

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Thompson, Juliana, McNall, Anne, Tiplady, Sue, Hodgson, Philip and Proud, Carole (2019) Whole systems approach: Advanced Clinical Practitioner development and identity in primary care. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 33 (4). pp. 443-459. ISSN 1477-7266

Published by: Emerald

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-11-2018-0337> <<https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-11-2018-0337>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/39205/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



Whole systems approach: Advanced Clinical Practitioner development and identity in primary care

Journal:	<i>Journal of Health Organization and Management</i>
Manuscript ID	JHOM-11-2018-0337.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Workforce, Workforce planning, Primary care, Advanced clinical practice, Nursing, Allied health professional

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Whole systems approach: Advanced Clinical Practitioner development and identity in primary care.

Abstract

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to ascertain primary care Advanced Clinical Practitioners' (ACP) perceptions and experiences of what factors influence the development and identity of ACP roles, and how development of ACP roles that align with Health Education England's capability framework for advanced clinical practice can be facilitated in primary care.

Design/methodology/approach

The study was located in the North of England. A qualitative approach was used in which 22 staff working in primary care who perceived themselves to be working as ACPs were interviewed. Data analysis was guided by Braun and Clarke's (2006) six phase method.

Findings

Five themes emerged from the data – the need for: a standardised role definition and inclusive localised registration; access to/availability of quality accredited educational programmes relevant to primary care and professional development opportunities at the appropriate level; access to/availability of support and supervision for ACPs and trainee ACPs; a supportive organisational infrastructure and culture; and a clear career pathway.

Originality/value

Findings have led to the generation of the Whole System Workforce Framework of INfluencing FACTors (IN FACT), which lays out the issues that need to be addressed if ACP capability is to be maximised in primary care. This paper offers suggestions about how IN FACT can be addressed.

Keywords: Workforce, workforce planning, primary care, advanced clinical practice, nursing, allied health professional

Paper type: Research paper

Introduction

The challenges that primary care is facing have been well documented. Issues include increasing demand on primary care services to support an ageing population with growing numbers of older people living with complex multi-morbidities and frailty (Barnett *et al.*, 2012a; NHS England, 2014; NHS England, 2019). In addition, the primary care sector is faced with increasing budgetary and organisational pressures (Fawdon and Adams, 2013), rising demand and increased patient expectations (Williams, 2017), and continuing problems with staff shortages, particularly general practitioner (GP) shortages (NHS England, 2019). The Centre for Workforce Intelligence (CFWI, 2014) identified that the existing GP workforce did not have sufficient capacity to meet current and expected patient needs. The *Five Year Forward View* (NHS England, 2014) suggested radical changes to current care models, which would support out of hospital care and the integration of health and social care. In response, the *General Practice Forward View: GPFV* (NHS England, 2016) aimed to support general practice with a strategy that included creating 5,000 additional doctors and at least 5,000 non-medical staff working in general practice by 2020/21, and investing in development programmes for practice nurses and administration staff. The focus on primary care continues in the recently published *NHS Long Term Plan* (NHS England, 2019). This report proposes extending the skills of registered professionals and developing advanced clinical practitioner (ACP) roles. These changes aim to mitigate some of the challenges of an overloaded GP workforce, offering opportunities for improved patient centred care, organisational efficiencies, and rewarding careers for health professionals.

Currently, ACP roles are utilised in a number of ways within primary care. NHS Digital (2018a) data for general and personal medical services suggest GP practices employ ACPs with nursing, pharmacy, physiotherapy, and paramedic backgrounds. These staff primarily provide care for presenting patients from initial clinical assessment to diagnosis, treatment and evaluation of care (Swan *et al.*, 2015). Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) and NHS Trusts employ ACPs as nurse consultants, extended practice physiotherapists, and advanced practitioner speech and language therapists (SALTs). Occupational therapists, dieticians and opticians working as advanced practitioners are increasingly being employed (NHS Digital, 2018b). These CCG/NHS Trust employees are expert clinicians, lead the development of non-medical led services, and lead service improvement and service transformation initiatives (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy, 2016; Pottle, 2018).

Literature review

A number of studies suggest the development of non-medical advanced practice roles in primary care is a response to medical staff shortages resulting from difficulties in recruitment

and retention (Delamaire and Lafortune, 2010; Barton *et al.*, 2012a; Williams, 2017). These authors suggest that to a large extent, the introduction of these roles involves a substitution of tasks away from doctors, with the main aim being to reduce demands on doctors' time, improve access to care, and reduce costs. Participants in Clay and Stern's (2015) study *Making Time in General Practice* commissioned by NHS England, estimated that 27% of GP appointments were potentially avoidable if the bureaucratic system operated differently. The most common potentially avoidable GP consultations were where the patient would have been better served by consulting someone else in the wider primary care team, for example, an ACP. A number of studies identify the benefits of the ACP role. For example, systematic reviews into the effectiveness of the ACPs in primary and community care services undertaken by Begley *et al.* (2013), Donald *et al.* (2013) and Laurant *et al.* (2018) suggest ACP care improves patients' functional, health and psychological status; improves rates of patients' goal achievements, and increases levels of family-expressed satisfaction. Swan *et al.*'s (2015) systematic review of the quality of ACP care delivery suggests that ACPs in primary care settings perform as well as medical staff in terms of clinical outcomes and patient satisfaction, but at a lower cost.

Despite the benefits that can arise from ACP care, a number of challenges to the development and effectiveness of the role have been identified. As highlighted above, the development of advanced roles in primary care has been reactionary in nature. In addition, in England, primary care is provided by a variety of health and social care providers including GP practices (which are independent employers), NHS Trusts, private social care providers and voluntary services. A number of studies suggest that these two factors have led to difficulties in defining, further developing and valuing the role. Bryant-Lukosious *et al.*'s (2004) evaluation of the implementation of ACPs identifies a range of problems relating to these difficulties: inconsistency and confusion about job title terminology; lack of clear definition in relation to role and objectives; and limited use of evidence-based approaches to guide role development, implementation and evaluation. A decade later these issues remain pertinent. Surveys and studies exploring ACP job titles and descriptions have identified considerable variation (East *et al.*, 2015; Elliot *et al.*, 2016). Barton *et al.* (2012b) and Fawdon and Adams's (2013) studies identified that recruitment to, and development of, advanced roles is ad hoc. These authors argue that such role inconsistency and confusion leads to inefficiencies in care, inconsistencies in levels of competency, duplication in care activities, ineffective professional relationships, and undeveloped career structures and pathways.

