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1 Frame of reference, object and procedural steps

1.1 Frame of reference

The accreditation of study programmes leading to a Federal Diploma in Pharmacy is mandatory according to the Federal Law on Medical Professions of 23 June 2006 (MedBG, Art. 23 § 1). The Federal Law on Financial Aid to Universities of 8 October 2009 (UFG) and Art. 24 § 1 MedBG define the criteria that must be fulfilled for accreditation of study programmes. The legally defined educational objectives are of key importance (Art. 4 MedBG, Art. 6-10 MedBG).

The quality assessment is based upon Quality Standards that were developed by the Deans of the five Swiss Medical faculties, in cooperation with the Swiss Center of Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education (OAQ) and the Federal Office for Public Health (FOPH). They were based on the internationally accepted "Basic Medical Education WFME Global Standards for Quality Improvement" and authorised on 11 June 2003 by the Joint Commission of the Swiss Medical Schools (SMIFK). In 2007 and 2010 on behalf of the FOPH, the OAQ revised and adapted the quality standards to the MedBG and to the specificities of pharmacy in consultation with the three Swiss academic institutions responsible for the pharmaceutical education. Those Quality Standards comply with the international recommendations of the "Pharmacy Education Taskforce".5

This work resulted in the development of the quality standard set "Accreditation of Study Programmes in Pharmacy. Quality Standards", dated April 2010, which comprises the educational objectives specified in Art. 4, 6, 7, 8 of the MedBG as well as the general and specific quality standards for study programmes outlined in the Accreditation Guidelines of the Swiss University Conference (SUC).7

Between March 2010 and August 2012 the OAQ conducts the accreditation procedures of all the Bachelor and Master programmes in Veterinary Medicine, Human Medicine, Dental Medicine and Pharmacy.

These procedures foresee the assessment of the fulfilment of the accreditation criteria according to the MedBG as well as the fulfilment of the quality standards according to the SUC Accreditation Guidelines.

---

1 Bundesgesetz über die universitären Medizinalberufe vom 23. Juni 2006 (MedBG), SR 811.11.
3 Accreditation of Study Programmes in Pharmacy / Pharmaceutical Sciences, Quality Standards, April 2010, Federal Department of Home Affairs (FDHA), Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH), from now quoted as „Quality Standards”
4 The standards of the World Federation for Medical Education (WFME) can be downloaded on www.wfme.org
5 www.fip.org/pharmacy_education
7 Guidelines of the Swiss University Conference for Academic Accreditation in Switzerland (Accreditation Guidelines) of 28 June 2007, SR/RS 414.205.3.
The accreditation proposals to the two accrediting bodies, the SUC (UFG criteria) and the Swiss Accreditation Council (MedBG criteria) are each limited to the respective quality criteria. However, the accreditation decision according to UFG is a precondition for accreditation according to MedBG.

The conceptual planning of the procedures as well as all accompanying instruments were defined by the OAQ under the mandate of the FOPH and in cooperation with the SUC and the FOPH itself.

1.2 Object of the accreditation procedure

The object of the accreditation procedure is the study programme in Pharmacy (full cycle, including the BSc in Pharmaceutical Sciences – BPharm – and the MSc in Pharmacy – MPharm) of the “Ecole de Pharmacie Genève-Lausanne” (EPGL). The EPGL was created in 2003, after the transfer of the Section of Pharmacy of the University of Lausanne (UNIL) to the Faculty of Sciences at the University of Geneva (UNIGE). The operational governance and the strategic planning of the EPGL is assured by the University of Geneva, which offers the full study programme in Pharmacy, from the first year BPharm to the end of the MPharm.

The EPGL has developed a strong partnership with the Universities of Lausanne and Neuchâtel (UNINE), allowing the students enrolled in the BSc in Pharmaceutical Sciences programme to follow the first year (BPharm-1) of their studies at either of these institutions. The terms of the collaboration between UNIGE, UNIL and UNINE were defined in a convention. At the University of Lausanne, the School of Biology, which is part of the Faculty of Biology and Medicine, is responsible for the first year of the BPharm. The majority of the students continue their studies at the University of Geneva, but they nevertheless have the possibility to continue their studies at the ETH Zurich or at the University of Basel.

At the University of Neuchâtel, the first year courses of the BPharm are provided by the Faculty of Science. The students attend some courses together with students of the BSc in Biology, and follow some additional courses specifically dedicated to the pharmaceutical sciences. As for the students from the University of Lausanne, they can continue their studies at the University of Geneva, but also at the ETH Zurich or at the University of Basel.

---

8 Self-evaluation report prepared in view of the accreditation of the study programme in Pharmacy, University of Geneva, University of Lausanne, University of Neuchâtel, p. 4. Thereafter cited as Self-evaluation report.
9 Self-evaluation report, p.4.
10 Self-evaluation report, p.7.
In 2010, there were 355 students enrolled in the study programme in Geneva, and 60 students graduated. 16 professors and 8 “Maîtres d’enseignement et de recherche” teach the pharmacy students and supervise 105 doctoral students (PhD).

In Lausanne, the number of 1st year students is stable with 29 students enrolled in 2010. In Neuchâtel, 14 students were registered for the year 2010.

1.3 Procedural steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07.02.2011</td>
<td>Opening of the procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.06.2011</td>
<td>Approval of the experts’ panel by the Swiss Accreditation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.06.2011</td>
<td>Approval of the experts’ panel by the Scientific Advisory Board of the OAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.08.2011</td>
<td>Self-evaluation report of the EPGL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14.10.2011</td>
<td>On-site visit of the EPGL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.11.2011</td>
<td>Preliminary experts’ report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.11.2011</td>
<td>Position statement of the EPGL (including position according to Art. 27 § 2 of the SUC Guidelines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12.2011</td>
<td>Final experts’ report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02.2012</td>
<td>Draft OAQ report with proposal on accreditation decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.03.2012</td>
<td>Statement of the Scientific Advisory Board of the OAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.04.2012</td>
<td>Statement of the MEBEKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.04.2012</td>
<td>Final OAQ report with proposal on accreditation decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The procedure was properly conducted under all formal aspects and legal requirements.

1.4 The panel of experts

- Prof. Dr. Claus-Michael LEHR, Peer Leader (Universität Saarland, Germany)
- Prof. Dr. Claude MAILLHOT, expert (Université de Montréal, Canada)
- Prof. Dr. Franz GERHARD, expert (University of Regensburg, Germany)
- Nicolas HUGUENIN, expert, Student MSc in Pharmaceutical sciences (ETH Zurich, Switzerland)
1.5 Reference documents

- Self-evaluation report prepared in view of the accreditation of the Study Programme in Pharmacy, University of Geneva, University of Lausanne, University of Neuchâtel, 23 August 2011.
- Experts’ report, dated 12 December 2011
- Position statement of the EPGL (including position according to Art. 27 § 2 of the SUC Guidelines), dated 28 November 2011
- Statement of the MEBEKo, dated 10.04.2012

2 External Evaluation

2.1 The self-evaluation report

The EPGL delivered its self-evaluation report in due time. The report, written in English, contains 88 pages completed by 72 appendices and fully complies with the recommendations of the OAQ. Each quality area is treated in one full chapter, and is concluded by an analysis including the main strengths and the points to be improved. Each sub-area comprises the status at the three universities, first at the UNIGE, and then, if applicable, at the UNIL and at the UNINE, giving a full view of the study programme.

The members of the experts’ panel judged the report as being systematic and honest and was perceived as a highly helpful source to evaluate the study programme.

2.2 The on-site visit

The on-site visit took place at the School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, in Geneva, from October 10th to October 12th 2011, starting with a briefing of the expert team by the OAQ representative in the evening. Besides the students and staff from Geneva, representatives of the Universities of Lausanne and Neuchâtel were present in some of the sessions, as well as invited representatives of other stakeholders. The on-site visit ended with a debriefing session, open for all interested participants in the accreditation process, during which the peer-leader exposed orally the main outcomes of the external assessment.

The experts could only visit the facilities of the Geneva campus.

All the time, the team encountered a friendly and highly supportive atmosphere. The programme was rather tight, but nevertheless provided sufficient opportunities to get a complete impression of the programme, its facilities and the people involved. The persons

12 Expert’s report, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences Geneva-Lausanne (EPGL), Faculty of Science, University of Geneva, University of Lausanne, University of Neuchâtel, 12th December 2011, p.4. From now on cited as Experts’ report.
interviewed were competent and collaborative, always responding to questions in an honest and open manner.\textsuperscript{13}

2.3 Assessment of the fulfillment of the quality standards by the experts

Based on the individual examination areas, the experts have highlighted the following strengths of the unit under accreditation:

- Thanks to the excellent collaboration with Lausanne and Neuchâtel, the first-year students are well trained to successfully continue their studies in Geneva with a relatively small drop-out rate.
- Besides teaching, EPGL provides a highly dynamic research environment, which is particularly attractive also for foreign students to get a well structured formation at high level.
- The department enjoys active support by relevant stakeholders, such as e.g. PharmaSuisse.
- The expert panel was impressed to see „enseignement coordonné“ as an example for interdisciplinary teaching and learning in clinical and practical pharmacy.
- A well-developed drug discovery, drug development and medicines and diseases module integrates different scientific disciplines, reflecting the entire value chain.
- Security measures and programs are well settled and convincingly implemented.
- The intermediate staff seems to be motivated and satisfied with the career perspectives.
- An excellent relation between teachers and students at all levels could be observed.
- There is adequate staffing with committed administrative personal.
- No gender or equal opportunity problems were observed. Recruiting policy and procedure for academic staff are transparent and well implemented.

