

Visitors' report – amended approval process for independent prescribing programmes

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Executive summary.....	1
Section three: Submission details.....	2
Section four: Additional documentation	2
Section five: Recommendation of the visitors.....	2
Section six: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescribing) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	7 November 2013

Section two: Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve education programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us.

As well as approving educational programmes for individuals who want to join the Register, the HCPC approve programmes for those already on the Register.

Along with several other entitlements, we currently approve programmes to allow:

- chiropodists / podiatrists, radiographers and physiotherapists to have their registration record annotated with supplementary prescribing; and
- chiropodists / podiatrists and physiotherapists to have their registration record annotated with independent prescribing.

We have previously ensured that currently running supplementary prescribing programmes at this education provider have met the standards of education and

training (SETs). As this new or amended programme is based on an existing HCPC approved supplementary prescribing programme, we can be satisfied that it meets some of the standards for prescribing, which are based on the SETs. However, we have identified some standards where we will need to make a judgement about how the introduction or modification of elements of the programme impact on the way it meets these standards.

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets the standards for education providers part of the standards for prescribing, and that those who complete the programme demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for all prescribers (along with the additional standards for independent prescribers where required).

Section three: Submission details

The following required documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Information for applicants (eg advertising materials, admissions / entry criteria)
- Programme specification
- Student handbook
- Information about programme and management team structure, including staff CVs
- Module descriptors
- Extracts from practice placement documents
- Extracts from assessment regulations relating to student progression and external examiners
- Standards for prescribing mapping document

Section four: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for which additional documentation is requested are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section five: Recommendation of the visitors

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme meets the standards for education providers part of the standards for prescribing, and therefore that the programme be approved
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme meets the standards for education providers part of the standards for prescribing. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence, and if required place conditions on approval of the programme.

Section six: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that there were references to the HCPC's former name, the Health Professions Council (HPC) in the documentation. They also noted that the HCPC was incorrectly referenced as the validating body (Appendix 1 - Rationale and critical commentary page 1) and an accreditor (Appendix 2 – NWP Programme specification page 2). This is incorrect as the HCPC approve programmes.

In addition, there was incorrect referencing to the role and remit of the HCPC. For example the subject benchmark statement states that the HCPC "...outline curriculum documents." (Appendix 2 page 5). The HCPC do not outline curriculum guidance for programmes. Therefore the visitors suggest that the programme team update their documentation to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.