A number of suggestions have been made about how to address inconsistency in ACP roles and competence. For example, some organisations have attempted to define the role. The International College of Nursing (2008) focusing specifically on nurses, rather vaguely defines the role as:

A registered nurse who has acquired the expert knowledge base, complex decision-making skills and clinical competencies for expanded practice, the characteristics of which are shaped by the context and/or country in which s/he is credentialed to practice.

In England, more recent definitions have been extended to include descriptions of expected practice levels, and minimum education standards. For example, DH policy statements expect that ACPs will have successfully achieved Master's level education (DH, 2010). Pearce and Breen (2018) provide a definition of ACP identifying that:

Advanced practice is a level of practice, rather than a type of speciality of practice...advanced clinical practitioners (ACPs) are educated to Master's level and are assessed as competent in practice, using expert knowledge and skills. They have the freedom and authority to act, making autonomous decisions.

By setting out clear frameworks for Master's level education, and emphasising autonomous practice, these definitions suggest ACP roles are not substitutes for medical care, but roles that enhance services.

Other organisations provide further clarity about the nature of 'expert knowledge and skills'. The DH's (2010) benchmark for advanced level nursing comprises of 28 elements grouped under four themes – clinical/direct care practice; leadership and collaborative practice; improving quality and developing practice, and developing self and others. Health Education England's (HEE) (2017) definition is similar in many respects to these definitions, but highlights the multi-professional potential of the role:

Advanced clinical practice is delivered by experienced, registered health and care practitioners. It is a level of practice characterised by a high degree of autonomy and complex decision making. This is underpinned by a master's level award or equivalent that encompasses the four pillars of clinical practice, leadership and management, education and research, with demonstration of core capabilities and area specific clinical competence.

These statements and definitions advocate for agreed standards for ACP as a way forward. In England, the question of registration of the role, however, has been the subject of long-standing debate. From a nursing perspective, Barton *et al.* (2012a) identify that UK regulatory debates have continued over decades, Ward and Barratt (2005) highlighted continued interest in this area, and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) has called for consultation (Royal College of Nursing (RCN) 2010). However, ACPs as part of the NMC

and Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) registers has remained unrealised. Barton *et al.* (2012a) suggest that registration is unlikely and potentially unworkable, and propose advanced practitioners represent no greater public risk than new registrants, therefore, a separate part of the register would hold little benefit. Nevertheless, concerns about lack of registration remain. This has resulted in a number of suggestions about how to regulate the role in the absence of national registration. Barton *et al.* (2012b) and East *et al.* (2015) highlight the use of governance via local NHS regulation, and the use of integrated health education boards. In England, the RCN (2018) has developed the notion of 'credentialing', where practitioners can apply to be recognised as ACPs via an on-line application, but this is not universally recognised as a means of regulation.

Achieving a standardised role definition is not the only challenge in the development and implementation of the ACP role in primary care. Kennedy *et al.* (2015) note wide variation in ACP education programmes offered by universities. These authors propose that such variation exacerbates inconsistencies in ACP competency levels, and preparedness for the role. Some studies have proposed that the role is only effective where service design as a whole is supportive. Imison *et al.* (2016) caution that careful attention to service design, executive level commitment to incorporating ACP roles within business/workforce planning, and effective education, training and commissioning processes are essential. The authors propose that without these, new and extended roles will simply supplement the existing workforce, rather than leading and managing care; cost rather than save; threaten the quality of care; and fragment care. Miller *et al.*'s (2009) evaluation of ACP roles, and the West Midlands' ACP framework (HEE, 2015) also emphasise the importance of executive support and a team approach when introducing new advanced roles, particularly if roles are to be standardised, sustainable and impact positively on service outcomes.

Previous literature suggests that the inclusion of ACPs in primary care can enhance care provision and alleviate some of the workload pressures on GPs. However, inconsistency and confusion about the scope and competency of ACP activity has led to calls for standardisation of the ACP role definition, and ACP education programmes and qualification requirements; ACP registration, and executive level commitment to ACP development processes. As few studies consider ACPs' perceptions and experiences of the factors that influence the development and utilisation of the role in primary care settings, the aim of this study was to explore these factors.

This paper reports on an aspect of a wider study commissioned by Health Education England to scope the profile and application of ACP in primary care in the North of England, and identify any specific developments required to support ACP is to be effectively

maximised 'at scale' within primary care. This article does not represent the study's findings in entirety, but presents the phase 2 aspect: ACPs' perceptions and experiences of what factors influence the development and identity of ACP roles, and how development of ACP roles that align with the 4 pillars of HEE's ACP capability framework can be facilitated.

Methods

For the study as a whole, a mixed methods approach was used. As phase 2 focused on exploring factors that influence the development of ACPs, a qualitative approach was taken for this aspect of the study.

Sample

The study location was the 3 HEE regions in the North of England (North West, Central North, and North East). During phase 1 of the study, an online survey was opened to staff working in primary care in these regions who perceived themselves to be working as ACPs. Due to the potential for variability in definitions and perceptions about what constitutes advanced clinical practice, purposive and snowball sampling was used. In total, 116 surveys were returned. All staff who completed the survey were invited to take part in an interview. Those agreeing to participate were requested to sign a consent form.

A total of 22 individuals agreed to participate in interviews. 91% were female; mean age was 49.1 years (SD=8.4 years); mean years qualified as a healthcare professional was 27 years (SD=9.8 years), and mean years working as an ACP since qualification was 13.5 years (SD=10.9 years). Table 1 provides details of participants' job groups, professional backgrounds, and employing sectors:

Table 1: Interview participants

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Data collection

Individual semi-structured interviews were carried out to explore participants' views and experiences of their ACP role. Topics covered during interviews were: professional and educational pathway to becoming an ACP, support required to achieve this, role activities in relation to the 4 pillars of the ACP framework, and barriers and enablers for future development. Participants were interviewed at locations chosen by themselves, and 15 chose to be interviewed at their work location, 3 were interviewed at the university, and 4 were telephone interviews. As all members of the research team were involved in

interviewing, an interview schedule was used to maximise consistency in interview approach.

