

Outcome Report 2024 - 2025

Foundation Trainee Pharmacist National Recruitment Scheme March 2025



Contents

Exec	Executive Summary				
Ovei	rview	4			
Emp	loying organisations, programmes and training places	4			
1.	Hospital and Community Pharmacy	4			
2.	Other employing organisations	6			
3.	Multi-Sector Programmes	7			
4.	Skilled Worker Visa Sponsorship	8			
5.	Rotations breakdown	9			
Appl	icant outcomes	9			
6.	Applications	9			
7.	Longlisting	10			
8.	Assessments	10			
9.	Applications and programme	10			
10.	Group Differences at a Test Level for SJT & Numeracy	13			
11.	Differential Item Functioning (DIF)	16			
12.	Applicants with Tier 4 Student Visas	18			
13.	Final programme offers	19			
Emp	loyer outcomes	20			
14.	Fill-rates	20			
END	O OF REPORT	21			

Executive Summary

NHS England coordinated a national scheme for recruitment to foundation pharmacist training programmes for the eighth time in October 2024.

The scheme advertised 4451 training places across multiple sectors of practice, continuing the trend of a far greater number of available places within the scheme than trainees to fill them.

A total of 3814 applicants applied for training programmes, 3138 of whom attended the assessments. At the end of the process, 99.6% (n=3127) of successful applicants had received a programme offer and 3039 of these final programme offers were accepted by applicants.

The scheme yielded a fill rate of 100.0% for programmes where hospital was listed as the primary employer, 58.1% for programmes where community pharmacy was listed as the primary employer, and 83.7% where general practice was listed as the primary employer.

The overall fill rate for all programmes was 68.3%. Programmes listed as multi-sector (in which trainees would spend at least 13 weeks in another sector of practice) achieved a fill rate of 90.6%.

Overview

This was the eighth year that NHS England conducted the National Recruitment Scheme (NRS), an entirely centralised process for recruitment to foundation pharmacist training programmes in England, using the Oriel recruitment platform. For the first time, access to all training posts was only via the NRS, in line with the reforms to initial education and training mandated by the pharmacy regulator, the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC).

This report provides information on applicants, applications, and outcomes of the 2024 NRS. Applications are reported by various demographics, highlighting any identified trends.

Independent analysis undertaken by the Work Psychology Group examines fairness issues surrounding use of the SJT and Numeracy test and reports on any group differences in performance.

For detailed information on all aspects of the National Recruitment Scheme, please refer to the pharmacy recruitment web page: <u>https://london.wtepharmacy.nhs.uk/national-recruitment/</u>

Employing organisations, programmes and training places

1. Hospital and Community Pharmacy

- 1.1 The 2024 foundation trainee pharmacist National Recruitment Scheme listed 3563 programmes for applicants to choose from, a 17.9% increase from the previous year. In total 4451 training places were available across all programmes, a significantly greater number than the anticipated number of scheme applicants.
- 1.2 Traditionally, pharmacy trainees have been employed in either the hospital or community pharmacy sectors. These sectors still represent the bulk of training opportunities for foundation trainee pharmacists. This year, 17.2% (n=612) of programmes were within the NHS hospital sector, representing 21.6% (962) of all available training places. This included n=116 in Wales, in which all trainees are employed by the NHS in a multi sector training programme. 10.5% (n=375) of programmes were offered by large community pharmacy employers, 20.1% (n=715) by medium pharmacy employers, 16.9% (n=605) by small pharmacy employers and 31.2% (n=1110) by independent pharmacy contractors. There was a slight overall increase in the number of programmes offered through the NRS

by community pharmacy employers, and a small increase in the number of programmes offered by hospital employers, compared with the previous year (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Year on year comparison of foundation training programme availability across sectors

1.3 Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the numbers of employing organisations, programmes and training places available in the 2024 scheme, broken down by sector and geography.