As for the weaknesses, the expert panel has underlined the following:

- Programme evaluation activities are taking place but it appears necessary to organize all these activities in a formal quality assurance system.
- A mission statement with clearly formulated objectives was not immediately visible for the experts.

\textsuperscript{13} Experts’ report, p.5.
The experts were surprised by the low mobility of students to leave the region or to go abroad in spite of provided financial support by national and European programs. Outgoing mobility should be further promoted and encouraged.

The time frame (14 weeks) currently allowed for master thesis is ambitiously short. It should be prolonged to be in line with (inter)national standards.

The education in patient-oriented aspects of pharmacy seems suffering from limited resources.

The participation of students and intermediate staff in different committees is wished, but not obvious at all levels.

There is a lack of incentives for well trained „pharmaciens formateurs“ to engage in internships outside Geneva.

Opportunities for transdisciplinary interactions with other health professions (e.g. medicine, nursing), especially during the internships, are poorly developed.

The experts have identified the following threats:

- Students might be not sufficiently exposed to the international dimension of their field of science and profession.
- Insufficient compatibility with curricula at other universities and recognition of externally taken courses and exams may lead to a loss of international visibility and reputation.
- The available resources in terms of space and budget may be not sufficient to cope with the increasing demand of well-trained pharmacists in Switzerland.

and the following opportunities for the study programme offered by the EPGL:

- The collaboration between Geneva, Lausanne and Neuchâtel (“3 campus situation”) should allow to further increasing the admission of students in the first year and to make a stronger selection of good students.
- Financial Support from PharmaSuisse may allow developing a unique profile with a particular strength in patient-oriented pharmacy.
- The very well developed collaboration with external stakeholders (e.g. hospitals and industry) may become a role model in Europe.

In their report, the experts have indicated various recommendations for the quality improvement of the study programme and for its further development. Additionally they have formulated three conditions for accreditation with regard to the following sub-areas:

- Sub-area 1.1 Mission and Objectives (standards 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3)
CONDITION 1: Formulate the mission statement and make it publicly visible, also consulting stakeholders and consistent with the strategic plan and research objectives.

- Sub-area 3.4 Student Representation (standard 3.4.1)

CONDITION 2: Representation of students must be formally integrated in the curriculum committee (“commission d’enseignement”).

- Sub-area 7.1 Study Programme Evaluation (standards 7.1.1, 7.1.2)

CONDITION 3: The School of pharmacy must implement a formal programme evaluation system.

- Sub-area 9.1: Continuous Renewal / Quality Assurance (standard 9.1.1)

CONDITION 3 applies.

As a conclusion, the experts recommend the accreditation of the Study programme in Pharmacy of the EPGL (including 1st year at the Universities of Lausanne and Neuchâtel) with 3 conditions to be reviewed within 1 year after accreditation decision.

2.4 Compliance with the legal requirements

The expert panel concludes that the curriculum as implemented at the EPGL complies with the legal requirements foreseen by Art. 24 MedBG. They confirm that the students will reach the goals and qualifications for a later career as academically trained health professionals, and to participate in subsequent continuous education programmes.

2.5 Position statement of the unit under accreditation on the experts’ report

The EPGL accepts the experts’ report and confirms that the comments found in the report were of positive and constructive nature. The EPGL has formulated factual corrections to the experts’ report, which have mostly been integrated into the final version of the experts’ report.

The EPGL has taken note of the conditions to be fulfilled for full accreditation, which already had been identified as problematic areas in the self-evaluation report. It also considers the recommendations to be very constructive and confirms that the majority of them will be implemented at medium term.14

2.6 Consultation of the OAQ Scientific Advisory Board

The OAQ sent the self-evaluation report, the expert report, the comments of the EPGL and the OAQ’s draft report to its Scientific Advisory Board on February 21, 2012 for consultation.

---

14 Response of the EPGL to the Report of the Experts mandated with the Accreditation of the Study Program in Pharmacy at the School of Pharmacy Geneva-Lausanne, 28th November 2011, p.1. From now on cited as „Response of the EPGL“.
On 27 March 2012 the OAQ Scientific Advisory Board confirmed that the procedure was properly conducted and supports the programme accreditation for a period of 7 years.

2.7 Consultation of the MEBEKO

The OAQ sent the self-evaluation report, the experts' report, the comments of the EPGL and the OAQ's draft report to the MEBEKO on February 21, 2012 for the first consultation, according to Art. 27 § 5 MedBG. In its position statement dated 10 April 2012 the MEBEKO confirms that the procedure was properly conducted under all formal aspects and supports the conclusions reached by the experts.

2.8 Position statement of the “Ecole de Pharmacie Genève-Lausanne” according to Art. 27 § 2 of the SUC Accreditation Guidelines

The EPGL stated in its response from 28 November 2011, that the three conditions will satisfactorily be met by implementing the following measures:

For condition 1, the visibility of the EPGL’s missions will be increased. These missions have been detailed in the Strategic Plan 2011-2014, which was accepted by all academic institutions related to EPGL.

For condition 2, the representation of students in the Study Commission (commission d’enseignement) of EPGL will be realized by the participation of a student at the Bachelor’s level, and one at the Master’s level. These students will be selected by the student body.

For condition 3, a formal evaluation process will be established according to the systematic evaluation procedure of study programs established at UNIGE in late 2009.

The OAQ acknowledges the measures to be taken by the EPGL and believes that they will allow the EPGL to fulfil the conditions made by the experts within a time-span of 1 year.

3 Conclusion of the OAQ

In order to comply with the accreditation criteria, not every single quality standard needs to be completely fulfilled. The recommendation for accreditation by the experts and the accreditation agency is the result of a global judgement taking into account evidences at the level of sub-areas of examination.

Based on the self-evaluation report, the experts' report, the comments of the EPGL on the expert's report, the statement of the MEBEKO and of the Scientific Advisory Board, the OAQ concludes that the Study Programme in Pharmacy of the EPGL (University of Geneva, University of Lausanne, University of Neuchâtel) fulfils to a large extent the Quality Standards of the FOPH for accreditation. It supports the accreditation of the programme for a

15 Response of the SPS, p.1.
period of 7 years. The OAQ generally agrees with the conditions proposed in the experts’ report, taking into account the following:

- the positioning of the EPGL should be part of the mission statement of the University of Geneva and oriented as well on the mission of the faculty. The first condition should therefore be reformulated as follows:

  Coherently with the strategic plan and research objectives and in consultation with its stakeholders, the EPGL’s mission must be oriented on the mission of the University of Geneva and of the faculty and be publicly visible.

This condition addresses both the UFG and the MedBG criteria for accreditation.

- The second condition should be maintained:

  The representation of students must be formally integrated in the curriculum committee ("commission d’enseignement").

  This condition addresses exclusively the UFG criteria for accreditation.

- The third condition should be maintained:

  The School of pharmacy must implement a formal programme evaluation system

  This condition addresses both the UFG and the MedBG criteria for accreditation.

The recommendations formulated in the expert report are intended by the experts to contribute to the development of the quality of the study programme. The OAQ agrees with the recommendations of the experts.

3.1 OAQ’s proposal for accreditation according to UFG to the attention of the SUC

Concluding that the Study Programme in Pharmacy of the EPGL (University of Geneva, University of Lausanne and University of Neuchâtel) fulfils to a large extent the accreditation standards pursuant to art. 10 of the Accreditation Guidelines, the OAQ thus recommends to the attention of the Swiss University Conference:

Accreditation of the Study Programme in Pharmacy of the EPGL of the University of Geneva, the University of Lausanne and the University of Neuchâtel for a period of 7 years, with the following 3 conditions to be reviewed within a time-span of 1 year:

- Coherently with the strategic plan and research objectives and in consultation with its stakeholders, the EPGL’s mission must be oriented on the mission of the University of Geneva and of the faculty and be publicly visible.
– The representation of students must be formally integrated in the curriculum committee ("commission d’enseignement").

– The School of pharmacy must implement a formal programme evaluation system.

3.2 OAQ’s proposal for accreditation according to MedBG to the attention of the Swiss Accreditation Council

Concluding that the Study Programme in Pharmacy of the EPGL (University of Geneva, University of Lausanne and University of Neuchâtel) fulfils to a large extent the objectives and accreditation criteria pursuant to Art. 4, 6, 7, 9 and 24 of the MedBG, the OAQ thus recommends to the attention of the Swiss Accreditation Council:

Accreditation of the Study Programme in Pharmacy of the EPGL of the University of Geneva, the University of Lausanne and the University of Neuchâtel for a period of 7 years with the following 2 conditions to be reviewed within a time-span of 1 year:

– Coherently with the strategic plan and research objectives and in consultation with its stakeholders, the EPGL’s mission must be oriented on the mission of the University of Geneva and of the faculty and be publicly visible.

– The School of pharmacy must implement a formal programme evaluation system.

3.1 Antrag des OAQ auf Akkreditierung gemäss UFG an die SUK

Das OAQ kommt zum Schluss, dass der Studiengang in Pharmazie von der EPGL (Universität Genf, Universität Lausanne und Universität Neuenburg) die Akkreditierungsstandards gemäss Art. 10 der SUK-Richtlinien in grossem Ausmass erfüllt.

Daher beantragt das OAQ die Akkreditierung des Studiengangs in Pharmazie von der EPGL (Universität Genf, Universität Lausanne und Universität Neuenburg) für 7 Jahre, mit 3 Auflagen zu überprüfen innerhalb 1 Jahr nach Rechtskraft des Akkreditierungsentscheids:

– Im Einklang mit der strategischen Planung und den Forschungszielen und nach Konsultierung der Interessenvertreter, muss das Leitbild der EPGL auf das Leitbild der Universität Genf und der Fakultät ausgerichtet, und öffentlich zugänglich gemacht werden.

