



Janice K. Brewer
Governor

Joey Ridenour
Executive Director

Arizona State Board of Nursing

EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 6, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kathy Malloch, Co-Chair, PhD, RN, MBA
Constance Woulard, Co-Chair, RN, MSN
Sharon Akes-Caves, RN, BC, MS, MSN
Sherrie Beardsley RN, MBA/HCM
Judi Crume, PhD, RN
Sally Doshier, EdD, RN, CNE
Terry Duffy, RN, MN, CDE
Rita Jury, MSN, CPHQ, RN
Mary Killeen, PhD, RN
Kathie J. Kulikowski, MSN, CNE, RN-BC
Jennifer Lakosil, RN, MSN, PNP
Ela-Joy Lehrman PhD, RN
Carol Mangold, RN MSN
Marty Mayhew RN, MSN
Debra McGinty, PhD, RN
Cheryl Roat EdD, MSN
M. Kitty Rogers, MS, RN
Brian Stewart, MSN, BSN, BFA, RN
Jane Werth, MS, RN

BOARD STAFF ATTENDING:

Joey Ridenour, Executive Director
Pamela Randolph, Associate Director, Education
Cory Davitt, Network Operations Director
Karen Gilliland, Education Department Staff

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Linda Riesdorph RN, MS, DON

GUESTS PRESENT

Virginia Armstrong, Fortis College
Debra Bailey, Student
Ed Beecham, IIA College
Susan Ciardullo, ITT Technical Institute
Theresa S. Chavez, Student
B. Eads, Student
Dina Faucher, Fortis College
Mercedes Goode, IIA College
Gary Gum, Brown Mackie College
Cynthia Hens, Student
Shelby Jones, Student
Peggy Keen, ITT Technical Institute
Mark Kenyan, Student
Heather Koester, Student
Nicole Leal, Student
Fred Lockhart, AZ Private School Association
Shawn Maddock, Student
Elizabeth Mancha, Student
Susan Maze, Student
Shawn McMurray, Student
Gene McWorter, ITT Technical Institute
Kathlyn Ray, IIA College
Susan Rhoads, Brown Mackie College
Mike Rooney, Sacks Tierney, PA
Monica Sisemore, Student
Nadia Sperry, ITT Technical Institute
Stephanie Steel, Student
Susan B. Stillwell, Student
Charlene Tindall, Student
Shirin Zavosi-Forrester, Student

1. CALL TO ORDER/OPENING REMARKS

The meeting was called to order by Constance Woulard at 9:32 a.m.

2. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

This item was not addressed.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – DECEMBER 9, 2008

Doshier moved and Roat seconded to approve the December 9, 2008 minutes without correction. Motion carried unanimously.

4. INFORMATION/POLICY

A. Orientation to Electronic Packet

Davitt addressed the committee and reviewed the new electronic process being used for the Education Advisory Committee meetings. Materials are being sent to committee members electronically to save on paper and postage. Members will be receiving the advanced reading materials on a flash drive in Adobe format. Davitt noted that members may navigate the several hundred pages of text by using the Bookmarks feature. Members were shown how to use comments and markups features on their documents. All flash drives are required to be turned in to Board staff at the close of each meeting. Flash drives will be returned once loaded with the upcoming meeting's advanced reading packet.

B. NCSBN Transition Model

Randolph addressed the committee stating that NCSBN will be formulating model rules. Randolph stated that transition programs are considered safe, result in greater retention, and have many benefits. The debate is whether they should be regulated by the Board of Nursing.

Members discussed comparisons to medicine and internships; regulation; impact on potential employment; timeframe for implementation; implications on patient safety; and current transition programs at facilities. Malloch suggested inviting Charlotte Beason of Kentucky to address the committee telephonically regarding the pilot instituted in that state and the challenges they faced.

This item will continued to next agenda at which time there may be model rules to review.

C. Clinical Availability/Hiring New Grads

Clinical Group Placements in 2008

Randolph presented the results of the clinical Group Placement Survey for 2008. The survey was sent to all program directors with approximately 90% responding. The survey measured group size, placements and scheduling, and suitability of placements. The survey also allowed for narrative comments from responders.

