




Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Nurse Education in Practice

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/nejpr

A scoping study to explore the application and impact of grading practice in pre-registration midwifery programmes across the United Kingdom

Margaret Fisher ^{a,*}, Heather Bower ^{b,1}, Sam Chenery-Morris ^c, Judith Jackson ^d, Susan Way ^e

^a 8 Portland Villas, Plymouth University, Drake Circus, Plymouth, Devon, PL4 8AA, United Kingdom

^b Oxford Brookes University, Jack Straw's Lane, Marston, Oxford, OX3 0FL, United Kingdom

^c University Campus Suffolk, Waterfront Building, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP4 1QJ, United Kingdom

^d London South Bank University, 103 Borough Road, London, SE1 0AA, United Kingdom

^e Bournemouth University, Royal London House, Christchurch Road, Bournemouth, Dorset, BH1 3LT, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 16 March 2015

Received in revised form

17 January 2016

Accepted 24 January 2016

Keywords:

Grading

Practice

Midwifery

Mentor

ABSTRACT

Grading of practice is a mandatory element of programmes leading to registration as a midwife in the United Kingdom, required by the Nursing and Midwifery Council. This validates the importance of practice by placing it on an equal level with academic work, contributing to degree classification. This paper discusses a scoping project undertaken by the Lead Midwives for Education group across the 55 Higher Education Institutions in the United Kingdom which deliver pre-registration midwifery programmes. A questionnaire was circulated and practice tools shared, enabling exploration of the application of the standards and collation of the views of the Lead Midwives. Timing and individuals involved in practice assessment varied as did the components and the credit weighting applied to practice modules. Sign-off mentor confidence in awarding a range of grades had increased over time, and mentors seemed positive about the value given to practice and their role as professional gatekeepers. Grading was generally felt to be more robust and meaningful than pass/refer. It also appeared that practice grading may contribute to an enhanced student academic profile. A set of guiding principles is being developed with the purpose of enhancing consistency of the application of the professional standards across the United Kingdom.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Since September 2008, the United Kingdom Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) has required all programmes leading to registration as a midwife to grade practice (NMC, 2009). The NMC sets the standards to be achieved, but the operationalising of these is the responsibility of the individual programme team in collaboration with clinical colleagues and subject to their Higher Education Institution (HEI) regulations.

In March 2013, the Lead Midwives for Education United Kingdom Executive Group (LME-UK) agreed that a sub-group of experienced colleagues with a shared interest in practice assessment would undertake a national scoping activity across the HEIs where pre-registration midwifery programmes are delivered. The LME role is a requirement of the NMC, having accountability and oversight for all matters pertaining to midwifery education in their institution. The LME-UK peer support group membership comprises senior educationalists from all 55 universities across the four countries who lead on development, delivery and management of midwifery education programmes, meeting separately from the NMC. This enables collaborative opportunities and integration of differing health policies across the UK (LME-UK Executive Terms of Reference (2014)).

The purpose of the project was to explore the range of methods of application of the NMC (2009) standards in relation to grading of

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44 07815 527989, +44 01752 587588.

E-mail addresses: margaret.fisher@plymouth.ac.uk (M. Fisher), H.M.Bower@greenwich.ac.uk (H. Bower), s.chenerymorris@ucs.ac.uk (S. Chenery-Morris), judithjackson90@gmail.com (J. Jackson), sueway@bournemouth.ac.uk (S. Way).

¹ Present address: University of Greenwich, Avery Hill Road, Eltham, London, SE9 2UG, United Kingdom.

practice across the UK. A survey evaluating assessment processes and views on the impact of grading of practice was undertaken through circulation of a questionnaire to the LME-UK group. No other study exploring midwifery practice assessment has been conducted on such a broad scale.

Background

The 'Standards for pre registration midwifery education' (NMC, 2009) require all universities in the UK to implement grading as a key aspect of practice based assessment in midwifery. The rationale is to place equal emphasis on practice and theory. Standard 15 (NMC, 2009, p. 21) identifies that:

- "Assessment of practice, which is direct hands-on care, must be graded.
- The grades achieved must contribute to the outcome of the final academic award.
- If the assessment of clinical practice involves a variety of components and the student fails to achieve competence in one of the components, then the student must fail."

