

LTC12D043

Title: Report of the Institutional Review of the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies, Guernsey
Author: Hannah Coman, Partnerships Manager, Partnerships Office
Date: November 2012
Circulation: Learning and Teaching Committee – 5 December 2012
Agenda: LTC12A002
Version: Final
Status: Open

Report of the Institutional Review of the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies, Guernsey

Issue

Attached at Appendix 1 is the report of the Institutional Review of the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies in Guernsey which took place on 30 October 2012.

Recommendation

The Learning and Teaching Committee is invited to recommend to the Senate of the University of East Anglia that the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies, Guernsey be re-approved as a partner institution of the University for a period of up to five years commencing October 2012.

Resource Implications

Not applicable.

Equality and Diversity

Not applicable.

Further Information

Hannah Coman, Partnerships Manager, 01603 591603, h.coman@uea.ac.uk

University of East Anglia

REPORT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW OF THE INSTITUTE OF HEALTH
AND SOCIAL CARE STUDIES, GUERNSEY

30 October 2012

1 Introduction and background

- 1.1 An institutional review panel met at the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies (IHSCS) on 30 October 2012 to consider the re-approval of the Institute as a partner institution of the University of East Anglia (UEA). Membership of the institutional review panel is shown in Appendix A
- 1.2 The panel met with a range of IHSCS staff and a group of students including recent graduates from both the pre-and post-registration programmes at the Institute (as listed in Appendix A). The panel were also provided with a tour of facilities including the IT suites, student common room, teaching rooms, lecture theatre, learning resources centre, study skills centre and practical skills room.
- 1.3 Discussions were informed by an evaluative report on the operation and management of the partnership produced by UEA and a self-evaluation document prepared by the Institute, accompanied by a range of supporting documentation.

2 Summary of discussions**Partnership Working**

- 2.1 The panel began by discussing with the Institute staff areas of the partnership which were felt to be working well and those which could be improved. Various examples of good practice were highlighted including the joint development of the pre-registration curriculum, the degree of autonomy and the tailored nature of the post-registration course and the open dialogue between the teams in Guernsey and Norwich, which had been helpful when considering policy changes within UEA. The administrative support provided by the Partnerships Office, particularly around the creation and implementation of the student marks system was also highlighted as having worked well.

Commendation: Good examples of effective Partnership working.

- 2.2 Areas where it was considered there could be improvement included the process for approval of new modules including the role of the critical read and some areas of communication.

Communication

- 2.3 The panel asked the Institute staff about communication between the two sites. Some issues had been identified in the SER report and these were explored further. The panel were informed that the informal lines of communication were working well and that a number of methods were used

including video-conferencing, collaborating on e-documents and in-person visits. The panel were also informed that the lead for Quality Assurance now had access to the UEA Taught Programmes Policy Group (TPPG) Blackboard site and also UEA Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) papers. It was hoped that this would keep the Institute informed about policy changes at the UEA and allow comments from the Institute to be taken into account along with those of the School of Nursing Sciences at UEA when new policies were being developed.

Recommendation: UEA Academic Link, Institute Quality Lead and Partnerships Office should develop appropriate measures to enhance communications between sites using the draft 'framework to enhance partnership working'.

- 2.4 The panel asked staff about the Joint Committee; its purpose and relevance. The panel were informed that staff at the Institute felt that the Joint Committee was an important mechanism for Quality Assurance and that it was the point where everything comes together. Staff felt that the standing items helped to focus the meetings although there was often limited discussion at the meetings as this had already taken place beforehand through alternative channels. It was felt that there could be greater discussion and cascading of information and also that a greater emphasis could be placed on academic debate.

Recommendation: Develop opportunities for enhanced academic debate within existing frameworks such as the Joint Committee.