Randolph noted that 81% of the 2,109 clinical groups in Arizona were placed according to prearranged plans. Only one group had the whole clinical canceled. Most of those placed without a prearranged plan were at the same facility and unit but on a different day. Clinical changes were reported as fairly frequent. Approximately 1900 students had to rearrange schedules for a different day. Different units or different types of facilities were cited as reasons for changing clinical. Most group sizes were 10. In some cases, programs and facilities are limiting size. Most clinical groups were rated optimal, however, 40% rated not optimal for the program. Narrative responses addressed cancelled clinical days, health restrictions, system issues, partnerships, nursing fatigue, patient acuity, and objectives met through simulation.

The hospital association provided a report on hiring new graduates.

2009 Survey of Clinical Coordinators

Werth addressed the committee stating that Doshier, Mangold, Werth were charged to ascertain concerns with regard to clinical placement. The subcommittee conducted a survey of clinical coordinators regarding capacity, scheduling, quality of learning and suggestions for improvement. Thirty-two out of 52 possible responses were received from coordinators representing various facilities. Of the responding coordinators, 78% were from Phoenix and 16% from Tucson. The survey addressed the number of students placed in a facility; placement request denials; quality of clinical learning; and additional capacity availability. Seventy-two percent of responders have other allied health professions scheduled in their facilities, and 72% are unable to accommodate additional students in the next year. Narrative comments addressed clinical experiences & clinical capacity; nursing staff feeling overwhelmed; programs being more flexible; limiting students; and approved clinical rotations being rescinded. Suggestions included smaller clinical groups; improved instructor preparation; varying shifts; conducting regular meetings to discuss placements; finalizing schedules sooner; students being better prepared; utilizing alternative shifts; augmenting with simulation; enrollment quotas; and a moratorium on all new programs.

Members requested the PowerPoint presentation be revised to include an opening statement identifying the specific issues addressed and how the committee and Board are addressing them from a regulatory perspective, and a second slide setting the context or providing an executive summary noting that the survey contains data which validates the concerns of the Education Advisory Committee regarding clinical capacity. Committee members requested Werth send the clinical coordinator presentation to the statewide summit, and share it with all clinical coordinators and schools noting that it would be beneficial to schools and faculty. A copy of the presentation will be provided to committee members. Ridenour stated that the information will be placed in the regulatory journal which goes to other state boards of nursing and to members of the legislature. Doshier volunteered to draft an introduction for the journal. Malloch requested the presentation be placed on the AZBN website with a contact number for Jane Werth. Randolph will send the presentation to the hospital association and AZONE. Committee members also requested the survey results be forward to Anne McNamara and the AzNA Education Committee, and presented at the Annual Statewide Educators meeting. The survey results will also be presented to the Board.

Members discussed the lack of connection between the clinical staff and faculty expressed in the narrative comments; disseminating information among schools; shortfalls for preceptors in Maricopa County, noting that currently there is a lack of 170 preceptors; exploring non-traditional resources; faculty experience and competence; the evaluation process; the use of evaluations at the end of clinical rotations submitted by the agency, faculty, and students; communication between the university and the clinical partners. Members asked for additional perspective noting their interest in comments and questions by agency leaders, stakeholders.

Students in the audience were invited to come forward to address the committee. In response to the discussion students opined that true evaluations are never given as students fear retaliation should they state anything negative, and are not sure if comments will remain anonymous. Students asked that a mechanism be put in place so that student feedback may be shared and the student may have anonymity. Students recommended evaluations be collected from faculty, students, and staff by a third party, and asked if there was an entity to bridge communication gaps between the agencies, schools and students.

AGENDA ITEM VII.F.2.a.

Students also noted concerns with preceptors and lack of expertise in the specialty area assigned. Members noted that the usefulness of feedback on effectiveness of learning must be anonymous, and discussed the evaluation process and how to impart to students the importance of evaluations.

D. Draft Policy on Submission to Education Committee

Having provided committee members an opportunity to work with the electronic packet, Randolph requested that a revised “Submission of Materials to Education Committee” policy, reflecting the change to electronic submission, be recommended for Board approval. Currently 10 paper copies are being requested. Some members received both paper and electronic copies while other wished to only receive an electronic version. Members were polled to ascertain in which format they wish to receive the advance reading material, resulting in 5 paper copies and 15 electronic copies.