The midwifery sign-off mentor is an experienced clinician who has undertaken additional academic preparation as well as been involved in the assessment process of a midwifery student on at least three occasions (NMC, 2008). In contrast to nursing, a sign-off mentor is required for all progression points. The Nursing and Midwifery Council (2009, p. 21) defines a progression point as: "a point (or points) established for the purpose of making summative judgments about safe and effective practice in a programme". The responsibility of this role is therefore very evident as sign-off mentors are essentially the gatekeepers to the profession from a practice perspective. Practice assessment brings with it challenges and rewards, and the lived experience of fulfilling a role which is paramount in ascertaining a student's competence is described in both midwifery and nursing literature (Duffy, 2004; Fisher and Webb, 2008; Fisher, 2009; Fisher et al., 2011; Jervis and Tilki, 2011; Marsh et al., 2005; Rutkowski, 2007; Skingley et al., 2007). Grading adds a further dimension in that not only is competence itself determined, but a scale measuring the level of performance in practice is also required (Chenery-Morris, 2010). Maxted et al. (2004) suggests that practitioners can find separating these concepts challenging. The process of grading practice is influenced by multiple assessors in the form of individual sign-off mentors. Interpretation of the grading tools used can challenge inter and intra-assessor reliability (Donaldson and Gray, 2012; Smith, 2007). Mentors have, however, found grading tools helpful for students who were not performing well (Heaslip and Scammell, 2012).

National Health Service (NHS) Education for Scotland (NES, 2008) noted that the range and breadth of practice assessments are diverse in contrast to greater similarity in theoretical modules. Gray and Donaldson (2009) recommended that ongoing evaluation and monitoring of grading processes should be undertaken, which is further supported by Heaslip and Scammell (2012) and Bennett and McGowan (2014).

The LME-UK group recognised from earlier discussions that a range of approaches was likely to be identified. It was therefore anticipated that a set of guiding principles to mitigate these factors in grading of practice may be a potential outcome of the project.

Project design

This descriptive evaluative survey sought to ascertain the varying practice assessment methods, tools and views across the full range of pre-registration midwifery programmes in the UK.

This particular approach was used in order to elicit in-depth details of the range of methods HEIs currently use when applying the NMC standards (2009) within the constraints of the individual institutional regulations across the four countries. The intention was to identify any perceived impact on degree classification and consider the experience of those involved in grading practice. This may help realise the contributory factors and impact of any inconsistencies in grading practice. As the LME-UK group had itself initiated this scoping activity as an internal evaluation and no other participants were involved, no ethical approval was required.

In order to elicit the information, three key areas were explored through circulation of a questionnaire: 1) the process of grading practice; 2) the impact of grading of practice on mark profiles; 3) clinicians' views on grading of practice (see Table 1).

This was circulated electronically via the professional network following an initial introduction at an LME-UK meeting. Colleagues were also invited to share the practice assessment tools used in their institutions. Subsequent rounds of requests for feedback were undertaken in person at LME meetings or electronically. A 73% response rate was achieved, totalling 40 of 55 universities and reflecting the whole geographic spread of HEIs providing pre-registration midwifery education across the UK (see Table 2).

The data was compiled onto a spreadsheet, categorised according to the questions and relevant institutions which were subsequently anonymised. The project team divided the questions for initial thematic analysis which was then cross-checked by the rest of the team.

Findings

The findings were categorised into: 1) The process of grading practice; 2) The impact of grading of practice on mark profiles; 3) Clinicians' views on grading of practice. A brief summary follows presentation of each section.

The process of grading practice

Practice placements where grading took place included community, labour suite, antenatal, postnatal and caseload holding. A combination of both formative and summative grading was used in most HEIs. Findings from the specific questions are identified below:

Table 1
Grading of practice scoping questionnaire.

1. For each year of the course/programme for both the long and the short courses/programmes:
 - a. When do you 'Grade practice'?
 - b. How do you 'Grade practice'?
 - c. What weighting is given to 'Grading of practice'?
2. Has there been any observable alteration to students' mark profiles since 'Grading of practice' was mandatory? (e.g., higher, lower, no difference)
3. From Annual Monitoring of the course/programme, how do clinicians view 'Grading of practice'?

Table 2
Profile of respondents.

Country	Number of HEIs	Number of respondents
England	47	34
Scotland	3	3
Wales	4	2
Northern Ireland	1	1
TOTAL	55	40 = 73%

When do you 'Grade practice'?

