

**U21 ANNUAL MEETING OF DEANS/HEADS OF MEDICINE, DENTISTRY,
NURSING AND REHABILITATION SCIENCES**

THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW - FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Report of the Rehabilitation Sciences Group

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

03/01 Session 2 Thursday 4TH SEPTEMBER 2003

Present

Co-convenors

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Dr Max Field | University of Glasgow |
| Prof Pat Wrightson | University of Birmingham |

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Dr Sue Kelly | University of Birmingham |
| Prof Lesley Bainbridge | University of British Columbia |
| Dr Catherine Backman | University of British Columbia |
| Prof John Gilbert | University of British Columbia |
| Dr Carolyn Johnson | University of British Columbia |
| Prof Joan McMeeken | University of Melbourne |
| Mr Grahame Pope | University of Nottingham |
| Dr Sylvia Rodger | University of Queensland |

Invited guests

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Dr Brian Durward | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Dr Heather Shamlaye | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Dr Valerie Webster | Glasgow Caledonian |

Disciplinary Workshops

The two day Annual Meeting of Deans/Heads of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing and Rehabilitation Sciences, held at the University of Glasgow, was organised around an interdisciplinary theme. Session 2 on day Thursday 4th September 2003 incorporated four separate discipline specific workshops. Selection and Building Research Capacity were two common topics for all groups. The third topic chosen by the Rehabilitation sciences Group was Benchmarking of Teaching and Research. The following gives a summary of the groups discussions.

1. Selection

A discussion was undertaken relating to the selection processes undertaken for entry to Rehabilitation Sciences programs in U21 University's. The discussions followed on from the keynote lecture given by Professor John Cairns (UBC) on 'Medical Student Selection –Rationale, Processes, Effectiveness.

A brief review of the current recruitment procedures was undertaken and is summarised in the table below:

Table 1 'What we do at the moment

| | Melb'n | UBC | B'ham | UQ | N'ham |
|--------------------|--------|---------|-------|----|-------|
| GPA | + | + Aud + | + | + | + |
| Psych T | + | - - | - | - | - |
| Interview | - | + - | + | - | - |
| Volun exp | - | + + | + | - | - |
| Reports | - | - + | + | - | + |
| Pos Recruit | + | + | + | + | + |

1.1 Positive recruitment of students

There was general consensus that there was a need to ensure that recruitment and selection procedures facilitated students from non standard backgrounds, including minority groups and disadvantaged backgrounds. Each country had a number of policy initiatives to fulfil the widening of recruitment initiatives. In some countries there were identified recruitment targets to be met for students from specified backgrounds.

Table 2. Positive Recruitment of Students

| University | Target |
|------------|--------|
| Melbourne | 8% |
| Birmingham | 10 % |
| UBC | 15% |
| Queensland | 5% |
| Nottingham | 10% |

1.2 Skills and abilities essential to graduates from Rehabilitation Sciences Programs

In addition to students achieving the required academic qualifications, there was considerable consensus within the group on the skills and abilities that members of professional groups within Rehabilitation Sciences need to develop with time:

- Adaptability
- Life-long learning
- Communication skills
- Problem solving
- Ethical Considerations

These identified skills and abilities are similar to those required in other health professions.

1.3 Summary

Selection processes must ensure that students have the baseline academic qualifications and personality profile to enter the program, and that they have the potential to develop these to meet the requirements of a practising health professional.

It was noted that there is considerable overlap between professions, which could be utilised in collaborative selection activities. Given the need to develop common areas of skill and knowledge, a common inter-professional first year program for health professional students could be a possibility.

Initiatives to widen access of non standard groups, were viewed positively by the group. The influence of funding bodies in setting targets for admission on minority groups, was recognised as influencing the overall profile of individual cohorts of students.