Motion: Adopt the policy with the one change that 7 paper copies be submitted by the programs.

Moved: Ms. Carol Mangold

Seconded: Mr. Brian Stewart

Discussion: None

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

E. Statewide Educator’s Meeting Planning

Randolph addressed the committee stating that every fall the Statewide Educators Meeting is held and requested the committee consider the following issues/topics that have come up during visits to programs: NCLEX pass rates; evaluation plans; clinical availability data discussed under Agenda Item 3C.

Members discussed evaluation, adequacy of clinical faculty, understanding different components of evaluation, and anonymity. Suggested topics included clinical instruction, mentoring clinical instructors. Randolph will share suggested topics with program directors and ask for a vote.

F. Use of Standardized Testing in Nursing Programs

This matter was placed on the agenda to determine how programs use the exams. Randolph requested input on the use of standardized test such as ERI and HESI. Randolph noted that in some programs the test has had many more consequences for the student in terms of failing the course or not being able to graduate, but does not seem to inform the program or faculty on programmatic and/or curriculum improvements.

Members offered that in some programs HESI is used as an exit exam, providing feedback to instructors for courses, and is helpful for students in understanding areas of weakness that require remediation. Other programs use the exam for progression, student guided remediation, and tracking to compare to NCLEX test scores. At one institution instructors are required to complete a report at the end of the course and must address HESI scores, noting what the course has done to address any issues based on the results. Another bought the HESI package which includes an admission test, a specialty test, and a custom mid-

AGENDA ITEM VII.F.2.a.

curricular test. Changes in text have been made based on the fundamentals test administered because of student scores. One member offered that the original use of HESI was a summative exam which students had to pass in order to get a passing grade in their final Capstone course to be allowed to sit for the NCLEX. This was later determined to not be the best use of the HESI exam. The program is now finding that there are other indicators for success that go along with HESI scores (course scores and exams, clinical evaluations).

Members further discussed the connection to evaluation and whether the exams are used in a formative or summative manner, noting that national organizations have substantial data to support strong significant correlation between performance on exit exams and the likelihood of passing NCLEX.

5. APPLICATIONS FOR PROPOSAL APPROVAL

A. ITT Technical Institute

ITT Technical Institute Representatives Present: Susan Ciardullo, Dean, ITT Technical Institute in Phoenix; Peggy Keene, Nursing Curriculum Manager from Indianapolis Headquarters; Fred Lockhart, Executive Director Arizona Private School Association; Gene McWorter, Director of the Campus; Attorney Mike Rooney, Sacks Tierney, Scottsdale AZ; Nadia Sperry, Program Chair ITT Associate Degree RN Program

McWorter addressed the committee stating that ITT Technical Institute responded appropriately to the request for additional information which is contained in the addendum to the application for the proposal approval, noting that the evidence for ITT having established a need for this particular program could be found on pages 2-7; a letter from Thomas Wickenden of ACICS defining ITT's relationship to that accrediting body on page 8; and an updated job description for program chair is contained therein. McWorter further stated that program representatives expressed concern regarding the questions, as they do not see a distinction between public and private. McWorter reiterated ITT's willingness to work with the "consortium", offered that ITT used market research in helping to determine whether it should go forward with the program proposal, and noted the effect that lack of funding may have on public institutions.

Committee members requested information and clarity regarding infrastructure and the supervisory relationship between the parent and branch campus. Members discussed recruitment strategies; attracting wait list candidates; availability of potential students; program approvals based on regulatory perspective, need, clinical placement, faculty, post graduate employment, program outcome; NCLEX pass rates and how pass rates may vary from site to site based on course correction or curriculum, faculty, or students; limiting enrollment. Members expressed concern that while ITT is opening other programs there is no nursing history, no measure of a successful nursing experience in the community and suggested limiting enrollment. Members also expressed concern with the impending impact clinical capacity and faculty shortages may have on program success and the health and safety of the community.

Committee members recommended ITT Technical Institute consider course correction (which may include limiting admission of additional students) if NCLEX 4th quarter data is less than 75%. ITT representatives agreed to share NCLEX results from the Indianapolis campus. If the data is below 75%, ITT will share the plan of correction for the Indianapolis campus and the rest of the schools within 30 days of the results.

