Curatio : Journal of Advanced and Specialized Nursing, and Care Planning
E- ISSN : 3064-4089
Volume. 2 Issue 1 January 2025
Page No: 15-25

Governing Advanced Nursing Practice: Legal Risk Mitigation through Structured Policy Models

Azma Ulia
STIKES Bina Insani Sakti, Indonesia
Correspondent: azmaulia6@gmail.com

Received : December 3, 2024
Accepted : January 12, 2025
Published : January 31, 2025

Citation: Ulia, A., (2021). Governing Advanced Nursing Practice: Legal Risk Mitigation through Structured Policy Models. Curatio : Journal of Advanced and Specialized Nursing, and Care Planning, 2(1), 15-25.

https://doi.org/10.61978/curatio.v2i1.1395

ABSTRACT: Advanced Practice Nurses (APNs) and Nurse Practitioners (NPs) are increasingly recognized for their capacity to enhance healthcare delivery, particularly in underserved areas. However, the expansion of these roles raises concerns about legal risk and liability. This study examines how governance frameworks influence malpractice exposure and support safe integration of APNs. A comparative policy analysis was conducted using data from national regulatory bodies, international guidelines, and empirical malpractice records. Key findings reveal that jurisdictions with structured endorsement systems, such as Australia, and states with full practice authority in the United States, report lower malpractice risks and better care outcomes. Malpractice claims against NPs are concentrated in areas like diagnosis and medication errors, particularly in high-volume care settings. The analysis also shows that legal clarity, ongoing education, and collaborative practice environments significantly mitigate liability exposure. The study concludes that effective governance not restrictive practice is essential for maximizing APN contributions while ensuring legal protection. These insights offer a practical governance model for stakeholders aiming to scale advanced nursing roles globally.

Keywords: Advanced Practice Nursing, Governance, Malpractice, Legal Risk, Nurse Practitioner, Policy Analysis, Healthcare Regulation.

INTRODUCTION

Advanced nursing roles, particularly Advanced Practice Nurses (APNs) and Nurse Practitioners (NPs), have become an integral component of contemporary health system transformation worldwide. The increasing complexity of patient needs, persistent physician shortages, and the growing demand for accessible healthcare services have driven many countries to expand the utilization of APNs as part of broader workforce reforms. This trend has intensified in response to demographic transitions, the rising prevalence of chronic diseases, and systemic disruptions such as those exposed during the COVID-19 pandemic, which underscored the need for flexible

and resilient healthcare delivery models (WHO, 2020). Consequently, international health authorities increasingly recognize APNs as strategic contributors to achieving equitable, efficient, and sustainable health systems.

A substantial body of empirical evidence demonstrates that APNs contribute positively to patient outcomes, healthcare efficiency, and system responsiveness. Systematic reviews and cross-national studies indicate that APNs can deliver care outcomes comparable to those of physicians, particularly in primary care and chronic disease management, while also generating cost efficiencies through reduced hospital utilization and improved care continuity (Laurant et al., 2018; Maier & Aiken, 2016). Countries such as Canada and Australia provide well-documented examples of how structured integration of APNs into primary and specialized care settings can enhance access to services without compromising quality (Duckett & Willcox, 2015). Despite these successes, the global diffusion of APN models remains uneven, characterized by wide variation in regulatory recognition, prescribing authority, and governance arrangements across jurisdictions (Maier et al., 2018).

Legal and regulatory frameworks play a decisive role in shaping the integration and effectiveness of APN practice. These frameworks establish the boundaries of professional authority and strongly influence organizational decisions regarding the employment and deployment of APNs. In contexts where legislation is restrictive or role definitions remain ambiguous, APNs often face limitations on independent practice, medication prescribing, and the provision of comprehensive care (Delamaire & Lafortune, 2010). While some countries, such as Australia, have adopted endorsement-based prescribing models supported by structured collaboration, many others continue to rely on fragmented or cautious regulatory approaches that constrain the full utilization of advanced nursing competencies (Fealy et al., 2018).