Data analysis

Audio recordings were made of the interviews. Audio recorded data was transcribed verbatim, then open coded by individual members of the research team. This allowed elucidation and description of participants' experiences, while creating meaningful themes. Thematic analysis was chosen as it is 'a method for organising, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organises and describes data set in (rich) detail' (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.79). The approach taken was inductive, in other words the analysis was data-driven, rather than theory-driven. The 6 phase guide to conducting thematic analysis, as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006) was used. During this process, all transcripts were independently coded by another team member, and the outcomes were compared with the original coding to validate themes.

Research ethics approval to undertake the study was secured from the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Northumbria University on 16 April 2018.

Findings

Findings from the study suggested that five factors had a significant influence. These were: role definition; access to/availability of quality educational and professional development opportunities; support and supervision, organizational culture and infrastructure; career pathway. These factors are discussed below.

Role definition

Participants' responses suggested that there is a lack of standardisation and consistency with regard to the ACP role. They proposed that an ACP role definition is required that is standardised across all sectors and organisations working in primary care, and that this standard definition should be based upon a number of factors. For example, practitioners need to be able to demonstrate a set of standardised advanced capabilities, if they are to be assigned the ACP title:

C2: There is such variation of skills in ACP, many working at different levels. If we're trying to make it a consistent standard that people meet and adhere to, then there's a consistency in practice and expectations.

Some participants said that implementing this requirement would be difficult because ACPs are employed in different sectors, professions and organisations. A number of participants proposed that a solution to this problem would be regulation via registration of the role with the NMC and HCPC:

W1: I would want it to be the NMC that would do that...our regulatory body. It's protection for people who are employing these people. People who are misusing the title.

Participants also suggested that a standardised capability framework and regulation would inform a standardised practice remit, job titles, and job descriptions for ACPs. They identified that currently there is a distinct lack of standardisation in these areas, resulting in problems such as varying remits, and confusion about remits and capabilities. Some participants argued that this leads to inefficiencies in care because the ACP role is not utilised to its full potential:

W2: I don't think people really understand it...that the term clinical specialist or nurse practitioner or practice nurse or non-medical prescriber, and advanced practitioner...And the impact is that I work in one place and I do all my referrals to consultants and two-week waits and things. And, in another place that I work, they don't think that that's really my role to do that, so it's less efficient.

Findings indicated that practice remits, and job titles and descriptions are often driven by the needs of individual employing organisations, rather than the ACP capability framework. Many interview participants, particularly those employed in GP practices proposed that they are primarily employed to ease the pressure on GPs affected by GP recruitment problems, which leads to the perception that they are 'inferior GPs' (C3). Some participants said because they are employed to 'fill clinical gaps' they are not required, or given opportunities to practice advanced level skills in leadership, education or research:

W2: It's frustrating. Certainly, all I do is clinical practice. Because I don't do any leadership. I don't do much teaching. And I don't do any research. And we all know that that is predominantly how nurses are used.

The majority of interviewees were nurse ACPs employed in GP practices. Recruiting participants from other professions and other sectors proved problematic. Participants who were recruited from these areas suggested low response rates were perhaps due to: AHPs not being regarded as ACPs, despite working to an advanced level, and can struggle to acknowledge ACP status themselves; the perception that ACPs do not work in the private sector.

E6: It's not my title, and my husband, who is a nurse consultant, he said, "You're not advanced clinical practice. That's a nurse consultant role". But actually, when

I think about the four pillars...this is bread and butter for me. I am an advanced clinical practitioner, but in some ways, I don't perceive it as that in my head [OT].

E4: So, advanced practitioners to me are NHS and GP-based, not private sector [care home manager].

Education

Participants discussed a number of challenges in education and development provision, for example, ensuring education courses are available that support and underpin advanced skill development. The majority of participants said that undertaking a formal programme of education specifically constructed to develop students to become ACPs in primary care is essential. The introduction of ACP Master's degree programmes that align with the HEE ACP framework was welcomed by the vast majority of interviewees. Those who had undertaken an ACP Master's degree programme felt that this had improved their critical thinking and decision-making skills, and 'changed' their professional identity:

W1: Master's level study is to critique evidence that is out there...And it's made a difference to my practice. And it has changed the practitioner I am to when I started the Masters - has changed.

When asked about their views on the quality of educational and professional development programmes they had accessed, participants expressed a number of concerns. Firstly, they said that ACP study programmes offered by universities vary in quality, which they felt impacts on the levels of care quality provided by ACPs undertaking these courses. To address this, participants proposed that a standard ACP course should be offered by all universities:

E3: It needs to be absolutely standard....We talk about managing unwarranted variation in all aspects of our care. I think this is no different.

Participants reported that quality depends upon courses' relevance to practice. Some felt that current provision does not always address the advanced level needs for ACP practice. They also proposed that clinical skills development is most effective when relevant, practice-based approaches are embedded in education. Some participants suggested that current provision lacks this, leaving ACPs unprepared for the demands of their role:

E8: The biggest issue is effective clinical development. Most courses fail to give this because practice-based learning is often limited, time critical and therefore not always sufficient to give the required depth of knowledge.

Participants also commented upon education provision regarding the leadership and research pillars. Again, they suggested this needs to be relevant to their everyday work, and

to innovations and projects they would like to take forward. Participants felt that these aspects are often omitted from courses that tend to be more theoretically-based:

E2: It's helpful to know where to go to look for project management skills and service development, would make much more sense than a purely academic piece of research.

A significant concern for participants was the limited relevance of current ACP education provision to primary care. A number of participants reported that current provision includes courses that are adapted versions of ACP secondary care courses that are already in existence. These participants proposed that if primary care ACP education is to be relevant, valuable and engaging, it has to be developed specifically with primary care in mind:

C1: You need whoever is running the course to be able to understand primary care and be able to see how you give exemplars of what works in primary care versus what works in secondary care. And I think that's been part of the problem is that primary care has been left behind in training courses.