Table 1: Programme Availability in the 2024 Foundation Pharmacist Recruitment Scheme

Sector	Number of Employing Organisations	Number of Programmes	Number of Training Places
	400	010	000
NHS Hospital	168	612	962
Large Community Pharmacy			
(Branches 200+)	4	375	411
Medium Community Pharmacy			
(Branches 25-199)	79	715	759
Small Community Pharmacy			
(Branches 6-24)	245	605	733
Independent Community Pharmacy			
(Branches 1-5)	908	1110	1394
Total	1404	3417	4259

NHS England Pharmacy Region	NHS England Local Area	NHS Hospital	Large Community Pharmacy	Medium Community Pharmacy	Small Community Pharmacy	Independent Community Pharmacy
East of England	East of England	54 (76)	34 (39)	44 (49)	65 (93)	86 (107)
London	London	88 (161)	57 (64)	102 (107)	104 (151)	290 (362)
	East Midlands	26 (62)	15 (16)	65 (70)	43 (47)	70 (99)
Midiands	West Midlands	50 (89)	26 (27)	50 (52)	133 (149)	155 (188)
	North East	18 (49)	26 (27)	30 (31)	31 (31)	76 (95)
North	North West	59 (112)	21 (22)	176 (189)	91 (106)	149 (196)
	Yorkshire and Humber	44 (58)	43 (46)	111 (115)	33 (40)	72 (93)
	KSS	44 (68)	26 (29)	41 (44)	15 (15)	72 (86)
South East	Thames Valley	13 (28)	11 (13)	41 (46)	19 (19)	27 (39)
	Wessex	17 (27)	29 (32)	10 (10)	23 (30)	38 (46)
South West	South West	85 (116)	87 (96)	45 (46)	48 (52)	75 (83)
Wales	Wales	114 (116)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Total	612 (962)	375 (411)	715 (759)	605 (733)	1110 (1394)

Table 2: Geographical Spread of Programmes (and Training Places), by Sector

2. Other employing organisations

2.1 From the 2025 training year, any organisation is able to employ a foundation trainee pharmacist so long as the programme requirements for the foundation training year are met. This allowed for a variety of employment opportunities. Table 3 overleaf describes the number of training opportunities advertised by various employing organisations across England and Wales.

NHS England Pharmacy Region	NHS England Local Area	Community	General Practice	Health and Justice	Hospital
East of England	East of England	229 (288)	14 (16)	0 (0)	54 (76)
London	London	553 (684)	38 (53)	0 (0)	88 (161)
Midlanda	East Midlands	193 (232)	7 (11)	0 (0)	26 (62)
widiands	West Midlands	364 (416)	9 (18)	0 (0)	50 (89)
	North East	163 (184)	12 (14)	0 (0)	18 (49)
North	North West	437 (513)	12 (15)	0 (0)	59 (112)
	Yorkshire and the Humber	259 (294)	19 (24)	0 (0)	44 (58)
	KSS	154 (174)	8 (12)	0 (0)	44 (68)
South East	Thames Valley	98 (117)	2 (3)	0 (0)	13 (28)
	Wessex	100 (118)	1(1)	0 (0)	17 (27)
South West	South West	255 (277)	22 (23)	2 (2)	85 (116)
Wales	Wales	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	114 (116)
	Total	2805 (3297)	144 (190)	2 (2)	612 (962)

Table 3 Geographical Spread of Programmes (and Training Places), by host employer

3. Multi-Sector Programmes

- 3.1 Four hundred and fifty organisations registered multi sector training programmes on Oriel in 2024. Programmes were split between at least two sectors, including Hospital, Community, General Practice, Academia, Integrated Care Board, Industry and Health and Justice posts, with each rotation being a minimum of 13 weeks.
- 3.2 Table 4 overleaf illustrates the spread of multi-sector programmes across England and Wales. 1241 multi sector programmes were available in total, representing a total of 1647 training places. Programme availability was generally evenly spread across regions, with the fewest programmes found in Thames Valley (n-19) and the most available in the South West (n=164) and London (n=241)

NHS England Pharmacy Region	NHS England Local Area	Programmes	Places
East of England	East of England	125	177
London	London	241	361
Midlanda	East Midlands	65	85
Midlands	West Midlands	129	168
	North East	32	43
North	North West	119	182
	Yorkshire and the Humber	127	153
	KSS	78	110
South East	Thames Valley	19	27
	Wessex	28	37
South West	South West	164	188
Wales	Wales	114	116
	Total	1241	1647

Table 4: Geographical Spread of Multi-Sector Programmes (and Training Places)

4. Skilled Worker Visa Sponsorship

Skilled Worker Visa-sponsored training place availability in the community pharmacy sector increased to 558 places in 2024; 28.9.0% (n=125) more sponsored places in total than were available to applicants requiring visas in 2023 (n=433).