AGENDA ITEM VII.F.2.a.

Motion: Recommend that the Board grant proposal approval to ITT Tech to establish an Associate Degree Nursing Program provided that the application for provisional approval is received within one year of the proposed approval.

Moved: Dr. Judi Crume

Seconded: Dr. Mary Killeen

Discussion: None.

Vote: 16 ayes, 3 nays
Motion carried.

McWorter thanked the committee for its recommendation and stated that they are looking forward to working closely with the Education Advisory Committee members.

Crume stated that a chapter of the Arizona National Organization of Associate Degree Nursing has recently been established which is a place in which faculty and people that are interested in doing a better job in associate degree nursing can come together. Ms. Sperry and Dr. Faucher are members. The organization is open to both public and private programs.

B. Fortis College LPN Program

Fortis College Representatives Present: Virginia Armstrong, Consultant; Dr. Dina Faucher, National Dean of Nursing, Interim Program Director; Glenn Tharpe, School Director

Randolph addressed the committee stating that an application for proposal approval was submitted over a year ago for an associate degree program, a LPN program, and an online program. RETS did receive approval, however, a timely application for provisional approval was not received. At this time Fortis College is re-submitting a proposal approval application for an LPN program. Examination of waiting lists for LPN programs reveal that in 2008 there were approximately 200 candidates on waiting lists, most in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Consistent with what was asked of ITT Technical Institute, Fortis College was asked to provide an analysis of tuition costs and a comparison to other LPN programs. As there were no other private LPN programs for comparison, Fortis provided a comparison with public programs.

Committee members requested information and clarity regarding tuition costs, attrition rates; transferability of credits; faculty; mentoring; NCLEX pass rates for RETS; incorporation of LPN in team model; obtaining necessary rotations in clinical specialties; and the role of the Director of Nursing. Members also discussed the challenges of clinical placements for LPNs and recommended including alternative sites.

Motion: Recommend the Board grant proposal approval provided that the school submits an application for provisional approval within one year from the Board date.

Moved: Dr. Cheryl Roat

Seconded: Ms. Marty Mayhew

Discussion: None

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

6. APPLICATION FOR PROVISIONAL APPROVAL

There were no provisional applications submitted.

7. APPLICATION FOR FULL APPROVAL RENEWAL

A. International Institute of the Americas

International Institute of the Americas Representatives Present: Ed Beecham, Chief Operations Officer; Mercedes Gordon, Director of Institutional Compliance; Kathlyn Ray, Assistant Dean, Acting Interim Dean

Randolph provided the report from site visit conducted by Karen Grady. A response from the program was also provided. Many of the potential violations have been remedied. Faculty evaluations have not yet been remedied, and NCLEX pass rates remain a concern.

Motion: Continue provisional approval until a determination is made of the program's remedying of the current deficiency of R4-19-206 D. The program shall provide monthly reports to the Board on changes in personnel and management, faculty evaluations, curriculum development, and measures to improve NCLEX pass rates. The Board shall re-evaluate program status at end of the deficiency period which is September 30, 2009.

Moved: Ms. Carol Mangold

Seconded: Ms. Terry Duffy

Discussion: Members noted that IIA College has had a pass rate below 70% for three consecutive years and inquired as to what student data has been analyzed to identify gaps and needs for the program. Members discussed student enrollment being limited based on low pass rates; curriculum consultants; required course grades; expressed concern that Ray has never run a nursing program before; and noted the potential of harming other students. Members recommended the program restrict/suspend admissions until they can see if implemented changes are working. Ray offered that changes in leadership which initiated changes and transition in the program slowed down progress. The program has revised the curriculum based on the NCLEX test plan, looked at faculty and faculty alignment; started a practice piece for faculty; looked at admission criteria; is focusing on remediation; and will work on a culture change at school. An NCLEX prep plan has been put in place.

Vote: 13 ayes, 5 nays, 1 abstention
Motion carried.

B. Northern Arizona University

Note: Education Committee member Dr. Sally Doshier recused herself from this portion of the agenda.

Northern Arizona University Representatives Present: Dr. Sally Doshier

Randolph addressed the committee stating that a site visit was conducted. The systematic evaluation plan submitted showed that NAU remedied every potential deficiency.

