

U21 Nursing Meeting 4-5 September 2003, Glasgow

Present:

Joan McDowell and Lorraine Smith (Glasgow)
Collette Clifford (Birmingham)
Nicky James (Nottingham)
Judy Parker (Melbourne)
Sally Thorne (University of British Columbia)
Susan French (McGill University)
Judy Fitzpatrick and Heather Baker (Auckland University)
Sophia Chan (Hong Kong University)
Ingalill Hallberg and Anna-Karin Dykes (University of Lundt)

In the Chair: Collette Clifford

The meeting opened with a brief discussion about the limited time available to discuss our issues given the interdisciplinary nature of the programme. It was agreed that in the nursing session timetable we would focus our attention on the work that had been ongoing with benchmarking. A few minutes were spent discussing issues related to selection and recruitment to nursing programmes to enable feedback to the main interdisciplinary group following the morning session.

Benchmarking – Two working groups had been developing benchmarking related to clinical teaching and research.

Clinical teaching – Heather Baker led the discussion circulating draft benchmark statements to the group for consideration. These were reviewed in some detail and suggestions made for refinement of the performance areas. It was agreed that the indicators and examples in each performance area could then be refined and edited once these were developed.

Key to the discussion was some debate as to what constituted clinical teaching and whether the word clinical was appropriate given the diversity of placements that students may have in the social world. It was agreed that the words ‘clinical teaching’ would be replaced with ‘practice based teaching’. It was also agreed that we would insert some statement of principles to indicate the difference between minimal and optimal standards.

Following the discussion Heather agreed to liaise back with colleagues to produce a second draft for further discussion.

Research benchmarks – The discussion was led by Sally Thorne. The background to the linking related to the benchmark draft document circulated was noted and it was

agreed that the format differed to the practice teaching for it was felt more important to have measures that reflected forms of research assessment that all the countries may face. A draft framework for individual completion and one for organisational completion has been prepared. Discussion took place as to the content of the two documents and some suggestions for editing were made within the meeting. It was agreed that these would be circulated to members of the group for modification in the coming year.

Other issues – It was noted that Sophie Chan had produced a detailed action list arising out of the 2002 meeting. Some aspects of this work had not been developed for various reasons in 2002 as attention had focused on the benchmarking activities. Consequently it was agreed that group members would revisit the objectives set out in the 2002 U21 report (previously circulated) and efforts would be made to address these in the coming year.

Group members felt that although there were many benefits in having an interdisciplinary meeting within the main sessions this had rather curtailed our individual group activity. It was suggested that for next year's meeting we would endeavour to create more time for the nursing group, perhaps by timetabling the session on the day prior to the formal meeting commencing. This will be addressed as the planning develops for the 2004 meeting in Brisbane, Australia.

On behalf of the group, thanks were expressed to Joan McDowell for all the work that she had done to facilitate the nursing group meeting in Glasgow. It was noted that this had been particularly challenging for Joan as she was a newly appointed Head of School who had not previously attended the meeting and given that she was 'working in the dark' she did an excellent job.

Notes prepared by Collette Clifford