– Die Vertretung der Studierenden in der Studienkommission muss geregelt werden.

– Die EPGL muss ein formelles Verfahren der Programmevaluation einführen.

3.2 Antrag des OAQ auf Akkreditierung gemäss MedBG an den Schweizerischen Akkreditierungsrat

Das OAQ kommt zum Schluss, dass der Studiengang in Pharmazie von der EPGL (Universität Genf, Universität Lausanne und Universität Neuenburg) die Ziele und Akkreditierungskriterien gemäss Art. 4, 6, 7, 9 und 24 MedBG in grossem Ausmass erfüllt.
Daher beantragt das OAQ die Akkreditierung des Studiengangs in Pharmazie von der EPGL (Universität Genf, Universität Lausanne und Universität Neuenburg) für 7 Jahre mit 2 Auflagen zu überprüfen innerhalb 1 Jahr nach Rechtskraft des Akkreditierungsentscheids:

- Im Einklang mit der strategischen Planung und den Forschungszielen und nach Konsultierung der Interessenvertreter, muss das Leitbild der EPGL auf das Leitbild der Universität Genf und der Fakultät ausgerichtet, und öffentlich zugänglich gemacht werden.
- Die EPGL muss ein formelles Verfahren der Programmevaluation einführen.

3.1 Proposition de l’OAQ relative à l’accréditation selon la LAU adressée à la CUS

L’OAQ certifie que la filière d’études en Pharmacie de l’EPGL (Université de Genève, Université de Lausanne et Université de Neuchâtel) satisfait dans une large mesure aux standards d’accréditation conformément à l’art. 10 des directives de la CUS et propose l’accréditation de la filière d’études en Pharmacie de l’EPGL (Université de Genève, Université de Lausanne et Université de Neuchâtel) pour 7 ans, avec les 3 conditions suivantes, à remplir dans un délai de 1 an:

- De manière cohérente avec le plan stratégique et les objectifs de recherche, en consultation avec toutes les parties prenantes, la mission de l’EPGL doit s’orienter à la mission de l’Université de Genève ainsi qu’à celle de la faculté et avoir une visibilité publique.
- Une représentation des étudiants doit être formellement intégrée dans la Commission d’Enseignement.
- L’EPGL doit mettre en œuvre un système d’évaluation formel de la filière.

3.2 Proposition de l’OAQ relative à l’accréditation selon la LPMed adressée au Conseil suisse d’accréditation

L’OAQ certifie que la filière d’études en Pharmacie de l’EPGL (Université de Genève, Université de Lausanne et Université de Neuchâtel) satisfait dans une large mesure aux objectifs et critères d’accréditation conformément aux Art. 4, 6, 7, 9 et 24 de la LPMéd et propose l’accréditation de la filière d’études en Pharmacie de l’EPGL (Université de Genève, Université de Lausanne et Université de Neuchâtel) pour 7 ans, avec les 2 conditions suivantes, à remplir dans un délai de 1 an:

- De manière cohérente avec le plan stratégique et les objectifs de recherche, en consultation avec toutes les parties prenantes, la mission de l’EPGL doit s’orienter à la mission de l’Université de Genève ainsi qu’à celle de la faculté et avoir une visibilité publique.
- L’EPGL doit mettre en œuvre un système d’évaluation formel de la filière.
## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPharm</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUS</td>
<td>Rectors' Conference of the Swiss Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUS / SUK / SUC</td>
<td>Conférence universitaire suisse / Schweizerische Universitätskonferenz / Swiss University Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOPH</td>
<td>Federal Office of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU / UFG</td>
<td>Loi fédérale sur l'aide aux universités et la coopération dans le domaine des hautes écoles / Bundesgesetz vom 8. Oktober 1999 über die Förderung der Universitäten und über die Zusammenarbeit im Hochschulbereich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPMéd / MedBG</td>
<td>Loi fédérale du 23 juin 2006 sur les professions médicales universitaires / Bundesgesetz vom 23. Juni 2006 über die universitären Medizinalberufe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEBEKO</td>
<td>Commission fédérale des professions médicales / Medizinalberufekommission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPharm</td>
<td>Master of Science in Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAQ</td>
<td>Center of Accreditation and Quality Assurance of the Swiss Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMIFK-CIMS</td>
<td>Commission of the Swiss Medical Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS / EPGL</td>
<td>School of Pharmaceutical Sciences / Ecole de Pharmacie Genève-Lausanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIGE</td>
<td>University of Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIL</td>
<td>University of Lausanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNINE</td>
<td>University of Neuchâtel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFME</td>
<td>World Federation for Medical Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

The accreditation for programmes leading to the Federal Diploma in Pharmacy is mandatory according to the Federal Law on Medical Professions from 23 June 2006 (MedBG: Art. 23 Para. 1). Accordingly, the study programmes must fulfil the criteria of the Federal Law on Financial Aid to Universities from 8 October 1999 (UFG) and those of the MedBG in order to be accredited. Article 24, Para. 1 of the MedBG lists the specific criteria, which must be fulfilled for accreditation. The legally anchored educational objectives (Art. 4, 6-10 MedBG) are of central importance.

The accreditation procedure examines the quality of the study programmes on the basis of pre-defined quality standards. These standards are based on quality standards developed by the deans of the five Swiss faculties of medicine in cooperation with the Centre of Accreditation and Quality Assurance of the Swiss Universities (OAQ) and the Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH). They have been developed based on the internationally accepted “Basic Medical Education WFME Global Standards for Quality Improvement” and authorised on 11 June 2003 by the Joint Commission of the Swiss Medical Schools (SMIFK). In 2007 on behalf of the FOPH, the OAQ revised and adapted the conditions to the MedBG.

These quality standards follow the international recommendations of the “Pharmacy Education Taskforce”.

Not every single quality standard must be completely fulfilled in order to qualify for accreditation based on MedBG criteria. The recommendation for accreditation by the experts and the accreditation agency, as well as the decision by the independent accreditation council (Art.47, Para. 1, MedBG) is the result of a global judgment.

The present report reflects the estimation of the expert group that was appointed by the OAQ for this accreditation procedure. The expert group analysed whether the study programmes in Pharmacy / Pharmaceutical Sciences at the University of Geneva, together with the first year of study at the Universities of Lausanne and Neuchâtel fulfil the quality standards defined for this accreditation procedure.

The judgment of the expert group is based on the self-evaluation report of the universities of Geneva, Lausanne and Neuchâtel, on various interviews carried out with all stakeholders during the on-site-visit in Geneva.

---

1 www.admin.ch/ch/d/sr/8/811.11.de.pdf
3 The original standards of the World Federation of Medical Education (WFME) can be found at www.wfme.org.
4 www.fip.org/pharmacy_education
2 Accreditation procedure

Presentation of the unit

The School of Pharmaceutical Sciences Geneva-Lausanne (EPGL) is one of the three institutions in Switzerland – besides ETH Zürich and Basel University – entitled and in charge of the complete education and training of pharmacists and pharmaceutical scientists. This means that at the one hand the curriculum must address the needs for educating future practitioners, well-prepared to work in hospital or community pharmacies immediately after their first qualifying exam (typically a Masters’ degree). On the other hand such curriculum must also provide an adequate first-level education for those who want to continue their professional training (typically aiming for a doctoral degree) in order to find a later employment in research institutions or in the pharmaceutical industry. The latter represents a significant element of the country’s economy.

In order to provide necessary capacity, courses for the first year of the curriculum are not only offered in Geneva, but also in Lausanne and Neuchâtel in collaboration with the respective local universities, all located in the French-speaking part of the country. This “3-campus situation” makes a certain difference to the situation in Zürich or Basel.

Self evaluation report

The self-evaluation report was provided in time in an electronic and print version. It met the requirement of the OAQ both in terms of structure and content. Although in particular the printed version of the report was perceived as a most helpful source to evaluate the study program, it was in many cases necessary to consult the appendices, only provided on CD. The expert team would have preferred to find some key figures also in the report itself.

Group of experts

Peer leader:

Prof. Dr. Claus-Michael Lehr
Helmholtz Institute for Pharmaceutical Sciences (HIPS) and Saarland University,
Head Dept. of Drug Delivery

Experts:

Prof. Dr. Claude Mailhot
Faculté de Pharmacie, Université de Montréal
Professeure titulaire and president of program evaluation council, Université de Montréal

Prof. em. Dr. Gerhard Franz
Universität Regensburg, Departement für Pharmazie
Chair TCM Working Party of the European Pharmacopoeia Commission (Strasbourg)
Nicolas Huguenin  
ETHZ  
Master student  

On-site-visit  

The on-site visit took place at the School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, in Geneva, from October 10, 2011, starting with a briefing of the expert team by the OAQ representative in the evening. Besides the students and staff from Geneva, representatives of the Universities of Lausanne and Neuchâtel were present in some of the sessions, as well as invited representatives of other stakeholders. The on-site-visit ended on October 12 at about noon with a debriefing, open for all interested participants in the accreditation process.

All the time, the team encountered a friendly and highly supportive atmosphere. The visit rather strictly followed the program outlined and the technical and logistic support provided by OAQ-staff was greatly appreciated. Hence, the program was rather tight, but nevertheless provided sufficient opportunities to get an impression of both the facilities, and the people involved in the program relevant to the accreditation. The persons interviewed were both competent and most willing to answer all questions, always responding in an honest and open manner.

In the opening discussion, a short presentation of the self-evaluation report by the Steering Committee to the experts, summarizing its major results, would have been helpful and is therefore recommended to be kept in mind for the future at such occasions.