Table 5 SWV places available in the hospital sector and in primary care.

		Size of Co					
Host Employer	NHS Hospital	Large	Medium	Small	Independent	Total Places	
Community	n/a	0	259	116	183	558	
General Practice	n/a	0	0	0	5	5	
Health and Justice	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	
Hospital	580	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	580	
Total	580	0	259	116	183	1143	

5. Rotations breakdown

Advertised programmes consisted of a range of rotational options, from single sector through to programmes with four rotations.

NHS England Pharmacy Region	NHS England Local Area	1 Rotation (single sector)	2 Rotations	3 Rotations	4 Rotations
East of England	East of England	172 (203)	115 (166)	9 (10)	1 (1)
London	London	438 (537)	231 (345)	10 (16)	0 (0)
Midlanda	East Midlands	161 (220)	64 (83)	1 (2)	0 (0)
Midiands	West Midlands	294 (355)	129 (168)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	North East	161 (204)	32 (43)	0 (0)	0 (0)
North	North West	389 (458)	115 (175)	2 (4)	2 (3)
	Yorkshire and the Humber	195 (223)	123 (147)	4 (6)	0 (0)
	KSS	128 (144)	77 (109)	1 (1)	0 (0)
South East	Thames Valley	94 (121)	19 (27)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Wessex	90 (109)	28 (37)	0 (0)	0 (0)
South West	South West	200 (230)	155 (176)	9 (12)	0 (0)
Wales	Wales	0 (0)	0 (0)	114 (116)	0 (0)
	Total	2322 (2804)	1088 (1476)	150 (167)	3 (4)

Tahla G	Geographical	Sproad of	Drogrammes	(and Training	Diacos) H	hy number of	rotations
	Geographical	Spieau UI	riogrammes	(and maining	r $accs), k$	Jy Humber Or	<i>i</i> otations

Applicant outcomes

6. Applications

- 6.1 3814 applications were made to the NRS (not including incomplete applications), compared with 2585 received in the first year, 2592 in the second year, 2485 in the third year, 2524 in the fourth year, 2763 in the fifth year, 3055 in the sixth year and 2922 in the seventh year.
- 6.2 13.1% (n=498) of applicants were either currently enrolled on an accredited Overseas Pharmacists' Assessment Programme (OSPAP) or were OSPAP graduates.

7. Longlisting

- 7.1 0.5% of total applicants (n=18) did not progress through the formal longlisting process due to not meeting basic eligibility criteria.
- 7.2 Sixty-four applicants subsequently withdrew their application, leaving 3732 applicants invited to assessment: a 29.3% increase from the previous year.

8. Assessments

8.1 3138 applicants attended their assessments and were eligible to receive offers.

9. Applications and programme

Table 7: Applications and programme offer by gender.

- 9.1 For the purposes of this section, we refer to the following:
 - Application the number of applications progressed after longlisting (n=3796)
 - Offer applicants who received a foundation programme offer (n=3127), irrespective of whether the applicant accepted this offer.

Table 7 below provides a breakdown of applicant gender, along with data pertaining to programme offers received.

Group	Number of Applications (%)	Number who attended interview (%)	Number of offers made (%)	Number of offers accepted (%)
Male	1119 (29.5%)	917 (29.2%)	917 (29.3%)	883 (29.1%)
Female	2586 (68.1%)	2153 (68.6%)	2143 (68.5%)	2092 (68.8%)
Not disclosed	91 (2.4%)	68 (2.2%)	67 (2.2%)	64 (2.1%)
Total	3796 (100.0%)	3138 (100.0%)	3127 (100.0%)	3039 (100.0%)

Table 8 provides a breakdown of applications received, along with data pertaining to the percentage of applicants attending assessments and programme offers received, for each of the age categories.

Group	Percentage of applications	Percentage of applicants who attended assessments	Percentage of offers made	Percentage of offers accepted
19-24 years	75.4%	77.7%	77.7%	77.9%
25-29 years	10.0%	8.4%	8.4%	8.3%
30–34 years	5.1%	5.0%	5.0%	4.9%
35-39 years	4.0%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%
40-44 years	2.1%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%
45-49 years	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%
50-54 years	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
55-64 years	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Not disclosed	2.4%	2.3%	2.3%	2.2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 8: Applications and programme offer by age group*

Table 9 provides a breakdown of applications and offers by individual ethnic groups.