Only an open question was asked, leaving respondents to use free text to explain their processes. Quantitative data were therefore not available, but four themes emerged to reflect the differing approaches: (i) Twice a year; (ii) End of year; (iii) Variety throughout the year; (iv) Clinical practice modules.

- (i) **Twice a year** – If grading took place twice a year it was generally at the end of a six-month period or semester. In some instances a formative assessment was undertaken after the first six months and a summative after the second. In some cases each semester had a summative assessment with occasionally an average of the two grades used as the final mark.
- (ii) **End of the year** – Although in this theme grading took place at the end of the year in all cases, some elements may also have been assessed at the end of specific placements. All grades were reviewed at the end of the year and could be increased if further experience had been gained. In one case practice was assessed as pass/fail using competence measured against the five core midwifery Essential Skills Clusters (NMC, 2009) and a grade was then awarded for overall performance at the end of the year.
- (iii) **Variety throughout the year** – Not all HEIs graded practice every year, whilst others undertook formative or summative assessment after each practice placement throughout the programme.
- (iv) **Clinical practice modules** – In many institutions discrete modules were allocated to practice, with at least one being included in each year of the programme. As described earlier, frequency varied and practice was not always a summative component of the module assessment in either year one or two. All final year practice modules across all universities were, however, summatively assessed.

How do you 'Grade practice'?

The qualitative responses to this open question were categorised in a grid using terms such as mentors, grading tool, summative or formative point and types of grades. These themes were then adjusted to reflect an emerging alliteration according to six 'Ps' – (i) **People**, (ii) **Process**, (iii) **Point in course**, (iv) **Package**, (v) **Pass marks** and (vi) **Portfolio**. This is reminiscent of themes identified in an earlier multiprofessional study on assessing practice (Fisher et al., 2011) – process, preparation, purpose, placement, people and professional persona.

- (i) **People** – Clinical and university based midwives were involved in the process of grading practice across all HEIs, with clinical staff comprising mentors, midwives or sign-off mentors. Academics were referred to as lecturer, link lecturer, personal tutor or teacher, midwife teacher or university lecturer. In one university a supervisor of midwives was involved in the process. Only a couple of responses stated that the students had contributed to their practice assessment.
- (ii) **Process** – A range of processes in awarding grades were described. These included: grades awarded only by sign-off mentors; assessment of competence and provision of qualitative feedback by sign-off mentors which was subsequently graded by academics; clinicians marked and lecturers moderated, or a clinical educational meeting was arranged for moderation. A tripartite meeting (or triad) involving the student, sign-off mentor and lecturer was mentioned by seven universities. This could be face-to-face or over the

telephone. On some occasions grading was undertaken at this meeting while in others marks had already been awarded prior to the discussion. In some institutions it was unclear whether the grade was actually derived from practice or from a written piece of work to complement this.

- (iii) **Point in course** – Continuous assessment was mentioned by several respondents. Practice was commonly graded in the final week of placement, although a range of assessment points were used across the UK, as identified earlier. One respondent mentioned intermediate and final, but these terms were not qualified. One explicitly stated that assessment was at academic levels five and six only (i.e., years two and three).
- (iv) **Package** – The framework or tool used in practice assessment varied across HEIs. The most frequent terms describing tools included criteria, scoring tool, criterion referencing, percentages and aggregate scores. Some tools had up to 20 descriptors with five possible grades. Criteria assessed included both clinical skills and concept-based components, with knowledge, skills, attitudes, communication, co-operation, team work, reflection, problem solving and self-awareness being cited. One HEI specifically mentioned the close relationship between the NMC Essential Skills Clusters (NMC, 2009) and the assessment tool. Others commented on continuous assessment, signing of learning outcomes and NMC Domains (NMC, 2009). Some programmes used published frameworks such as Benner's 'Novice to expert' (1984) or Steinaker and Bell's 'Experiential taxonomy' (1979). Others devised their own framework, incorporating the '6Cs' (Department of Health (2012)). Two cited common assessment documents used in their region.
- (v) **Pass marks** – In compliance with NMC requirements, all HEIs ensured that if one element of practice did not pass, the whole assessment was deemed a fail and had to be achieved at second attempt (NMC, 2009). Pass marks were defined as 'D', 40%, 50% or a simple pass/refer. One rubric indicated a choice of grades within a band. Descriptive measures ranged from refer to excellent with up to five or six available scores, or A–F and AA–F. Several respondents stated that the academics undertook a formulaic calculation to convert these descriptive terms to numeric marks.
- (vi) **Portfolio** – Not all of the institutions used a grade which was derived only from direct assessment of practice in the placement. Other modes of assessment included portfolios or reflective accounts, caseload reports, viva voce and Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) such as hand washing and administration of medicines. One university incorporated ward and medicine management assessments in the clinical environment as part of the practice grade. As little as 10% of the grade could arise from clinical practice only; in this institution a portfolio and viva voce made up 90% of the practice grade. One tool had four elements marked by the mentor (contributing to 50% of the assessment) with another marked by mentor and lecturer comprising the second half. Another university determined achievement of practice competencies through confirmation by the sign-off mentor, with the portfolio itself comprising 100% of the practice grade.