Equitability of Student Experience

- 2.5 The panel enquired about the nature of the pre-registration courses, being NMC-endorsed but localised to Guernsey. The staff team informed the panel that the learning outcomes at module level were the same as those for the pre-registration courses in Norwich, however the student experience was different. The curriculum at the Institute was slightly different to that in Norwich in order to meet the requirements of health and social care on the island however all criteria for the UK were also met. In essence, the courses were contextualised for Guernsey but met all the learning outcomes of the provision in Norwich, and were all approved at validation and endorsement.
- 2.6 The Mentor Preparation Programme (MPP) module was another NMC-endorsed course run in both Norwich and Guernsey. Some differences were noted, for example there was a local version of the VLE (Moodle) rather than students having access to the UEA's Blackboard site and the module was delivered over full-days rather than half-days as in Norwich to meet the needs of staff on island. All differences had been agreed during programme development by staff at both centres to ensure that the programmes were equitable, and approved at validation and endorsement.

Learning Resources

- 2.7 Staff at the Institute were asked by the panel to explain the differences in access to UEA learning resources experienced by students on the pre-and post-registration courses. The panel were informed that the pre-registration programme students had access to a range of resources at UEA including e-

journals. The post-registration students did not have access to UEA's e-resources, however they were able to utilise the inter-library loan service to access specialised journals and texts. It was felt that this service bridged the potential gap these students might experience without access to UEA's e-resources and the students spoke positively about their experiences of requesting and receiving journals and papers via the service.

Student Experience and Student Voice

- 2.8 Students were very complimentary about the enthusiasm of the staff and the support they received from their Personal Teachers.

Commendation: Support of the Institute team of its students; in particular the Personal Teacher system and the Learning Resources team.

- 2.9 The students were asked about module evaluation forms and what happens to the comments provided. The students felt that their comments were listened to, and acted upon, and a number of examples were given. The panel were told that some students had struggled with report writing in their first module and following feedback on this, instruction on report writing was now included in the induction the students receive. Another example was the timing of the second term which meant that students commencing modules had yet to submit summative assignments for modules undertaken in the first term. The Institute responded to this feedback from students and changed the start date of the second term so that students had fully completed modules in term one before commencing their studies in term two.

- 2.10 The panel asked the students what other methods of feedback existed at the Institute and were informed that student representatives have the opportunity to feed comments into regular course committee meetings, there was a discussion group on Moodle, although it was acknowledged that this was new and was not yet widely used, and that students were able to feedback to personal teachers.

- 2.11 The panel discussed student feedback with staff at the Institute and were informed that students were made aware of their student representatives via posters and that the role of the student representative was included in the induction programme.

Commendation: Positive and constructive response of course teams to student feedback.

- 2.12 The panel asked the students whether they felt part of the UEA whilst studying for their programme and what interaction, if any, they had with other UEA nursing students. Feedback was mixed and generally students did not feel part of UEA. One area of the pre-registration courses where students did interact across the two sites was the Inter-professional Learning module (IPL), however some students had experienced frustrations over lack of communication from their counterparts in Norwich and communicating over long distance, often via e-mail, could be difficult at times.

Recommendation: Work with UEA to consider how the inter-student communications and processes underlying the IPL element of the pre-registration course can be enhanced.

- 2.13 The post registration students felt that greater communication with students at UEA would be beneficial as it could feel isolated on island, especially if there were no other students specialising in the same area at the Institute.
- 2.14 Students were asked how prepared they felt for work in the UK. The students informed the panel that they felt the course on island offered more breadth than the version delivered in Norwich but that as a result, some areas were covered in slightly less depth. One experience students felt was lacking was working with Junior Doctors as this role did not exist on island. It was noted however that Guernsey based students benefitted from teaching and learning that combined both the local and national context.
- 2.15 The panel noted that the students were professional and articulate in their responses and were a credit to the Institute.

Commendation: The Institute's development of professional, articulate and reflective students.

Staff Development and Scholarly Activity

- 2.16 The panel asked staff about development opportunities and involvement with scholarly activity. The panel were informed that attendance at many UEA Centre for Staff and Educational Development (CSED) courses was not viable given the time required for travel. Delivery of some programmes via video-conference was being investigated and this could allow staff at the Institute to benefit from the programme on offer.