Building situation:

A particular feature of the SPS (School of Pharmaceutical Sciences) to be accredited here is given by the fact that the full curriculum is only implemented at the University of Geneva, while the Universities of Lausanne and Neuchâtel only provide first year programs (“3 campus situation”).

The experts' team could only visit the facilities of the Geneva campus which, however, appeared to be adequate, both in terms of size and infrastructure. Obviously, the prospects of having to move into another building by the year 2015 will be a good opportunity to facilitate either the situation for the students or the scientific collaborations of researchers. It is recommended that UNIGE shall carefully evaluate the needs for future expansion in line with the planned increased number of students.

Lausanne: The Dorigny campus is about 10 minutes by metro from City Center, where Pharmacy teaching is done in two main buildings. No need or plans to move or to expand. Space and facilities were reported to be adequate in relation to the number of incoming first year students

Neuchâtel: Space is fine; buildings are still relatively modern. The involvement in the Pharmacy program, in spite of relatively small numbers of students, is obviously seen as an asset for both the university and the Canton.
3 Compliance with the Quality Standards

Area 1: Mission and Objectives

Overall evaluation: The standards of this area are partially fulfilled; most essentially, the expert group could not identify an explicit mission statement. For the accreditation, it is a condition that a mission statement shall be formulated, made public and therefore be clearly visible to all parties involved in the curriculum (i.e. students, staff and stakeholders).

Sub-area 1.1: Mission and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 The academic unit defines its mission and objectives and makes them known publicly. The mission statement and objectives describe the educational process. After completion of the programme, pharmacists have the ability to practice their profession as well as an appropriate basis for further training in any specialised branch of pharmacy. They are able to take responsibility for their role as pharmacists in the health care system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 The mission statement and the objectives take into consideration social responsibility and community involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 The mission statement and objectives are compatible with the strategic planning and the research goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Clearly, the mission of the SPS is to train pharmacists and pharmaceutical scientists. In the way, as the curriculum is implemented, the expert group could recognize two core aspects, namely a) the patient oriented (community or hospital) pharmacists and b) the science oriented research pharmacist. The aim to keep a good balance between patient oriented and research oriented pharmaceutical science was positively noted by the experts.

The mission statement still needs to be formally developed and must be visible in an appropriate way.

Moreover, the experts suggest to stronger address international partnerships. International visibility is already well developed at the research level, which attracts many foreign students at post-graduate from abroad to do their PhD in Geneva. However, outgoing mobility of students from Geneva, both at graduate and undergraduate level, is something that must be improved.

Conclusions

5 Compare with 8.1.2.
As the reviewers could nowhere find an explicit mission statement, the standards 1.1.2 till 1.1.3 are not formally fulfilled, but this can be easily solved.

Condition: Formulate the mission statement and make it publicly visible, also consulting stakeholders and consistent with the strategic plan and research objectives.

**Sub-area 1.2: Participation in formulation of Mission and Objectives**

| Standard | 1.2.1 | The mission statement and objectives regarding the pharmaceutical education of the academic unit are defined by its principal stakeholders and other interested parties. |

Analysis

Other interested parties are seen in the pharma and biotech companies, the community and hospital pharmacists. There are bilateral discussions going on. One representative of the industry is already in the steering committee.

Conclusions

St. 1.2.1 is partially fulfilled.

Recommendation: The establishment of a “conseil des sages” with adequate representatives of all stakeholders is recommended.

**Sub-area 1.3: Academic autonomy**

| Standard | 1.3.1 | The academic unit has a policy within which it has freedom to design the curriculum and allocate the resources necessary for its implementation. |

Analysis

The department feels to have this autonomy, but is sometimes practically limited by the restricted resources. This holds in particular for the internships. Joint appointments of the School of Pharmacy (SPS) with hospitals and pharmacists would be helpful.

Conclusions

St. 1.3.1 is fulfilled.
Sub-area 1.4: Educational outcome

Standards

1.4.1 The Swiss Catalogue of Learning Objectives for Training in Pharmacy according to the MedBG\(^6\), the academic unit defines the competencies to be achieved by students at the completion of their studies, necessary for their subsequent training and their future roles in the health care system.

1.4.2 Information concerning performance assessment and other data on the competence of the graduates will be used for the further development of the educational programme.

Analysis

The faculty is aware of the SCLO and has been using it for the revision of their curriculum. Information from the federal exam is provided but the implementation appears to be still unclear.

Conclusions

St. 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 are partially fulfilled.

Recommendation: It is recommended to implement mechanisms for continuous improvements of the program based on the outcomes of the state exam.

Area 2: Study programme

Overall evaluation: The standards of this area are either fulfilled or partially fulfilled. Globally the curriculum is based on the goals of the Swiss Catalogue of Learning Objectives in Pharmacy according to the MedBG. Some recommendations are made in the sub-areas of self-directed learning, in the composition of the curriculum committee, in the content of the program (increase duration of the research project and increase the development of patient-oriented courses), in the clinical knowledge and skills development and in the sub-area of linkage with pharmaceutical practice and the health care system.

Sub-area 2.1: Curriculum models and instructional methods

Standards

2.1.1 The academic unit defines the curriculum models and the instructional methods.

\(^6\) The Swiss Catalogue of Learning Objectives for Training in Pharmacy was accepted in consensus by the three Swiss sites for the pharmaceutical education (Basel, Zürich, Geneva) and submitted to the SFOP. It serves as basis for the federal pharmacy examinations according to the MedBG. www.bag.admin.ch/themen/berufe/00408/00557/index.html?lang=de
2.1.2 The study program and the instructional methods ensure that the students have responsibility for their own learning processes and are prepared for lifelong, self-directed learning.

Analysis

The curriculum has been defined based on the Swiss catalogue of learning objectives (SCLO) for training in Pharmacy. It includes specific disciplines and transversal interactions (e.g. drug discovery, drug development and medicine and diseases courses, and "enseignements coordonnés"). However, in the educational methods ex-cathedra lectures are still prevailing. Problem-based and self-directed learning starts only at the master's level.

Conclusions

St. 2.1.1 is fulfilled.

St. 2.1.2 is partially fulfilled.

Recommendation: It is recommended to implement self-directed learning already at the Bachelor-level.

Sub-area 2.2: Structure, Composition and duration of the study programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 The academic unit describes and defines the contents, extent, and sequencing of the study programme elements, including the balance between core and optional content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 The study programme is based on the goals of the Swiss Catalogue of Learning Objectives in Pharmacy according to the MedBG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 Basic natural and biomedical sciences, pharmaceutical and clinical sciences and Public health are integrated in the study programme as well as the interface with complementary therapies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Educational Programs in Switzerland must follow the Bologna process, this also holds for Pharmacy.

The Bologna process and the bachelor/master degrees have been successfully implemented. But in some respects the situation has not changed significantly: The possibility to switch after the Bachelor is hardly used, but more a theoretical possibility. There are also no real job opportunities for Bachelor’s. Switching between Basel, Zürich and Geneva for the master's study is a real option for students, but is not often used, possibly due to personal reasons of the students (language, housing, etc.) Nevertheless, the implementation of the Bologna system was helpful to renew and strengthen the curriculum.
Core and optional contents: In the former systems there were more options and the curriculum was broader. Since the introduction of SCLO, there are less options for a specialisation, but the students get an overview of more disciplines. The new system is considered as more effective.

The Swiss Catalogue of learning Objectives (SCLO) is fully implemented. One strength of Geneva is an option for pharmacoeconomics. More room for interactive learning methods would be desirable.

Basic and clinic sciences, public health, and complementary therapies are integrated in the study program: complementary therapies are included in the 5th year; public health is addressed and includes epidemiology principles; Clinical sciences, pharmaceutical care and communication are also included in the curriculum. The emphasis of the curriculum, however, is still on both practice and research oriented pharmaceutical sciences.

The master’s project has to be completed in only 14 weeks. This appears rather short compared to the situation in Basel and Zürich, and also in comparison to other universities in Europe. Inter-sectorial mobility seems already well developed with 11 projects (=20% of all projects) performed in industry. In contrast, international mobility (e.g. to conduct a master’s project abroad) is rarely seen and therefore should be encouraged.

When analysing appendix 43 of the self-evaluation report, it seems that the courses (and their total number of ECTS) devoted to some of the SCLO, such as “connaissance du medicament et suivi pharmaceutique” (5.2 B), “competences de gestion” (5.4) and “competences personnelles” (5.5 A) could be developed further.

Conclusions

The standards 2.2.1-2.2.3 are fulfilled.

Recommendations:

To make the master’s program internationally competitive, the time to work on a master’s project should be increased.

Analogously, the School of Pharmacy should also pursue the development of patient oriented courses and management courses.

In doing so, graduates of the program will be equally well prepared for a subsequent career either in clinical, practical or industrial pharmacy, as well in the pharmaceutical sciences.

Sub-area 2.3: Study programme management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 A curriculum committee has the responsibility for the planning and implementation of the study programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.2 The curriculum committee has appropriate resources for the choice and implementation of appropriate teaching and learning methods, evaluation of students, evaluation of programme, and innovations in the study programme. The administration, academic staff, students, and other stakeholders are represented in the curriculum committee.

Analysis
Curriculum committee ("commission d’enseignement") is in place. There is no permanent student representative in this committee.

The curriculum committee (CC) can only make suggestions but not take decisions. The latter is done by the "collège des professeurs" which, however, typically follows the CC suggestion. The CC gets together about 6 times a year.

CC has no own resources, but there are resources and instruments available at faculty and university level. In general this situation is experienced as adequate.

