

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/141911/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Cooke, Alison, Hancock, Angela, White, Helen, Clark, Nicky, Gibb, Fiona, McNeill, Jenny, Thomas, Grace, Lloyd, Carmel and Furber, Christine 2021. Exploring the STEP-uP to practice: A survey of UK lead midwives for education views of the student midwife extended practice placement during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Midwifery* 101 , 103048. 10.1016/j.midw.2021.103048

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2021.103048>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Exploring the STEP-uP to practice: a survey of UK Lead Midwives for Education views of the Student midwife Extended Practice Placement during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic

Highlights

Midwifery education was affected by regulatory standard changes early in the pandemic

There was variation in how the extended placement option was implemented

UK AEs provided midwifery students with the majority of decisional support

LMEs experienced both internal and external pressures to instigate rapid change

Learning can be taken from the impact of COVID-19 on midwifery education

Abstract

Objective: to assess the implementation of the extended placement option available to midwifery students during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Design: Online survey open from 2nd June 2020 to 15th July 2020.

Setting: United Kingdom.

Participants: Lead Midwives for Education (LMEs).

Findings: A total of 38 of 55 LMEs responded (response rate 69%). The majority of Approved Education Institutions (AEIs) offered an extended placement to students, but with some variation in the choices offered, unrelated to geographical location or size of student cohort. AEIs appeared to provide the majority of decisional support for students. Many practice learning environments became unavailable, particularly community, gynaecology/medical wards and neonatal units. LMEs experienced both internal and external pressures to instigate rapid change.

Key conclusions: The impact of COVID-19 on midwifery education is significant and will need continual scrutiny to minimise future detriment. The pressures of providing midwifery education throughout the early phase of COVID-19 were substantial, but it is important that we learn from the immediate changes made, value and pursue the changes that have been beneficial, and learn from those that were not.

Implications for Practice/Research: Student learning experiences have undergone significant change during the pandemic. It is essential to assess what effect the extended placement has had on student readiness for practice, their confidence, resilience, mental health, and attrition and retention. Educators transitioned to remote working, and rapidly assimilated new skills for online education; exploration of the impact of this is recommended.

Keywords: COVID-19, student midwives, extended practice placement, survey, UK

Introduction

A global pandemic was declared by the World Health Organization (WHO) on the 11th March 2020 in response to the evolving coronavirus crisis (Cucinotta and Vanelli, 2020). Worldwide, governments sought to increase their current healthcare workforce recognizing that there were already shortages of health care professionals (Bogossian et al, 2020), and that staff may also succumb to COVID-19 (Renfrew et al 2020). Lead Midwives for Education (LMEs) in the United Kingdom (UK) monitored the developing crisis, mindful of the potential impacts on midwifery education. Concerns about the UK midwifery workforce focused on being able to sustain maternity services, with a shortage of 2500 midwives in England already identified (Royal College of Midwives [RCM], 2019) and similarly in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

By mid-late March 2020, UK maternity services were rapidly shifting to accommodate changed priorities amid risks from COVID-19 that were not fully understood (Renfrew et al, 2020; Royal College of Midwives and Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, 2020), within an emerging wider national healthcare crisis related to capacity and resource (Iserson, 2020).

Mobilization of the student workforce therefore became a significant opportunity to substantially increase the immediate workforce and support the fluctuations expected in staffing levels as the pandemic progressed (Bogossian et al, 2020). Several variations to education programmes were discussed (Dunkley-Bent personal communication 17th March 2020). These included recognizing the potential of senior students to support the NHS workforce, and the limitations of junior students whose contributions would be less effective due to their supervision requirements (Nursing and Midwifery Council [NMC] 2009; NMC, 2018). Acknowledging that the future workforce is reliant on students completing midwifery programmes, it was important that education continued to be supported in order that students graduate as planned (Bogossian et al, 2020). The NMC collaborated with Chief Nursing (CNO) and Midwifery Officers (CMO) of the four UK countries with respective health education bodies, professional organisations and the Council of Deans of Health to publish

Emergency Standards (NMC, 2020) that enabled nursing and midwifery students to opt-in to an extended practice placement to support the workforce.