A major issue discussed was funding of education programmes. Participants said that while funding for courses is available (for example, from HEE), backfill needs to be funded to allow trainees to be released from their existing practice roles to enable them to take advantage of learning opportunities. Many participants stated that backfill costs prohibited the expansion of the ACP role in primary care:

E3: The biggest challenge of developing ACPs is that people can't afford to allow that person to become supernumerary, to be learning. You can't get funding for a workforce thing. It's purely about the academic qualification that they fund.

There were some instances where employers had negotiated with CCGs to provide backfill funding. While this support was very much welcomed, participants explained that even where funding for backfill is secured, it can be difficult to obtain because there is a dearth of skilled staff to provide cover:

E2: It's pointless saying to people "We'll give you backfill. We can pay for backfill." Because people aren't sitting about waiting to pop in and fill in a gap.

The inconsistency in the provision of CPD updates, in particular non-medical prescribing (NMP) updates, was referred to during interviews. Participants felt that a more standardised, formalised approach to updates is required, and that updates should occur regularly to ensure ACP practice is safe and up-to-date:

E9: Once you've got your qualification, there doesn't seem to be much afterwards...I feel like we could do with more formal updates for non-medical prescribers. Just to make sure that we're still practicing as we should be.

Support/supervision

Participants proposed that ACP development requires the support and supervision in practice of allocated mentors/supervisors. They suggested that in order for mentors/supervisors to provide adequate support, they need to be fully committed, and need to understand what this role entails in terms of demonstrating, observing and assessing practice, and the long-term commitment involved:

C1: They need to understand what that might mean. That they might need to sit in with the trainee ACP while they're practicing, as an observer. They may need to be there, being the person who's being observed. They need some ability as a mentor. And some understanding of the fact that this is a two-year thing.

Some participants felt that supervision is not only about supporting clinical development, but a means of providing support for staff coming to terms with a change in role, and the uncertainty about professional identity that may bring:

W2: An aspect of clinical supervision, that is seen to be most important is the massive change that goes on when you're transitioning from nurse to ACP. We do nothing to support people at an emotional and personal level, in how they go through the evolution of coping with the change from being an ordinary nurse to an ACP.

Many participants stated that it is essential to obtain the support of practice education facilitators who have knowledge and understanding about ACP development programmes, are skilled at facilitating teaching/learning within practice, understand and can address the logistical and organisational challenges involved in practice learning, and can support both students and mentors:

E3: There's something about practice education facilitation, so you've got that cover. And thinking about the relationship and support that management and mentors need as well.

Organisation and culture

All participants reported that organisational and cultural factors have a significant impact on ACP development and practice. The pressure on services in primary care, together with the GP recruitment crisis, is a driver for ACP recruitment. Some participants suggested recruitment of ACPs to 'fill GP gaps' can restrict ACPs' scope of practice to clinical activities. These participants proposed that a hierarchical culture operates in primary care, whereby GPs are perceived as business/practice/clinical leaders, and the only option to manage complex clinical cases. Some participants said this leads some GPs to feel 'threatened' by

1
2
3 ACPs, which can result in GPs' reluctance to allowing ACPs scope to work at their full
4 potential. They also said that this situation is unlikely to change unless GPs are willing to
5 change how care is organised and delivered:
6
7

8 C4: And there was loads of them that had seen a GP that actually could've seen
9 an ACP nurse or physio, or pharmacist. But I think the doctors don't want to give
10 up their role. So, there's a reluctance from GPs to change.
11

12 Other participants suggested the problem lies less with hierarchical culture, and more with
13 employers' lack of understanding or recognition of the scope or benefits of the ACP role in
14 care delivery. These participants felt that until employers are properly conversant with the
15 scope of the role, opportunities to utilise its full scope would be limited:
16
17

18
19 E8: There needs to be some focus on increasing the understanding and
20 appreciation of ACP roles across the wider system to ensure that the scope of
21 the job is recognized.
22
23

24 Many of the factors influencing the development and practice of ACPs that were discussed
25 by participants concerned system-wide, organisational infrastructure challenges. For
26 example, cross-organisational ACP referral procedures are inconsistent leading to
27 inefficiencies in practice. While some NHS Trusts and departments accept ACP referrals,
28 others do not:
29
30
31

32 E9: Some of the barriers come from secondary care in some don't like referrals
33 from us. They like referrals from GPs.
34
35

36 Participants working in the private social care sector and voluntary sector proposed that a
37 major difficulty in initiating development of ACPs outside of the NHS is the need for NHS/GP
38 medical support. They explained that the challenges of obtaining agreement for cross-sector
39 support in the current climate prohibits this development:
40
41

42 E9: I just don't know it would be achieved. Who would be able to provide them
43 with the relevant support...that's where we, from a care home perspective, would
44 really struggle.
45
46

47 A few participants proposed that wholesale organisational system change is required if
48 ACPs are to be developed to meet standardised capabilities, have standardised role
49 definitions, receive comprehensive support, and practice to their full potential. This would
50 involve a move away from individual GP practice businesses to large primary care
51 employing organisations. The following interviewees proposed that the current GP led
52 system is too diverse, reactive and inconsistent to offer a standard quality service that is
53 both effective and efficient:
54
55
56
57

58 E3: We haven't moved from general practice to primary care, and we have to
59 move to primary care. I go into every forum now to say if you don't think of primary
60

care as an organisation in a system, that needs the same kind of logistical set up as big Trusts have - we're finished.

Career pathway

During interviews, participants were asked how they became ACPs in primary care.

Although many suggested that there was an appetite for development opportunities, the majority of participants said that there is no clear career pathway for ACPs in the primary care sector. For many participants, career development was a reactive process to address local need. For example, many were directed towards the role specifically to address gaps in service:

W3: I'd worked in the practice for nearly 30 years, then at the time there was a shortage of GPs and there was funding, so I was nudged in that direction.

Others had moved into primary care after long careers in secondary care. These participants often commented that this move was a kind of 'winding down'. One interviewee 'fell into the role' when looking for post-retirement opportunities:

E8: I fell into the role by accident, retired from an NHS role and actually through visiting my own GP surgery and seeing the nurse there thought it would be interesting.