Recommendation: Investigate ways to maximise staff development opportunities at UEA for staff at the Institute.

- 2.17 The panel were informed that staff at the Institute accessed various webinars and online conferences and a programme of sharing following these sessions or attendance at conferences had been established.
- 2.18 New staff received an induction programme and were supported by the Institute in undertaking a PGCE. New staff were also allocated a mentor and all staff received annual peer teaching reviews. Annual appraisals with 6 monthly reviews were also in place for all staff.

QAA

- 2.19 The panel asked the staff at the Institute how they utilised the QAA resources. The panel were informed that the Lead for Quality Assurance used publications from the QAA to keep informed of developments and that regular weekly meetings to discuss changes and developments were well established. The Quality codes were also in the process of being mapped and a schedule of when these would be presented to the Joint Committee had been agreed.

Commendation: Weekly academic team meetings with a focus on quality assurance.

- 2.20 The panel asked about the use of outcome papers from the QAA and it was evident that there was currently limited use of this resource at the Institute.

Recommendation: Develop an action plan to demonstrate engagement with the QAA, particularly with regard to outcome papers and the Quality Code.

Policies

- 2.21 The Institute staff were asked about how policies at the Institute were created and agreed. The panel were informed that policies for pre-registration student nurses were developed jointly with UEA with local policies being taken into account. An example was the fitness to practise/HSSD Disciplinary policy. The panel were informed that issues were reported back to UEA and then may be presented to the UEA fitness to practise panel, in line with the agreed procedure.
- 2.22 The panel enquired about the effect a professional misconduct/fitness to practise issue might have on a student nurse given that they are also employed by the Institute whilst studying. The panel were informed that a condition of employment is a place on the course and therefore if a student was withdrawn from the programme, their employment would also cease.

Future Plans

- 2.23 The panel were given a short summary of the future plans of the Institute. It was informed that these plans were driven by island needs. Known future activities included the revalidation of the BA Professional Practice course with UEA and revalidation of the Return to Practice course with the University of York.
- 2.24 Future plans of the Institute included development of level 7 provision from September 2013, following a similar format to the BA Professional Practice course. The panel were informed that the Institute previously ran specialist practice degree modules at level 7 with the University of Sheffield. A proposal was currently being considered for a Joint Head of Research post for the Institute and the School of Nursing Sciences at UEA which would be instrumental in the development of level 7 delivery. The UEA was currently reviewing the level of support it could offer and the Institute was considering alternative options for meeting the need for study at level 7, if UEA were unable to support this development.
- 2.25 Plans also included the potential delivery of midwifery programmes on island from November 2014. The business case had been written and it was expected that the initial cohorts would be small, potentially 2-6 students.
- 2.26 Feasibility work was also on-going for additions to the pre-registration programme in the areas of Children and Learning Disability nursing fields. This would be dependent on organisational workforce development plans.
- 2.27 The panel were informed that the Institute also had plans to develop in the areas of Allied Health Professions and Social Work. Support from UEA was likely to be limited in these areas, therefore this would be reviewed in conjunction with level 7 study discussions.

- 2.28 The panel were informed that discussions had taken place with Jersey around extending pre-registration provision to the Island. Jersey had now gone out to tender for pre-registration provision.
- 2.29 The Institute were also investigating the use of technology to improve the student experience including using turn-it-in, electronic coursework submission and a States of Guernsey wide Management Information System.

3 Summary of Conclusions

The panel resolved to recommend to the Senate of the University of East Anglia that the IHSCS be re-approved as a partner institution of the University for a period of up to five years commencing October 2012. Recommendations are contained in the action plan at Appendix B.

4 Commendations

- 4.1 Support of the Institute team of its students; in particular the Personal Teacher system and the Learning Resources team.
- 4.2 The Institute's development of professional, articulate and reflective students.
- 4.3 Positive and constructive response of course teams to student feedback.
- 4.4 Good examples of effective Partnership working.
- 4.5 Weekly academic team meetings with a focus on quality assurance.