The Emergency Standards (NMC, 2020) enabled Approved Education Institutions (AEIs) to make changes to current nursing and midwifery programmes of education based on local need, and availability and safety in practice placements, with their National Health Service (NHS) partners (Health Education England [HEE], 2020b; Health Education and Improvement Wales [HEIW], 2020; NHS Education for Scotland [NES], 2020). Students in the last six months of their programmes could opt-in to complete their programme on an 'extended placement', providing the learning outcomes required by the NMC (2019) and European Union Directives (Directive 2013/55/EU) were met. Students in their second year or the first six months of their final year, or first year of postgraduate programmes, could opt-in to undertake a split of 80% practice and 20% theory. Across all four countries of the UK, these placements were funded by their respective governments (after agreement with local maternity providers) with year 2 students paid at NHS Agenda for Change (AfC) Band 3 and year 3 students paid as AfC Band 4 (HEE, 2020b; HEIW, 2020; NES, 2020; Department of Health Northern Ireland [DoHNI], 2020). The finer detail of implementation arrangements facilitated by the Emergency Standards (NMC, 2020) was at regional level between respective Departments of Health and AEIs, as there is some variation across England and the devolved countries. The Emergency Standards (NMC, 2020) revoked the mentorship model of student learning and assessment in practice (NMC, 2008) and required implementation of the Standards for Student Supervision and Assessment (SSSA) (NMC, 2018) in AEIs where this model had not already been adopted.

Across the UK, all face-to-face teaching transitioned to on-line, digital learning. This generated an unexpected and substantial workload for educators. The transition created a number of challenges related to technical issues, student engagement and home-working and many students have required intensive support. The lack of face-to-face peer support and pastoral contact appeared to

have caused students to feel isolated and disconnected from their programme of education and the midwifery profession. For the first time since midwifery education moved into higher education in the 1990s (Le Var 1997), direct entry student midwives were employed by the NHS.

Anecdotally, it became apparent that there were variations in the timing, initiation and design of the extended placements. It was also clear that some stakeholders identified concerns including the risk to students with the likely increased exposure to the coronavirus through lack of personal protective equipment (PPE) for maternity staff (RCM, 2020) and students not being able to achieve the learning outcomes of their programmes (Luyben et al, 2020).

LMEs across the UK therefore questioned the impact of the extended placements on the student experience and sought to explore the different options, their immediate advantages and disadvantages, and consider the possibilities and impact on future midwife curriculum design and implementation.

Methods

An online survey was chosen to assess the extended placement options available to midwifery students throughout the UK. LMEs were invited to respond to ensure that all AEs who offer midwifery education could be accessed. A national survey provided evidence of the extent of variation in what options were offered, and the barriers and facilitating factors in providing those options, in order to support the development of further research in this area.

Development and validity

The survey was developed by five of the authors, and reviewed by all authors. The questions were informed by LMEs to ensure content validity. All ten members of the steering group piloted the survey online prior to wider exploration. These results were assessed by three of the authors to ensure face validity; any issues of ambiguity were corrected prior to 'going live'. The survey was set up as an online survey to ensure that respondents could be contacted quickly and easily by email

due to COVID-19 restrictions. The email invitation contained a direct link to the survey. The survey comprised 30 questions which took approximately 15 minutes to complete and respondents had the option to leave the survey at any point. However, by the number of views compared to responses, it is clear that some LMEs reviewed the survey first and may have had to source additional information before completion. Although the survey contained mainly closed questions, free-text questions were also included to obtain more in-depth qualitative responses. Respondents were asked to disclose their specific AEI to assess whether there were any duplications. Respondents were given complete anonymity in the data analysis and dissemination.

Sample

The survey web-link was sent by email to all UK LMEs (n=63). Requests to complete the survey were directed to the LME, but the survey could be delegated to one other member of staff within the AEI if necessary. Of the 63 UK LMEs, 8 were deducted from the total number eligible (England n=3; Scotland n=4; Northern Ireland n=1), as these AEIs were known not to have a pre-registration midwifery programme. The total target population was 55 LMEs.

Data collection

Data were collected and managed within the data collection facility of the online survey software SelectSurvey (ClassApps). The survey opened on 2nd June 2020 and closed on 15th July 2020. Responses were regularly examined and three reminders were issued by email.

Data analysis

Data were exported from the SelectSurvey software into Excel. The data were coded by the first author (XX) and this process was duplicated by the second author (XX) to compare for any inputting and coding errors. Any discrepancies were corrected. Cleaned data were transferred into IBM SPSS Statistics version 25 and analysed descriptively using frequency tables. The qualitative content from

the open free-text questions were analysed thematically (Braun and Clarke, 2006) by two authors (XX/XX) independently and a high level of consensus was attained.

