

# **EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES**

## **February 13, 2004**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kathy Malloch, Chair, RN, PhD, MBA  
Joyceen S. Boyle RN, PhD  
Teri Britt RN, Ph.D  
Lucy Flaaten RN, Ed.D, MS,  
Susan Gallagher RN, MS  
Sue Hanauer RN, BSN, MS  
Mary Killeen RN PhD  
Sue Macdonald RN, MSN, MBA  
Marty Mayhew RN, MSN  
Brenda Morris RN, EdD, MS  
Linda Riesdorph RN, MS, DON  
Margi Schultz RN, MSN  
Judith Sellers RN, DNSc, FNP

### **BOARD STAFF ATTENDING:**

Joey Ridenour, RN, MN  
Pamela Randolph RN, MS, CPNP

### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

### **GUESTS PRESENT**

21 Nursing Students/ CAC & MCC  
Emelia Lewis, PCC-CTD  
Stephanie Stewart, PhD, RN, U of  
Wisconsin, Oshkosh (by phone)

#### **1. Call to Order – (Opening Remarks)**

Kathy Malloch called the Education Committee to order at 10:00 a.m. in the boardroom of the Arizona State Board of Nursing. Malloch acknowledged the students in the audience and asked them to introduce themselves. She explained the purpose of the Education Committee and its relation to the Board; and asked that a copy of the Education Charge be distributed to them.

#### **2. Approval of Minutes January 16, 2004**

Macdonald asked that in Agenda Item 6 (Minimum Faculty Requirements), 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, line 4 – “and graduate degree with a major in nursing” be added following baccalaureate. And in Agenda Item 4.a., line 2 should be changed to read: “Nogales in Santa Cruz county”; and “two counties (Gila and Santa Cruz)” and line 3 to state: “lack the tax base and/or population base”.

Sellers moved and Britt seconded to approve minutes as corrected. Motion carried.

#### **3. NCLEX-PN Test Plan(Discussion/Recommendation)**

Randolph stated that the Board reviewed the feedback from the Committee and decided that the Committee could submit their comments directly to National Council along with any additional comments made at this meeting.

The discussion at the last meeting regarding Pharmacology needing to have more emphasis to reflect the Job Analysis data on the revised Test Plan was reviewed by Randolph. She shared an informal discussion she had with some members of the Exam Committee in recalling the reasons behind their decision on this.

The committee recommended to the Exam Committee the following:

- A. To reflect the data or what the evidence is in the Job Analysis.
- B. When modification in the test plan is contrary to the data in the Job Analysis than providing a rationale for the decision would be helpful.
- C. Medication errors and patient safety issues are two of the components being addressed.
- D. Regarding where to make the changes in percentages, weightage should always follow the data.

Macdonald commented that she felt there are a number of areas in this study where the LPN may be working more towards the RN practice level; and in the future, we may need to reevaluate the Arizona LPN role.

#### **4 Education Levels in Nursing (Discussion/Recommendation)**

In response to a question regarding if a graduate student was going to help with this project, Randolph felt there has been a lot of research done and documents to pull from; therefore, a small committee from this group could assemble a new document using the data and language already available. A summary of each article follows:

- A. Indiana handout – two years post graduate – may be helpful for some language.
- B. Levels of Nursing Education (CA) – describes the educational levels of nursing.
- C. “Nursing World” Education for Participation in Nursing Research – a little too narrow but may have some education pieces that would be useful.
- D. Oklahoma document – closest to what the committee might want to do - clear, good format.
- E. Kentucky format – another model close to desired result; also includes the Certified Nurse Assistant. Good format - delineates nursing roles and integrated concepts.

The following volunteered to be on this sub-committee: Britt, Boyle, Sellers, Schultz, Riesdorff, and a member from the CNA Committee will be sought by Randolph who will facilitate the meeting.

In response to a question from a student, “why is this needed?” Sellers explained that the committee is concerned the public, and even nurses, do not understand the differentiations in nursing roles, from the nursing assistant to the doctorate level. What the requirements for education in each one of those roles is and what the responsibilities are. To clearly outline this in an easy-to-find format that would go on the website would benefit the public.

#### **5. Article 2 (Discussion/Recommendation)**

Randolph stated that Article 2 reflects the changes suggested at the last meeting. Some new modifications were made to R4-19-214 Approval of Refresher Programs. This was felt necessary since Article 3 has gone through GRRC and will become a final Rule April 5,

2004; in Article 3, there is a requirement for a Refresher Course for RNs if they have not met the practice requirements of 960 hours in 5 years.

Randolph explained to the audience, a few months ago, the committee received communication from a school that was nationally accredited who wanted to establish a nursing program in Arizona. Because the Board had a requirement that a nursing program had to be regionally accredited, to accept this nursing program would incur changing the rule. What this committee needed to assure was that the national accreditation standards were comparable to the regional accreditation standards that exist now for educational institutions. After reviewing a well-researched document that demonstrated the comparability of regional and national accreditation for parent institutions for nursing program, this committee recommended to the Board changing the rule to allow for nationally accredited programs; and as a result, the proposed language in Article 2. R4-19-201.

Legislation was introduced (Senate Bill 1248) proposing to change the Nurse Practice Act to allow a regionally or nationally accredited educational institution or school in this state to conduct a professional, practical, nurse practitioner or clinical nurse specialist nursing program. The Board has provided input that the wording is problematic.

The Arizona State Board of Nursing cannot support the current proposed language of SB 1248. Ridenour and Randolph proposed response to this bill to explain the Board's position and suggest language changes.

Ridenour asked that those present contact their legislators to inform them of current concerns with this bill or request changes in the wording; and to work with others in their organization or other organizations to bring awareness of this bill.