Phase 1 of the study indicated that in primary care, many ACPs are reaching or considering retirement. In addition, the responses cited above show that the ACP primary care role may not be perceived as a dynamic role, or a career goal in its own right. Many participants were concerned that this would result in: gaps in the ACP workforce in the near future because there is no structured succession plan; a depletion of other parts of the workforce as staff are moved into ACP roles to fill that gap; staff who have 'fallen into' ACP roles not having the advanced level skills required to manage an ageing population with complex needs. Most participants expressed the opinion that in order to address these problems, more needs to be done to develop a clear career pathway. Many said that having the ACP framework was a good start, but that other factors need to be considered too, for example, developing a pathway requires an infrastructure, funding and organizational processes to facilitate skilled backfill, and learning support in practice in order to provide a sustainable professional development 'flow'. Many participants stated establishing a career pathway and an ongoing professional development 'flow' would be best facilitated by a nationally recognised career framework. They also suggested that currently, ACP level practice is the most nurses and AHPs can expect to achieve in clinical primary care, but a formalised, standard national career framework, which prescribes a career pathway, would enable development beyond ACP:

C5: At present once you are an ACP, you are perceived to be at the top of your clinical career path. Surely we should be seeing this is the initial stepping point to progression as a "General Clinical Practitioner" for those that want to progress. I would hope that one day these individuals are given a career pathway to support this.

Discussion

Findings from the study suggest that a number of factors influence the development and practice of ACPs in primary care settings, and ACP professional identity. These are not limited to access to, and quality of, education but reflect the need for a 'systems thinking approach' as findings demonstrate a need to address role definition, supervision/support requirements, organizational infrastructure and culture factors, and career progression, as well as education. Table 2 summarizes the findings of the study and highlights the influencing factors (IN FACT framework) that should be considered if ACPs in primary care to be effectively maximized at scale:

Table 2: IN FACT framework

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Role Definition

Fundamentally, findings from this study have identified that a major challenge for ACPs in primary care is negotiating and navigating their professional identity, and their professional boundaries and development, where there is a system-wide lack of understanding or recognition of the scope or benefits of the ACP role in care delivery. This lack of understanding may result from a perception of ACPs as 'gap fillers', and confusion, in the absence of a standard definition, about what the remit of ACP actually is. Findings also identified that AHPs and staff from the private and voluntary sector are less likely to be recognised as ACPs, even if they have extended practice roles. This can impact in various ways. ACPs working in GP practices suggested their practice is restricted and professional boundaries are reduced. Their expectations of what ACP working is are therefore not realised, nor are they working at their full potential – something which they found frustrating. Their response reflects Hackman and Oldman's role characteristic model (Hackman and Oldham, 1980, Devaro et al., 2007), which proposes that such circumstances impact on occupational identity and job satisfaction. The model supposes that job satisfaction results from individuals' abilities to perform the work characteristics which they perceive to be intrinsic to their role. The performance of expected characteristics associated with any role

increases job satisfaction because there is a link between expectations regarding role and feelings of personal meaningfulness. When the actuality of the role does not equate with expectations, then job satisfaction is diminished, and role identity becomes uncertain. On the other hand, ACPs employed by the private and voluntary sector, and those with AHP backgrounds, 'internalised' the lack of understanding about their ACP status to the extent that they did not always recognise themselves as ACPs. This may be a consequence of interpellation, defined for example, by Althusser (1971), as the process by which a social situation precedes or produces an individual's sense of their own identity. Only by changing the social situation, in this case by clearly promoting ACP as inclusive and broad, can this be rectified.

Findings indicate other possible contributing factors to restrictions in ACP practice are at play. For example, negotiating differing agendas generates a tension for ACPs, particularly those working in GP practices. This group of participants acknowledged their role in 'freeing up GPs', as intended by the *GP Forward View*. However, they also proposed GPs can be reluctant to relinquish aspects of their role other than 'routine' clinical practices. It may be that some GPs resist any role overlap, as an incursion on their own professional identity and boundaries. This can lead to the creation of a hierarchy of practice whereby leadership, education, research and complex clinical practice become the remits of medics, and the scope and career progression of ACP practice is restricted, and potentially undervalued. Judge *et al.* (2000) suggest restricting complexity within occupational roles can impact on individuals' self-concept. Complex activities are more likely to require and encourage skill improvement, interest and innovation, aspects which promote feelings of fulfilment and positive self-concept. Furthermore, ACPs undertaking restricted practice fails to acknowledge the strategic plan (NHS England 2015; 2019) to develop primary care and out of hospital services to meet the changing demographics.

Organisational system change

Some participants argued for wholesale organisational system change if ACPs are to be developed to meet standardised capabilities, have standardised role definitions, receive comprehensive support, practice to their full potential, and have opportunities for career progression. These participants proposed radical system change, involving a move away from individual GP practice and private businesses to large primary care employing organisations, in which ACPs would work alongside a range of professionals. Robertson *et al.*'s (2016) report on clinical commissioning for the King's Fund, to some extent supports this finding. The report proposes that effective, efficient primary care that is consistently of a

high quality, requires an integrated organisation of care delivery including 'scaled up' forms of care. In GP practice in England, scaling up is generally achieved via federation working. In 2008, the Royal College of GPs (RCGP) published its plan for primary care federations. In this plan, federations were viewed as a method of offering extended services, strengthen links with other primary care services, and redesign services to be closer to patients. There was no mention of plans for ACP utilisation at scale. The NHS *Five year Forward View*, proposed future care models including multi-speciality community providers (MCP). MCPs offer federations the potential to integrate with community services to create a broader, resilient type of general practice with a single whole population budget. Plans and recommendations for the development of MCPs and federations recognise that they could facilitate flexible and adaptable workforce models, and centralisation and standardisation of workforce development (Connor, 2016; NHS England, 2016). However, these recommendations do not make clear whether these new models should include plans for ACP practice. In this study, participants who suggested the GP model was restrictive were employed in federation and non-federation practices. This suggests that the utilisation of the full ACP potential at scale is less about the size of the employing organisation, and more about employment and workforce development strategies.

