

**T level outline consultation: Pharmacy Services Specialism-**

**Royal Pharmaceutical Society response**

**1.Does the T level specialist content include the right knowledge, skills and behaviours to allow someone to gain employment in a chosen occupation within the route?**

We believe the T level proposal does not align with current and future pharmacy practice. It needs to make students aware of future pharmacy roles e.g., Research/clinical trials, genomics, consultation skills, human factors and medicines safety, telemedicine and digital systems, procurement and cost effectiveness. The focus of this is contextualising the role rather than a detailed knowledge of these.

**2.Is there anything missing from the specialist content?**

Yes, see Q1. In addition, there are elements of the GPhC IET standards that are not covered in the T level of accelerated apprenticeship e.g., accuracy checking.

**3.Is there anything in the specialist content that is not necessary?**

No. There is a risk that students that progress to the MPharm route would repeat content and it needs to be clear to them how their learning is spiralling to reflect a higher level.

**4.Is the pharmaceutical content in line with relevant industry standards?**

No, it needs to align better with the GPhC Initial Education & Training standards 2017.

**5.Is the scientific content at an appropriate level to support progression into higher education in a relevant area?**

Don’t know. There is some concern from our members about high standards being maintained and whether there is a risk that academically weaker students will not meet the requirements of an MPharm programme or the regulatory registration assessment. We are mindful that Universities will make individual decisions as to whether they will accept T levels as entry towards an MPharm degree. The likely level of acceptance should be made clear to students.

We are mindful that completion of a T level only limits the breadth of learning that students taking A levels or a similar range of subjects will experience.

We support the principles of widening participation and encouraging entry to the pharmacy professions via different routes, provided regulatory standards are maintained for public protection. We question the demand and subsequent viability of the programme given that it will take longer to become a pharmacy technician than the current GCSE/ 2-year programme. We are also mindful of placement capacity and workplace pressures and would seek an assurance that the quality of placements will be guaranteed.

**6. Is the scientific content at an appropriate level to support progression into employment in a relevant area?**

We would like clarity on whether this route will be recognised as an alternative path to work as a pharmacy assistant, for those that decide not to continue with further or higher education.

**7.Is the content at the appropriate level of demand for a level 3 qualification?**

Yes, but see Q1 for content to be included

**8. Is the content suitable for teaching in a classroom-based setting?**

Yes, but placements required to support the practical components and professional socialisation.

**9.Overall, do you think it is feasible to deliver this content within 600 guided learning hours?**

Don’t know