Ethics

The study team used the Health Research Authority (HRA) decision tool (HRA, 2020) and consulted the Chair of the University Ethics Panel, both of which confirmed that we did not require ethical approval. The study was a survey of existing practices, rather than a survey of individual experiences. However, ethical principles of confidentiality and anonymity were applied, for example data were anonymised; where respondents had reported their place of work this was only known to two authors (XX/XX). The lead investigator provided a presentation about the survey to the LME network prior to the survey going live, and LMEs had the opportunity to ask questions. Further information about the survey was also included on the front page of the online survey (prior to any questions). Completion of the survey was voluntary; consent was implied if the survey was completed. It was not mandatory for respondents to complete a question if they did not want to, and they could withdraw from the survey at any time.

Findings

Demography

There were a total of 297 views of the survey, and 43 completed responses of which 5 were duplicated. With 38 valid responses this gave an overall response rate of 69%. The majority of respondents were LMEs (94.7%).

Pre-registration three year midwifery programmes were most commonly provided and some AEIs provided more than one type of programme (figure 1). The total numbers of students within AEI cohorts varied: 26.3% (n=10) of AEIs had more than 100 students; 26.3% (n=10) had between 70 and 99; 28.9% (n=11) had between 40 and 69 and 18.4% (n=7) had less than 39 students in a cohort.




Figure 1: Type of midwifery education programme

The majority of AElS (92.1%) offered students an extended placement option. Pre-COVID-19, some AElS (7.9%) had offered integrated theory and practice programmes (for example, three days practice and two days theory each week), compared to the majority (84.2%) who provided block placements (for example four weeks of theory followed by four weeks of practice, or similar). More AElS had implemented SSSA pre-COVID-19 (52.6%, n=20), compared to those who had not yet implemented SSSA (39.5%, n=15). Three LMEs (7.9%) did not provide an answer.

There was some variation between which year groups were offered extended placements across AElS (figure 2), with 89.5% (n=34) of AElS offering placements to second and third year students but 10.5% (n=4) to third/final year students only.




Figure 2: Year groups who were offered extended practice placements

Second year student midwives

There was variation in the options offered to second year students across UK AEIs for an average week under the Emergency Standards (NMC, 2020) (figure 3). The most commonly offered choices were ‘80% practice and 20% theory, paid’ (55.3%, n=21) and ‘theory only’ (47.4%, n=18). There were no trends evident in terms of geographical location or size of student cohort.




Figure 3: Options available to second year student midwives

The survey also asked LMEs about types of support offered to students of all years to facilitate their decision-making other than usual pastoral support provided pre-COVID-19. AElS appeared to provide the largest share of decisional support to students (figure 4). There were examples of excellent support from placement providers reported in the open-text responses, but overall were limited in number. In total, 66.7% (n=26) of AElS provided decision-making support to students and 12.8% (n=5) reported a practice provider offering support alongside the AEl.




Figure 4: Source of additional support offered to first and second year students

The survey considered in-depth support for specific groups including Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students, those with health issues, those on an action plan/learning agreement and those who were 'shielding' (figure 5). Again, AElS considered that they were the main source of support to these students in these circumstances.




Figure 5: Source of support for special circumstances for first and second year students

Third and final year students

There was variation in the choices offered to third/final year students across AEIs for an average week under the Emergency Standards (NMC, 2020) (figure 6). The most commonly offered choices were ‘80% practice and 20% theory, paid’ (44.7%, n=17), ‘paid block placements’ (39.5%, n=15) and ‘theory only’ (44.7%, n=17). No trends were evident in terms of location or size of student cohort.




Figure 6: Options available to third/final year student midwives

In terms of additional decision-making support for final year students, other than routine pastoral support provided pre-COVID-19, again AEIs considered that they provided the majority (figure 7). As

for first/second year students, there were examples of excellent support from placement providers reported in the open-text responses, but these were limited and in the same areas where support was offered to other students. In total, AEs provided the decision-making support required by students in 97.4% (n=37) of responses. Within these, 31.6% (n=12) of AEs also had a practice provider offering support alongside, and 2.6% (n=1) of AEs had support from Occupational Health colleagues.




