Successful RPS e-portfolio candidates table

CPPE
CENTRE FOR PHARMACY
POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION

Successful candidates tend to….	Unsuccessful candidates tend to…
Use a broad range of supervised learning events (SLEs), including direct observation, to evidence their practice.	Provide one or two SLEs in their portfolio to evidence their practice. Have limited evidence of direct observation of practice.
Include feedback and observations from a wide range of collaborators from both within and outside of pharmacy.	Only have direct observations from one or two individuals from the pharmacy team.
Engage with collaborators so that they feel confident which curriculum outcomes the candidate is demonstrating and how to provide rich and meaningful feedback.	Include poor or very limited feedback from collaborators that does not explicitly describe the complexity of the situation or directly reference the curriculum outcomes they are trying to demonstrate.
Have support from expert mentors and professional coaches who provide impactful reports on their progress and act as a critical friend of the quality of their evidence and portfolio	Build their portfolio in isolation without the support and constructive criticism of expert mentors, a professional coach or similar.
Provide evidence summaries and/or reflection for assessors at a domain level to make it clear how they meet the curriculum outcomes.	Do not clearly articulate how the evidence they are presenting in their portfolio explicitly demonstrates the curriculum outcomes.
Balance their portfolios by including evidence of outputs, reflection and third-party corroboration in line with RPS guidance.	Do not balance their portfolio appropriately, and omit evidence of outputs, reflection and/or third-party corroboration.
Provide evidence (through outputs and reflection) of how their practice has had a demonstrable positive impact on patients and service development.	Do not clearly articulate and/or evidence how their practice has impacted positively on patient care.
Use reflection to "tell the evidence's story" and explicitly describe how it meets the curriculum outcomes.	Do not use reflection effectively meaning it is unclear how the uploaded evidence demonstrates the curriculum outcome(s) to which it is mapped.
Use reflection to describe their individual role in delivering the outputs evidenced in their portfolio.	Do not use reflection to describe their role in developing the evidence presented (especially for collaborative projects or research activities), meaning it is unclear to assessors what the candidate did as an individual.
Reflect on feedback they have received and provide evidence of how they have acted on that feedback to improve their practice.	Provide feedback in their portfolio from collaborators that suggest areas for development but show no further reflection or action on how they acted on this to improve their practice.
Map carefully and sparingly, making sure they only map curriculum outcomes that are strongly demonstrated by the evidence.	Map all evidence to multiple curriculum outcomes when it is only marginally relevant – this makes it less clear that the candidate is operating at the required level
Curate their evidence to clearly demonstrate the depth and breadth of their practice.	Upload a very large quantity of evidence that is similar, or which does not meet the standard.
Include more pieces of evidence for high stakes outcomes vs lower stakes outcomes	Do not differentiate the evidence they upload based on the stakes ratings of the curriculum outcomes.