Conclusions
St. 2.3.1 is fulfilled.
St. 2.3.2 is partially fulfilled.

Recommendation: The integration of a permanent representative of the students in the curriculum committee is recommended.

Sub-area 2.4: Scientific methods

Standard
2.4.1 The academic unit teaches the principles of scientific methods and evidence-based medicine, including analytical and critical thinking, throughout the entire study programme.

Analysis
Analytical and critical thinking has to be developed during the course of the curriculum. In this context, practical laboratory work and internships are most helpful to develop critical thinking.

Interactive and team-teaching courses are implemented in the Master’s level (e.g. interactive course in drug discovery, which addresses targets, natural compound, chemical compounds etc.).

The individual research project (Mpharm-1) is positively noted and considered as important to develop scientific thinking.

The concepts of evidence-based medicine and meta-analyses are implemented in the courses of clinical pharmacy in the last year.
Conclusions
St. 2.4.1 is fulfilled

**Sub-area 2.5: Basic natural and biomedical sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Standards</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1 The academic unit identifies the contributions of the basic natural and biomedical sciences, and integrates them into the study programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2 The contributions of natural and biomedical sciences are adapted to scientific, technological, and clinical developments, as well as to the health needs of society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

The collaboration of Geneva with Neuchâtel and Lausanne is a working example for the integration of basic sciences into bio-pharmaceutical sciences.

The adaptation to scientific, technological and biomedical developments is reflected by timely equipment even in undergraduate laboratory courses.

Conclusions
St. 2.5.1 is fulfilled

**Sub-area 2.6: Behavioural and social sciences, medical ethics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Standards</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1 The academic unit identifies the contributions of behavioural and social sciences, medical ethics, educational sciences, and the legal and economic basis of health care that enable effective communication, clinical decision-making, and ethical practices. This is integrated into the study programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.2 The contributions of behavioural and social sciences, medical ethics and humanities are adapted to scientific developments in pharmacy, to changing demographic and cultural contexts, and to the health needs of society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

A list of courses relevant to these aspects was provided, reflecting both the contribution of behavioural and social sciences, as well as their adaptations to scientific developments in pharmacy and the health needs of the society.
Conclusions

St. 2.6.1 and 2.6.2. are partially fulfilled.

Recommendation: A “skill-lab” to further improve the communication with patients and health professionals appears nevertheless desirable.

**Sub-area 2.7: Clinical knowledge and skills**

| Standard | 2.7.1 | The academic unit assures that the students have patient contact appropriate to their level of education and have acquired sufficient pharmaceutical and clinical knowledge and skills, so that after graduation they can assume appropriate responsibility. |

Analysis

Laudable attempts are made towards an adequate implementation of clinical skills. In particular by several joint appointments, namely one Full Professor in Clinical Proteomics, two Associate Professors in Hospital Pharmacy, one Associate Professor in Community Pharmacy, one Senior Scientist (MER) in Clinical Pharmacy, and one Associate Professor in Clinical Pharmacology”.

The collaboration with community and hospital pharmacists already exists, but pharmacy preceptors are involved on a voluntary basis only. Additional formal joint appointments would help to strengthen the implementation of clinical knowledge and skills in the program.

Training in clinical and community pharmacy is mainly relying on external resources and under the responsibility of the professional associations. If the school had more responsibility this would also mean more leadership.

Patient contact in cooperation with other health professionals is not fully implemented due to the lack of pharmacist’s role models in the hospital setting and to the very limited amount of time spent by students in interdisciplinary teams.

It appears important to note that the Confederation should participate in the funding of such measures. This would be in alignment with the common practice in medicine, where training practitioners are reimbursed, but which is not the case for the training of pharmacists.

Conclusions

St. 2.7.1 is partially fulfilled.

Recommendation: It is recommended to consider additional joint appointments of community and hospital pharmacists. Joint activities with medical students should be implemented in order to fully develop teamwork and pharmaceutical counselling of health professionals.
Sub-area 2.8: Linkage with pharmaceutical practice and the health care system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1 The content based, competency based and operational link between the study programme, postgraduate education, and independent professional practice is assured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2 The curriculum committee uses information from the professional field, the health care system, and society to improve the study programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Discussion with alumni revealed that there is an operational link with practitioners in community, hospital and industrial pharmacy. Their implementation however seems to rely more on personal contacts and is on a voluntary basis, i.e. no formal joint appointments. This is however seen positively by those stakeholders, but has not yet been discussed with the faculty.

Information from the professional field is been used according to the report, but nobody of the interviewed alumni seemed to be practically involved.

Conclusions

St. 2.8.1 and 2.8.2 are partially fulfilled.

Recommendation: Consider formal appointment of stakeholders and have representation of alumni in the curriculum committee.

Area 3: Students

Overall evaluation:

The standards of this area are largely met. The only recommendation is to formally integrate student representative in the curriculum committee ("commission d’enseignement").

Sub-area 3.1: Admission policy and selection process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1 The governing body and the academic unit have formulated admission conditions that clearly explain the student selection process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2 Gender equality is guaranteed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

As public institution the three universities must accept all the candidates that are qualified. Pharmacists are missing in Switzerland; there is no numerus clausus and no selection process for admission to the 1st year. Everybody is admitted, but only about 70% pass the first year. Selection is concretely done between the 1st and 2nd year. As this seems to be a
national rule that cannot be influenced by the universities/schools, the expert committee prefers not to comment on the pros/cons of this system in the context of this accreditation report.

The “3 campus situation” is not seen as a problem; instead the capacity delimiter might be the output (internships, laboratory capacity etc.) rather than the input of students.

The teaching situation is seen as financially stable and not essentially dependent on third party funding. The latter is nevertheless seen as an important addition to the available resources, since PhD students financed by these funds are involved as teaching assistants.

Gender equity is not an issue in pharmaceutical sciences in view of the large number of female applicants/students. Moreover, the regulatory provisions in force at UNIGE guarantee equal opportunities as stated in the “Loi sur l’université”.

Conclusions

St. 3.1.1 does not apply. Consider removal from catalogue

St. 3.1.2 is fulfilled

**Sub-area 3.2: Number of students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1 In all phases of the study programme, the number of students is in accordance with the capacity of the academic unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

For the first year of the curriculum the capacities provided by Neuchâtel and Lausanne are adequate for the current number of students.

It appears that supply and demand for study places is in reasonable balance. A slight increase of first year students (10-20%) is possible. A further increase would require a commensurate growth of the resources, especially in Geneva.

Conclusions

St. 3.2.1 is fulfilled

**Sub-area 3.3: Student support and counselling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1 The academic unit offers support and counselling services for the students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 The counselling services take the learning progress and their social and personal needs into account.

3.3.3 Students have access to a gender equality commission.

Analysis

3.3.1 Lausanne offers good support in terms of housing and has student counsellor in biology and chemistry available. The same situation applies for Neuchâtel where the absolute numbers of students are small. They are therefore known personally by the teachers and receive an excellent support.

In Geneva, many counselling services are also available and professors are accessible for discussion with students.

3.3.2 There is a counselling officer at the level of the faculty and of the pharmacy section.

3.3.3 The “Bureau de l’égalité” is accessible for each student. Gender balance is however not seen as an issue regarding students, as there are 75-80% female students. In this respect, pharmacy makes a positive contribution to compensate the still observed under-representation of women in other fields of sciences.

Conclusions

St. 3.3.1 -3.3.3 are fulfilled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1 The academic unit settles the representation and appropriate participation of the students in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the study programme, as well as in other matters relevant to the students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 Student organisations are promoted.

Analysis

The students feel sufficiently well represented in the various committees. Nevertheless, students would prefer to be permanently represented in the curriculum committee ("commission enseignement"). Professors are always approachable for individual problems.

Looking at the success rates of students from Neuchâtel and Lausanne that are at least as good if not higher than those of Geneva in the second year, the transition of the students from their home university to Geneva after the first year is not perceived as a difficulty.

A pharmacy student organisation does exist in Geneva and is provided with space by the faculty. It appeared to the expert panel that an Internet page on which students exchanged
didactic material was closed. This was, however, not a decision by SPS but apparently by the students themselves.

Conclusions

St. 3.4.1 is not fulfilled.

Condition: Representation of students must be formally integrated in the curriculum committee ("commission d'enseignement").

St. 3.4.2 is fulfilled

**Area 4: Assessment of students**

**Overall evaluation:**

The standards in this area are in principle fulfilled. It is recommended to reduce the allowed number of failed attempts after the first year.

**Sub-area 4.1: Assessment methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 The academic unit defines and communicates the methods for the assessment of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2 The reliability and validity of the assessment methods are documented and evaluated and new assessment methods developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

Different assessment methods are being implemented, trying to find an adequate balance to the level of students (i.e. Multiple-choice more prevailing in the beginning). According to the interview with students, written exams are preferred over oral exams, but not necessarily as MCQ’s.

The mode of the respective exam is always communicated via the DOKEOS system as well as in the student guide.

The experience with the newly introduced OSCE is positive, encouraging to further explore this mode of examination. However, the infrastructure would need an update, e.g. video cameras etc. to record simulated patient-pharmacists dialogues.

The expert team could observe that there is no common policy between the 3 universities concerning the assessment methods. An overall evaluation of the assessment methods of the whole curriculum in collaboration with all 3 institutions would be profitable.

In Geneva, students have in total 4 attempts for the first year exams. Moreover, the fact that the faculty easily allows weak students to spend a 6th year in the Bachelor makes difficult to
dismiss them based on poor performance and slow progress. This is resulting in late failing of students at the master level or at the federal exam.