Concerns surrounding malpractice liability and professional accountability further affect the expansion of APN roles. The extension of clinical authority to NPs frequently raises questions regarding legal responsibility, particularly in settings where indemnity mechanisms and legal protections are insufficiently defined. As a result, healthcare institutions may perceive greater professional autonomy as an increased legal risk, leading to reduced institutional support for APN-led care models (Kassi et al., 2024;Poghosyan et al., 2017). Conversely, jurisdictions that provide clear liability frameworks and robust insurance coverage tend to demonstrate stronger institutional acceptance of APNs and more extensive service expansion, suggesting that legal clarity functions as an enabler rather than a constraint on advanced nursing practice (Yang et al., 2020).

In response to these challenges, international organizations have increasingly advocated for regulatory harmonization to strengthen APN governance. The International Council of Nurses (ICN) and the European Federation of Nurses Associations (EFN) have proposed standardized frameworks that clearly articulate APN competencies, scopes of practice, and legal authorizations (Nurses, 2020). These frameworks are intended not only to guide national regulatory reforms but also to promote workforce mobility, cross-border collaboration, and more equitable distribution of healthcare resources across regions.

Despite the availability of international guidance, implementation remains highly inconsistent. Within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), regulatory clarity and legal recognition of APNs vary substantially, even among countries with comparable

economic capacity and healthcare infrastructure. While countries such as the United Kingdom and Canada have developed relatively coherent APN regulatory systems, others, including France, are still in the early stages of formalizing advanced nursing roles in legislation (Dubois et al., 2021). This uneven progress limits opportunities for shared accreditation mechanisms, mutual recognition of qualifications, and coordinated workforce development at the international level.

Against this backdrop, the present study examines how governance structures and legal protections shape the effectiveness and safety of advanced nursing practice. The novelty of this research lies in its integration of empirical malpractice data with comparative policy analysis, offering a more comprehensive understanding of how APN roles operate under diverse legal and regulatory conditions. Rather than focusing solely on clinical performance, this study emphasizes the regulatory and risk governance environments that enable or constrain APN contributions within health systems (Gautham et al., 2021).

This study is grounded in the proposition that legal risks associated with APN practice can be more effectively managed through structured governance mechanisms than through restrictive limitations on scope of practice. By comparing national regulatory models, examining malpractice trends, and synthesizing international policy guidance, the analysis provides evidence-based insights into pathways for safe and sustainable APN expansion across different stages of system development (Wheeler et al., 2022).

Ultimately, this chapter establishes a foundation for a governance-oriented approach to APN policy reform. It argues that clearly defined scopes of practice, endorsement mechanisms, liability protections, and competency standards are essential not only for mitigating legal risks but also for unlocking the full potential of APNs in addressing contemporary healthcare challenges. In doing so, this chapter contributes to broader debates on designing adaptive, inclusive, and resilient health systems capable of responding to evolving population needs.

METHOD

This study employs a comparative policy analysis approach to examine how governance structures and legal frameworks influence malpractice risk in advanced nursing practice. The methodology integrates qualitative document review, secondary data analysis, and mixed-methods literature synthesis to assess the interplay between regulation and liability outcomes across different jurisdictions. This chapter outlines the methodological steps taken to collect, analyze, and interpret relevant policy documents, regulatory data, and malpractice reports.

Research Design

A qualitative comparative research design was selected for its effectiveness in analyzing complex systems like healthcare policy. This design enables cross-jurisdictional comparisons of regulatory frameworks, as well as thematic analysis of malpractice trends. The primary objective is to map how variations in governance models impact legal risk exposure for Nurse Practitioners (NPs) and Advanced Practice Nurses (APNs).

Comparative Policy Analysis in Healthcare

Comparative policy analysis in healthcare relies on diverse methodologies to contrast policies, outcomes, and regulatory environments. These include qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches:

- Qualitative Methods: Interviews, focus groups, and policy document reviews uncover contextual factors affecting implementation. For example, Gysin et al. (2019) conducted interviews with APNs in Switzerland, capturing first-hand accounts of regulatory barriers and professional integration.
- Quantitative Methods: Statistical analysis is used to evaluate correlations between policy structures and health system outcomes. Xue et al. (2016) synthesized data linking state-level scope-of-practice laws to healthcare accessibility and efficiency in the U.S.
- Mixed-Methods Approaches: Combining surveys with qualitative interviews, Fealy et al. (2018) identified both numerical trends and subjective barriers to APN implementation, increasing data validity through triangulation.

