hpc health professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Cardiff University
Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Independent (Non-Medical) Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapy Podiatry/Chiropody Radiography
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary Prescribing
Date of visit	20 November 2008

Contents

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve are supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, radiographers and physiotherapists) and programmes in local anaesthetics and prescription-only medicine (for chiropodists / podiatrists).

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 March 2009. At the Committee meeting on 25 March 2009, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	David Whitmore (Paramedic) Emma Supple (Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
HPC observer	John Archibald
Proposed student numbers	35
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	David Lloyd (Cardiff University)
Secretary	Karen Moore (Cardiff University)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☐	☐	☒
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐
Application pack	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum document	☒	☐	☐
School and assessment strategy handbooks	☒	☐	☐

The HPC did not review the mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs prior to the visit as a mapping document was not required by the visitors as the programme is a post-registration qualification.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HPC met with previous and current students from the supplementary prescribing and independent prescribing programmes for nurses and pharmacists as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any AHP students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are often suggested when it is felt that the standards of education and training have been met at the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1   The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make or take up the offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must amend the programme documentation to reflect that an HPC-registered Allied Health Professional (AHP) who successfully completes the programme will have the HPC register annotated with the Supplementary Prescribing entitlement.

Reason: In the programme documentation submitted it was not always clear that HPC-registered AHPs who successfully complete the programme will have the HPC Register annotated with the Supplementary Prescribing entitlement rather than the entitlement allowing access to the relevant HPC register. It was also not clear across all of the documentation that AHPs would only be able to supplementary prescribe and not independently prescribe on successful completion of the programme. This information must be clearly stated in the documentation to prevent confusion amongst applicants that apply to the programme.

2.1   The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make or take up the offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that references to the roles and requirements of professional bodies and regulatory bodies are accurate and up-to-date.

Reason: The documentation currently fails to distinguish between the different roles and requirements of the regulatory and professional bodies of the different professions that will have access to the programme. In particular, the HPC is not a professional body and should not be referred to as such in any materials related to an HPC approved programme. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must also be updated to reference the current Standards of proficiency, Standards of education and training and Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in order to reflect current practice and guidelines. This information must be updated so that applicants have the correct information they require to take up a place on the programme.

5.3.1   The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment.

Condition: The education provider must formulate a process to ensure a safe environment is provided for students at placement.

Reason: From the submitted documentation information about placement audits and therefore how the education provider ensures that placement environments are safe was not provided. During the visit the senior team was not able to assure the visitors that a thorough and effective system for approving all

placements was in place. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

5.3.2 **The practice placement settings must provide safe and effective practice.**

Condition: The education provider must formulate a process to ensure provision of safe and effective practice.

Reason: From the submitted documentation information about placement audits and therefore how the education provider ensures that placement environments enable safe and effective practice was not provided. During the visit the senior team was not able to assure the visitors that a thorough and effective system for approving all placements was in place. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

5.6 **The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.**

Condition: The education provider must formulate a process to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving all placements.

Reason: From the submitted documentation information about placement audits and therefore how the education provider ensures that placement environments are suitable was not provided. During the visit the senior team was not able to assure the visitors that a thorough and effective system for approving all placements was in place. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

5.13 **The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.**

Condition: The education provider must formulate a process to ensure an equal opportunity and anti-discriminatory policy is in place when auditing placements.

Reason: From the submitted documentation information about placement audits and therefore how the education provider ensures that placement environments have suitable policies in place was not provided. During the visit the senior team was not able to assure the visitors that a thorough and effective system for approving all placements was in place. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the current external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme,

Commendation: The visitors wished to commend the education provider on the use of electronic resources in the programme.

Reason: At the visit the visitors were shown the electronic resources that were available to students on the programme within the clinical skills laboratories. The visitors felt that the recording facilities and the extensive use of these to support student learning, portfolios and continued professional development demonstrated innovation and an example of best practice.

David Whitmore
Emma Supple