Statistics: 47% are passing BS after 3 years, 13% after 4 years, 2% after 5 years, the total success rate being 62%. This appears to be acceptable to the expert panel.

Conclusions
St. 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 are fulfilled.
Recommendation: Reduce the number of allowed attempts for the exam after the first year.

**Sub-area 4.2: Relationship between assessment and learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Assessment principles, methods and practices correspond to teaching and learning objectives and promote learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 The number and type of examinations encourage integrated and interdisciplinary learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

There is some training of the faculty members to compose Multiple Choice Questions and OSCEs. The medical faculty has a unit that provides support in this aspect.

The expert panel feels that more time should be allocated to the Master Thesis, also to meet common practice internationally and at the other Swiss universities. Possibilities to go abroad would also be greater with a longer period of time and students would benefit from it.

Team work: In the first year of the Master’s program, seminar work is being done in small groups and also being evaluated. Integrated and interdisciplinary learning is encouraged by oral presentations of case studies.

Conclusions
St. 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 are fulfilled.

**Area 5: Academic staff/faculty**

Overall evaluation: The standards of this area are mostly fulfilled. However, it is recommended that the SPS shall consider possibilities for hiring more faculty- and staff members regarding the increasing demand of well-trained pharmacists in the future.

The apparent imbalance between male and female faculty members should be resolved.

**Sub-area 5.1: Recruitment policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5.1.1 The academic unit has a staff recruitment policy, which defines the academic staff required for the adequate implementation of a high qualitative and well organised programme. It takes into account the balance between academic, technical and administrative staff, as well as between full and part-time employees. Responsibilities are clearly defined and periodically examined.

5.1.2 The academic unit has formulated staff selection criteria, which take into account performance in science, teaching and clinical activities, as well as the demands of the mission statement of the institution, economic considerations, and further issues.

5.1.3 The recruitment policy for academic, administrative, and technical personnel is published.

Analysis

In all three Universities, a transparent recruiting policy and procedure for staff engagement is apparent.

Appointment of professors, if such position becomes available, occurs according to typical academic procedures in agreement with common practice.

The expert committee appreciates that SPS has two posts financed at 50% by PharmaSuisse over a time period of 5 years, and that this cooperation with PharmaSuisse will equally continue in the future.

For PhD students to be employed as Teaching Assistant, there is a consensus in the faculty that a certain quorum must have the qualification as pharmacist in order to cope with the specific demands of the curriculum.

There are no formal requirements regarding language proficiencies, but foreign students are expected to become fluent in French during the first year.

Conclusions

St. 5.1.1 – 5.1.3 are fulfilled

Recommendation: In order to be prepared for the increasing demand and need to educate qualified pharmacists, the School of Pharmaceutical Sciences is recommended to consider possibilities for enlarging its capacities in the near future, in particular by creating the necessary faculty and staff positions.

Sub-area 5.2: Staff policy and development

Standards

5.2.1 With its staff policy, the academic unit strives for a balance in teaching, research, and service functions, and ensures recognition of meritorious academic activities with appropriate emphasis on both, research attainment and teaching qualifications.
5.2.2 The staff policy includes training, development, and assessment of the teaching staff. It considers teacher-student ratios appropriate to the various components of the study programme, and assures that teaching staff is represented on relevant committees and bodies.

5.2.3 The staff has access to a gender equality commission.

5.2.4 The academic unit supports a long-term promotion of young academic staff.

5.2.5 The staff has access to continuing education, career development opportunities, and appropriate counselling.

Analysis

Promotion possibilities for professors at the same university may vary between the institutions: in Lausanne and Geneva promotion is possible, but currently not in Neuchâtel.

Average teaching load for professors is not fixed, but apparently 6 hours per week. There are regular evaluations of professors at all levels and of academic staff.

Career development and promotion is equally based on teaching, research and service functions and well described in the “Loi sur l’Université”.

Lausanne has a pedagogic centre for the academic staff; similar facilities are available in Neuchâtel and Geneva.

5.2.3. A Gender Equality Commission is in place. Currently, about 80% of the faculty is male, which is actually almost completely reverse to the student situation, where about 75-80% female students are inscribed for pharmacy (see 3.3.3.).

5.2.4. The “Maître d’Enseignement et de Recherche” seems to be an interesting career perspective as an alternative to professor positions of different levels.

5.2.5. Continuing Education, development opportunities and counselling are well implemented.

Conclusions

St. 5.2.1 till 5.2.5 are fulfilled.

Recommendation: Measures should be taken to increase the proportion of female Professors or “Maître d’Enseignement et de Recherche”.

Area 6: Educational resources

Overall evaluation: The standards of this area are largely fulfilled. It is recommended to keep an eye on the probably increasing number of students in the next years in order to be able to react accordingly. This concerns the building situation as well as practical training of
students and IT resources for students. Apart from that, the mobility of both students and staff should be encouraged and facilitated by introducing more flexibility in the curriculum.

**Sub-area 6.1: Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1 The academic unit provides an appropriate infrastructure to ensure that the study programme can be adequately implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2 The learning environment for the students is regularly adapted to developments in education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

University Buildings and equipment for the different pharmaceutical disciplines are adequate to follow the actual curriculum given the present student capacity. The facilities in the new building in 2015 have to be adapted to the planned increased number of students.

**Conclusions**

St. 6.1.1 and 6.1.2. are fulfilled.

**Sub-area 6.2: Practical pharmaceutical training resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1 The academic unit provides access to the necessary resources and training facilities for adequate practical education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

The capacity of lab space and teaching staff is adequate for 70 students a year, but not sufficient to cope with larger numbers of students. Such expansion, however, is currently discussed since there is a high demand for the study of pharmacy, and well-trained pharmacists are urgently needed throughout the country. However, at the moment larger numbers of students could not be accommodated without a significant loss of quality, mainly after the first year.

Laboratory safety is warranted throughout by adherence to guidelines and responsible persons. The service STEPS (Santé au Travail, Environnement, Prévention, Sécurité) evaluates security on a yearly basis and gives advice on an ad-hoc basis.

There was no major accident in the student labs recorded in the past five years.

Internships are taking place in community and hospital pharmacies. However, the role of the school of pharmacy in choosing and accrediting these practice sites and in selecting the
preceptors is limited. Clinical experience in hospitals is limited due to a very limited number of practice sites.

Conclusions

St.6.2.1 is fulfilled, but the following recommendations should nevertheless be considered:

Recommendations:
- The School of pharmacy should be involved in the selection and training of preceptors and practice sites.
- Consider additional formal joint appointments to strengthen the implementation of clinical knowledge and skills in the program by creating new practice sites for internships.
- Overall, all three universities should prepare themselves for an increasing number of pharmacy students in the upcoming years. Foreseeable demographic developments will create an increasing demand for well-trained pharmacists, both nationally and internationally. This has consequences for the necessary training resources.

Sub-area 6.3: Information Technology

**Standard**

6.3.1 The academic unit has a policy for the efficient use of information and communication technologies in its study programme. Teachers and students are enabled to use information and communication technology for their self learning, accessing information, and working in the health care systems.

**Analysis**

IT-facilities in general are adequate. The document management system for the lectures ("Dokes") is well accepted. However, students have pointed out that the availability and the access to IT-facilities is rather limited and should be improved.

**Conclusions**

St. 6.3.1 is partly fulfilled.

Recommendation: It is recommended to increase the number of IT workplaces for students in the near future.

Sub-area 6.4: Research

**Standards**

6.4.1 The academic unit has a policy describing the research facilities and areas of research priorities at the institution, as well as the relationship between research and teaching.
6.4.2 The interrelationship between research and teaching is reflected in the study programme and in the current course offerings. The students are encouraged and prepared to participate in pharmaceutical research and development.

Analysis

6.4.1: Master students are allowed to do internships in the research groups and by doing so get good insight in the research projects going on at the institution.

Only 14 weeks for the major research project in the Masters program is ambitiously short. The expert panel feels that more time should be allocated for these projects, also to meet common practice internationally and at the other Swiss universities.

Especially for clinical research, resources are limited as such projects are typically done in hospitals which are not university institutions.

6.4.2: Interrelationship between research and teaching: Graduates from Geneva are excellently prepared to enrol in subsequent PhD projects. Internships in the course of the MS project may help to get an orientation. Over a longer period of time, only 20-30% of the currently enrolled PhD students are internals from Geneva. The experts appreciate that the percentage of internal PhD students is currently increasing (about 50% in 2011). Recruiting PhD candidates from external applications may be helpful to get some additional input, but the relatively high costs of living in Switzerland is often perceived as a problem in recruiting foreigners.

Conclusions

St. 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 are partially fulfilled.

Recommendations:

Allocate at least 20 weeks for completing the master thesis and consider measures to increase the proportion of internal candidates to pursue PhD studies.

Sub-area 6.5: Educational expertise

Standard

6.5.1 The academic unit includes educational expertise when planning pharmaceutical education and developing teaching, learning and assessment methods.

Analysis

Planning and development tools for teaching at different level are provided by central facilities (“Adeven”) in Geneva. Situation in Neuchâtel and Lausanne is similar. Using the feedback systems, however, is time intensive. Personal feedback is preferred, but not always used by the students.

Since 2010 the system was implemented as a mandatory process, i.e. being no longer informative but also indicative for possibly needed adjustments.
The interaction between the School of Pharmaceutical Sciences and the central evaluation unit seems to work well and without problems.

Using the Internet may not increase but eventually even reduce the compliance by the students to the instrument. Anonymity must be warranted.

Educational expertise of new faculty members is an important criterion for their appointment and is addressed in the selection process.