What weighting is given to 'Grading of practice'?

This was again an open question, and general categorisation of qualitative responses took place. At least 50% of the practice module/s in the majority of programmes comprised grading of practice, but this attracted a variable number of credits. Between 10

and 60 of the 120 academic credits were awarded each year for practice across the UK, with some institutions increasing the credits incrementally as the years progressed, such as 20 in year one and 60 in year three. Some extremely complex calculations were used.

In summary, a significant lack of parity in the process of grading practice was demonstrated across UK pre-registration midwifery programmes. Although all institutions met Standard 15 of the NMC requirements for grading of practice (2009), there was a wide variation in approach. Timing included differing interpretations of 'progression points'. A range of modes of assessment attracting practice grades were described, and weighting was variable. There were notable differences in the assessment of observed practice in clinical settings and the extent to which this contributed to the overall practice grades. Although a sign-off mentor was always part of the practice assessment process, a number of other contributors were cited.

A diversity of frameworks or assessment tools were used, however commonalities in clinical skills and concept-based components as outcomes were noted.

The impact of 'Grading of practice' on mark profiles

Quantitative responses were sought to the question about whether there had been any observable alteration to students' mark profiles since grading of practice became mandatory, with options being provided. The results are shown in Fig. 1. The six respondents (15%) who said they were unable to comment explained that this was either because grading had been undertaken for over 10 years in their institution so it was not possible to make comparisons with previous academic profiles, or that grading had only recently been introduced. Half of the respondents (n = 20) stated that students' mark profiles were higher since practice had been graded. Fourteen (35%) stated that no difference was evident. Of note, no respondents said the profiles had decreased.

Themes which emerged in the qualitative responses to this question were categorised into: (i) Degree classification; (ii) Correlation between practice and academic modules; (iii) Grading profile; (iv) Increased confidence; (v) Moderating influences; (vi) Contributory factors.

- (i) **Degree classification** – The general view was that the positive impact on degree classification was acceptable and to be

expected as a minimum of 50% of the programme was practice-based. It was suggested that academic module profiles were often close to the next grading band and the practice module/s tipped them over into the next category as they often fell in the 70% + bracket.

- (ii) **Correlation between practice and academic modules** – Generally students who were academic high-achievers also gained high marks for practice. There were, however, exceptions to this: one cited a band difference (higher) for weaker students and another noted that some students who were less able academically but known to perform at a high standard in practice achieved grades reflecting this. The resultant altered profile was considered to recognise the importance of practice.
- (iii) **Grading profile** – The full range of grades was now seen and a more normal distribution curve was noted in a number of HEIs. One respondent stated that the profile of marks achieved by individual students across criteria showed variations which indicated that sign-off mentors were thoughtful about grades awarded, and that the range of grades across the cohort was reassuring of the process in placements across the region. However, one respondent stated that students did not always feel their achievements in practice were reflected in the grade awarded, thinking this should be higher. They also perceived a variation in the grading process between different mentors and personal tutors in their institution.
- (iv) **Increased confidence** – Nearly all respondents noted that as sign-off mentors became more familiar with the process and the assessment tool became more refined, they appeared more appreciative of the implications of giving higher grades and reserved these for 'exceptional' students. This increased confidence also resulted in enhanced decisiveness in constructive referral.
- (v) **Moderating influences** – Factors identified which appeared to enhance the 'moderation' of inflated grades and rigour of assessment included:
- (vi) **Contributory factors** – Two respondents noted that other initiatives could have resulted in the apparent improvement in profiles and awards over the past few years, such as a change to degree pathways and recruitment practices. This included the requirement for higher academic achievements




Fig. 1. Alterations to students' mark profiles.

for entry to many of the programmes, reflected in increased UCAS points (the UK Universities and Colleges Admissions Service rating system). It was also suggested that students' improved uptake of and responsiveness to formative feedback and feed-forward in theory and practice could contribute to increased marks.

