
CONSULTATION ON:

Project to Develop Standards and Criteria for the Accreditation of Nursing and Midwifery Courses Re-Entry to the Register Standards Draft 3 – Registered Nurses January 2010

A project of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Council

Feedback form

Instructions

The headings and questions on this form follow the structure of the documents *Draft Accreditation Standards and Criteria for Courses Leading to Re-entry to the Register for Nurses and Midwives*. The intention of the form is to make it easier for you to provide us with feedback on the document. Your comments need not be confined to the space provided or to those questions included in the feedback form as these are only prompts. Whilst not specifically sought you are also welcome to make comments on the literature review.

Please complete a separate feedback form for each set of standards you are commenting on.

Electronic responses are preferred.

Please return this form by Friday 19 March 2010 to:

Rowena Robinson
Research and Policy Officer
Australian Nursing and Midwifery
Council
PO Box 873
Dickson ACT 2602
Email: rrobinson@anmc.org.au
Fax: 02 6257 7955

Your name: Professor Patrick Crookes

**Organisation: Council of Deans of Nursing
and Midwifery (Australia & New Zealand)**

Phone: +61 2 4221 3174

**Email contact:
patrick_crookes@uow.edu.au**

Please tick which standards you are commenting on (please use a separate feedback form for each one):

- Registered Nurse
 Enrolled Nurse

Midwife

General comments

Do you have any comments about the document as a whole? Is the document accessible and easy to use?

Yes. It is clear and concise. A document that covers a bridging program for internationally trained Registered Nurses or the inclusion of this group into this process would help in the development and management of such programs leading to registration.

Explanations of Terms

Is the explanation of terms comprehensive? Are there any additional terms that should have been included? Are there any explanations of terms that you feel are incorrectly defined? How would you define them? Do you have any further comments on the explanation of terms?

We have concerns that nursing competence is only defined in terms of clinical practice – all of the standards make reference to clinical practice / clinical competence. Yet, nursing practice is defined elsewhere by the ANMC as incorporating research, education, administration etc. To truly reflect this, the re-entry should allow re-entry to each of those aspects of practice, not just clinical practice. For example, RNs who are academics, who might not “practise as an educator of nurses” for 5 years and then want to come back to teach nursing / or to an academic or admin position - to require such a person to go back to demonstrating competence in clinical is not useful. It would be better to have a system that allowed competence as an educator of nurses to be assessed.

Standard 1 - Governance

Is the overall format of the Standards and Criteria clear and easy to understand? Are the Standard statements clear and easy to understand? Are the Statements of Intent clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria clear and easy to understand? Is the Evidence Guide clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria congruent with the Standard statements and the Statements of Intent? Is the Evidence Guide congruent with the Criteria.

No areas of confusion

Standard 2 – Teaching Staff

Is the overall format of the Standards and Criteria clear and easy to understand? Are the Standard statements clear and easy to understand? Are the Statements of Intent clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria clear and easy to understand? Is the Evidence Guide clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria congruent with the Standard statements and the Statements of Intent? Is the Evidence Guide congruent with the Criteria.

The standards are based heavily on the standards for accreditation of courses leading to registration etc – with the same level of detail required in terms of documentary evidence of all of the standards – and the same concerns therefore exist in terms of the amount of documents to be produced for this process. For example, in standard 2, the evidence guide asks for position descriptions for all teaching staff, sample copies of practising certificates for teaching staff (which in itself is strange as there may only be one kind of practising certificate from mid 2010), and sample CVs (which for unis would mean we should provide a sample of every level from A to E)

Also, in this standard there is a requirement to provide justification of staff selection against course delivery (Does this mean there should be evidence of a process, or do you want actual justifications for staff that have been selected?)

It seems that there is no option for challenge testing someone – ie if someone has been out of practice (however defined) for just over 5 years, it may be that they have maintained an interest and could pass a challenge test of some kind, demonstrating competence without having to formally undertake a re-entry course. This should be an option – and certainly should be able to be done on a modular basis – so students could challenge certain aspects of the course even if not all of it – this may be too operational for this response, but an important point at the higher level of the need for there to be a case by case consideration (for example, someone who has been out of practice for say 20 years may need to undertake a much more rigorous re-entry than someone out for 6 years)

On that note, there was always an issue about what the maximum absence from practice could / should be before requiring someone to undertake full BN rather than just a re-entry – this was never resolved (no hard evidence, although lots of anecdotal reports that 15 was probably the limit.)

Standard 3 - Students

Is the overall format of the Standards and Criteria clear and easy to understand? Are the Standard statements clear and easy to understand? Are the Statements of Intent clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria clear and easy to understand? Is the Evidence Guide clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria congruent with the

Standard statements and the Statements of Intent? Is the Evidence Guide congruent with the Criteria.

No areas of confusion

Standard 4 – Course length and structure

Is the overall format of the Standards and Criteria clear and easy to understand? Are the Standard statements clear and easy to understand? Are the Statements of Intent clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria clear and easy to understand? Is the Evidence Guide clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria congruent with the Standard statements and the Statements of Intent? Is the Evidence Guide congruent with the Criteria.

No areas of confusion

Standard 5 – Curriculum Content

Is the overall format of the Standards and Criteria clear and easy to understand? Are the Standard statements clear and easy to understand? Are the Statements of Intent clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria clear and easy to understand? Is the Evidence Guide clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria congruent with the Standard statements and the Statements of Intent? Is the Evidence Guide congruent with the Criteria.

There is a list of things that need to be included in the re-entry course (see page 15, evidence guide 4) – including health priorities, rural health, mental health, chronic disease self management, aged care, primary care, inter-professional learning and practice, and pharmacology (and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health from another section) – this is mirroring the requirements for an undergraduate course, and would, I suspect, need about as much time as that. So re-entry courses will become very lengthy, making returning to the workforce a huge hurdle

Standard 6 - Approaches to Teaching and Learning

Is the overall format of the Standards and Criteria clear and easy to understand? Are the Standard statements clear and easy to understand? Are the Statements of Intent clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria clear and easy to understand? Is the Evidence Guide clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria congruent with the

Standard statements and the Statements of Intent? Is the Evidence Guide congruent with the Criteria.

No areas of confusion

Standard 7 – Student Assessment

Is the overall format of the Standards and Criteria clear and easy to understand? Are the Standard statements clear and easy to understand? Are the Statements of Intent clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria clear and easy to understand? Is the Evidence Guide clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria congruent with the Standard statements and the Statements of Intent? Is the Evidence Guide congruent with the Criteria.

No areas of confusion

Standard 8 – Professional Experience

Is the overall format of the Standards and Criteria clear and easy to understand? Are the Standard statements clear and easy to understand? Are the Statements of Intent clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria clear and easy to understand? Is the Evidence Guide clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria congruent with the Standard statements and the Statements of Intent? Is the Evidence Guide congruent with the Criteria.

No areas of confusion

Standard 9 – Research

Is the overall format of the Standards and Criteria clear and easy to understand? Are the Standard statements clear and easy to understand? Are the Statements of Intent clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria clear and easy to understand? Is the Evidence Guide clear and easy to understand? Are the Criteria congruent with the Standard statements and the Statements of Intent? Is the Evidence Guide congruent with the Criteria.

No areas of confusion

Do you have any comments about the literature review

No areas of confusion

Thank you for your time and contribution