the system. A tutor network had also been established to share issues and to identify tutor training needs and was linked to a programme being offered by SEMMED.

b) SC Report

Reading and Portsmouth HEIs were working closely together although a formal meeting had not been held recently. Portsmouth was re-engaging with hospital tutors.

c) EoE Report

The next JPB EoE meeting was scheduled for 5th June.

d) London Report

The most recent meeting had discussed the fees and options around the programme length. As a result twice strands of work were to be undertaken; one to review the foundation programme and the other to explore support for the development of specialist practitioners.

7. Update from East Midlands

Margaret Stone was unable to attend.

8. AOB

There was no further business to discuss

9. Date of next meeting

This would be scheduled for October 2011 and dates would be circulated by email.