Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important area of nursing practice. Below are the comments from the Graduate School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health on the consultation document. As the Graduate School is a provider of a Master of Nursing Science with a specific Nurse Practitioner pathway and have two Nurse Practitioners on our academic team we support aspects of the changes proposed but require more information on some areas to give an informed position.

**Question 1: Do you support NP being a broad generic scope of practice and the removal of the requirement for regulation to be restricted to a specific area of practice?**

Yes – this approach safeguards the patient, gives assurance to the clinical team, and protects the nurse.

The scope for the specific area of practice needs further discussion. It needs to be specific enough to give indication as to the area of practice and yet have some breadth for flexibility.

**Question 2: Do you support the focus on leadership in clinical practice in the new proposed scope of practice statement?**

The new statement is not clear in its leadership application and needs to go further and be more specific regarding leadership. There should be some reference to influencing and informing clinical services – leadership is not only at the level of individual patients, but should also be expected within the clinical team, clinical services (working with others) and within the profession. There needs to be acknowledgement of the role of undertaking audit and monitoring, of quality and governance to inform service development and profiling the role of advanced nursing practice within the profession.

**Question 3: Do you agree with the inclusion of advanced nursing skills and knowledge in the proposed new scope of practice?**

It is difficult to see the advanced component within the new scope: this needs to be more clearly articulated. The proposed scope could, technically, describe RN competencies. The word advanced needs more frequent usage in the narrative.

**Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed new scope of practice for nurse practitioners?**

The proposed scope reads more as a role description. Our understanding is that a scope of practice should specify actions and procedures permitted by law for a specific profession and outline restrictions on the role, based on experience and educational qualifications.
Question 5: Do you support a dedicated Master’s programme with a broad focus for nurse practitioner preparation?

We support a broad clinical Masters programme with a dedicated nurse practitioner pathway within it.

Question 6: Do you support the Council’s specific clinical learning time in the programme for nurse practitioners?

Yes – this is required in order to protect the public, clinical team and the nurse.

Question 7: How much clinical learning time should be included in the programmes in addition to the prescribing practicum?

We require more detail before an informed position can be given. We would be happy to comment on this further at a later date.

Question 8: Do you think that a student must have employer support to complete a practicum with supernumery hours?

Whilst ideally yes – the reality is still that many students do not, and should not be disadvantaged in progressing their goal of becoming a Nurse Practitioner. However, the advantage of supernumerary hours is that this is an indication of a substantial commitment by the employer to the post and student.

Question 9: What other requirements for the clinical learning hours should be specified by the Council?

Activities undertaken during clinical learning hours need to be mapped/directed towards the specific NP competencies.

Question 10: Do you think the PG Dip in RN Prescribing for Long Term and Common Conditions should be a pre-requisite for nurse practitioner programme?

No - this would be too restrictive. It could be used as one platform for RN prescribers who want to become NPs but NOT as pre-requisite for NP status/progression.

Question 11: Do you support Nursing Council setting the programme outcome for nurse practitioner programmes.

Yes – and that these should then be able to be locally interpreted and configured.

Question 12: Do you agree with the draft programme outline for nurse practitioners?
This requires more detail before an informed position can be given. We would be happy to comment on this further at a later date.

**Question 13:** Do you think the Council has a role in accrediting tertiary courses and programmes that do not lead to nurse practitioner or RN prescribing?

Yes -this will ensure quality assurance for nursing programmes in New Zealand.