

3795. ~~47~~
116

VICTORIAN NURSING COUNCIL
REGISTRATION EXAMINATION - (GENERAL NURSES)
SURGICAL NURSING - COMMENTS OF EXAMINERS

3RD APRIL, 1985

SECTION A. Raw mean - 22.79

SECTION B.

Question 1.

- (a) (i) On the whole good.
- (ii) Some candidates failed to give adequate justification for calculation of fluid balance.
- (iii) Satisfactory.
- (iv) Satisfactory.
- (v) Some failed to give Tetanus cover and antibiotic cover.
- (b) On the whole well answered.

Question 2.

- (a) Some answers were vague.
- (b) Reasonable on the whole.
- (c) Often confused with varicose veins.
- (d) (i) Poorly answered. Most candidates seemed confused.
- (ii) Satisfactory but often confused with (i).

Question 3.

- (a) Satisfactory.
- (b) Students did not relate their answer to spinal anaesthesia and its after effects.
- (c) Most students failed to cover all aspects of safety.

Question 4.

- (a) Satisfactory.
- (b) Well done.
- (c) A few students attended to the 'T' - tube which was not required.

Question 5.

- (a) Usually well answered but some students failed to emphasize anaerobic characteristics of organism.
- (b) Where builder B was chosen, answers were well done; where builder A was chosen answers were frequently confused.
- (c) Well done except some students failed to give Penicillin.

Question 6.

- (a) Many students failed to give an adequate definition.
- (b) Poorly understood. Most students related their answers to the development of extraocular muscles rather than basinal pathways.
- (c) On the whole satisfactory but some had poor knowledge of post operative care. E.G. both eyes were bandaged.

Question 7.

- (a) Satisfactory although some failed to mention force and were unable to differentiate between (a) and (b).
- (b) As above.
- (c) Generally satisfactory.
- (d) Well done.
- (e) Some had difficulty defining underwater seal drainage.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Examiners were gratified that students handwriting was legible.