9.2 75.9% (2883) of applications were received from applicants of 'Black, Asian and minority ethnic' (BAME) or 'mixed' origin and 18.2% (689) were received from applicants of 'White' origin. 5.9% of applicants (n=224) chose not to declare their ethnic origin.

^{*}Age as of 1 September 2024

Group	Percenta Applica	age of tions	Percent applicar Atter Assess	Percentage of applicants who Attended		Percentage of Offers Made		Percentage of Offers Accepted	
	12.20/	1	14 40/		1/ /0/		11 50/		
White - British	(502)		(454)		(453)		(411)		
White - Irish	1.5%	18.1% (689)	1.1%	19.1% (559)	1.1%	19.1% (598)	0.7%	18.8% (570)	
	(37)	(009)	(33)	(339)	(33)	(000)	(20)	(010)	
Any other white background	3.4% (130)		3.6% (112)		3.6% (112)		3.6% (109)		
Mixed White and Black	0.2%		0.2%		0.2%		0.2%		
Caribbean	(7)		(6)		(6)		(6)		
Mixed White and Black African	1.0% (39)	3.7%	1.1%	3.9%	1.1%	3.9%	1.0% (31)	3.6%	
	1 70/	(140)	1 99/	(119)	1.99/	(119)	1.6%	(110)	
Mixed White and Asian	(65)	(1.1.2)	(55)	-	(55)		(50)	(
	0.8%		0.8%		0.8%		0.8%		
Any other mixed background	(29)		(25)		(25		(23)		
	12.5%		12.1%		12.1%		12.3%		
Asian or Asian British Indian	(476)		(379)		(378)		(374)		
	17.8%		17.2%		17.2%	43.3%	17.4%		
Asian or Asian British Pakistani	(676)	44.4%	(542)	43.3%	(540)		(528)	43.9%	
	4.6%	(1685)	4.7%	(1362)	4.7%	(1358)	4.8%	(1335)	
Asian or Asian British Bangladeshi	(173)		(148)		(148)		(146)		
	9.5%		9.3%		9.3%		9.4%		
Any other Asian background	(360)		(293)		(292)		(287)		
Dia ale an Dia ale Drittiale	0.4%		0.5%		0.5%		0.5%		
Black of Black British Caribbean	(16)		(15)		(15)		(15)		
	15.4%	16.4%	15.1%	16.2%	15.1%	16.2%	15.0%	16.1%	
Black or Black British African	(583)	(620)	(475)	(509)	(472)	(505)	(456)	(489)	
	0.6%		0.6%		0.6%		0.6%		
Any other Black background	(21)		(19)		(18)		(18)		
Chinese	3.6% (137)	3.9%	(124)	4.0%	(124)	3.9%	(121)	
Any other ethnic group	7.9% (301)	8.2%	(256)	8.2%	(256)	8.2%	(248)	
Not disclosed	5.9% (2	224)	5.4%	(169)	5.3%	(167)	5.5 (166)	
Total	100% (3	3796)	100% (3138)	100%	(3127)	100%	(3039)	

Table 9: Applications and programme offer by ethnic group.

9.3 The majority of applicants to the NRS for 2024 were the first who would be graduating against the revised MPharm curriculum according to the 2021 GPhC reforms to the Standards for the initial education and training of pharmacists and would require a prescribing environment for their foundation training year.

A sizeable minority of applicants remained on the 2011 GPhC Standards, either due to breaks in their education or graduation via an OSPAP course, as described in Table 10 below.

Applicant Type	GPhC Standard	Number of applications (%)	Number of applicants who attended assessments (%)	Number of offers made (%)	Number of offers accepted (%)
Current MPharm	2021	2886 (76.0%)	2643 (84.2%)	2635 (84.2%)	2568 (84.5%)
Current merhann	2011	416 (11%)	99 (3.1%)	97 (3.1%)	81 (2.7%)
MPharm Graduate	2011	12 (0.3%)	8 (0.3%)	8 (0.3%)	7 (0.2%)
Current OSPAP	2011	480 (12.6%)	386 (12.3%)	385 (12.3%)	12.5%
OSPAP Graduate 2011		2 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)	0.1%
	Total	3796 (100.0%)	3138 (100.0%)	3127 (100.0%)	3039 (100.0%)

Tabla	10	Loorning	Outcomo	brookdown	by	applicant	tuno
Iable	10-	Leanning	Oulcome -	DIEakuOWII	IJУ	αρριισατι τ	ype.