Access to professional development programmes

Findings suggest education level and professional registration can influence role identity and development of ACPs. Professional registration and having a Master's qualification were viewed as integral to being an ACP. This reflects Beddoe's (2010) work, which suggests professional registration and qualifications support standardisation of practice and facilitate safe, effective care, but also generate professional capital, recognition, understanding and value for the role from the perspectives of both the individual practitioner, and the society in which they work. The question of registration has been the subject of debate for several years. Critics of registration with professional bodies propose it is unnecessary and unworkable, because ACPs are already registrants therefore do not represent any greater risk to the public than non-ACPs (Barton *et al.*, 2012a). In the absence of national professional registration, East *et al.* (2015) propose local NHS regulation. However, NHS-held registers would not account for ACPs working in the private and voluntary sectors.

While participants welcomed the advent of a requirement for a Master's degree, some proposed having a Master's qualification in itself is not enough. This is because a tension exists between being 'educated to Masters level', and 'how staff are educated to Masters level'. Lack of standardisation of programmes leads to differentials in ACP capability, but also findings indicate that current Master's education is not practice-based enough, in that

education (particularly research and leadership) focus on theory and philosophies that do not sit well with practical project management/service improvement that are expected of the ACP role. In addition, participants were concerned that ACP programmes do not adequately address the requirements of primary care. While this can be detrimental to the quality of primary care specific competency development, it also suggests that primary care is not acknowledged as an area requiring advanced practice skills in its own right. According to Beddoe (2013), areas of practice are devalued where there is such absence of professional recognition.

For participants, supervision and support within the working environment are integral to ACP competency development, but also to supporting a sense of role identity. Illeris (2014), extended Mezirow's (2000) work on transformational learning and argued that learning and competency development are psychosocial processes, not simply cognitive processes. As such, identity both influences, and is influenced by, interaction between the individual and the social environment in which learning and development takes place. For Illeris (2014), lack of this interaction can lead to a poorly developed sense of identity resulting in practitioners learning 'tasks', rather than fulfilling 'role' – in this case, clinical skills rather than fulfilling the role remit as perceived in the ACP literature.

Some previous approaches include methods that may be useful in addressing these factors. For example, the West Midlands ACP framework (HEE, 2015) has standardised the ACP role across England's West Midlands region via engaging all healthcare and university stakeholders in the development and incorporation of the ACP role into organisations. The West Midlands' model also acknowledges the benefits of practice-based education, and supervision and support networks by integrating formal clinical supervision and team support into its workforce development approach. A difficulty with the West Midlands model, however, is that in aiming for standardisation, paradoxically it is perhaps too generic, and in need of consideration and adaptation for the primary care context. In this study, a major concern of participants was that current ACP development approaches are grounded in secondary care approaches, and are not relevant enough for primary care requirements.

Standardisation of programmes can be achieved through commissioning and greater awareness, and use of, apprenticeships, although this would require aligning ACP study programmes with national apprenticeship standards. The apprenticeship model could be useful as a means to support provision of effective learning environments, as learning would be practice-based, which participants proposed was the most effective method of ensuring learning is relevant to their development needs. Also, contractually, apprenticeships would

commit the required resources to provide practice-based support and supervision that is of a standardised, high quality. Apprenticeships do not on their own address some of the other problems highlighted in the study, for example, lack of understanding about the role and remit of ACPs, and difficulties in cross-organisational working.

Career Progression

Findings show that career progression opportunities for ACPs are limited and inconsistent, and there is no clear ACP career pathway, or opportunities to develop beyond the ACP role. Barton *et al.* (2012b) proposes that this is to be expected in circumstances where there is no standard role definition, job title or job description. Findings indicate the lack of career pathway can adversely influence professional identity and as well as professional development, as the situation means staff often drift into the role reactively to 'fill gaps', or take on the role as a means of 'winding down' their careers. Bern-Klug *et al.* (2003) suggest that a number of worker 'types' exist, including 'inheritors' – workers, such as some participants in this study, who enter an occupation because they have inherited a position, or because they have settled for any position. The authors argue that if an occupation's workers are primarily 'inheritors', then occupational status is lowered, and the occupation becomes an unattractive employment prospect

Recommendations

During the discussion, proposals have been suggested to address the requirements of the IN FACT framework, but these may be insufficient, as none address the system in its entirety. A potential whole-system strategy could be the development of primary care workforce development hubs, which are employing organisations funded by health education commissioners (in England, this would be HEE), as a means to facilitate standardisation of workforce development. In this model, the hub would take on responsibility for developing capacity for practice-based learning and assessment, and ongoing supervision of ACPs, both during formal learning programmes and upon qualification. The team would comprise of ACPs working as workforce development leads/practice educators, GP vocational training leads and practice placement facilitators. This ensures that appropriate skills resources are readily available, enabling members of the team undertaking ACP study to have time to engage fully with the course. This team would provide the infrastructure to develop practice placements in primary care; and support, supervise and assess students in practice on a wide range of programmes including ACP with backgrounds in nursing and AHP. It may be beneficial to allocate student ACPs to hubs, rather than individual practices or organisations. This would enable students to experience a range of primary care placements, maximising

opportunities to develop confidence and competence in working across an integrated care system, and could maximise ACP development in primary care at scale. This would also alleviate some of the pressures and challenges faced by employing organisations regarding ongoing provision of a learning environment and backfill for employees who are both studying and working as clinical practitioners within that environment.

In terms of professional registration, if ACP capabilities are clearly defined and able to be evidenced, voluntary local registration is possible and could be managed at regional level by the hubs. This would inform future workforce planning and development, and could encompass all ACPs working in primary care, including independent sector workers.

Findings suggest it is imperative that a universally accepted definition of ACP is implemented, and a National Career Framework for primary care ACPs is introduced. Using the primary care hub approach discussed above would support a professional development ‘flow’ through the primary care workforce system, which could facilitate future workforce succession planning, and the development of a workforce skilled in managing care specifically in the primary care setting.