- Careful wording of grading frameworks or criteria;
- Support from academics at implementation of a new assessment tool or process;
- Formative grading opportunities which provided a benchmark for subsequent summative grading activities and also enabled new sign-off mentors to practise these skills;
- In institutions where this was used, tripartite (or 'triad') discussions involving an academic, the sign-off mentor and student were valued as a moderation process, ensuring that grading aligned with the sign-off mentor's qualitative (written or verbal) evaluation of the student's performance;
- In institutions where other components in addition to pure clinically-based practice assessment were included, respondents considered that this helped mediate grade inflation yet maintained the focus on accredited practice.

In summary, the majority of respondents noted an increase in or maintenance of academic profiles since grading of practice was introduced. It was clear that these changes were generally welcomed by the academics, who considered that the increased emphasis on practice was a positive development. It was evident that as the grading process had become embedded, so sign-off mentor confidence had grown – and this was further enhanced by clear frameworks and processes. The importance of academics supporting sign-off mentors in their role in order to ensure a level of intra and inter-assessor reliability was highlighted, and a range of approaches was taken to address this. Some alternative influences were suggested which may have also contributed to the apparent increase in mark profiles.

Clinicians' views on grading of practice

Respondents were asked to draw on their experiences from internal quality monitoring processes and other interactions with clinicians in order to determine their perceptions of grading of practice. Qualitative responses were themed: (i) Being valued; (ii) Specificity; (iii) Partnerships; (iv) Challenges.

- (i) **Being valued** – Nearly all respondents said that clinicians were positive about grading of practice and comfortable with the process. Reasons included especially:
- The value this gave to practice and its minimum 50% contribution to the programme;
 - The opportunity to reward and value students who excelled in practice, contributing to their degree classification;
 - The value this gave to the sign-off mentors as contributors to the assessment process and their role as professional gatekeepers.
- (ii) **Specificity** – Clinicians were not keen on a pass/fail system and preferred the awarding of grades, considering this to be more robust; those who had experienced assessment of students prior to the implementation of grading were particularly vocal. Sign-off mentors felt grading acknowledged good practice across different domains and highlighted strengths and weaknesses in a way that was

comparable. They saw grading as essential to properly reflect a student's capabilities. They also liked the fact that students received instant feedback about their performance. Those who had experienced poorly achieving or failing students were positive about the assessment document enabling them to pin-point areas of weakness and make clearer decisions through having to award a specific grade. It was evident from the majority of the HEI responses that as clinicians became more confident in the process, so did their appreciation of grading.

- (iii) **Partnerships** – Academic staff or link lecturers were considered very important to the assessment process. Their role included clarification of issues, support of sign-off mentors to make their decisions, moderation at tripartite meetings (where these occurred), or provision of general guidance at mentor updates and ad hoc encounters. Grading workshops were seen as very useful. Academics and clinicians appreciated collaborative partnerships and clinicians were positive about being consulted. There was a willingness of academics to modify assessment tools following clinician feedback regarding clarity. In one institution, clinicians had appreciated their workload being taken into account when they expressed a wish not to grade practice themselves – instead qualitative comments were awarded a mark by academics. Consultation was reported to have been commended by the NMC at validation events. Not all clinicians were equally enthusiastic about their increased role, however. One respondent commented that mixed opinions had been expressed by sign-off mentors about recent changes to the programme whereby they were now required to undertake grading which had previously been performed by an academic and supervisor of midwives.
- (iv) **Challenges** – Challenges to clinicians and the grading process included:
- Time to complete documentation or undertake the grading process was considered a major factor.
 - Tripartite meetings (triads) were resource-intensive although beneficial.
 - Objectivity could be difficult – some sign-off mentors became too 'close' to students. Some found grading challenging as they felt this was a judgement on an individual rather than appreciating it was the student's performance which was being assessed.
 - Some sign-off mentors were reluctant to award higher grades early in the course and needed guidance from academics to differentiate between criteria associated with different stages of the programme and to use the full range of grades. One respondent said that concern not to over-inflate grades could result in the opposite outcome. Lecturers worked hard with sign-off mentors to explain the concept of a normative curve.
 - Some sign-off mentors still found it difficult to fail students. Students were noted to be very competitive.
 - Some mentors found it difficult to provide face-to-face feedback and phrased comments differently in written and verbal forms – this could result in a discrepancy between qualitative comments and grades awarded.
 - Clinicians in one area had been concerned about the move to an electronic portfolio, although another HEI said that the advantage of grading being electronic was that it was auditable.