10. Group Differences at a Test Level for SJT & Numeracy

10.1 Independent analysis undertaken by the Work Psychology Group examined fairness issues surrounding use of the SJT and Numeracy test. Group differences in performance between applicants were analysed based on age, gender and ethnicity. Analyses were conducted after outliers (applicants with very low/high scores and / or missing data) had been removed (n=3)

10.2. Age

- 10.2.1 Pearson's correlations were conducted to examine the relationships between age and scores on the SJT and Numeracy test.
- 10.2.2 SJT: A significant negative correlation (Pearson's r) between age and SJT score was found (r=-.307, p<.001). This suggests that younger applicants typically performed slightly better than older applicants on the SJT.

10.2.3 Numeracy: A significant negative correlation (Pearson's r) between age and Numeracy score was found (r=-.183, p<.001). This suggests that younger applicants typically performed slightly better than older applicants on the Numeracy test.

10.3. Gender

- 10.3.1 Independent t-tests were conducted to examine whether there were significant differences in SJT and Numeracy test scores based on gender (Table 11).
- 10.3.2 SJT: A significant difference in performance on the SJT based on gender was found, although the effect size was small, indicating that females scored marginally higher than males (t (2644) = -8.64, p<.001, d = -.37).
- 10.3.3 Numeracy: There were no significant differences in performance on the Numeracy test based on gender (t (2644) = 1.36, p=ns, d = .06).

Table 11: Gender – Descriptive Statistics by Selection Method

		Female	Male
	Ν	1851	759
SJT	Mean	556.13	543.71
	Std. Deviation	34.05	33.50
	Ν	1851	795
Numeracy	Mean	8.08	8.18
	Std. Deviation	1.74	1.78

10.4. Ethnicity

10.4.1 Ethnic backgrounds included: 'White', 'Asian', 'Black', 'Chinese', 'Mixed' and 'Other'. Applicants were also given the response option 'Prefer not to say', though these individuals were not included in the analysis. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to investigate whether there were significant differences on the SJT and Numeracy test scores dependent on ethnicity (Table 12).

- 10.4.2 SJT: Significant differences in performance between applicants of different ethnicity were found on the SJT (F (5,2563) =29.59, p<.001, η^2 =0.06), indicating a moderate effect size. Applicants who identified as 'White' scored significantly higher than those in the 'Asian', 'Chinese', 'Black', 'Mixed', and 'Other' groups. Applicants who identified as 'Chinese' scored significantly higher than those who indicated that they were 'Black'. It should be noted that differences in sample size between the groups may have an impact on the analysis and therefore, these results should be interpreted with caution.
- 10.4.3 Numeracy: Significant differences in performance between applicants of different ethnicity found on the Numeracy test (F (5,2563) =29.39, p<.001, η^2 = 0.05), indicating a small effect size. Applicants who identified as 'Chinese' or 'White' scored significantly higher than 'Asian', 'Black', 'Mixed' and 'Other' applicants. It should be noted that differences in sample size between the groups may have an impact on the analysis and therefore, these results should be interpreted with caution.

		White	Asian	Black	Chinese	Mixed	Other
	Ν	546	1150	445	107	106	215
SJT	Mean	567.45	549.66	545.09	557.31	546.63	548.72
	Std. Deviation	30.90	34.26	32.08	26.67	38.76	37.18
	Ν	546	1150	445	107	106	215
Numeracy	Mean	8.76	8.02	7.61	8.84	7.88	7.84
	Std. Deviation	1.33	1.78	1.79	1.56	1.80	1.99

Table 12: Race - Descriptive Statistics by Selection Method

10.5. Summary

- For both the SJT and Numeracy Test, younger applicants scored marginally higher than older applicants.
- For the SJT, females scored marginally higher than males, and for the Numeracy Test, there were no significant differences in performance between females and males.
- For the SJT and Numeracy Test, differences in performance were seen based on applicant ethnicity. For the SJT, applicants who identified as 'White' performed better than 'Asian', 'Black', 'Chinese', 'Mixed' and 'Other' applicants. Applicants who identified as 'Chinese' scored significantly higher than those who identified as 'Black'.