Conclusion

The debate about how best to address the challenges of an overloaded GP workforce, improve patient care, and facilitate organisational efficiencies, remains a prominent political, health and social care, and economic theme. Previous literature suggests inclusion of ACPs in the primary care workforce can contribute to the mitigation of these challenges, but standardisation of role and competency are required if the initiative is to be effective. To-date, proposals to address these challenges have been insufficient on their own. Utilising a workforce development approach to explore ACPs’ perceptions and experiences of ACP identity and role development has led to the generation of the Whole System Workforce Framework of Influencing Factors (IN FACT), which lays out the issues that need to be addressed if ACP potential is to be maximised in primary care. This paper offers suggestions about how IN FACT can be addressed. However, as the study findings are based on the responses of a small number of participants located in the North of England, recommendations offered need to be piloted, and evaluations undertaken to measure impact on a range of outcomes including practitioner, patient and practice outcomes, and cost benefit analysis.

References

- Althusser, L. (1971), "Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation)", in Brewster, B. (Ed.), *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, Monthly Review Press, NY, pp.127-186.
- Barnett, K., Mercer, S.W., Norbury, M., Watt, G., Wyke S, and Guthrie, B. (2012), "Epidemiology of multimorbidity and implications for health care, research, and medical education: A cross-sectional study", *Lancet*, Vol.380 No.9836, pp.37-43.
- Barton, T.D., Bevan, L., and Mooney, G. (2012b), "A governance framework for advancing nursing", *Nursing Times*, Vol.108 No.25, pp.22-24.
- Barton, T.D., Bevan, L., and Mooney, G. (2012a), "The development of advanced nursing roles", *Nursing Times*, Vol.108 No.24, pp.18-20.
- Beddoe, L. (2010), *Building Professional Capital: New Zealand Social Workers and Continuing Education*. Deakin University, Victoria.
- Beddoe, L. (2013), "Health social work: Professional identity and knowledge", *Qualitative Social Work*, Vol.12 No.1, pp. 24-40.
- Begley, C., Elliot, N., Lalor, J., Coyne, I., Higgins, A., and Comiskey, C.M. (2013), "Differences between clinical specialist and advanced practitioner clinical practice, leadership, and research roles, responsibilities, and perceived outcomes (the SCAPE study)", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol.69 No.6, pp.323–1337.
- Bern-Klug, M., Buenaver, M., Skirchak, D., & Tunget, C. (2003), "I get to spend time with my patients': Nursing home physicians discuss their role", *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, Vol.4 No.3, pp.145-151.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), "Using thematic analysis in psychology", *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, Vol.3 No.2, pp.77-101.
- Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Browne, G., and Pinelli J. (2004), "Advanced practice nursing roles: Development, implementation and evaluation", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol.48 No 5, pp.519–529.
- Centre for Workforce Intelligence. (2014), "In-depth review of the general practitioner workforce: Final report 2014", available at: <http://www.cfwl.org.uk/publications/in-depth-review-of-thegpworkforce/attachment.pdf> (accessed 20 October 2018).
- Chartered Society of Physiotherapy. (2016), "Advanced practice in physiotherapy", available at: https://www.csp.org.uk/system/files/csp_advanced_practice_physiotherapy_2016_2.pdf (accessed 14 January 2019).
- Clay, H., and Stern, R. (2015), "Making time in general practice", available at: https://www.primarycarefoundation.co.uk/images/PrimaryCareFoundation/Downloading_Reports/PCF_Press_Releases/Making-Time-in_General_Practice_FULL_REPORT_28_10_15.pdf (accessed 18 January 2019).
- Connor, R. (2016), "Supporting sustainable general practice: A guide to networks and federations for general practice", available at: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/south/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2015/12/guide-netwrks-feds-gp.pdf> (accessed 20 October 2018).

Delamaire, M. and Lafortune, G. (2010), "Nurses in advanced roles: A description and evaluation of experiences in 12 developed countries", available at: [http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=delsa/hea/wd/hwp\(2010\)5&doclanguage=en](http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=delsa/hea/wd/hwp(2010)5&doclanguage=en) (accessed 20 October 2018).

Department of Health. (2010), *Advanced Level Nursing: A Position Statement*, Stationery Office, London.

Devaro, J., Li, R. and Brookshire, D. (2007), "Analysing the job characteristics model: New support from a cross-section of establishments", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.18 No.6, pp.986-1003

Donald, F., Martin-Misener, R., Carter, N., Sonald, E., Kaasalainen, S., Wickson-Griffiths, A., Lloyd, M., Akhtar-Danesh, N. and DiCenso, A. (2013), "A systematic review of the effectiveness of advanced practice nurses in long term care", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol.69 No.10, pp.2148–2161.

East, L., Knowles, K. and Pettman, M. (2015), "Advanced level nursing in England: Organisation challenges and opportunities", *Journal of Nursing Management*, Vol.23 No.8, pp.1011-1019.

Elliot, N., Begley, C., Sheaf, G. and Higgins, A. (2016), "Barriers and enablers to advanced practitioners' ability to enact their leadership role: A scoping review", *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, Vol.60, pp.24-45.

Fawdon, H. and Adams, J. (2013), "Advanced clinical practitioner role in the emergency department", *Nursing Standard*, Vol.28 No.16-18, pp.48-51.

Hackman, J. and Oldham, G. (1980), *Work Redesign*, Addison-Wesley, MA.

Health Education England. (2015), "Advanced clinical practice framework for the West Midlands", available at: <https://hee.nhs.uk/sites/default/files/documents/West%20Midlands%20Advanced%20Clinical%20Practice%20Framework.pdf> (accessed 20 October 2018).

Health Education England. (2017), "Multi-professional framework for advanced clinical practice in England", available at: <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Multi-professional%20framework%20for%20advanced%20clinical%20practice%20in%20England.pdf> (accessed 20 October 2018).

Illeris, K. (2014). "Transformative learning and identity", *Journal of Transformative Education*, Vol.12 No.2, pp.148-163.

Imison, C., Castle-Clarke, S. and Watson, R. (2016), "Reshaping the workforce to deliver the care patients need: Research Report, Nuffield Trust", available at: <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/reshaping-the-workforce-web-final.pdf> (accessed 20 October 2018).