In summary, responses to this question were largely positive about the feedback received from clinicians regarding grading of practice. Most described an increased satisfaction in the specificity

of assessment since grading had been introduced. It was clear that mentors took their role very seriously and felt valued for the contribution they made to the process. They appreciated partnership-working and support from academics. A number of challenges were highlighted including time constraints, objectivity, benchmarking, failing students, comment and grading congruence and the use of electronic portfolios.

Discussion

As the purpose of the project was to evaluate and elicit in-depth detail of the application of the NMC (2009) standards relating to grading of practice, quantitative data were considered of lesser importance and free text in response to open questions was encouraged. Therefore, although some quantitative data were produced, these were generally only used as a guide in relation to whether findings were unique to an institution or more widespread. No attempts were made to draw any within-group comparisons. The project group was more interested in establishing patterns of similarity or variance and ascertaining the possible causes and impact of inconsistencies through examining the emerging themes from the qualitative responses.

Key findings around timing, modes and academic weighting given to practice assessment demonstrated widespread variation in application of the NMC standards to pre-registration midwifery programmes across the UK. Similarly, the extent to which clinicians were involved and the emphasis given to the contribution of directly observed practice to the overall practice grade and therefore academic profile showed notable differences. Although all institutions complied with the core principles of Standard 15 (NMC, 2009), the wide variations in interpretation caused some concern. These were reflected in another published scoping exercise in nursing (Mallik and McGowan, 2007). The scale of this midwifery survey has, however, provided new information relating to the extent of these discrepancies.

The benefits and challenges of reflection, portfolios, observations and tripartite meetings in a range of professions are well documented in the wider literature (Doughty et al., 2007; Fisher and Webb, 2008; Fisher et al., 2011; Smith, 2007), and this study provided further evidence to support these. The findings also concur with the literature that support from academics is needed to enable those assessing practice to fulfil their role (Bennett and McGowan, 2014; Black et al., 2013; Fisher and Webb, 2008; Fisher, 2009; Gainsbury, 2010; Heaslip and Scamell, 2012). This is essential in order to avoid 'failure to fail' which continues to be an issue particularly in the nursing literature (Black et al., 2013; Duffy, 2004; Jervis and Tilki, 2011; Rutkowski, 2007). This project identified, however, that mentors become more confident in grading practice and use the full range of marks available as they gain experience – particularly when supported by academics. Although opinions are divided as to the academic's role in grading practice since they do not usually witness the student's performance (Passmore and Chenery-Morris, 2014), their role in tripartite or triad meetings may – as seen in this study – fulfil a combination of valuable educational and psychosocial support. Of note, a number of respondents stated that clinicians indicated that they found the grading process helpful in discerning levels of performance and specifying those students who were not achieving. This suggests that grading may empower clinicians to more effectively determine fitness to progress or enter the register as a midwife.

This study found that there appeared to have been a positive skew in the profile of midwifery students' marks and therefore degree classification since grading of practice became mandatory. This was a finding which has not previously been reported on such a wide scale. Whether – as suggested by some respondents – this is

a good thing as it emphasises the importance of practice, or whether it may reflect challenges of inter and intra-assessor reliability due to the range of individuals involved in the process is open to debate. A systematic literature review of grading in a range of professional practices also raised the issue of grade inflation (Gray and Donaldson, 2009). They found that this could be attributed to pressure by students, leniency of mentors, inadequate understanding of the impact of grading, a close student–mentor relationship and efficacy of the tool. Their later paper (Donaldson and Gray, 2012) offered ways to reduce this, such as development of a common practice assessment tool. Whilst a range of assessment methods were used in the programmes evaluated in this study, all incorporated a combination of concept-based and practical skills assessment. The importance of assessing all these criteria is supported in the wider literature and across health professions (Fisher et al., 2011; McLean et al., 2005; McLean, 2012; Nicholls and Webb, 2006). It is, however, important that there is parity in the measures used to assess competence at point of registration, or inter-assessor reliability and validity is compromised and the consistency of decision-making is put into question.