Figure 7: Source of additional support offered to third/final year students

AEIs were the main source of support offered to third and final year students with specific needs, including students from BAME backgrounds, those with health concerns, students on an action plan

or learning agreement and those who were shielding (figure 8).




Figure 8: Source of support for special circumstances for third/final year students

Placement restriction and pressures faced

LMEs reported that some placements became unavailable to students during the pandemic. The placement reported as most affected was community (73.7%, n=28), but it was also noted that gynaecology/medical wards (39.5%, n=15) and neonatal units (34.2%, n=13) were widely affected (figure 9).




Figure 9: Practice areas that became unavailable for student allocations during the pandemic

LMEs suggested that there were various internal (n=2) and external pressures (n=14) or both (n=5) faced when deciding what deployment options were offered to students, for which they provided

additional depth in qualitative open-text responses (covered separately in the next section). A similar number of LMEs reported facing no pressures (n=16) and one LME reported that this question was not applicable to them.

Qualitative findings

The survey asked several open questions with unlimited text availability for LME responses, including: What type of additional support was offered to students? What types of pressures were faced? Any other information or comments? LMEs provided more depth when asked about what pressures they faced when determining what deployment options they could offer with regard to an extended placement. Those who reported facing no pressures felt that they received sufficient direction from placement providers, health education bodies and the NMC and that this guidance was clear, or they reported working concordantly with placement providers.

External pressures

External pressures mainly focused on working with national guidance that was not always clear or timely, placement capacity, working with placement providers, midwifery identity, urgency for students to return to practice, aligning with neighbouring AEIs and placement providers, and protecting the 'student' status.

Working with national guidance: This was the most common pressure reported by LMEs. Reference was made to frequent changes to guidelines and the resultant challenges in 'keeping up' with the guidance. Responses indicated that national guidance conflicted with each other and with placement provider 'demands'. Some implied that national guidance from national health education bodies and the NMC was overly complex, confusing and lacking in clarity, which led to delays in deployment of students and a poor experience for LMEs who were attempting to negotiate and balance demands:

"Trying to keep up with HEE requirements has been a challenge."

LME14

Placement capacity: Placement capacity put pressure on deployment of students. Different reasons included certain placement areas being unavailable (community and intrapartum areas were cited), service changes, staff sickness and competing demands on capacity from neighbouring AEIs.

Working with placement providers: Operational issues, such as confusion around student contracts and job descriptions, whether students were supernumerary or not, confirmation of where funding was coming from, and which students would be accepted were reported. Working together was made difficult in some cases due to differences of opinion between placement providers and AEIs about student pay for their protected study time and not deploying students until they had completed their theory:

“difficulties with contracting, job descriptions and timely return to practice” LME17

Midwifery identity: Several responses suggested that the identity of midwifery and student midwives was not distinct from nursing and student nurses in the emergency response to COVID-19. LMEs indicated that having the same guidance and being treated in the same way as student nurses was inappropriate. One LME reported that this caused uncertainty for students, additional work and stress for educators and eroded working relationships. Another felt that the LME role itself was misunderstood and criticised:

“[There was] commissioner pressure with little understanding of midwifery as a profession and maternity services - wanted to treat us the same as nursing!” LME16

Urgency for students to return to practice: Some LMEs felt pressure to return students to practice as soon as possible; in one case prior to risk assessments, assurance of PPE or contracts providing death in service protection:

“concerns with regard to students entering a potentially dangerous clinical situation.”

LME21

Aligning with local HEIs and placement providers: Some LMEs reported the pressure of aligning processes with other local AEs and more than one placement provider, to ensure equity for students.

Protecting 'student' status: LMEs had concerns about their ability to protect the student status, and ensure that students were not deployed to any area as Health Care Assistants or Maternity Support Workers:

"[Concerns about] Student midwives remaining as such (working towards achievement of competencies etc) and not being HCAs/MSWs." LME44

Internal pressures

Internal pressures focused on the midwifery identity, aligning with AEI policies and guidance, responsibility and programme changes and remote working.