Conclusions
St. 6.5.1 is fulfilled

**Sub-area 6.6: Cooperation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.6.1 The academic unit has formulated a policy for cooperation with other educational institutions and the transfer of educational credit points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2 Regional and international exchange of academic staff and students is facilitated by the provision of appropriate resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

6.6.1. There is of course a very intensive collaboration of Geneva with Neuchâtel and Lausanne for the first year of the curriculum.

Regarding outgoing students, Geneva students rarely spend time in Basel or Zürich. Erasmus contracts are in place with a number of European universities. However, there are only very few Geneva students that want to go out. Practically, the curriculum allows this only for the master thesis. In general, the motivation of Geneva students to leave their University or even go abroad seems not to be very high in view of the administrative, practical, financial and personal obstacles. This is moreover not facilitated by a rather conservative policy to recognize courses and exams taken at other universities, especially abroad.

The situation for incoming students looks different, though: Up to 8-10 students a year are coming from Italy, France and Spain, also Canada. It is sometimes difficult to integrate them into the existing courses in correspondence with their needed learning agreements and previous experience.

The urgent need for an international mobility policy is clearly recognised by the faculty and the corresponding implementation is being worked on. The same weakness may already be observed regarding national mobility (e.g. with Zürich or Basel).

Although helpful with respect to internationality, switching to teaching in English, at least at undergraduate level is not recommended. The fact that teaching is done in French is seen as an asset regarding the training of pharmacy practitioners.
6.6.2. Resources: There is extra financial support for student mobility inside Switzerland, provided that the exams are mutually recognized. There is an on-going discussion of this issue at a national level in National Academy of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

Mobility to go out of Switzerland is facilitated by the favourable exchange rate and special mobility programs. Nevertheless, only few Swiss students want to leave the country. Vice versa, the high costs of living in Switzerland and in particular in Geneva might represent a serious burden for foreign students, but they seem to be nevertheless attracted to study in Geneva.

Student mobility, e.g. to study for some time at another university, is restricted by the limited recognition of credit points gained elsewhere. At the master’s level, internships in foreign labs are not really encouraged. Rules asking for a second professor abroad are helping to keep the quality standards up. In practice, this is experienced as rather strict.

Conclusions
St. 6.6.1 and 6.6.2 are partially fulfilled.

Recommendations:
- Encourage and increase the regional and international mobility of students and staff, especially in outgoing direction.
- Establish collaborations with other universities also in the pre-Master’s parts of the curriculum and facilitate mutual recognition of courses and exams.
- Encourage students to make better use of the existing excellent possibilities provided by ERASMUS and other mobility programs.

**Area 7: Programme evaluation**

Overall evaluation: The standards of this area are not entirely fulfilled. Program evaluation activities are taking place but it appears necessary to organize all these activities in a formal evaluation system.

**Sub-area 7.1: Study programme evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1.1 The academic unit has quality assurance mechanisms (i.e. evaluations) that monitor the study programme and student progress, and ensure that weaknesses are identified and addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2 Study programme evaluation includes the context of the educational process, the specific components of the study programme, and the learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
There is no formal evaluation of the study program but discussions are carried out at the “commission d’enseignement” based on examinations’ results. Ad hoc meetings with head of disciplines and modules are also taking place. These activities are neither systematic nor formalized.

Conclusions

St. 7.1.1 and 7.1.2 are not fulfilled

Condition: The School of pharmacy must implement a formal program evaluation system. (see also area 9.1)

Sub-area 7.2: Teacher and student feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2.1 Feedback from both teachers and students is systematically collected, analysed, and used to continually improve the study programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.2 Teachers and students are to be actively involved in planning the study programme evaluation and using its results for programme development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

To monitor the student program, regular feedback is sought from students using courses evaluation questionnaires administered either by direct contact or via computer tools. A new course is evaluated yearly for the first 3 years, and then a given course is evaluated every 3 years. UNIL and UNINE have also implemented evaluation procedure for their courses.

The feedback of teachers (intermediate staff) is collected at least to some extent for Geneva, but this could be further developed.

Evaluation of teaching by the “Maîtres d’Enseignement et de Recherche” and by the assistants is done every three years, but not on an individual basis.

Conclusions

St. 7.2.1 and 7.2.2 are partially fulfilled

Recommendation: The School should evaluate how to implement systematic feedback from the teachers on the study program (for example, organisation of annual meeting of all teaching staff; surveys addressed to teaching staff…). For instances, the School could organize yearly focus group discussions with students to gather their feedback on the program (courses objectives, courses continuity, competencies development, workload, suggestions for better learning, etc.)
Sub-area 7.3: Student performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.3.1 Student performance is analysed in relation to the mission, objectives, and study programme of the academic unit, and brought to the attention of the curriculum committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

The “bureau des statistiques” from UNIGE provides statistical analysis of the examinations’ results. Success rates for the Bachelor in Pharmaceutical Sciences are available to the “commission enseignement”. Specific examination results are discussed at the commission d’enseignement when a problem happens.

Performance of students form Neuchâtel and Lausanne are also examined once in Geneva. Regarding to the results, students of these two partner Universities seem to have at least the same if not better success rates than students that began their studies in Geneva, showing the quality of the teaching at UNINE and UNIL its consistency with the program at UNIGE.

A new federal exam has been introduced in 2011. Results were made available during external evaluation visit. It was mentioned that the “commission d’enseignement” was responsible for the analysis of the results and would take the appropriate actions to improve the program based on these results.

Conclusions

St. 7.3.1 is fulfilled

Recommendation: Implement an annual analysis of the federal exam results by the “commission d’enseignement” as part of its mandate.

Sub-area 7.4: Involvement of stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.4.1 The processes and outcome of study programme evaluation involve the governance and administration of the academic unit, academic staff and students, and take into consideration feedback from additional stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Program evaluation involves the governance and administration of the entire academic unit, academic staff and students. Additional stakeholders, such as community, industry or hospital pharmacists, are being consulted with. This could further be expanded by the regular involvement of alumni. A survey evaluating the curriculum was sent to alumni in 2011. It was the first time such a survey was done. The “commission d’enseignement” is
planning to repeat this survey on a regular basis in order to use the results for the purpose of program improvement.

Conclusions

St. 7.4.1 is fulfilled

Recommendation: The School of Pharmacy is encouraged to pursue its consultations with stakeholders and its alumni survey every two years.

**Area 8: Governance and administration**

Overall evaluation:

The standards in this area are largely fulfilled. Some recommendations have been made to make decision making processes more participative for the entire teaching staff, and to discuss the achievement of missions and objectives in the study commission.

**Sub-area 8.1: Governance structures and functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1.1 Governance structures of the academic unit and their functions are defined, including their relationship within the university and to other academic institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.2 The academic unit has a strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.3 The academic staff participates in decision-making processes concerning teaching and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.4 Decision-making processes, competencies, and responsibilities are communicated to all participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

8.1.1 The existing governance structure is complex (see p.72 in report), but experienced as functional.

8.1.2. A strategic plan is in place and has been accepted by all academic institutions (Section, Faculty, Rectorate, EPGL).

8.1.3. Academic staff is involved in decision-making processes from he level of “Maître d’Enseignement et de Recherche” onwards, but Teaching Assistants (e.g. graduate students) are not typically involved.

8.1.4. As the expert were assured by the president of the EPGL and the accreditation steering committee the strategic plan is available and has been communicated to all...
individuals as defined by law. Within the SPS, this has been done via the ‘Conseil de Section’.

Conclusions
St. 8.1.1 - 8.1.4. are partially fulfilled
Recommendation:
Consider a stronger involvement of teaching assistants in decision-making processes and the establishment of some general assembly (“Conseil de Section”) of the entire teaching staff.

Sub-area 8.2: Academic leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.2.1  The responsibilities of the academic leadership of the academic unit for the study programme are clearly stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.2  The academic leadership is periodically assessed with regard to the fulfilment of the mission and objectives of the academic unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
8.2.1. The responsibilities of the academic leadership of the academic unit for the study programme are clearly stated.
8.2.2. The experts noted that there is a mandatory regular evaluation for professors every 7 years. However, there are no mechanisms to evaluate the performance of the head of the unit. They are elected for 2 years and can be re-elected.

Conclusions
St. 8.2.1 and 8.2.2 are fulfilled.

Sub-area 8.3: Administrative staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3.1  The academic unit has sufficient administrative personnel. This ensures the organisational implementation of the study programme and other activities, and guarantees efficient resource management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
The number and qualification of the administrative staff appears to be adequate.
It is positively noted that there are special positions for qualified pedagogic advisors each in Geneva, Neuchâtel and Lausanne.

Conclusions
St. 8.3.1 is fulfilled

Sub-area 8.4: Educational budget and resource management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.4.1 The academic unit has clear authority and responsibility for the study programme and its financing. This includes a dedicated educational budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.2 The academic unit has sufficient autonomy to direct resources, including the remuneration of teaching staff, in order to achieve the overall objectives of the academic unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.3 The financial sources and all conditions linked to financing are transparent, and do not hinder the autonomy of the academic unit to make decisions concerning teaching and research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

8.4.1. A dedicated educational budget is provided at BS level; autonomy is there. MS projects are paid from the research budgets of the supervising professors.

8.4.2. There is a salary scale, but no bonus option for better performance. External teachers can be appointed for short periods.

8.4.3. The financial situation is transparent and not considered as a hindrance for teaching and research. The SAP system is implemented and is perceived as functional and helpful.

Conclusions
St. 8.4.1 - 8.4.3. are fulfilled.

