

North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust

Emergency Department – Nursing Placement Risk-based Review (on-site visit)



Quality Review report

26 October 2017

Final Report

Developing people
for health and
healthcare

www.hee.nhs.uk



Quality Review details

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Training programme | Emergency Department |
| Background to review | <p>The quality review team initiated the Risk-based Review (on-site visit) to North Middlesex University Hospital (NMUH) NHS Trust to explore the learning and training environment of the pre-registration nursing students in the emergency department (ED). The quality review team wanted to explore the level of support provided to the nursing students in ED, identify good practice and highlight any areas for improvement. The Nursing Placement Learning Review followed the Urgent Concern Review (on-site visit) to NMUH NHS Trust of medical trainees in ED, which was conducted earlier on the same week.</p> <p>The emergency department at NMUH had been a placement provider for pre-registration nursing students from three universities: Middlesex University (MU), City, University of London, and University of Hertfordshire (UH). The majority of students allocated to the department had been from MU. However, at the time of the on-site visit, the department was hosting students from MU only, and therefore no students from City, University of London or UH had been on placement in ED. Also at the time of the on-site visit, there had been four pre-registration nursing students allocated to the emergency department, but only one student had been on duty (on a day shift) on the day.</p> <p>The visit was supported by prior information from all three universities that had placed students in ED at NMUH. The information provided to the quality review team included summaries of student feedback/evaluations over the previous academic year. The on-site visit was also supported by the most recent educational audit conducted by MU, with Trust staff in April 2017. This information suggested that students' experience had generally been positive and the audit did not identify any significant areas for improvement.</p> |
| HEE quality review team | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Louise Morton, Dean of Healthcare Professions, Healthcare Education England, London and the South East • Diane Morgan, Interim Dean of Healthcare Education, Health Education England, London and the South East • Kathy Wilson, Head of Practice-based Learning, School of Health and Education, Middlesex University • Julie Moody, Link Lecturer, School of Health and Education, Middlesex University • Adora Depasupil, Learning Environment Quality Coordinator, Quality and Regulation Team, Health Education England (London and the South East) |
| Trust attendees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alan Makepeace, Trust Education Lead • Karen Wheeler, Department Pre-Registration Lead • Deborah Wheeler, Director of Nursing |

The quality review team also met with one pre-registration nursing student during the course of the visit. A second student with whom the team were hoping to meet was off sick.

Conversation details

| Ref. no. | Summary of discussions | Action to be taken? Y/N |
|----------|---|-------------------------|
| EDN1 | <p>Length of time allocated to emergency department (ED), shift patterns and time off</p> <p>The quality review team heard that the nursing students from MU were usually allocated to ED for five weeks. The quality review team heard that the shift pattern allocated to the nursing student that the team met on the day, had been similar to the other areas and wards in the Trust that the nursing student had previously worked in. The quality review team was also informed that the nursing students had been allocated shift patterns based on their allocated mentor's rota, to ensure that constant supervision and support was provided. It was reported that shift patterns were only changed to accommodate a student's request, or if the mentor allocated was scheduled to go on leave, then the nursing student was rostered with another mentor.</p> | |
| EDN2 | <p>Overview of the learning experience in ED</p> <p>The nursing student that the quality review team met reported that ED had been a very busy environment that offered a good learning experience, which facilitated the application of theory into practice. The quality review team heard that nursing students in ED were well supported and that staff were friendly. The quality review team was informed of a well-structured and helpful orientation process and saw a comprehensive and 'student-friendly' induction booklet that had been provided to the nursing students on the commencement of their ED placement.</p> <p>The trust education lead was extremely complimentary of the nursing staff in ED and of the practice education facilitator (PEF) regarding the level of support that they had provided to the nursing students. The quality review team was informed that the nursing students in ED enjoyed working in the department and that they felt supported.</p> <p>The quality review team was informed that the qualified nursing staff in ED had access to a range of post registration education opportunities including the Emergency Department Nursing Course, advanced life support courses and advanced assessment skills programmes.</p> <p>The quality review team learnt that the Trust education team conducted a weekly student forum, which students from ED had been encouraged to attend. The student who met with the quality review team reported that this had been a positive resource for the nursing students. The quality review team was informed that the department had two practice development nurses (PDNs) which had also contributed to the positive and supporting environment provided to the nursing students in ED. The Trust had just appointed an experienced ED nurse to a senior practice development nurse role in the department. This was a new role to oversee nursing education in the department, and had followed a recommendation from the previous Health Education England (HEE) quality review in March 2016. The Trust reported that the</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>preceptorship programme provided to all newly registered nurses had been well evaluated. The quality review team was further informed that following the preceptorship programme, as nurses entered into the second year post qualifying, the Trust had started to look at facilitating career-conversations, as developed through the CapitalNurse programme.</p> <p>The quality review team heard that the nursing students in ED had had access to various learning and training opportunities including: cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), catheterisation, pain management, computed tomography (CT) scan, management of acute chest pain and abdominal pain, electrocardiogram (ECG), deteriorating patients, and Sepsis Six. The quality review team heard that the nursing students had been introduced to policies and procedures in ED, and had received guidance as to how complete patient documentation. The quality review team was also pleased to hear that the nursing students had been provided with opportunities to encourage application of what they had learned in theory into practice.</p> <p>The quality review team heard an example of how the department had worked with the university to flex their approach to one of the students who needed additional support. The ED team had recognised that the student felt overwhelmed due to the number of staff talking with and assessing the student at the same time. However, the quality review team heard that plans had been put in place to organise the support provided to the student nurse which focused on selected learning objectives.</p> <p>The Trust noted the impact of reduction in post graduate/post registration education funding in the year 2017, and had reviewed their postgraduate provision accordingly. The quality review team learnt that the department had benefited from additional HEE funding to support Qualification in Speciality (ED nursing course) and advanced practice programmes. The quality review team also learnt that the Trust had also developed in-house mentorship course, in collaboration with London South Bank University.</p> <p>In regards to learning from the doctors, the Trust reported that medical teaching opportunities had been available to the nursing students. However, the quality review team heard that uptake had depended on content and level, as to whether it was appropriate for the nursing students and they felt sufficiently confident to participate.</p> <p>The emergency department is a fast-paced, busy environment with various learners seeking teaching, and therefore the quality review team heard that nursing students had been encouraged to be proactive and to use assertiveness in seeking guidance or explanation to maximise their learning opportunities.</p> <p>The quality review team heard that the nursing student that was met on the day of the visit had been allocated to care for a group of patients on trolleys in ED corridors during busy times. The nursing student stated that it was recognised that whilst this might not be optimal for patient experience, that support had been well provided to care for these patients. The nursing student further reported access to appropriate registered nurse guidance and supervision to provide safe care. The student gave an example of how communication in the department had worked well, and that with the support from the registered nurse supervisor, the student was able to liaise with the relevant consultant to deliver the required care. The nursing student also explained</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|------|--|--|
| | <p>that working with this group of patients, the learning objectives had been met and the student learnt how to apply the department's policies and procedures.</p> <p>The department pre-registration lead reported that the nursing students had been advised that on some occasions in ED, the staff may not always have time to explain procedures due to the emergency nature of some care. However, this had been explained to the students on induction and they had been actively encouraged to participate in care as appropriate and record their questions, and encouraged to seek explanation later. The nursing student reported that in ED, students had been encouraged to be proactive and to use their initiative. Therefore, the quality review team heard that some of the students, depending on their healthcare background had lacked confidence which sometimes resulted in a delay in completion of practice learning assessment document (PLPAD). Additionally, the nursing student further reported that students had no problem receiving clinical learning from the nursing staff, but that some staff had been reluctant to sign off their PLPADs if not the student's allocated mentor. However, the quality review team heard that the students recognised that this was often due to the busy environment in ED and the quality review team considered this to be a not uncommon finding across placement learning environments, which is addressed through mentor updates and student preparation. The quality review team saw an example of where a doctor had given positive written feedback to a student in their PLPAD.</p> | |
| EDN3 | <p>Examples of good practice</p> <p>The quality review team was informed that there had been good role-modelling by all staff members in the department which the nursing students had been able to observe. The nursing student reported that it was noticeable that the department had been extremely busy and described a high frequency of ambulance attendance but it had been observed that the staff, including doctors, nurses and paramedics in the department had been diligent and had been able to attend to the patients' needs and maintain their privacy. The nursing student reported that all staff remained professional and helpful at all times. The quality review team did not hear any reports of unprofessional behaviour or attitudes amongst staff in the department.</p> <p>The quality review team heard that nursing staff in ED tried to take regular breaks with cover, especially during very stressful times. The student explained how breaks were organised and that the nursing students had been encouraged to take a break especially if they felt overwhelmed by any stressful incidences in the department. The nursing student reported that the nursing staff had demonstrated that they had been able to look after their team members, and this had demonstrated good team work, cooperation and compassion within the department.</p> <p>The quality review team was informed that the mentors had helped students make the best use of the learning experience, and signposted students to relevant opportunities in order to provide the essential experiences needed to meet learning outcomes and complete the PLPADs. The Trust further reported that the nursing students had been able to benefit from shared learning during the ED nursing course where various staff members in ED had been able to share their different experiences in the department.</p> | |
| EDN4 | <p>How learning is shared</p> <p>The student/staff were invited to talk through with the quality review team any areas for improvement, where things have not gone well and how learning is shared in the department as a result.</p> <p>The quality review team was informed of an occasion when the nursing student came across a commode in the sluice area, which hadn't been cleaned appropriately. The nursing student reported that he had carried out appropriate cleaning and reported this</p> | |

| | | |
|------|--|--|
| | <p>to the nurse-in-charge. Subsequently, learning relating to infection control policies and procedures had been shared in the department during the regular handover meeting. The student described to the quality review team other examples of how learning and 'key messages' had been shared at handover.</p> <p>The quality review team was informed of one occasion when a student had transferred a patient to a ward and had not been well supervised. The department pre-registration lead informed the quality review team that the incident had been discussed with the nurses in the department, and there had been no reports of similar incidents that had taken place since.</p> <p>The quality review team was informed that adverse incidents (AIs) that had taken place in the department had been utilised for shared learning. It was reported that although the nursing students did not complete Datix, the quality review team heard that they had been invited to attend Datix/learning from incidents meetings. The quality review team considered this an excellent learning opportunity for students as an integral part of their placement learning experience in the department.</p> | |
| EDN5 | <p>Multidisciplinary team work</p> <p>The quality review team was pleased to hear that the nursing students felt that they had been well embedded within the multidisciplinary team in the department. It was also reported that although ED could be a challenging place to work in, the nursing students felt respected and valued as team members with excellent levels of support and supervision that had been provided by the nursing staff.</p> <p>During the time of the visit, the learning and training environment provided to the medical trainees in emergency department was also in the process of being reviewed. The quality review team heard that the Trust education lead felt that although the nursing students had been aware, that they had not been involved with the medical trainees' issues due to the nursing staff's nurturing approach with the nursing students. On the other hand, the quality review team heard concerns that if junior doctors were to be removed from the department, this may impact how ED is run and therefore may have an impact on the nursing students.</p> <p>The nursing student reported that if a task had been allocated to them that had been out of their competence, that they felt comfortable to inform their mentor or the nurse-in-charge who had been understanding and re-allocated care accordingly. The department pre-registration education lead hoped that the nursing students did feel that they had been part of a multidisciplinary team, and reported that students had been allocated to the resuscitation area and had been well supported by the nurses. The quality review team learnt that final-placements students had been supported to undertake care for a designated group of patients to meet the requirements of their sign-off placement. It was also reported that nursing students had been able to get experience with mental health patients, but the students had only been allocated if their mentors had been rostered in that area already.</p> | |
| EDN6 | <p>Mentorship</p> <p>The quality review team heard that Trust education team members either held or were working towards a practice teaching qualification. The quality review team was informed that the department had been well supported in regards to access to mentorship courses and that more staff had been encouraged to be mentors. It was reported that the practice education facilitator (PEF) had organised mentor updates as part of regular Band 6 and Band 7 away-days and MU had also provided mentor updates in the department. The quality team saw that the mentor register was up to</p> | |

| | | |
|------|--|--|
| | <p>date, with all active mentors compliant with mentorship updates. The department pre-registration lead reported that mentors had been encouraged to report if there had been any issues in relation to working with the students, and any foreseen delays with practise assessment documents sign-off completion.</p> <p>The quality review team heard that the Trust usually allocated two to three mentors to each nursing students. The department had sufficient sign off mentors but it was recognised by all that the department would benefit from additional sign-off mentors being trained in advance of the next cohort of final placement nursing students (in March 2018). There had been places available on sign-off courses at MU in the next few months that followed the time of the visit, and MU had planned to work with the ED and Trust education team to identify candidates to train as sign off mentors.</p> | |
| EDN7 | <p>Student evaluation and feedback</p> <p>The quality review team was informed that the nursing students had completed a university evaluation form at the end of their placement. Evaluations had been shared with the Trust on a quarterly basis. The Trust reported that although this meant that there can be a time-lag before the Trust received student-feedback, any issues identified had also been captured by the PEF which had immediately been addressed with the Trust education lead. The university also had reviewed evaluations so that any issues needing immediate attention had been identified and fed back to the Trust in a timely fashion. However, at the time of the visit, the Trust reported that an electronic form had just been launched to use locally.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Trust reported that the PEF had regularly met with the students during student forum meetings, and teaching sessions which also allowed the department to receive feedback from the students. Indeed, the nursing student that the quality review team met during the visit was positive about the student forum, and the support and opportunity for reflective practice that this provided. The MU head of practice-based learning highlighted that there had been no concerns reported by the students from the evaluation conducted prior to the visit, nor in the most recent educational audit carried out in April 2017.</p> <p>The quality review team was reassured by the report of the nursing student that feedback on end-of-placement work had been completed both at the Trust and at the university. The quality review team heard that if there had been a serious incident or poor practice that took place that involved the students, the students felt comfortable and knew to raise concerns as soon as possible. The nursing student was complimentary of the working relationship between the Trust and MU. The quality review team heard that this positively impacted the learning experiences of the nursing students within ED in North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust.</p> | |

Next steps

| Mandatory Requirements | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Req. Ref No. | Requirement | Required Actions / Evidence |
| N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Recommendations | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Rec. Ref No. | Recommendation | Recommended Actions / Evidence |
| N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Other Actions (including actions to be taken by Health Education England) | | |
|--|--|----------------|
| Recommendation | Recommended Actions | Responsibility |
| The quality review team recommended that there was a need for some clarification, in terms of department structures, regarding senior support provided to the pre-registration education lead and agreed routes of escalation. Whilst the visit team was satisfied, that requirements for mentor/student review meetings and practice assessment requirements were being met, there was scope for greater clarity in relation to oversight and assurance of this and how/where this should be evidenced. | Trust and department leadership team to review senior support and routes of escalation for pre-registration team in the department. Trust education team to work with department leads to ensure appropriate measures in place to monitor and evidence that education requirements for pre-registration nurses are being met. | The Trust |
| The quality review team considered that the pre-registration education lead may benefit from wider peer support from colleagues in similar roles outside the department. | Trust education team to work with the department leads and pre-registration lead to determine how best to support educational development of pre-registration lead and access to peer support | The Trust |
| It was reported that the nursing students were able to have their practice assessment documents completed and sign-off mentor arrangements were in place. However, the quality review team heard that the department would benefit from additional sign-off mentors being trained in advance of the next cohort of final placement nursing students (March 18). | ED department and Trust education team to determine candidates for sign-off mentor training and confirm places/training dates with MU. | The Trust |

| Signed | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| By the HEE Review Lead on behalf of the Quality Review Team: | Louise Morton and Diane Morgan |
| Date: | 8 November 2017 |