Midwifery identity: Responses suggest that LMEs were faced with internal, as well as external, pressures to align the changes to their programmes with nursing programmes. LMEs highlighted that this was inappropriate due to programme and calendar differences. Some responses indicated that the midwifery team's decision-making had to align with decisions made for nursing students rather than focus on midwifery needs:

"I worked closely with the Head of Midwifery to ensure that placements could support student return. ... This plan was supported by the Head of School however, ... this decision ... did not align with the decision for nursing students. This caused an unnecessary amount of uncertainty for students, work for the team and University and LMEs. In addition, it caused a great deal of stress and eroded working relationships that LMEs nationally had worked hard to improve. There does not appear to be any parity of esteem for midwifery educators nationally (in comparison with nursing colleagues)." LME15

HEI policies and guidance: Further indication of midwifery educators being prevented from making decisions was apparent in relation to removing students from and returning them to practice, and facing barriers to being able to appropriately support students.

Responsibility: Responses suggest that LMEs felt a personal weight of responsibility to make the best decisions, and had concerns about students entering a potentially dangerous clinical situation.

“...general weight of responsibility to make the best decisions in partnership and collaboration with student body.”

LME26

Programme changes and remote working: Educators also experienced the added pressure of needing to reformat programmes and work remotely.

Discussion

This survey has established a dataset to understand how midwifery educators in the UK responded to the COVID-19 pandemic during the summer of 2020. Several issues arose from the survey data, including the pressures on AEIs, the variation in provision of choices offered to students, and influences on decision-making. Luyben et al (2020) concur that midwifery education has been greatly affected by the changes implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Pressures on AEIs

Overall, the data highlighted that the pressures experienced in midwifery education were variable across the UK. Those who reported facing no pressures felt that they received sufficient and clear direction from stakeholders. Others who found the situation stressful outlined external pressures, including guidance that was not always clear or timely, placement capacity, working with placement providers to safely integrate students into practice, lack of midwifery identity, an urgency for students to return to practice, the need to align with local AEIs and placement providers and protecting the ‘student’ status. Internal pressures also focused on midwifery identity, in addition to aligning with local AEI policies and guidance, personal responsibility, programme changes and

remote working. Hunter and Warren (2014) identify the importance of a strong sense of professional identity as a midwife. Some LMEs struggled to highlight the need to address midwifery education separately from nursing, thus adding to the pressures and stifling midwifery leadership. We need to advocate for the creation of cultures where midwifery leaders can thrive, both within placement settings, but also in AEs.

AEIs perceived that they provided the majority of decisional-support for students. The rapid changes taking place within maternity service made this challenging. Stress levels were high in the midwifery profession pre-COVID (Hunter et al, 2019), therefore it is paramount that we learn from these experiences to develop support strategies that minimise dissatisfaction. Erland and Dahl (2017) reported learning from the experiences of midwives working in Sierra Leone during the Ebola crisis. They note one theme of motivation and support, which influenced the midwives' ability to cope with challenging clinical situations. Renfrew et al (2020) discuss vulnerability of students in these circumstances and suggest taking stock and debriefing; learning from experiences once the immediate crisis allows. A proposed model to aid collective learning from the experience of midwifery education during the pandemic is Appreciative Enquiry (Cooperrider and Whitney, 2005). Understanding and valuing the positive aspects of this period including student motivation to remain in practice, their employment experiences and off-curricular learning, while acknowledging the negative experiences will stand students and educators in good stead for their future careers and curriculum development.

Variation in provision

Our survey demonstrated that there was substantial variation in the choices offered to students across AEIs during the pandemic. The most commonly offered choices were '80% practice and 20% theory, paid', 'paid block placements' and 'theory only'. Which options were the most 'fit for purpose' and what we can learn from the extended placement option that can inform future midwifery curricular (NMC, 2019) is unknown. Discussions between LMEs and other key

stakeholders acknowledged similarities with the apprenticeship style of midwifery education prior to transfer of healthcare education to universities in the 1990s (Le Var, 1997). Considerations noted the potential of the extended placement experience to enhance confidence, competence and skills in team-working prior to qualification similar to the model in Ireland where fourth year student midwives undertake a paid internship in practice prior to employment (Bradshaw et al, 2018). It was noted that these attributes may support students crossing the 'flaky bridge' to become a newly qualified midwife (Lovegrove, 2018), and ultimately lead to minimizing attrition from the maternity workforce. The extended placements also have potential to foster a sense of belonging to the workplace and the profession. West et al (2020) report success in minimising attrition in South Wales with an intervention focusing on 'continuity placements' at the end of the programme with first placements as new midwives. While there are many advantages of this approach, it represents a significant change for students. Clarity will be required to avoid blurring the students' role with that of a healthcare support worker, and to maintain students' supernumerary status to enable completion of programme requirements.