Motion: Recommend Board continue approval.

Moved: Dr. Mary Killeen

Seconded: Mr. Brian Stewart

Discussion: None

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

Members asked whether it is required for Board to conduct a site-visit when the accrediting body is conducting a visit. Randolph informed the committee that it is not mandated. If the Board does not attend the accrediting body's site visit an ancillary site-visit may be conducted at which time a separate self-study should be made available.

8. APPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM CHANGE

There were no applications for program change.

9. APPLICATION FOR NURSE PRACTITIONER PROGRAM

A. University of Arizona Pediatric Nurse Practitioner

Note: Education Committee member Ms. Carol Mangold recused herself from this portion of the agenda.

Randolph stated that Dr. Sally Reel submitted a copy for courtesy review and has made revisions based on feedback. The application meets rule requirements for a pediatric nurse practitioner program.

Members requested information and clarity regarding accreditation requirements of 1000 hours for a pediatric nurse practitioner programs.

Randolph stated that Board rules require 500 hours. Randolph will inquire as the accreditation status and inform Dr. Reel of accreditation requirements of 1000 hours.

Motion: Recommend Board approve.

Moved: Dr. Sally Doshier

Seconded: Ms. Marty Mayhew

Discussion: None.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

10. APPLICATIONS FOR REFRESHER PROGRAM APPROVAL

There were no refresher program applications.

11. NCLEX

A. NCLEX 4th Quarter Reports, 2008

Randolph addressed the committee stating that the fourth quarter reports reflect several programs at a 77% pass rate. EVIT was issued a Notice of Deficiency with 8 months to correct at the last Board meeting. The 8 months for correction is in line with a model the committee may consider adopting so that fewer students are at risk for NCLEX failure.

Randolph provided the committee with the accreditation basics document. The information will be presented in the upcoming journal. Malloch suggested Randolph include "Q&A" at the end of the column. The document is also available on the AZBN website.

B. Annual NCLEX Pass Rates

This item was discussed under Agenda Item 11A.

12. BOARD AND MEMBER UPDATES

Randolph informed the committee that a complaint was received against East Valley Institute of Technology. The complaint initiated a site-visit at which time some complaints were substantiated. Students from the program attended the Board meeting and made additional allegations initiating a separate investigation. The Board issued a Notice of Deficiency with eight (8) months to correct and a Notice of Deficiency for inadequate faculty with thirty (30) days to correct. Information from the program will go directly to Board.

Central Arizona College received student complaints which initiated an investigation. Potential deficiencies were fixed under the direction of the new program director. The complaint was dismissed. An investigative report on University of Phoenix was presented to the Board. Two sites were visited. Restructuring is needed as the organizational structure of program does not allow for enough oversight for the director of the program. The Board accepted the recommendation of the Education Advisory Committee regarding Cochise College and Arizona Western College remedying of deficiencies. The Board voted to extend approval of the Northland Pioneer College refresher program. Randolph provided a summary of the CNA Educators Retreat. Chamberlain College and IIA College appointed new and interim directors. The complaint against Direct Caregivers for allowing a CNA to teaching the CNA course was dismissed as the program remedied the situation. The Board looked at proposed legislation. An article will appear in the upcoming journal outlining the proposed changes.

13. DEBRIEFING ON TODAY'S MEETING

Members found the meeting difficult and frustrating, particularly the admission of students that they were lying on evaluations; expressed concerns that survey data and information was not taken into serious consideration by applying programs; stated that the committee concern is not only patient safety but student success as well. Members were concerned with the vote for IIA College and the number of students that have been affected by the failure of the IIA program, many of whom come from low income populations. Members also discussed regulatory without ethical piece; frustration with the rules the committee must work with, how to fairly apply the rules, expressed frustration with there being no definition of need. Members appreciated the report by clinical coordinators.

14. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Susan Stillwell, DNP student, commented on program approval process, and ethics vs. legality. Additional student comments were recorded under agenda item 4c.

15. FUTURE MEETING TOPICS/DATES

Education Advisory Committee next will be re-scheduled. Randolph will contact members with a proposed date.

16. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business Woulard adjourned the meeting at 3:03 p.m.

MINUTES APPROVED BY:

 Signature

:kg