
HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Reading |
| Name of programme(s) | PGCert Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Part time PGCert Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Part time |
| Approval visit date | 30 October 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-14804-Y0X5B2 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 3 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review | 4 |
| Section 5: Visitors' recommendation..... | 5 |

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Manoj Mistry | Lay |
| James Pickard | Independent prescriber |
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive |

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

| | | |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Matthew Almond | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Reading |
| Eve Davey | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Reading |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | PGCert Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing |
| Proposed first intake | 01 January 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50 across both programmes |
| Intakes per year | 3 |
| Assessment reference | APP02106 |

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | PGCert Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| Proposed first intake | 01 January 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50 across both programmes |
| Intakes per year | 3 |
| Assessment reference | APP02107 |

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Type of evidence | Submitted |
|---|-----------|
| Completed education standards mapping document | Yes |
| Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements | Yes |
| Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning | Yes |
| Proficiency standards mapping | Yes |
| Information provided to applicants and learners | Yes |
| Information for those involved with practice-based learning | Yes |
| Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme | Yes |

We also usually ask to meet the following groups at approval visits, although there may be some circumstances where meeting certain groups is not needed. In the table below, we have noted which groups we met, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

| Group | Met | Comments |
|---|--------------|--|
| Learners | Yes | As the programmes are not approved, we met two nurses and a pharmacist who had successfully completed the nursing and pharmacist independent prescribing programmes. |
| Service users and carers (and / or their representatives) | Not Required | We did not meet with service users and carers as the panel did not have any issues to explore with them. |
| Facilities and resources | Yes | |
| Senior staff | Yes | |
| Practice educators | Yes | |
| Programme team | Yes | |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 11 December 2019.

C.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour in prescribing practice, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

E.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how learners are able to understand and how assessments throughout the programme ensure learners are able to meet the expectation of professional behaviour in prescribing practice, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

Reason: From a review of the documentation to meet this standard, it was noted the education provider said that throughout the programme emphasis is put on professional practice and upholding the standards of the professional regulator. The visitors were made aware the programme handbook stated that as registered healthcare professionals, learners are expected to maintain behaviours associated with their professional code of conduct, including the SCPEs. However, the visitors could not see references to the SCPEs in the learning outcomes, nor in details of the assessments on the programmes. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how the education provider ensures the SCPEs are outlined across modules on the programme explicitly through the learning outcomes, and how they are assessed so learners are able to demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour in prescribing practice. The visitors require further evidence which shows the learning outcomes being explicitly linked to the SCPEs across modules on the programme and how assessment of the expectations of professional behaviour in prescribing practice, including the SCPEs, are carried out at appropriate points through the programme.

D.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the training they offer practice educators is mandatory, and how they ensure that practice educators complete the training.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware practice educators are able to access information on what the role entails. They are sent the handbook which explains the role, the learning outcomes and the support learners need. They are also offered training from the education provider for their role as practice educators at the start of each cohort. During the facilities and resources presentation, the visitors were informed training for practice educators is mandatory. However, in the meeting with practice educators, they told the visitors they had not received any training for the role. The visitors were also informed the programme does not have a mechanism to record who has completed the training. The visitors were unsure whether it is mandatory for practice educators to complete training so they are adequately prepared to support learning and assess learners effectively. The visitors could also not see how the programme determines which practice educators have completed the training and those who have not. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show how whether the training offered by the education provider is mandatory, and how the education provider ensures that practice educators complete the training.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).