Influences on decision-making

The qualitative data suggests that midwifery education decisions were influenced by those made for nursing education, which resulted in concern from LMEs about the loss of the midwifery identity. When leadership in nursing and midwifery is considered, often midwifery and midwives are under the nursing umbrella, creating difficulty due to the lack of understanding of the needs of midwifery as a profession. The LME is responsible for midwifery education in the AEI (NMC, 2019), hence was in the best position to lead decision-making regarding the changes required due to the Emergency Standards (NMC, 2020). Having nurse leadership responsible for midwifery decisions is 'increasingly outdated' (RCM 2019, p5). Positively the situation is changing with the introduction of national CMOs and increasing numbers of Directors of Midwifery providing a midwifery voice at a high strategic level, but there is still work to do, particularly in the devolved countries (RCM, 2019). In Scotland the invitation to opt-in was sent directly to students from the CNO with the expectation

that midwifery students would start placements alongside nursing students. Additional time to consider the impact of differences in nursing and midwifery programmes, along with considering the impact for practice partners of COVID-19 in maternity settings, would have resulted in a more measured approach. From the student perspective, information sent to them directly from national midwifery leaders may have enhanced their perception of deployment, as Erland and Dahl (2017) note the importance of midwives' identity and pride in their roles during a crisis.

Many LMEs reported the difficulty in responding to constant changes in national guidance, requiring numerous amendments to midwifery education programmes. Rapid decision-making without underpinning evidence of effectiveness can be harmful (Renfrew et al, 2020); indeed the challenge of constant change was a significant pressure for LMEs. Viewed positively, unprecedented rapid transfer of knowledge has occurred while globally learning about the virus (Palanica and Fossat, 2020), demonstrated by the development of 22 rapid guidelines (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence [NICE], 2020). Social media has enabled evidence to be disseminated quickly and widely (Chan et al, 2020). There are evident benefits to maternity care and midwifery education resulting from innovative changes driven by the pandemic, such as student-led online parent education resources (Greater Manchester and Eastern Cheshire Local Maternity System, 2020) or the introduction of innovative teaching methods. However, LMEs in our survey questioned whether the rapid changes made to midwifery programmes of education were necessary, and insisted that we must learn from this for future crisis situations. LMEs worked collegially to present evidence to the NMC to request an extension to the 2021 new curricular implementation, which was accepted; providing an opportunity to use the lessons learned from this unprecedented time to develop responsive and contemporary curricular.

Where LMEs reported no additional pressures there was strong partnership working between placement providers and AEs. Regular interaction and mutual decision making that ensures

consistency in the future may lead to less pressure on AEs and an equitable learning experience for students.

Strengths and limitations

The survey had a response rate of 69% which is very high for an online survey (Shih and Fan, 2008). The findings are consequently representative of AEs across the UK providing a high level of understanding of the changes made to midwifery education programmes during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic and the challenges faced.

Respondents comprised LMEs only. Of equal importance are the views of practice providers and students, to analyse the extended placement through the experiences of all of those affected. As this was a survey, further probing of qualitative responses to obtain a more in-depth exploration was not possible. Future research should include more in-depth qualitative inquiry.

Recommendations for practice, education and research

This survey focused on educators. Only LMEs were approached in order to provide a dataset that could act as a foundation for future research and evidence what provision had been offered under the Emergency Standards (NMC, 2020) implemented during COVID-19. Other stakeholder experiences need to be explored to provide a holistic overview to inform future research and practice, including students and practice providers.

The pandemic has had a significant impact on the students' experience and the students themselves. It is essential that both short and longer term impacts on their experience of midwifery education during the pandemic are explored. Many students were, and still are, facing their own personal challenges of managing studies, caring responsibilities for family, and undertaking employment contracts with minimal flexibility in terms of full-time or part-time hours available. It is unclear what effect the extended placement has had on student readiness for practice, confidence, resilience or

mental health, or on midwifery retention. It would be helpful to review student experiences using qualitative inquiry through the lens of the findings of the RePAIR project (Lovegrove, 2018).

Equally, educators have undergone substantial changes in terms of the transition to remote working, and rapid assimilation of new skills to provide online education. It is unknown what the impact of these changes are on educators or on the AEs, which could be explored through qualitative study.