11. Differential Item Functioning (DIF)

11.1 One explanation for test level group differences is that SJT item content discriminates against applicant sub-groups however, the content development process aims to ensure that items are designed to avoid content that might discriminate, for example, avoiding the use of colloquial words/phrases, which might disadvantage some groups. Another explanation for group differences in performance is that real differences exist between groups of applicants due to differences in experience, attitudes, or differential self-selection.

DIF analysis was performed to identify whether individual items are differentially difficult for members of different groups (i.e. based on gender and ethnicity). DIF analysis considers whether the prediction of an item's score is improved by including the background grouping variable in a regression equation after total score has been entered. A positive result suggests that people with similar overall scores from different groups have different success rates on the item. However, because of the number of statistical tests involved, there is a danger that random differences may reach statistical significance (type 1 error). For this reason, positive results are treated as 'flags' for further investigation of items, rather than confirmation of difference or bias. Items exhibiting R-squared values with a negligible effect size, even where these differences are significant, are unlikely to indicate a meaningful difference in the performance between the groups (Cohen, 1988)¹. As such, only items exhibiting at least a small effect size are reported, as determined by an R-square change value of 0.01 or above.

Two items were flagged for gender differences (females performed better than males) at a test level for Paper B. No items were flagged for gender differences at a test level for Paper A. Eight items were flagged for ethnicity differences (White applicants performed better than BME applicants for four items and BME applicants performed better than White applicants for four items) at a test level for Paper A. Five items were flagged for ethnicity differences (White applicants performed better than BME applicants for two items and BME applicants performed better than White applicants for two items and BME applicants performed better than White applicants for two items) at a test level for Paper B.

Given most items were not flagged for gender or ethnicity differences, this suggests that group differences at a test level are not likely the result of the questions being more difficult for some groups. This is especially likely as both ethnic groups (White and BME) performed better than the other group on an equal number of items. Therefore, it is recommended that other explanations of group differences are considered. The items that were flagged will be reviewed considering the results, to identify whether there appears to be any potential bias in the item content. A note will also be made in the item bank so that it can be taken into consideration in the placement of the item for any future use.

Differences in Performance Based on Date

- 11.2 Analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted to investigate whether performance differs on the SJT, and Numeracy test based on when applicants undertake the assessment process. This was operationalised as whether assessments were completed at the beginning (19th 24th September 2024, middle (25th 29th September 2024) or end (30th September 4th October 2024) of the testing period. The sample size per testing window; n=519 (15.31%) completed the test in Time One, n=1054 (31.10%) completed the test in Time Two, and n=1596 (47.09%) completed the test in Time Three. Analyses were conducted after outliers (those with very low/high scores and/or missing data) had been removed (n=3). Descriptive statistics are outlined in Table 8.
- 11.3 SJT: A significant difference in performance on the SJT based on the time point within the selection window at which it was completed was found (F (2,3166) =8.51, p<.001, η^2 = 0.005). Applicants who completed the SJT in Time 1 scored significantly higher than those who completed the SJT in Time 2 and Time 3, although the effect size was small. No significant difference in performance on the SJT between applicants who completed the SJT in Time 2 and applicants who completed the SJT in Time 3 was identified.

11.4 Numeracy: A significant difference in performance on the numeracy test based on the time point within the selection window at which it was completed was found (F (2,3166) = 14.58, p<.001, η^2 = 0.009), with a small effect size. Applicants who completed the Numeracy test in Time 1 scored significantly higher than those who completed the Numeracy test in Time 2 or Time 3. No significant difference in performance on the Numeracy test between applicants who completed the Numeracy test in Time 2 and applicants who completed the Numeracy test in Time 2 and

Tost	Docorintivo	Time One	Time Two	Time Three
1651	Descriptive	19/09 - 26/09	27/09 – 30/09	01/10 – 04/10
	Ν	519	1054	1596
	Mean	558.33	552.55	551.32
SJT	Standard Deviation	33.71	33.94	33.75
	Minimum	436.00	416.86	419.04
	Maximum	632.68	641.40	639.22
	Ν	519	1054	1596
	Mean	8.46	8.13	7.99
Numeracy	Standard Deviation	1.61	1.74	1.78
	Minimum	0	0	0
	Maximum	10	10	10