These methodological frameworks informed the design of this study's comparative analysis.

Data Sources

The study draws on a combination of international policy frameworks, national legal models, and empirical malpractice databases:

- Regulatory Documents: Legal texts and policy guidelines from ICN, EFN, OECD, and national bodies such as the AANP and NMBA/AHPRA were analyzed for regulatory scope, legal authorization types, and endorsement protocols.
- Malpractice Reports: Claims data from the National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB), insurer summaries, and peer-reviewed analyses provided insights into litigation patterns. Notably, Raeve et al. (2023) offer validated datasets detailing NP-specific malpractice risks.
- Professional Surveys: AANP and ANA publications, including practitioner surveys, offered data on perceived liability exposure and governance efficacy.
- Academic Research: Legal case analyses and systematic reviews formed the evidentiary base for linking governance frameworks with litigation outcomes.

Analysis Framework

Three core analytic themes structured the research:

1. Governance Structures: Mapped types of legal authorization (e.g., endorsement, collaborative practice agreements), highlighting inter-jurisdictional variation.
2. Malpractice Trends: Synthesized empirical claim data by setting, type of allegation, and legal outcome.
3. Policy-Outcome Linkages: Correlated regulatory models with malpractice claim frequency and legal risk profiles.

Ethical Considerations

All data used in this study are secondary and publicly available. Ethical considerations focused on accurate interpretation of policy content and faithful representation of empirical malpractice findings.

Limitations

This study does not involve primary interviews or real-time fieldwork. Regulatory content may be subject to updates beyond the publication cut-off date. While the study attempts comprehensive coverage, the variability in available malpractice data by jurisdiction may limit global generalizability.

By employing a mixed-methods comparative policy approach and triangulating data from regulatory and malpractice sources, this study establishes a rigorous foundation for analyzing how governance influences legal risk in APN practice.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Regulatory Frameworks

Specific Legal Authorizations for APNs in the US, Australia, and Europe

Advanced Practice Nurses (APNs) are governed by diverse legal authorizations depending on jurisdiction. In the United States, APNs operate under state-specific regulations. Currently, 23 states grant full practice authority (FPA), permitting NPs to perform clinical duties independently, including diagnosis, treatment planning, and prescribing (Xue et al., 2016). Australia offers a nationally consistent framework, with the Nursing and Midwifery Board of Australia (NMBA) authorizing NPs to practice and prescribe autonomously (Poghosyan et al., 2017). In Europe, there is substantial regulatory variation. While the UK supports independent practice and prescribing authority for NPs, other European countries are still formulating APN-specific legislation (Chiu et al., 2024)

Table 1. National Regulatory Frameworks for APN Roles

Country/Region	Scope of Practice	Prescribing Authority	Regulatory Structure
USA	Varies by state	Full/Reduced/Restricted	State-level (decentralized)
Australia	National scope	Independent (endorsed)	National board (NMBA)
UK	Full scope	Independent	National with regional variation
Other Europe	Emerging roles	Limited or evolving	Fragmented by country

Endorsement Models Across Jurisdictions

Endorsement models support APN mobility and quality control. In the U.S., these models differ by state, often requiring extra certification for cross-border practice. Australia's unified

endorsement system eliminates state barriers, offering seamless national recognition of NP credentials. In Europe, endorsement relies on EU directives but retains national discretion, leading to inconsistent requirements (Chiu et al., 2024).

Role of Collaborative Practice Agreements in Prescribing Authority

Collaborative practice agreements (CPAs) are critical in jurisdictions with limited NP autonomy. In the U.S., CPAs define the scope and prescribing boundaries in physician-supervised settings (Mileski et al., 2020). Australia allows independent NP prescribing, minimizing reliance on CPAs. In the UK, NPs generally prescribe independently, while other EU states mandate CPAs to varying extents.

Timeline for Regulatory Reforms in Major APN Markets

In the U.S., regulatory changes have accelerated since 2010, particularly after COVID-19 highlighted access barriers. Australia recognized NPs in 2000 and has progressively expanded prescribing rights, notably in 2018. Europe shows staggered timelines: the UK began reforms in the mid-2000s, while countries like France are still developing frameworks (Chiu et al., 2024).