2. Building Research Capacity

A brief discussion on building research capacity identified the following issues: identified:

- Critical Mass – difficulties in reaching critical mass with teams that have a sustainable future
- Career structure – poor career structure and support of research pathways
- Funding – limited access to funding and lack of track record of successful applications
- Logistics of grant applications – complex administration process and lack of experience hindering applications
- Time commitment for academic and clinical research – demands of clinical qualifying programs restrict time available

2.1 Recommendations

- Research training support – to encourage progression through PhD to post doctoral research
- Promotion of research leaders – infrastructure support
- Pump priming research projects – explore sources of funding
- Linked projects with clinical centres
- Use of Learning Objects (LRC) as a focus for increasing research capacity

3. Benchmarking

- Agreement on template developed at last meeting (2002) and added to by School of Health and Rehabilitation Science at University of Queensland.
- Need to follow up on outcomes of using the template.
- No one had completed data collection using template as yet.

- University of British Columbia and Melbourne had been approached at Dean's level but information had not reached Health and Rehabilitation Sciences schools and divisions. University of British Columbia and Melbourne willing to be involved with benchmarking process for University of Queensland in 2003.
- Need for benchmarking was acknowledged as global issue, with slightly different focus in different countries eg. United Kingdom quality assurance measures, research exercise different requirements.

3.1 Process for collecting Benchmarking data between U21 Health and Rehabilitation Sciences Schools:

- Contact person at U 21 institutions: Head of program
- Frequency of data collection; to be determined on an as needs basis when Schools are under review. There did not seem much support for making everyone do this every year for the exercise.... It is a big process and time consuming task, undertaken when needed for University review processes. In 2002 we discussed doing this annually with due dates being March 2003 for last years data, but no one had completed this.
- Review data collection process in 2004 after University of Queensland and University of Melbourne reviews for advice to others on the process.
(Template agreed on and School of Health and Rehabilitation Science, University of Queensland modifications Attachment 1)

Discussion Meeting of Rehabilitation Sciences Group Friday 5th September 2003

Present

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Prof Pat. Wrightson | University of Birmingham |
| Dr Sue Kelly | University of Birmingham |
| Prof Lesley Bainbridge | University of British Columbia |
| Dr Catherine Blackman | University of British Columbia |
| Prof John Gilbert | University of British Columbia |
| Dr Carolyn Johnson | University of British Columbia |
| Prof Joan McMeeken | University of Melbourne |
| Mr Grahame Pope | University of Nottingham |
| Dr Sylvia Rodger | University of Queensland |

A working lunch was held on Friday 5th September 2003, in order that the Group could discuss collaborative activity. It was agreed that how to the three discussion topics from the Rehabilitation Sciences Group meeting at the University of Glasgow should be taken forwards.

Action Points

- **Rehabilitation Sciences Web Site**
Professor Pat Wrightson agreed to contact Mrs Lorraine Devitt, Executive Officer, to initiate transfer of the Rehabilitation Sciences Group's web site, to the main U21 Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing and Rehabilitation Sciences web

site. This was identified as a priority to be completed at the earliest opportunity.

➤ **Research Capacity**

A on-line discussion related to this topic would be initiated by Professor Lesley Bainbridge and Dr Sue Kelly by 1st January 2004

➤ **Benchmarking**

Professor Joan McMeeken and Dr Sylvia Rodger, agreed to circulate the revised Benchmarking documentation to all members of the U21 Rehabilitation Sciences Group and collate the responses.

➤ **Selection**

Professor Wrightson agreed to initiate in 2004 an on-line discussion on selection, following completion of the Research Capacity discussions. The information collected should then be used to develop benchmarking statements for selection of students to Rehabilitation Sciences programmes.

Outstanding Topics

The following topics were identified as being important to included in future discussions:

- Clinical Education
- Workload Analysis
- Graduate Entry Programmes

It was agreed that clinical education, specifically the challenges in relation to placing students in clinical fieldwork, would be the major theme for the Rehabilitation Sciences group at the 2004 annual meeting in Queensland.