Stephen Knock
Partnerships Manager
October 2012

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW OF INSTITUTE OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE
STUDIES, GUERNSEY**

30 October 2012

PANEL MEMBERSHIP

Dr Nicola Spalding, Deputy Head of School of Allied Health Professions, University of East Anglia (*Chair*)

Kathleen Owens, Senior Lecturer, with portfolio for Head of Academic Unit (Professional Practice in Health Sciences), University of Southampton

Dr Gibson D'Cruz, Senior Lecturer, School of Nursing Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of East Anglia

Anita Gaudion, Head of Institute, Institute of Health and Social Care Studies, Guernsey

Cathy Bailey, Guernsey Student Representative, Ex Post-Registration Student (BAPP)

Sally Walker, Head of Partnerships, University of East Anglia

Laurence Daly, Senior Partnerships Manager, University of East Anglia

Stephen Knock, Partnerships Manager, University of East Anglia (*Secretary*)

MEMBERS OF IHSCS STAFF INVOLVED IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE PANEL

Louise Cogher, Senior Lecturer - Quality Assurance Lead

Janey Speers, Senior Lecturer - Pre-Registration Programmes Lead

Tracey McClean, Senior Lecturer - Post Qualifying Programmes Lead

Judy Moore, Programme Lead BA (Hons) Professional Practice

Emma Le Poidevin, Programme Lead – Mental Health Field, BSc (Hons) in Nursing

Joanne Goodchild, Programme Lead – Return to practice (York University)

Rachael Major, Programme Lead – Mentor Preparation Programme

Jane Blowers, UEA Academic Link

Kirstie Godfrey, Training Manager

Jodie Knight, Library and Information Services Manager

IHSCS STUDENTS INVOLVED IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE PANEL

Rachel Bott, BA (Hons) Professional Practice (graduate)

Paul Corcoran, BA (Hons) Professional Practice (graduate)

Mandy de la Cour, BA (Hons) Professional Practice (graduate)

Yvette Strudwick, BA (Hons) Professional Practice (graduate)

Brenda Munro, BA (Hons) Professional Practice (graduate)

Julie Locke, BA (Hons) Professional Practice (3rd year student)

Nicola van Schalkwyck, BA (Hons) Professional Practice (2nd year student)

Matt Smart, Diploma of Higher Education Mental Health Branch (graduate)

Sue Lesbirel, BSc (Hons) Mental Health Branch (2nd year student)

Charlotte Le Lievre, BSc (Hons) Adult Branch (2nd year student)

Dominique Hunter, BSc (Hons) Adult Branch (1st year student)

Will Luscombe, BSc (Hons) Mental Health Branch (1st year student)

Maggie de Carteret, BSc (Hons) Mental Health Branch (2nd year student)

Institutional Review Outcomes Action Plan

**Institute of Health and Social Care Studies, Guernsey
30 October 2012**

Outcomes				Course Team's Response
Type*	No.	Details	Deadline	
Rec	1.	UEA Academic Link, Institute Quality Lead and Partnerships Office should develop appropriate measures to enhance communications between sites using the draft 'framework to enhance partnership working'.	To be set	
Rec	2.	Work with UEA to consider how the inter-student communications and processes underlying the IPL element of the pre-registration course can be enhanced.	To be set	
Rec	3.	Develop opportunities for enhanced academic debate within existing frameworks such as the Joint Committee.	To be set	
Rec	4.	Investigate ways to maximise staff development opportunities at UEA for staff at the Institute.	To be set	
Rec	5.	Develop an action plan to demonstrate engagement with the QAA, particularly with regard to outcome papers and the quality code.	To be set	

* Outcome Types: Con (Condition) – must be addressed prior to an institutional re-approval, by agreed deadlines
Req (Requirement) - must be completed by given deadline, once institutional re-approval has started
Rec (Recommendation) – must be responded to by given deadline