International College of Nursing. (2008), "Definition and characteristics of the role: Nurse practitioner and advanced practice roles", available at:
<https://international.aanp.org/Practice/APNRoles> (accessed 20 October 2018).

Judge, T., Bono, J., and Locke, E. (2000), "Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.85, No.2, pp.237-249.

Kennedy, C., Brooks Young, P., Nicol, J., Campbell, K. and Gray-Brunton, C. (2015), "Fluid role boundaries: Exploring the contribution of the advanced nurse practitioner to multi-professional palliative care", *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, Vol.24 No.21-22, pp.3296-3305.

Laurant. M., van-der-Biezen, M., Wijers, N., Watananirun, K., Kontopantelis, E. and van-Vught, A. (2018), "Nurses as substitutes for doctors in primary care". *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Vol.2018 No.7, Art.CD001271.

Mezirow, J., (2000). *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco

Miller, L., Cox, A. and Williams, J. (2009), "Evaluation of the advanced practitioner roles", available at: <https://www.employment-studies.co.uk/system/files/resources/files/465.pdf> (accessed 4 November 2018).

NHS Digital. (2018a), "General and personal medical services, England: Final 31 December 2017 and Provisional 31 March 2018, experimental statistics", available at:
<https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/general-and-personal-medical-services/final-31-december-2017-and-provisional-31-march-2018-experimental-statistics> (accessed 14 January 2019).

NHS Digital. (2018b), "NHS workforce statistics – September 2018", available at:
<https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/nhs-workforce-statistics/september-2018> (accessed 14 January 2019).

NHS England. (2014) "The five year forward view", available at
<https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/5yfv-web.pdf> (accessed 26 January 2019)

NHS England. (2015), "The multispecialty community provider (MCP) emerging care model and contract framework", available at: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/mcp-care-model-frmwrk.pdf> (accessed 16 January 2019).

NHS England. (2016), "General practice forward view", available at:
<https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/gpfv.pdf> (accessed 16 January 2019).

NHS England. (2019), "The NHS long term plan", available at:
<https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/nhs-long-term-plan.pdf> (accessed: 18 January 2019).

Pearce, C. and Breen, B. (2018), "Advanced clinical practice and nurse-led clinics: A time to progress", *British Journal of Nursing*, Vol.27 No 8, pp.444-448.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Pottle, A. (2018) "Reflection on the development of the nurse consultant role", *Nursing Standard*, Vol.33 No.6, pp.45-49.

Robertson, R., Holder, H., Ross, S., Naylor, C. and Machaqueiros, S. (2016), "Clinical commissioning: GPs in charge?" available at: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/field/field_publication_file/Clinical_commissioning_web_pdf.pdf (accessed 15 October 2018).

Royal College of General Practitioners. (2008), "Primary care federations: Putting patients first: A plan for primary care in the 21st century from the Royal College of General Practitioners", available at: file:///C:/Users/Juliana/Downloads/Primary_Care_Federations-document.pdf (accessed 9 October 2018).

Royal College of Nursing. (2010). *Advanced Nurse Practitioners: A RCN Guide to the Advanced Nurse Practitioner Role, Competencies and Programme Accreditation*, RCN, London.

Royal College of Nursing. (2018), "RCN credentialing", available at: <https://www.rcn.org.uk/professional-development/professional-services/credentialing> (accessed 12 October 2018).

Swan, M., Ferguson, S., Chang, A., Larson, E. and Smaldone, A. (2015), "Quality of primary care by advanced practice nurses: A systematic review", *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, Vol.27 No.5, pp.396–404.

Ward, H. and Barratt, J. (2005), "Assessment of nurse practitioner advanced clinical practice skills: Using the objective structured clinical examination (OSCE)", *Primary Health Care*, Vol.15 No.10, pp.37-41.

Williams, K. (2017), "Advanced practitioners in emergency care: A literature review", *Emergency Nurse*, Vol.25 No.4, pp.36-41.

Table 1: Interview participants

Number of participants (n=22)	Job group	Professional background	Employing sector
1	Care home manager	Nurse	Private
1	Home care provider	Nurse	Private
1	Care home provider regional manager	Nurse	Private
1	ACP GP services	Nurse	Self-employed
1	ACP primary care/lecturer	Nurse	NHS
2	Clinical commissioning group (CCG) nurse leads	Nurse	NHS
1	Admiral nurse (dementia nurse)	Nurse	Voluntary
7	ANP GP	Nurse	GP practices (3 from GP federations)
2	CCG strategic workforce leads	AHP	NHS
1	CCG strategic workforce leads	Nurse	NHS
1	Clinical lead for intermediate care	OT	Private
1	Practice educator	OT	NHS
1	Extended scope practitioner/lecturer	Physio	NHS
1	Specialist dietician for older people	Dietician	NHS

Table 2: IN FACT framework

A Whole System Workforce Framework of INfluencing FACTors (IN FACT)	
Standardised role definition and inclusive localised registration	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standardised capabilities and capability framework• Registration/regulation• Clearly defined practice remit, job title, job description• AHPs, private sector, social care sector, voluntary sector inclusion and recognition
Access to/availability of quality accredited educational and professional development opportunities at the appropriate level	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Masters/APEL aligned to standardised capabilities and capability framework• Standardised, relevant courses that include a practice-based approach• Focus on PRIMARY CARE• Includes regular, formalised CPD updates
Support and supervision	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support within practice for trainee ACPs<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Culture and belief○ Understanding support needs○ Induction into the role○ PEFs• Supervision and support networks for ACPs<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Induction into the primary care sector○ Supervision○ Support networks
Supportive organisational infrastructure and culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support with accessing and understanding costs of ACP development• Provision of backfill for practice and mentorship• Shift in organisational culture• System-wide recognition of the scope and benefits of the ACP role• Cross-organisational agreement to support ACP development and practice (eg between NHS, private sector, voluntary sector, social care sector)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Move to a system-wide primary care organisational model
Career pathway	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• National career framework for ACPs in primary care:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Dynamic, attractive role○ Structured succession planning○ Avoid depletion of other parts of the workforce○ Advanced skills for primary care○ Professional development 'flow' through the system○ Develop beyond ACP level• Regular, formalised appraisals