Table 13: SJ1	and Numerical	assessment	performance	bv date of	assessment

12. Applicants with Tier 4 Student Visas

- 12.1 Some international students require a Tier 4 visa to undertake their academic study in the UK. 8.8% (n=334) of longlisted applications were received from those who indicated their immigration status as requiring a Tier 4/student visa. These applicants would generally enter their training year either by applying for a Skilled Worker (formerly Tier 2) Visa (requiring employers to be registered as sponsors) or obtaining a training place via the Graduate Visa route of entry.
- 12.2 75.7% (n=253) of applicants with Tier 4 visas attended the assessments, amounting to 6.7% of all successful applicants.
- 12.3 Training place offers were made to 99.6% (n=252) of Tier 4 student visa applicants. This is largely due to there being a significantly greater number of available Skilled Worker Visa (SWV) places in the NRS than applicants to fill them and the option of the Graduate

Visa route, affording a variety of training environments for applicants to select from. Any applicant wishing to utilise the Graduate Visa route of entry could select any training place within the NRS, as this route does not require employers to be registered as sponsors of overseas trainees.

12.4 Table 14 below provides a breakdown of places accepted by those applicants on Tier 4 student visas, displayed by employer type and nation.

Region	Community	Hospital	Health & Justice	General Practice
England	153	69	1	7
Wales (all programmes are multi-sector)	0	4	0	0
Total	153	73	1	7

Table 14: Tier 2 training places accepted by employer type and region.

13. Final programme offers

- 13.1 At the end of the process, 99.6% of successful applicants (n=3127) had received a programme offer. Of these, 45 offers were declined, 41 offers expired and 2 were accepted and then withdrawn. Overall, 97.2% (n=3039) of final programme offers were accepted by applicants.
- 13.2 0.4% (n=11) of successful applicants were left without a foundation programme offer at the end of the process. These applicants did not achieve a ranking high enough to gain an offer for any of their preferenced programmes. This normally occurs in instances where applicants preferenced very few programmes.

Employer outcomes

14. Fill-rates

- 14.1 At the end of the recruitment process, 100.0% of available NHS Hospital training places were filled and 58.1% of community pharmacy training places.
- 14.2 The fill-rate overall was 68.3%.
- 14.3 Table 15 below provides a breakdown of the fill-rate, by number of training places available within each sector.

Total Training Host Employer	Training Places Available	Overall Fill-Rate Places Filled	Overall Fill-Rate Places Not Filled	Fill Rate
Hospital	962	962	0	100%
Community	3297	1916	1381	58.1%
General Practice	190	159	31	83.7%
Health and Justice	2	2	0	100%

Table 15: Summary of fill-rate by sector.

14.4 Table 16 below provides a breakdown of programme fill rate by NHS England region.

NHS England	NHS England Local Area	Places		Fill Rate	Fill Rate	
Pharmacy Region			Accepted	(Local)	(Regional)	
East of England	East of England	380	221	58.2%	58.2%	
London	London	898	730	81.3%	81.3%	
Midlanda	East Midlands	305	212	69.5%	<u> </u>	
Micianus	West Midlands	523	359	68.6%	68.9%	
	North East	247	176	71.3%	71.3%	
North	North West	640	460	71.9%		
	Yorkshire and the Humber	376	265	70.5%		
	KSS	254	154	60.6%		
South East	Thames Valley	148	72	48.6%	53.1%	
	Wessex	146	65	44.5%		
South West	South West	418	209	50.0%	50.0%	
Wales	Wales	116	116	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total	4451	3039	68.3%		

Table 16: Summary of regional fill-rates

14.5 Table 17 below compares fill rates of single sector programmes to multi sector programmes, with multi-sector programmes achieving a significantly higher fill rate across all regions.

Table 17							
NHS England Pharmacy	NHS England Local Area	Single Sector	Multi Sector				
Region		Fill Rate %	Fill Rate %				
East of England	East of England	42.9	75.7				
London	London	69.8	98.3				
Midlanda	East Midlands	62.3	88.2				
iviidiands	West Midlands	56.3	94.6				
	North East	67.6	88.4				
North	North West	62.7	95.1				
NORT	Yorkshire and the Humber	58.3	88.2				
	KSS	41.7	85.5				
South East	Thames Valley	38.0	96.3				
	Wessex	31.2	83.8				
South West	South West	23.0	83.0				
Wales	Wales	n/a	100.0				
	Overall Fill Rate %	55.2	90.6				

END OF REPORT

¹ Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates