

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	St George's, University of London
Name of programme(s)	PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health Professions Council (HPC) members) Level 7, Part time Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members Level 6, Part time Prescribing: Independent and Supplementary, Part time Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Health and Care Professionals Council (HCPC) members), level 7, Part time
Date submission received	15 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15744-K9Y1Z1

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	4

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:

David Rovardi	Independent prescriber
James Pickard	Independent prescriber
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health Professions Council (HPC) members) Level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 April 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04495

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members Level 6
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 April 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04520

Programme name	Prescribing: Independent and Supplementary
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 June 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04521

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Health and Care Professionals Council (HCPC) members), level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 March 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04543

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.

The education provider has informed us they have:

- changed the credit value of the programme;
- changed learning outcomes of the programme; and
- made changes to the programme in line with our revised prescribing standards.

We adopted revised standards for prescribing from September 2019. We are satisfied programmes will continue to meet most of our standards based on the revisions we have made. We expect education providers to have made any changes needed to align their programmes to the HCPC revised standards by September 2019. This can include updating requirements to appoint suitable non-medical prescriber supervisors to support the delivery of programmes. We would normally assess changes relating to the revised prescribing standards via our annual monitoring process. However, as changes to delivery of competence links to revisions of learning outcomes and the credit value of the programme, we will consider all changes that the education provider has flagged through the major change process.

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.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Reason: On their review of the mapping document, the visitors were informed that no changes had been made to the way the programmes meet this standard. The visitors were made aware of a narrative to demonstrate how they meet a different standard which said that “the pre-requisite criterion for the module application is the completion of the Clinical Reasoning in Physical Assessment (CRiPA) (30 credit)”. The visitors were also made aware that from the module descriptor that one of the pre-requisites for entry onto the programme was learners need to complete CRiPA “or equivalent certificated learning.” The visitors were therefore unclear whether the selection and entry criteria includes “equivalent certificated learning”. The visitors need to see further evidence giving clarity about whether the selection and entry criteria includes the completion of “equivalent certificated learning”.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence giving clarity about whether the selection and entry criteria includes the completion of “equivalent certificated learning”.

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](#).