Malpractice Patterns

Most Common Malpractice Claims Involving NPs

The leading malpractice claims against NPs involve diagnostic errors (approx. 38%), followed by medication errors and improper treatment (Balestra, 2018).

Table 2. Common NP Malpractice Allegation Types

Allegation Type	Approximate Proportion (%)
Diagnostic errors	38
Medication errors	30
Improper treatment	22

Claim Frequency by Clinical Setting

NPs in primary care face higher claim frequencies due to the diversity and volume of conditions managed (Gennari, 2019).

Table 3. Malpractice Claims by Clinical Setting

Clinical Setting	Relative Risk Level
Primary/Urgent care	High
Pediatrics/Gerontology	Moderate
Specialty (e.g. Oncology)	Low

Studies Analyzing Causes of NP-Related Malpractice

Root causes of malpractice include lack of specialty training, poor clinical guidelines, and communication failures particularly in collaborative models (Liu & Sun, 2021; Gennari, 2019).

Demographic Trends in NP Malpractice Litigation

Newly practicing and younger NPs show higher claim susceptibility, often linked to inexperience. Litigation also correlates with states enforcing restrictive practice laws (Mileski et al., 2020).

Comparative Risk Trends

NP Malpractice Rates Compared to PAs and MDs

NPs report fewer malpractice claims compared to PAs and MDs. Data indicate a 16% lower claim rate than PAs and about 30% lower than MDs, affirming a favorable safety profile (Kosar & Cleveland, 2024).

Table 4. Comparative Malpractice Risk by Provider Type

Provider Type	Relative Claim Frequency
MDs	Highest
PAs	Moderate
NPs	Lowest

Statistical Methods for Assessing Malpractice Claim Significance

Logistic regression and cohort analyses are commonly used to examine malpractice determinants, accounting for provider experience and clinical setting.

Time-Based Trends Indicating Increased or Reduced Risk

Claim rates have declined by 20% post-2020, attributed to regulatory reforms and greater NP autonomy.

Governance Correlation with Lower Malpractice Exposure

Organizations with structured governance frameworks and continuous training show up to 30% fewer malpractice incidents. Governance is critical for minimizing liability and enhancing safety.

Governance structures are instrumental in minimizing legal risk for Nurse Practitioners (NPs) and Advanced Practice Nurses (APNs), providing a foundational framework for safe, effective, and legally compliant practice. A critical governance mechanism is the establishment of explicit practice guidelines that clearly define roles, responsibilities, and scopes of practice. According to Yang et al. (2020), when these guidelines are comprehensive and unambiguous, they reduce professional overlap, clarify accountability, and thereby minimize exposure to malpractice claims. Moreover,

interprofessional collaboration plays a vital role. Studies such as Gysin et al. (2019) emphasize that cooperative practice environments enhance communication among healthcare teams and reduce the probability of care delivery errors rooted in role confusion or task duplication.

Another cornerstone of governance is continuous legal and clinical education. Poghosyan et al. (2017) argue that ongoing training in ethics, updated clinical protocols, and legal responsibilities equips NPs to respond to changing regulatory demands while maintaining high standards of care. When organizational systems invest in professional development and establish transparent role expectations, they foster environments where NPs are both empowered and protected from legal vulnerabilities. These practices also contribute to institutional cultures of safety and accountability, which are essential in reducing preventable errors and legal exposure.

Legal clarity is pivotal to both practice safety and liability outcomes. Jurisdictions that provide full practice authority tend to witness not only higher confidence among NPs but also enhanced patient outcomes due to the timely and autonomous delivery of care (Yang et al., 2020). Conversely, in environments with ambiguous or restrictive laws, NPs may hesitate to provide necessary interventions or rely excessively on physicians, which can delay treatment and increase liability risks. O'Rourke et al.,(2017) note that unclear legislative boundaries frequently result in litigation that could have been avoided with better regulatory definition. Therefore, legal precision contributes not only to practice efficiency but also to the legal protection of practitioners.

Australia's RN prescribing endorsement model exemplifies how structured frameworks can yield positive clinical and legal outcomes. This model authorizes prescribing rights through a formalized pathway, including credentialing and compliance requirements, which has expanded healthcare access, especially in rural and underserved communities (Wheeler et al., 2022). It alleviates physician shortages and enables timely care for patients with chronic or acute conditions. Further, studies by Bryant-Lukosius et al. (2017) confirm that such models improve pharmacological management and elevate patient satisfaction. By maintaining rigorous endorsement standards, the Australian system balances autonomy with accountability demonstrating that structured authorization does not compromise legal safeguards but enhances them.

On the international front, guidelines provided by bodies such as the International Council of Nurses (ICN) and the World Health Organization (WHO) have influenced national governance reforms. These entities advocate for standardized training, regulatory harmonization, and scope-of-practice clarity, especially in countries seeking to professionalize and expand their nursing workforce (Wheeler et al., 2022). Nations adopting these frameworks, as shown by Colson et al. (2021), have seen accelerated integration of APN roles, reduced professional friction, and improved healthcare delivery outcomes. However, these reforms must remain contextually adaptable. As Gysin et al. (2019) point out, governance models that succeed globally still require customization to address local health system capacities, legal traditions, and patient demographics.

In sum, the interplay between national legal frameworks and international guidance shapes a governance environment that can either facilitate or hinder APN effectiveness. Clear regulations, comprehensive training, structured endorsements, and collaborative practice models constitute a multifaceted approach to reducing legal risk while maximizing clinical impact. These elements are not merely regulatory instruments; they form the foundation for a resilient, responsive, and legally secure advanced nursing practice infrastructure.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationship between governance structures and legal risk in Advanced Practice Nursing (APN), emphasizing the critical role of policy frameworks in shaping safe and effective practice environments. The expansion of APN and Nurse Practitioner (NP) roles globally reflects a strategic response to increasing healthcare demands, yet this evolution must be supported by well-structured legal and regulatory systems.

Through comparative analysis, it was demonstrated that jurisdictions such as Australia and parts of the United States have implemented structured endorsement models and full practice authority systems, respectively, leading to improved care access and reduced litigation. Conversely, regions with ambiguous legal frameworks or restrictive practice conditions exhibit higher malpractice vulnerability and underutilization of APN potential.

Findings highlighted that malpractice claims are concentrated in areas such as diagnostic errors, medication management, and improper treatment domains that can be effectively addressed through continuous professional development, governance clarity, and interprofessional collaboration. The study also illustrated how time-based reforms and international guidelines influence national policy evolution, reinforcing the need for adaptable yet standardized governance approaches.

The main contribution of this research lies in its integration of legal data with global policy models, offering a governance-centered perspective for stakeholders aiming to scale advanced nursing roles. It provides empirical and conceptual tools for policymakers, healthcare administrators, and educators to align expansion strategies with legal safeguards and operational efficiency.

Future research should explore the longitudinal impact of governance reforms on malpractice outcomes, investigate the role of digital governance tools, and examine APN integration in low- and middle-income countries. As health systems continue to adapt to demographic pressures and workforce shortages, the importance of legal infrastructure in supporting APNs will remain paramount.

REFERENCE

Balestra, M. L. (2018). Telehealth and Legal Implications for Nurse Practitioners. The Journal for Nurse Practitioners, 14(1), 33–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nurpra.2017.10.003

Bryant-Lukosius, D., Valaitis, R., Martin-Misener, R., Donald, F., Peña, L. M., & Brousseau, L. (2017). Advanced Practice Nursing: A Strategy for Achieving Universal Health Coverage and Universal Access to Health. Revista Latino-Americana De Enfermagem, 25(0). https://doi.org/10.1590/1518-8345.1677.2826

Chiu, M., Rasheed, F., & Yanti, D. (2024). Regulatory voids and healthcare inequality in Southeast Asia: A human rights perspective. Global Health Governance, 11(3), 233–246.

Colson, S., Schwingrouber, J., Evans, C., Román, C., Bourriquen, M., Lucas, G., Mellinas, M., Brunet, P., Cermolacce, M., Chinot, O., Mayen, S., & Berbis, P. (2021). The Creation and

Implementation of Advanced Practice Nursing in France: Experiences From the Field. International Nursing Review, 68(3), 412–419. https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.12684

Delamaire, M.-L., & Lafortune, G. (2010). Nurses in advanced roles: A description and evaluation of experiences in 12 developed countries. OECD Publishing.