Recently, the diminishing numbers of midwifery educators has been raised as a concern with recruitment of lecturers an ongoing challenge (Ross-Davie, 2020) and at time of writing the RCM has released a national survey assessing the wellbeing of midwifery educators. Furthermore, there is a need to assess placement capacity and the impact of increased numbers of students, as many students will need to catch up on missed practice hours. There is also the impact of the NHS England/HEE student expansion programme in England (HEE, 2020a) to consider and the need to accept additional students onto midwifery programmes due to a change in government policy about A level grades (Department for Education, 2020).

Finally, this pandemic has been a serious challenge for global health and a review of the midwifery education response should be urgently undertaken in order to identify what worked well, and what was not as relevant.

Conclusions

It is evident that COVID-19 will continue to affect the provision of midwifery education for some time, particularly the cohorts of students undergoing their education in 2019/20. It is important that we learn from the immediate changes made, value and pursue the changes that have been beneficial, and learn from those that were not. The period of time since March 2020, when midwifery education has been so rapidly driven towards major changes must be viewed positively. The volume of knowledge that has been acquired during the pandemic has been unprecedented; there are examples of new ways of providing programmes of education to midwifery students and

new ways of working that would never have been experienced without this crisis. It has also facilitated teams to work more closely and produce quality innovative approaches within midwifery education, with individual AEI implementation responsive to local need. Lessons can be learned from the importance of maintaining the identity of midwifery and midwifery education as separate from nursing. Although there is no doubt that midwifery education has been under substantial pressure, it is important to remain optimistic and keep driving forward so that our future midwives will benefit from what we have learned, to become even more resilient, stronger and in a position to provide evidence-based, high-quality care in any circumstances.

Reference List

- Bogossian F, McKenna L, Levett-Jones T. 2020. Mobilising the nursing student workforce in COVID-19: The value proposition. *Collegian*, 27, 147-149.
- Bradshaw C, Tighe SM, Doody O. 2018. Midwifery students' experiences of their clinical internship: A qualitative descriptive study. *Nurse Education Today*, 68, 213-217.
- Braun V, Clarke V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Chan A, Nickson C, Rudolph J, Lee A, Joynt G. 2020. Social media for rapid knowledge dissemination: early experience from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Anaesthesia*. Available from: <https://associationofanaesthetistspublications.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anae.15057?af=R> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].
- Cooperrider D, Whitney D. 2006. Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change. In: Holman P, Devane T, Cady S. *The Change Handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc.
- Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. 2020. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomedica*, 91, 1, 157-160.
- Department for Education. 2020. Information for students about GCSEs, AS and A levels and other qualifications in 2020. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/summer-gcse-as-and-a-level-results-2020-information-for-students/information-for-students-about-gcse-as-and-a-levels-and-other-qualifications-in-2020> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].
- Department of Health (Northern Ireland) [DoHNI]. 2020. Deployment Guidance for Nursing and Midwifery Students. Available from: <https://www.health-ni.gov.uk/publications/deployment-guidance-nursing-and-midwifery-students> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].
- Dunkley-Bent J. 2020. Personal communication with Clark N and Furber C in teleconference on 17th March 2020.
- Erland E, Dahl B. 2017. Midwives' Experiences of Caring for Pregnant Women Admitted to Ebola Centres in Sierra Leone. *Midwifery*, 55, 23-28.
- Greater Manchester and Eastern Cheshire Local Maternity System. 2020. Antenatal Education. Available from: <https://www.mybirthmychoice.co.uk/antenatal-education/> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].
- Heath Education England [HEE]. 2020a. Health Education England to invest up to £10m in clinical placements across England. Available from: <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/news-blogs-events/news/health-education-england-invest-%C2%A310m-clinical-placements-across-england> [Accessed: 30th September 2020].
- Health Education England [HEE]. 2020b. Deployment of student midwives during the COVID-19 emergency Available from: <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/coronavirus-covid-19/coronavirus-covid-19-information-midwives> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].
- Health Education and Improvement Wales [HEIW]. 2020. Support for nursing and midwifery students able to join the fight against COVID-19. Available from:

<https://heiw.nhs.wales/news/support-for-nursing-and-midwifery-students-able-to-join-the-fight-against-covid-19/> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

Health Research Authority. 2020. Is my study research? [online] Available from: <http://www.hra-decisiontools.org.uk/research/> [Accessed: 12th February 2021].