Killeen moved and Riesdorff seconded to recommend to the Board acceptance of the additions and changes to Article 2 and the changes and additions to the response of Senate Bill 1248. Motion carried.

**6. Foreign Based or Non Accredited Distance Nursing Education (Discussion/Recommendation)**

Randolph reviewed the handouts from nursing programs and noted the many deceptive words in the marketing of their accreditations. An example of a Cease & Desist Letter sent to a non-approved school was shared. It was also noted that they are also turned over to the Attorney General's Office. Staff was directed to draft a form response letter that could be used to contact the program to let them know that their literature has been reviewed; and that their program does not comply with the rules of the Arizona State Board of Nursing. It was suggested to send it with a return receipt requested; and forward a copy of the letter to other state BONs.

**7. Proposed HB 2265 – Medication Technician Pilot (Discussion/Recommendation)**

Randolph clarified why this is before the committee. The Board has been having on-going communication with the sponsor and the Arizona Nurses Association to make this the best pilot study it can be. The Board has the obligation to prescribe the education and training for this program. Does this committee want to be involved in developing the curriculum in conjunction with the CNA Committee and Law & Rules Committee? The committee

indicated it did. The enclosed handout, “Work in Progress”, is an intensive effort to acquire an accurate data base by researching the rules in other states. This is a “pilot study” to gather data to determine if licensing Medication Technicians, Certified Nurse Assistants with extra education to allow them to pass medication at skilled nursing facilities, is safe practice.

Discussion included:

- A. Require a Competency Test;
- B. An evaluation from the licensed nurse perspective and some type of patient outcome.
- C. The selected population – is it the right population? Sellers concerns is that geriatric patients are the most complex medication patients. Ridenour explained that the Board really wants the data not just for the long term care facilities; there are 1500 assisted living facilities in the state and 15,000 patients. The other very vulnerable group of concern is the school nurse and the fact that he/she can’t delegate medication; therefore, the principal delegates. If we can provide data on why they should or should not be doing this, then it should apply to all populations not just long term care.
- E. Evaluation of the nurses role; with not seeing the patients to prescribe medication, what does the nurse do.
- F. The Board of Directors of AzNA, Morris said, feel the need to set the guidelines and support the legislation, otherwise, we are setting ourselves up for someone else to come in and control the development of the study.

In the next newsletter, the Board will publish an article supporting this and why. The Board believes it supports public safety because it supports evidenced-based regulation. The Board is going to have control over all processes including selection of the skilled nursing facilities to ensure appropriate staffing .

**8. University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Accelerated Distance Program (Discussion/Recommendation)**

Dr. Stewart and Sharon Chappie, Project Director, were present by phone to answer question regarding this pre-licensure distance learning program in which students will have 56 hours at Oshkosh and clinical with preceptors at clinical agencies of their choice in Arizona. The program has been approved as a 3-year pilot by the Wisconsin State Board of Nursing and comes under the CCNE accreditation at the University of Wisconsin. The first cohort includes Wisconsin residents; next cohort has students from Colorado, Utah, and Minnesota.

Gallagher moved and Boyle seconded to table this discussion to the April 21, 2004, meeting. Motion carried.

Areas of discussion and information still needed from program for next meeting:

- A. In conflict with Advisory Opinion - Preceptorship is beneficial in the final semester of the nursing program.
- B. In conflict with Rule requirement that students to have clinical with OB/GYN, Pediatric, and Mental Health patients. Dr. Stewart stated they could not insure that.
- C. Preceptor concerns:
  - 1. Workload.

2. Observational evaluation.
3. Dual areas of responsibility.
4. Definition of preceptorship; is AZBN definition same as AZONE; Campaign for Caring?
- D. Invite administrator from hospital and preceptor.
  1. Vicky Buchda @ Mayo.
  2. Sue Hollobaugh.
- E. Agency responsibility - preceptor agency support may include decreasing nurse preceptor patient load or allowing preceptor to choose assignment based on student need.
- F. Ask Dr. Stewart, Oshkosh, to present at April meeting for clarification and dialogue.
  1. Letter was sent to program asking for empirical data about use of preceptors, but this data has not been received.
  2. Any evaluation mechanisms or data available

9. **Open Forum – Program Issues (Discussion)**

None

10. **Items for Future Meetings (Discussion)**

Discussed within each agenda item.

11. **Board Decisions (Discussion)**

Randolph reviewed decisions from the January Board meeting.

12. **Call to the Public**

One of the students asked if all schools give competency exams; do they get competency exams from another business or school? And do they use them as assessment tools or pass/fail?

Randolph responded that most of the schools use some type of outside predictor exam for NCLEX; some require passing these exams before graduation; others use it for extra credit; or just use it as a feedback tool for students.

Riesdorff explained to the students the concern of the committee over accreditation is to protect the integrity of the profession. As graduating students, having gone through a very stringent program, they can understand that this is a standard the committee wants to maintain.

Ridenour asked the students if they would be willing to contact their legislators in their district regarding SB 1248 by giving them directions for how to access them on-line. She explained the importance of legislators hearing from voters in their district.

13. **De-briefing on Today’s Meeting (Discussion)**

First meeting in a long while without a Nursing Program request.  
How to get “out of the box” without losing the Education Charge; a glimpse of the future.

Appreciated how students were treated and welcomed.  
Congratulations to Killeen and Morris re: opening of ASU East.

**14. Meeting Schedule (Discussion/Decision)**

April 21, 2004 – Wednesday – 9:00 a.m.- 1:30 p.m. (*Date & time change*)

August 27, 2004 – Friday – 9:30 a.m.

**17. Adjournment**

Boyle moved and Riesdorff seconded to adjourn meeting. The motion carried. Meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

**MINUTES SUBMITTED/APPROVED BY:**

Pamela Randolph Signature