

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Distance learning
Date submission received	15 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14946-W7D4Y6

### 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 .....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	5
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s) .....	6

### 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.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

## 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:

Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Nicola Carey	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04374

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04375

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04400

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

Amendments will be made to learning outcomes, and a new mode of delivery for the programme will be added – a distance-learning route.

### 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.

**A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.**

**Reason:** Following their review of the evidence submitted, the visitors were not clear how the new distance learning (DL) route through the programme would be delivered. They were therefore unable to determine whether the admissions procedures would give DL applicants the information they required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the DL route.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence clarifying how the distance learning route through the programme will work, and how learners will be given appropriate information.

**B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.**

**B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**B.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**B.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Reason:** The visitors' understanding of the programme was that the new distance learning route would require significant additional resourcing, in terms of staff resources, learning resources and IT resources. However, it was not clear to them from the evidence submitted whether this extra resourcing was in place, and if so whether it was appropriate and accessible. They were therefore unable to be clear that this standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence clarifying whether the education provider expects to have to provide extra resources, and if so how it plans to provide such resources and ensure that they are appropriate.

**B.14 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.**

**Reason:** From the evidence submitted, it was not clear to the visitors how the distance learning route would be delivered. They were therefore unable to make a determination as regards how the education provider could reliably identify to learners where attendance will be mandatory.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show that the education provider will identify the parts of the programme where attendance is required.

**C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.**

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear from their review of the evidence how the learning outcomes would be delivered on the distance learning route. There was not a mapping

document which would enable the visitors to understand how the new learning outcomes linked to the standards for Prescribers. More broadly it was not clear to them how the new parts of the programme would be structured, and how it would function, in the absence of significant further evidence relating to this.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the learning outcomes will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

### **C.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear from the evidence supplied how theory and practice would be integrated in the new curriculum.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how theory and practice would be integrated.

### **C.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear from the evidence supplied what learning and teaching approaches would be used on the distance learning variant of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show what learning and teaching approaches would be used.

### **D.6 The designated medical practitioner must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

### **D.7 The designated medical practitioner must undertake appropriate training.**

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear from the evidence supplied that the education provider could demonstrate consistently that the standards were met, as some of the terminology used was not clear. They considered that the documentation as presented was not clear around the different roles involved in supervision on the programme, for example the designated medical practitioners, the practice supervisors and the practice assessors. The documentation refers to the HCPC standards for prescribing when laying out the role of the practice supervisor and practice assessor, when these roles are described by the Nursing and Midwifery Council. The visitors considered that this posed a risk that HCPC registrant learners would not be clear about their role. They considered also that there needed to be much clearer explanation of the role of Practice Assessor, Practice Supervisor and DMP within the documentation.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which clearly lays out the different roles within the programme, their position in regard to the relevant professional and regulatory bodies, and the training each will receive.

## **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](#).

## Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The visitors did have an outstanding concern around the mapping of the programme learning outcomes and assessment strategy with the relevant Competency Framework for all Prescribers, as required by the amended standards for prescribing. However, they understood that all education providers with prescribing programmes would be required to demonstrate that they met the revised standards for prescribing through the annual monitoring process during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 academic years. They considered that it would be reasonable and proportionate for the HCPC to use this mechanism to ensure that the standards were met. These programmes are due to go through the audit process in 2019-20.

The visitors also noted that some of the documentation had not been straightforward for them to understand, and suggest that to make sure the standards continue to be met in future the education provider should ensure that it is clear how the evidence presented shows that they meet the standards.