Hunter B, Fenwick J, Sidebotham M, Henley J. 2019. Midwives in the United Kingdom: levels of burnout, depression, anxiety and stress and associated predictors. *Midwifery*, 79.

Hunter B, Warren L. 2014. Midwives' experience of workplace resilience. *Midwifery*, 30(8), 926-934.

Iseron K. 2020. Augmenting the disaster healthcare workforce. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine: Integrating Emergency Care with Population Health*. Available from: <https://westjem.com/articles/augmenting-the-disaster-healthcare-workforce.html> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

Le Var R. 1997. Project 2000: A new preparation for practice – has policy been realized? Part 1. *Nurse Education Today*, 17(3), 171-177.

Lovegrove M. 2018. Reducing Pre-registration Attrition and Improving Retention [RePAIR]. Available from: <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/our-work/reducing-pre-registration-attrition-improving-retention> [Accessed 9th October 2020].

Luyben A, Fleming V, Vermeulen J. 2020. Midwifery education in COVID-19 time: Challenges and opportunities. *Midwifery*. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7263260/> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

Marshall J. 2015. The power of the lead midwife for education (LME): the role, function and challenges. *MIDIRS Midwifery Digest*, 25(1), 11-14.

NHS Education for Scotland [NES]. 2020. Coronavirus (COVID-19): guidance for medical, nursing and midwifery students. Available from: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/student-support-guidance-scotland-during-covid-19-outbreak-medical-nursing-midwifery/pages/3/> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence [NICE]. 2020. Coronavirus (COVID-19). Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/covid-19> [Accessed: 21st September 2020].

Nursing and Midwifery Council [NMC]. 2008. Standards to Support Learning and Assessment in Practice. Available from: <https://www.nmc.org.uk/standards-for-education-and-training/standards-to-support-learning-and-assessment-in-practice/> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

Nursing and Midwifery Council [NMC]. 2009. Standards for pre-registration midwifery education. Available from: <https://www.nmc.org.uk/globalassets/sitedocuments/standards/nmc-standards-for-preregistration-midwifery-education.pdf> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

Nursing and Midwifery Council [NMC]. 2018. Standards for Student Supervision and Assessment. Available from: <https://www.nmc.org.uk/globalassets/sitedocuments/standards-of-proficiency/standards-for-student-supervision-and-assessment/student-supervision-assessment.pdf> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

Nursing and Midwifery Council [NMC]. 2019. Standards of Proficiency for Midwives. Available from: <https://www.nmc.org.uk/globalassets/sitedocuments/standards/standards-of-proficiency-for-midwives.pdf> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

Nursing and Midwifery Council [NMC]. 2020. Emergency Standards for Nursing and Midwifery Programmes. Available from: <https://www.nmc.org.uk/globalassets/sitedocuments/education-standards/emergency-standards-for-nursing-and-midwifery-education.pdf> (Accessed: 25th March 2020).

Palanica A, Fossat Y. 2020. COVID-19 has inspired global healthcare innovation. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 111, 645-648.

Renfrew M, Cheyne H, Craig J, Duff E, Dykes F, Hunter B, Lavender T, Page L, Ross-Davie M, Spiby H, Downe S. 2020. Sustaining quality midwifery care in a pandemic and beyond. *Midwifery*. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0266613820301315?via%3Dihub> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

Ross-Davis M. 2020. Midwifery numbers are up, but where are the educators? *The Herald*. Available from: <https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/18711047.agenda-midwifery-numbers-educators/> [Accessed: 9th October 2020].

Royal College of Midwives [RCM]. 2019. Strengthening midwifery leadership: a manifesto for better maternity care. London: RCM.

Royal College of Midwives [RCM]. 2020. RCM expresses concern at supply of personal protection equipment for midwives. Available from: <https://www.rcm.org.uk/media-releases/2020/march/rcm-expresses-concern-at-supply-of-personal-protection-equipment-for-midwives/> [Accessed: 29th September 2020].

Royal College of Midwives and Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. 2020. Guidance for antenatal and postnatal services in the evolving coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. Version 1: Published Monday 30 March 2020. London: Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.

Shih T-H, Fan X. 2008. Comparing Response Rates from Web and Mail Surveys: A Meta-Analysis. *Field Methods*, 20(3), 249-271.

West S, Bailey S, Williams E. 2020. The courage of compassion: Supporting nurses and midwives to provide high quality care. London: King's Fund.