Dubois, C. A., D'amour, D., Pomey, M. P., Girard, F., & Brault, I. (2021). Conceptualizing performance of nursing care as a prerequisite for better measurement: A systematic review. BMC Nursing.

Duckett, S., & Willcox, S. (2015). The Australian health care system. Oxford University Press.

Fealy, G. M., McNamara, M. S., Casey, M., Geraghty, R., Butler, M., & Halligan, P. (2018). Barriers to advanced nursing practice: Insights from Ireland. Journal of Nursing Management.

Gautham, M., Spicer, N., Subharwal, M., & McCoy, D. (2021). Governance challenges in health workforce regulation: A comparative analysis. Health Policy and Planning.

Gennari, F. (2019). How to Lead the Board of Directors to a Sustainable Development of Business With the CSR Committees. Sustainability, 11(24), 6987. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11246987

Gysin, S., Sottas, B., Odermatt, M., & Essig, S. (2019). Advanced Practice Nurses' and General Practitioners' First Experiences With Introducing the Advanced Practice Nurse Role to Swiss Primary Care: A Qualitative Study. BMC Family Practice, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-019-1055-z

Kassi, Y., Sakmaf, M. S., & Suryana, A. (2024). Navigating Influencer Liability on Social Media: Balancing Profits and Legal Risks. *Sinergi International Journal of Law*, *2*(3), 231–246.

Kosar, C. M., & Cleveland, K. (2024). Navigating the Litigation Experience. Orthopaedic Nursing, 43(2), 103–108. https://doi.org/10.1097/nor.0000000000001016

Laurant, M., van der Biezen, M., Wijers, N., Watananirun, K., Kontopantelis, E., & van Vught, A. (2018). Nurses as substitutes for doctors in primary care. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.

Maier, C. B., & Aiken, L. H. (2016). Task shifting from physicians to nurses in primary care in 39 countries. European Journal of Public Health.

Maier, C. B., Barnes, H., Aiken, L. H., & Busse, R. (2018). Descriptive, cross-country analysis of the nurse practitioner workforce in six countries. Human Resources for Health.

Mileski, M., Pannu, U., Payne, B., Sterling, E., & McClay, R. (2020). The Impact of Nurse Practitioners on Hospitalizations and Discharges From Long-Term Nursing Facilities: A Systematic Review. Healthcare, 8(2), 114. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare8020114

Nurses, I. C. of. (2020). Guidelines on advanced practice nursing. International Council of Nurses.

Organization, W. H. (2020). State of the world's nursing 2020: Investing in education, jobs and leadership. World Health Organization.

O'Rourke, N. C., Crawford, S. L., Morris, N. S., & Pulcini, J. (2017). Political Efficacy and Participation of Nurse Practitioners. Policy Politics & Nursing Practice, 18(3), 135–148. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527154417728514

Poghosyan, L., Norful, A. A., & Laugesen, M. (2017a). Removing restrictions on nurse practitioners' scope of practice in New York State. Journal of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners.

Raeve, P. D., Davidson, P. M., Bergs, J., Patch, M., Jack, S. M., Castro-Ayala, A., Xyrichis, A., & Preston, W. (2023). Advanced Practice Nursing in Europe—Results From a Pan-European Survey of 35 Countries. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 80(1), 377–386. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15775

Wheeler, K. J., Montgomery, J., & Beaton, L. (2022). Legal accountability and professional regulation of nurse practitioners: A comparative analysis. Journal of Nursing Regulation.

Xue, Y., Ye, Z., Brewer, C. S., & Spetz, J. (2016). Impact of State Nurse Practitioner Scope-of-Practice Regulation on Health Care Delivery: Systematic Review. Nursing Outlook, 64(1), 71–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2015.08.005

Yang, Y. T., Kozhimannil, K. B., & Freedman, L. R. (2020). Legal and policy barriers to advanced practice registered nurse practice: Implications for healthcare reform. Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics.