

**Northern Ireland Practice and Education Council for Nursing and Midwifery
(NIPEC)**

The Development Framework for Nurses and Midwives

Notes of the Third Meeting of the Project Board held on Wednesday 8th October 2003 at 2.00pm in the Council Room, NIPEC, 79 Chichester Street, Belfast

Present

Mrs M Griffith (Chair)
Miss P Blaney (CE)
Professor M Bradley(RCN)
Mrs M Gordon (LHSCG)
Professor M Hanratty (BMC)
Ms Breedagh Hughes (RCM)
Ms Janet Montgomery (IHCP)
Professor H McKenna (UU)
Mrs Maria O'Hare (Lay member NIPEC)
Ms Briega Coyle (CPHVA)
Ms Joyce Cairns (DHSSPS)
Ms Janice Smyth (DHSSPS)
Mrs Hazel Baird (Homefirst Trust)
Mr John Mone (Craigavon Hospital HSS Trust)
Mrs M Waddell (EHSSB)
Mrs Martina O'Neill (Nurse Rep.)
Mrs Elaine Madden (Midwife Rep.)
Professor Brendan Mc Cormack (Nurse Rep. Practice Development)
Mr Stephen Hodkinson (C.E. Rep.)

In attendance

Mr B McGrath (SPO, NIPEC)
Miss L Barrowman (SPO, NIPEC)
Dr T McCance (SPO, NIPEC)
Mrs E Blaney (Note taker)

1.0 Apologies

Ms Linda Coey (UNISON)
Ms Irene Duddy (Altnagelvin Hospitals Trust)
Ms Marie Mallon (Royal Group of Hospitals Trust)
Professor J Orr (QUB)
Ms Siobhan Rooney (South and East Belfast Trust)
Mrs Delia Van Der Lenden (SHSSC)

2.0 Notes of the previous meeting (27& 28 August 2003)

The notes of the last meeting held on 27th and 28th August, were agreed as an accurate record.

3.0 **Matters Arising**

(i) **Values Clarification Exercise – Presentation**

Members were reminded that a draft copy of the Values Clarification paper and audit trail had been circulated at the close of the workshop on 28th August. Members who were unable to attend the workshop were invited to complete the Values Clarification Exercise and their responses had been incorporated into the revised version of the paper that was circulated prior to the Project Board meeting. Brendan McGrath then presented the main themes within each stem formulated into sentences. He concluded that the Values Clarification work would serve three purposes,

- (i) It would become a foundation piece in design of Development framework
- (ii) It would be incorporated into the Project Plan, and
- (iii) It would be valuable during the evaluation of the project.

During a brief discussion that followed members acknowledged that the presentation adequately reflected the key values and beliefs held about the Development Framework and that the exercise of formulating sentences helped clarify the purpose and value of the exercise.

(ii) **Model Gantt Chart**

Members were issued with a copy of the model gantt chart constructed using the suggested tasks and activities during the workshop. Chair explained that this would serve as a record of the original ideas put forward by the Project Board. This work would now be revised in preparing the project plan which would be informed by the Project Board's response to the presentation on the Work Plan scheduled for the meeting.

4.0 **Project Group**

Members received a copy of the membership of the Project Group. Paddie Blaney explained that she was having difficulty getting a representative from Human Resources. Members reiterated that the person would need to be at senior level. Mrs Mary Waddell suggested Therese McKernan from Greenpark. Paddie Blaney agreed to follow this suggestion up. Members were also informed about the Project Group's residential event planned for 4th and 5th December 2003.

5.0 **Project Manager**

Paddie Blaney gave an update on the recruitment of the Project Manager and confirmed that interviews were being held on 17th October 2003.

6.0 **Work Plan – Presentation**

Paddie Blaney gave a presentation on the proposed work plan for the Development Framework. She advised members that the Work Plan had been informed by the Values Clarification Exercise and the model Gantt Chart from the Project Board Workshop. She highlighted that the detail of the Communication Strategy was not included in the Work Plan presentation. This piece would be further developed by the Project Manager and Mr Edmund Thom, Head of Corporate Services at NIPEC.

