

Case study 1	Veterinary Professionalism, stress and work life balance.
School or Department	Nottingham Veterinary School
Institution(s) involved	Nottingham Veterinary School
Contact + Email	Liz Mossop Liz.mossop@nottingham.ac.uk Gillian Brown gillian@medev.ac.uk
Date	12/04/2010
Tags	MEDEV; OOER; UKOER; Professional skills; Professionalism; Study skills; Stress awareness; Stress management; Veterinary; RCVS; Time management; Work life balance; toolkit usability; toolkit v1
Questions	Explanation and further information
1. What is the curriculum context of the resource or resource collection?	This session forms part of the University of Nottingham undergraduate veterinary degree. It is a facilitated small group session run as part of the Professional and Personal Skills module. The personal and professional skills module aims to equip students with generic and professional skills necessary for university life and ultimately the workplace. This session focuses on the identity of veterinary surgeons, and asks students to discuss what the concept of veterinary professionalism means to them. It also covers the role of the professional regulatory body, and issues of stress and work life balance which are extremely pertinent to veterinary surgeons.
2. What were the aims and objectives of the resource or resource collection?	Teachers accessing this resource will access the following learning outcomes: Define the meaning of professionalism within the veterinary context Give examples of good and bad professional behaviour Understand the role of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons and the "Guide to Professional Conduct" Understand the consequences of inefficient timekeeping and its effects on others, relate this to being a professional Understand time demands of the course Prioritise tasks as necessary and develop a study plan to ensure all subjects are dealt with effectively Evaluate and revise plan to ensure most effective use of time Understand the concept of work/life balance Describe the signs of stress and how to deal with it. Know the routes for help within the university and beyond
3. How was the resource or resource collection implemented?	The resource is comprised of two Microsoft Word documents – one is guidance for facilitators, the second is a student task sheet. The two documents need to be used together to run the session
4. What technologies and/or e-tools were needed to deliver this?	TurnitinUK was used to confirm the originality of the resource (http://www.submit.ac.uk/static_jisc/ac_uk_index.html). Visual Understanding Environment (http://vue.tufts.edu/) was used to construct decision tree maps for guidance package advice. Open Labyrinth (http://sourceforge.net/projects/OpenLabyrinth/) was used to create an online application to deliver the decision tree maps. SurveyMonkey (http://www.surveymonkey.com/) was used to survey interested parties and collection data on their methods used in pedagogy and resource discovery. JorumOpen (http://www.jorum.ac.uk/) was used as a repository to which this learning resource was uploaded to.
5. What guidance and/or support did you develop?	Categorisation guidance was followed and inputted into the MEDEV proposal system with as much information to hand as possible. Patient Consent guidance was followed but this WP did not seem relevant to this particular resource. A flowchart process (if possible to include in Open Labyrinth) may be a better solution. IPR/Copyright guidance was followed but we felt there were questions missing. This session has had several authors contributing over the four years it has been run and so the providence of all material could not be guaranteed. This tool kit is not geared towards copyright for written documents, or this element was unclear to us as users. Internationalisation guidance is not available Pedagogy/QA guidance was followed but the survey was unavailable. "The survey has been completed". Having used it successfully an hour earlier we closed the browser and reloaded but got the same response (survey monkey sometimes only allows one response per IP address – depending on how it's been set-up and we wondered if this was the reason?). The OOER Project Manager (SH) kindly emailed a PDF version of the questions so we were able to go through the process, but it will not have been recorded on the survey. Resource Discovery/Re-use guidance was not available. The survey was closed. Resource Upload guidance - the upload to Open Jorum was quite straightforward.
6. Uploading and hosting	Was the resource successfully uploaded as an OER? YES

<p>resources.</p>	<p>Does the repository upload system meet your requirements? YES Does the repository publishing environment meet your needs? YES – although retrieval of a resource seems 'clunky'. What is your role in the organisation e.g. Learning Technologist, Lecturer, etc.? Lecturer.</p>
<p>7. What are the key outcomes of the resource or resource collection?</p>	<p>The outcome for teachers is the ability to access this session and implement it in their own institution should they wish. The contribution to OER practice within this institution is currently small, as the University of Nottingham already has a clear policy and practice, running its own OER institutional strand. However, the pit falls and issues surrounding OER release have been highlighted on an individual basis.</p>
<p>8. What follow-up activity will be/has been carried out as a result of the resource or resource collection?</p>	<p>A verbal report to the school management team on this process will allow the school to consider future OER policy. Retrieval(s) of the resource will be monitored if possible. Monitoring of the time taken to go through the toolkits We also 'googled' to see if we could find the resource on Open Jorum but were unsuccessful. Will monitor over next few days.</p>
<p>9. What are the lessons learned from the resource or resource collection?</p>	<p>This resource was relatively easy to achieve upload, as it contained no images or slides. However text based resources are not without their own copyright issues. This resource has been modified by several different authors over the years it has been in use, and so it was felt important to run a plagiarism check via the TurnitinUK software package. Considerable time was spent using the tool kits and we still did not have complete confidence that all the elements of copyright and open resources had been covered. There is a focus on patient consent which is not relevant in this situation, and it would be interesting to use other more generic tool kits on resources such as this.</p>