Separate to this project but happening at a similar time, funding was agreed by three UK Local Education and Training Boards to develop a common midwifery practice assessment tool between eight universities and their practice partners in London (Gillman, 2014). This initiative was in response to a request from the local Trusts after the successful implementation of a PAN London nursing practice assessment document in 2014. Similar unpublished work had previously been undertaken across six sites in the Yorkshire and Humber region of England, where a common midwifery practice assessment tool had been implemented and evaluated. A Scottish tool is also being proposed.

The design of this study was largely qualitative and statistical significance cannot therefore be defined, however the inconsistencies in interpretation and application of the NMC (2009) standards are unequivocal. Although some diversity is inevitable as the structures of curricula will differ, programme teams will have a unique ethos and university regulations will vary, it could be argued that a move towards greater equity of assessment would be good practice. It is therefore intended that a set of core principles and common grading matrix will be developed by the LME-UK group, drawing on the findings from this study. Work is already underway to refine these. As the NMC standards are currently being reviewed and the opportunity will therefore arise for teams to incorporate these principles into newly validated programmes, it is hoped that parity of practice assessment processes will thus be enhanced.

Conclusions

The LME-UK group benefits from opportunities for collaboration and sharing of projects which are perhaps unique due to the network of midwifery educationalists and institutions across the four countries. This facilitates dissemination of 'best practice'. This scoping activity was therefore important as it enabled a nationwide evaluation of methods, tools and views currently used to grade practice in midwifery programmes. The value of undertaking such a widely representative project cannot be underestimated, and some findings may be transferable to other professions and programmes.

There is the opportunity for key educationalists and professional regulators to embrace some of these concepts in future midwifery programmes. Ongoing efforts to address some of the inconsistencies highlighted in this study will promote greater parity in the application of professional standards across the four countries in the UK. This will enhance reliability in assessment of competence of future registrants, better fulfilling the partnership

responsibilities between clinicians and academics to be gatekeepers to the profession and thereby promoting protection of the public.

Ethical approval statement

None declared.

Role of funding source statement

None declared.

Conflict of interest statement

None of the authors have any financial or personal conflict of interest with other people or organisations which could bias this work.

Acknowledgements

Members of the Lead Midwife for Education United Kingdom (LME-UK) Executive Group and associates, whose contributions to the scoping project were essential to gain an increased understanding of the complexity and yet shared ethos of grading of midwifery practice across the four countries. Particular thanks to Dr Kuldip Bharj and Nicky Clark for supplying information about the common assessment tool in the Yorkshire and Humber region.