Sub-area 8.5: Interactions with the health sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.5.1 The academic unit collaborates with the health and health related sectors of society and government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

There is good relationships and regular consultancy with professional organisations and societies. PharmaSuisse appears to be the most important and actively involved one, at
regional level PharmaGeneve. There are frequent and intensive contacts and consultations, but no formal appointment.

Regarding the medical field there is collaboration with the medical faculty in some courses. There are, however, no joint courses or classes for medicine and pharmacy students.

The third part of the federal exam for pharmacists is the responsibility of the Department of health. Pharmacy professors are involved as examiners.

Representatives of the Pharmaceutical industry confirm that the graduates of Geneva are trained very well. Deficiencies are in the area of intellectual properties and the industrial drug development process.

As a suggestion for further development, a MAS program for industrial pharmacy (as it already exists for hospital pharmacy and community pharmacy) on top of the regular curriculum should be considered to better address the needs and demands by the pharmaceutical industry.

Conclusions
St. 8.5.1 is fulfilled.

ANNOTATION: One external reviewer recommends to encourage a stronger cooperation with school of medicine to implement joint activities for pharmacy and medicine students. Moreover, an increased cooperation with public and private health care facilities appears also desirable in order to develop more clinical practice sites for internships.

Area 9: Continuous renewal/quality assurance

Overall evaluation:

Procedures for the periodic reviewing and updating of its structure and functions, and for the rectification of documented deficiencies, have been mainly implemented, in particular thanks to the OAQ accreditation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1.1 The academic unit and institution implement procedures for the periodic reviewing and updating of its structure and functions, and rectify documented deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

While there has already been some evaluation of the Pharmacy Curriculum in Geneva before, this OAC accreditation is the first together with Neuchâtel and Lausanne. In the future this shall be done every 7 years. The process is quite clear and no major changes appear to be necessary. By becoming more a routine, the whole evaluation may be done quicker and more efficiently. Regular evaluations are seen as helpful.
The assessment is organized and experienced as a participative process. The written report reflects consensus among professors, intermediate and administrative staff, and students.

Students were not integrated in steering committee due to high teaching load. There was not a single person but always some representative

In Neuchâtel and Lausanne the accreditation project was discussed also with the university president and the dean of the faculty to give them a better feeling for the objectives and needs of the entire pharmacy curriculum.

Stakeholders from the pharmaceutical industry were also consulted for the preparation of the self-evaluation report

As a peculiarity of the “3 campus situation”: Money is coming from three universities who have equal rights. Consensus must always be found. This process appears to be relatively difficult, but is seen as important for N to recruit pharmacy students. In L, the same is true. Recruiting pharmacy students later for master’s projects is seen as an incentive.

PharmaSuisse/PharmaGeneve are ready to be continuously involved in the improvement of the program. At national level, the so-called “PAP” (Plattform Ausbildung Pharmazie) is the appropriate forum for such consultations.

The process of OAQ accreditation implicates a thorough periodic review and update of the structure and functions of the unit, as well as opportunities to rectify documented deficiencies. Therefore the expert group feels that there is no need for additional QA instruments, provided that the condition (7.1) to implement a formal program evaluation system shall be fulfilled.

Conclusions

St. 9.1.1 is not fulfilled

Condition: The School of pharmacy must implement a formal program evaluation system. (see also area 7.1)

4 Compliance with the art. 24 para. 1 a and b MedBG

The curriculum as implemented at the EPGL is in agreement with this law. Students will reach the goals and qualifications for a later career as academically trained health professionals, and to participate in subsequent continuous education programs.

5 Strengths, weaknesses, recommendations on quality improvement

STRENGTHS:
- Thanks to the excellent collaboration with Lausanne and Neuchâtel, the first-year students are well trained to successfully continue their studies in Geneva with a relatively small drop-out rate.
- Besides teaching, EPGL provides a highly dynamic research environment which is particularly attractive also for foreign students to get a well structured formation at high level.
- The department enjoys active support by relevant stakeholders, such as e.g. PharmaSuisse.
- The expert panel was impressed to see „enseignement coordonné“ as an example for interdisciplinary teaching and learning in clinical and practical pharmacy
- A well-developed drug discovery, drug development and medicines and diseases module integrates different scientific discipline, reflecting the entire value chain.
- Security measures and programs are well settled and convincingly implemented.
- The intermediate staff seems to be motivated and satisfied with their career perspectives.
- An excellent relation between teachers and students at all levels could be observed.
- There is adequate staffing with committed administrative personal.
- No gender or equal opportunity problems were observed. Recruiting policy and procedure for academic staff are transparent and well implemented.

WEAKNESSES:
- A mission statement with clearly formulated objectives was not immediately visible for the experts.
- The experts were surprised by the low mobility of students to leave the region or to go even abroad in spite of provided financial support by national and European programs
- The time frame (14 weeks) currently allowed for master thesis is ambitiously short. It must be prolonged to be in line with (inter)national standards.
- Instruments for recognition of courses and exams from foreign universities are not in place, discouraging/disabling outgoing mobility.
- The education in patient-oriented aspects of pharmacy still suffering from limited resources.
- The participation of students and intermediate staff in different committees is wanted, but not obvious at all levels.
- There is a lack of incentives for well trained „pharmaciens formateurs“ to engage in internships. At the same time, there is no encouragement for students to leave Geneva at least on such occasion
- Opportunities for trans-disciplinary interactions with other health professional (e.g. medicine, nursing), especially during the internships, are still poorly developed.

THREATS:
- Students might be not sufficiently exposed to the international dimension of their field of science and profession.
- Insufficient compatibility with curricula at other universities and recognition of externally taken courses and exams may lead to a loss of international visibility and reputation.
- The available resources in terms of space and budget may be not sufficient to cope with the increasing demand of well-trained pharmacists in Switzerland.
OPPORTUNITIES:

- The collaboration between Geneva, Lausanne and Neuchâtel (“3 campus situation”) should allow to further increase the admission of students in the first year and to make a stronger selection of good students.
- Financial Support from PharmaSuisse may allow to develop a unique profile with a particular strength in patient-oriented pharmacy.
- The obviously well developed collaboration with external stakeholders (e.g. hospitals and industry) may become a role model in Europe.

6 Comprehensive list of recommendations and conditions

CONDITIONS:

1. Formulate the mission statement and make it publicly visible, also consulting stakeholders and consistent with the strategic plan and research objectives. (Area 1.1)

2. Representation of students must be formally integrated in the curriculum committee (“commission d’enseignement”). (Area 3.4)

3. The School of pharmacy must implement a formal program evaluation system. (Areas 7.1 and 9.1)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The establishment of a “conseil des sages” with adequate representatives of all stakeholders is recommended. (Area 1.2)

2. It is recommended to implement mechanisms for continuous improvements of the program based on the outcomes of the state exam. (Area 1.4)

3. It is recommended to implement self-directed learning already at the Bachelor-level. (Area 2.1)

4. To make the master’s program internationally competitive, the time to work on a master’s project should be increased. (Area 2.2)

5. The School of Pharmacy should pursue the development of patient oriented courses and management courses. (Area 2.2.)

6. The integration of a permanent representative of the students in the curriculum committee is recommended. (Area 2.3)

7. A “skill-lab” to further improve the communication with patients and health professionals appears nevertheless desirable. (Area 2.6.)
8. It is recommended to consider additional joint appointments of community and hospital pharmacists. Joint activities with medical students should be implemented in order to fully develop teamwork and pharmaceutical counselling of health professionals. (Area 2.7.)

9. Consider formal appointment of stakeholders and have representation of alumni in the curriculum committee. (Area 2.8.)

10. Reduce the number of allowed attempts for the exam after the first year (Area 4.1.)

11. In order to be prepared for the increasing demand and need to educate qualified pharmacists, the School of Pharmaceutical Sciences is recommended to consider possibilities for enlarging its capacities in the near future, in particular by creating the necessary faculty and staff positions. (Area 5.1)

12. Measures should be taken to increase the proportion of female Professors or “Maître d’Enseignement et de Recherche”. (Area 5.2)

13. The School of pharmacy should be involved in the selection and training of preceptors and practice sites. (Area 6.2.)

14. Consider additional formal joint appointments to strengthen the implementation of clinical knowledge and skills in the program by creating new practice sites for internships. (Area 6.2.)

15. Overall, all three universities should prepare themselves for an increasing number of pharmacy students in the upcoming years. Foreseeable demographic developments will create an increasing demand for well-trained pharmacists, both nationally and internationally. This has consequences for the necessary training resources. (Area 6.2.)

16. It is recommended to increase the number of IT workplaces for students in the near future. (Area 6.3.)

17. Allocate at least 20 weeks for completing the master thesis and consider measures to increase the fraction of internal candidates to pursue PhD studies (Area 6.4).

18. Encourage and increase the regional and international mobility of students and staff, especially in outgoing direction. (Area 6.6)

19. Establish collaborations with other universities also in the pre-Master’s parts of the curriculum and facilitate mutual recognition of courses and exams. (Area 6.6)

20. Encourage students to make better use of the existing excellent possibilities provided by ERASMUS and other mobility programs. (Area 6.6)

21. The School should evaluate how to implement systematic feedback from the teachers on the study program (Area 7.2).
22. Implement an annual analysis of the federal exam results by the “commission d’enseignement” as part of its mandate. (Area 7.3).

23. The School of Pharmacy is encouraged to pursue its consultations with stakeholders and its alumni survey every two years. (Area 7.4).

24. Consider a stronger involvement of teaching assistants in decision-making processes and the establishment of some general assembly (“conseil des sections”) for the entire teaching staff. (Area 8.1).

7 Recommendation on accreditation

Accreditation is recommended, provided the aforementioned conditions will be met within a time-span of 12 months after accreditation decision.