

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300), Part time Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300), Part time Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300) Level 7, Part time
Date submission received	14 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15063-Q2X0T5

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
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 major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. 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:

Janet Lawrence	Independent prescriber
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04444

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300)
----------------	--

Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04445

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes reported to us via the major change process.

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300) Level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04488

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes identified via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

The education provider has indicated a change to the names of the programmes that indicate the running of a level 7 programme. The HCPC has not approved a level 7 prescribing programme but upon further discussions with the education provider they have confirmed that the programme has been running since January 2015. In order for the HCPC to update the programme records we will need to ensure the level 7 programme is meeting our prescribing standards.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require 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.

Required documentation	Submitted
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

### **Further evidence required**

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

### **B.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.**

**Reason:** Upon review of the documentation, visitors noted that some documents did not contain accurate terminology or wording in line with HCPC requirements. Firstly, in the Assessment of Practice document the visitors noted various sections such as the guidelines for practice assessors, roles and responsibilities and marking guidelines only make mention of Nursing learners or the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) standards. In the purpose and process section the HCPC standards for prescribing from 2013 are referenced, however this reference is now out of date as of September 2019. Furthermore, the visitors noted the use of Designated Medical Practitioner (DMP) throughout the documentation which is no longer a requirement of the HCPC. The visitors noted that if the documentation used in the teaching and learning is not accurate for HCPC learners then it is not appropriate to the delivery of the programme. The education provider must ensure that documentation that is used in the teaching of the programme is accurate and appropriate for HCPC-registered learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show the relevant teaching resources are updated for HCPC-registered learners to ensure their accuracy and appropriateness.

### **E.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.**

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider directed the visitors to the course specification template (CST), module guides, practice document and performance marking descriptors. When looking through the supporting documents the visitors noted the difference between the learning outcomes listed in the module descriptors and the course learning outcomes in the CST document. The outcomes differed in both number and content and so the visitors were unsure which outcomes related to the programme. To be certain the assessment methods are appropriate to and effective at measuring the learning outcomes, the visitors need clarity around which learning outcomes the assessments are measuring.

**Suggested evidence:** A definitive list of the learning outcomes and evidence to show how the assessment methods are appropriate and effective at measuring them.

**E.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is an appropriately qualified and experienced prescriber and on the register of their statutory regulator with annotation(s) for prescribing where applicable.**

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider highlighted university academic regulations and the assessment handbook which explained that all programmes must have external review in the form of an external examiner. The visitors were confident that there would be external review of the assessment process but the regulations did not confirm the qualifications and experience required to be an external examiner. The standard requires that at least one external examiner is an appropriately qualified and experienced prescriber and appropriately registered with their statutory regulator. From the information provided the visitors were not able to confirm that at least one external examiner would meet these requirements. The education provider must therefore show how they ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is an appropriately qualified and experienced prescriber and on the register of their statutory regulator.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that at least one external examiner for the programme is an appropriately qualified and experienced prescriber and on the register of their statutory regulator.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain 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](#).