References

- Benner, P., 1984. *From Novice to Expert: Excellence and Power in Clinical Nursing Practice*. Addison-Wesley, Menlo Park.
- Bennett, M., McGowan, B., 2014. Assessment matters—mentors need support in their role. *Br. J. Nurs.* 23 (9), 454–458.
- Black, S., Curzio, J., Terry, L., 2013. Failing a student nurse: a new horizon for moral courage. *Nurs. Ethics* 21 (2), 234–238.
- Chenery-Morris, S., 2010. Grading midwifery practice: a discourse analysis. *Evid. Based Midwifery* 8 (4), 122–127.
- Department of Health, 2012. *Compassion in Practice: Nursing, Midwifery and Care Staff – our vision and strategy* [Online], Available. <http://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/compassion-in-practice.pdf> (8.03.15).
- Donaldson, J., Gray, M., 2012. Systematic review of grading practice: is there evidence of grade inflation? *Nurse Educ. Pract.* 12 (2), 101–114.
- Doughty, R., Harris, T., McLean, M., 2007. Tripartite assessment of learners during practice placements in midwifery pre registration programmes. *Educ. Train.* 49 (3), 227–235.
- Duffy, K., 2004. *Failing Students: a Qualitative Study of Factors that Influence the Decisions Regarding Assessment of Students' Competence in Practice*. Nursing and Midwifery Council, London.
- Fisher, M., Webb, C., 2008. What do midwifery mentors need? Priorities and impact of experience and qualification. *Learn. Health Soc. Care* 8 (1) [Online], Available. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1473-6861.2008.00193.x/pdf> (08.03.15).
- Fisher, M., 2009. How can midwifery sign-off mentors be supported in their role? An evidence-based discussion of the challenges facing clinicians, managers and academics. *MIDIRS Midwifery Dig.* 19 (3), 319–324.
- Fisher, M., Proctor-Childs, T., Callaghan, L., Stone, A., Snell, K., Craig, L., 2011. Assessment of professional practice: perceptions and principles. In: Wergers, C.E. (Ed.), *Nursing Students and Their Concerns*. Nova Science Publishers, New York, pp. 1–36 [Online], Available. https://www.novapublishers.com/catalog/product_info.php?products_id=22965 (08.03.15).
- Gainsbury, S., 2010. Mentors admit to passing bad students. *Nurs. Times* 106 (16), 1–3.
- Gillman, L., 2014. *Grading clinical practice in midwifery, the opportunities and challenges*. Maternity, Mother and Baby: Caring through the Science and Art of Midwifery Conference, London.
- Gray, M.A., Donaldson, J., 2009. Exploring issues in the use of grading in practice; literature review. Edinburgh Napier University, Edinburgh.
- Heaslip, V., Scammell, J.M.E., 2012. Failing underperforming students: the role of grading in practice assessment. *Nurse Educ. Pract.* 12 (2), 95–100.
- Jervis, A., Tilki, M., 2011. Why are nurse mentors failing to fail student nurses who do not meet clinical performance standards? *Br. J. Nurs.* 20, 582–587.
- Lead Midwives for Education United Kingdom Executive Group, 2014. *Terms of Reference*. LME-UK Executive.
- Mallik, M., McGowan, B., 2007. Issues in practice based learning in nursing in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland: results from a multi professional scoping exercise. *Nurse Educ. Today* 27 (1), 52–59.
- Marsh, S., Cooper, K., Jordan, G., Merrett, S., Scammell, J., Clark, V., 2005. *Assessment of Students in Health and Social Care: Managing Failing Students in Practice*. Making Practice Based Learning Work Project [Online], Available: http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/9780415537902/data/learning/5_Assessment%20of%20Students%20in%20Health%20and%20Social%20Care.pdf (08.03.15).
- Maxted, M., Grant, J., Wooding, K., Norcini, J., 2004. *Assessing Healthcare Students in Practice Placements: An Overview of the Literature*. Association for the Study of Medical Education (ASME), Edinburgh.
- McLean, C., 2012. The yellow brick road: a values based curriculum model. *Nurse Educ. Pract.* 12 (3), 159–163.
- McLean, C., Monger, E., Lally, L., 2005. Assessment of practice using the national health service knowledge and skills framework. *Nurs. Crit. Care* 10 (3), 136–142.
- National Health Service Education for Scotland, 2008. *Nursing and Midwifery in Scotland; Being Fit for Practice*. NHS Education for Scotland, Edinburgh.
- Nicholls, L., Webb, C., 2006. What makes a good midwife? An integrative review of methodologically-diverse research. *J. Adv. Nurs.* 56 (4), 414–429.
- Nursing and Midwifery Council, 2008. *Standards to Support Learning and Assessment in Practice*. Nursing and Midwifery Council, London [Online], Available. <http://www.nmc-uk.org/Documents/NMC-Publications/NMC-Standards-to-support-learning-assessment.pdf> (08.03.15).
- Nursing and Midwifery Council, 2009. *Standards for Pre-registration Midwifery Education*. Nursing and Midwifery Council, London [Online], Available. <http://www.nmc-uk.org/Documents/NMC-Publications/nmcStandardsforPre-RegistrationMidwiferyEducation.pdf> (08.03.15).
- Passmore, H., Chenery-Morris, S., 2014. Exploring the value of the tripartite assessment. *Nurse Educ. Pract.* 14 (Issue 1), 92–97.
- Rutkowski, K., 2007. Failure to fail: assessing nursing students' competence during practice placements. *Nurs. Stand.* 22, 35–40.
- Skingley, A., Arnott, J., Greaves, J., Nabb, J., 2007. Supporting practice teachers to identify failing students. *Br. J. Community Nurs.* 12 (1), 28–32.
- Smith, J., 2007. Assessing and grading students' clinical practice: midwives' lived experience. *Evid. Based Midwifery* 5 (4), 112–118.
- Steinaker, N.W., Bell, M.R., 1979. *The Experiential Taxonomy: a New Approach to Teaching and Learning*. Academic Press, London.