7.0 **Discussion**

Following the initial presentation, Chair commended the Senior Team in NIPEC on the work to date. As a way forward, she suggested that the Project Board discuss each section of the Work Plan in turn.

General Comments

General comments included that the presentation appeared comprehensive and reflected the size of the task of designing the Development Framework. Concerns expressed included, to what extent the Work Plan reflected the ideas of the Project Board and how realistic the volume of work was within the proposed timeframe.

The need to complement other developmental work that related to the Development Framework was highlighted, such as work being undertaken as part of the Modernisation Agenda and work being undertaken by the NMC, RCN and Department of Health in England.

The style of language used to market and communicate the Development Framework was raised which prompted the question as to whether the Project Board needed to do some further Values Clarification work on terminology. Paddie Blaney reminded members that today's presentation reflected a first attempt at structuring the work required to produce the Development Framework. Before the Framework would be communicated to the wider stakeholder population it would be presented in a format capable of being understood by all, in keeping with all NIPEC publications.

Phase 1: Foundation Work.

There was a general acceptance of the need for the identified literature searches. The discussion centred on the systematic type reviews or comprehensive literature reviews required and the time required to undertake or commission these. It was agreed that a specification would be drawn up within NIPEC and that 8 months should be allowed for the completion of Phase 1.

The availability of workforce information was debated for a time and the challenge of capturing reliable data from the independent sector was acknowledged. In conclusion it was agreed that the focus of the Development Framework was not about workforce planning, but that the Framework needed to be aware of the changing profile of the nursing and midwifery workforce.

Phase 2: Guidance Papers

Clarification was sought on two issues. The first was the context of the word 'guidance', the second was whether the guidance papers would be separate papers. Paddie Blaney explained that it was envisaged that the primary outcome of the work on Role Development, Learning and CPD and Performance Assessment was to inform the design of the Development Framework. However guidance documents could be produced as a secondary output in a similar fashion to the Commission of Nursing in the Republic of Ireland and Extended Nursing Roles in Practice Project (ENRiP) initiatives. Regarding the issue of whether the guidance papers would be separate documents, Paddie Blaney explained that the papers could be considered as individual sections within a reference package that would collectively represent the core features of the Development Framework. She indicated that employers of nurses and midwives would be the target audience for the guidance document.

With regard to a point raised during the general comments on the Work Plan about learning from other development work, Paddie Blaney remarked that the Project Outline was being shared with the Chief Nursing Officer in England, Scotland and Wales.

Phase 3: Two versions of the Development Framework for Consultation.

Paddie Blaney highlighted that it was envisaged that two versions of the Development Framework may be issued for consultation. One version directed at individual nurses and midwives within teams and one version directed at employers and directorate or divisional teams.

The Project Board members agreed with this proposal but emphasised the need for an effective communication strategy with all stakeholder groups.

Phase 4: Project Report

The proposed contents of the Project Report were accepted. The Project Board specifically highlighted the importance of the recommendations being made soundly and clearly to the DHSSPS.

Communication Issues

The need for a comprehensive communication strategy was agreed and Paddie Blaney added that this would be one of the primary responsibilities of the Project Manager when in post.

Challenges

A range of challenges anticipated from designing the Development Framework were presented. Members accepted that these were realistic and that the work would have to be closely monitored to identify problems at an early stage.

Ownership of the Development Framework

The issue of who would own the Development Framework was raised. Chair explained that the Development Framework was one of the five corporate areas identified within NIPEC's Corporate Strategy and thus was the responsibility of NIPEC to deliver on. However the DHSSPS would play a vital role in the implementation of the Development Framework through its endorsement of the Framework and reference within future policy documents. Ownership of the Development Framework by the wider nursing and midwifery community and employers was also very important for its successful implementation which would be guided by NIPEC.

8.0 **Schedule of dates for future meetings**

The schedule of dates for future meetings was agreed.

9.0 **Any Other Business**

9.1 Logo

A logo for the Development Framework devised as one of the outputs from the Project Board Workshop in August 2003 was presented and approved.