



State of Oregon
Kate Brown, Governor

Oregon State Board of Nursing
Ruby Jason, MSN, RN, NEA-BC
Executive Director

17938 SW Upper Boones Ferry Road
Portland, OR 97224-7012
Telephone: (971) 673-0685
Fax: (971) 673-0684
E-Mail: oregon.bn.info@state.or.us
Website: www.oregon.gov/OSBN

Meeting Topic: Nursing Education Advisory Group
Meeting Date: August 6, 2015
Meeting Time: 9:00 am to 12:00 pm

Location: Legacy Meridian Park
Facilitator: Michele Decker
Recorded: No

NAME

Sheryl Caddy
Michele Decker
Beverly Epeneter
Debbie Henry
Troy Larkin
Marilyn McGuire-Sessions
Ginger Simmons
Cynthia Stegner
Diane Waldo

AFFILIATION

Linn-Benton Community College
Central Oregon Community College
Oregon State Board of Nursing
Legacy Health & Student MAX Connections
Providence – Oregon Region
Portland Community College
Oregon State Board of Nursing
Samaritan Health Services
Oregon Assoc. of Hospitals & Health Systems

Excused: Debra Buck, Joy Ingwerson, Mallie
Kozy, Joanne Noone, Cynthia Stegner, Gerry
Sullivan, Linda Wagner

| TOPIC | DISCUSSION | DECISION/FOLLOW-UP |
|--|--|--|
| Approval of June Minutes | The minutes of the June 4, 2015 NEAG meeting were reviewed. (The July meeting was cancelled.) | The June 4, 2015 meeting minutes were approved as presented. |
| Applications for Group Update | J Ingwerson provided a written update regarding open positions on the Nurse Education Advisory Group. To date, the Board received three inquiries, but only one completed application. The application will be submitted to the Board at the September 17 th meeting for approval. Additional applicants from nursing practice settings are desired. | J Ingwerson will make contacts with individuals from facilities for additional applicants. |
| Report on ACEMAPP Unit Profiles and Data Request | J Ingwerson provided a written report that she and D Henry met with Alex Asbury, ACEMAPP, in June to review what is currently in place for “unit profile” descriptions and what might be possible in the future. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current “unit profile” information in the system is not completed by everyone thus is variable. | J Ingwerson to add review of ACEMAPP data to the agenda for the next meeting. |

| TOPIC | DISCUSSION | DECISION/FOLLOW-UP |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Asbury and D Henry secured agreement to have the unit profile function required for everyone in ACEMAPP and the items included are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unit Name 2. Unit Description 3. Number of Budgeted (Staffed) Beds 4. Average Daily Patient Visits (Census) 5. Unit Shift: 8, 10, 12 ○ T Larkin stated he would continue to ask all Providence hospitals to submit their unit profiles to A Asbury at ACEMAPP. He added that some hospitals may not have the info available, Medford for example. He asked to be notified if A Asbury decided not to use the data. • Staffing numbers (e.g. numbers of RNs, LPNs, CNAs, etc) were not included in the agreement, but the Nsg Ed group could ask for these in addition to the profiles. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D Henry, Legacy, and T Larkin, Providence, responded they would not be able to provide a staffing matrix. D Henry added that census drives student acceptance. • Joy has submitted a list of requested data points to Alex to pull from ACEMAPP related to questions the group has had. He has provided multiple detailed pivot tables which will be reviewed at the next meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Note: ACEMAPP has no recorded requests for placements of 5 hours in length or less for M/S, Peds, OB, or psych units. | |
| <p>Focused Questions for Clinical Facilities</p> | <p>After review and discussion of the documents that captured placement numbers in a variety of ways, the group agreed the best method was to use the survey. However, with ACEMAPP providing norms in the Portland metro area and the programs providing actual placement data, the group agreed it was not necessary to also capture these numbers on the facility survey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T Larkin added that some data would be missed from an ACEMAPP data extraction, | <p>Not applicable</p> |

| TOPIC | DISCUSSION | DECISION/FOLLOW-UP |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The students from non-ACEMAPP schools would not be included in the data, but would take placements ○ Data would only be from the Portland metro area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Group agreed utilizing the Portland metro area data was a good place to start. In the near future, they could possibly do an additional survey to capture the rural areas and non-ACEMAPP programs. | |
| <p>Focused Questions for Clinical Facilities</p> | <p>Group reviewed and discussed the current draft of the facility survey questions along with OCN's submitted comments and proposed revisions resulting in the following:</p> <p><u>Pre-licensure/RN/BSN – Precepted</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions about the precepted clinicals need to specifically be identified as pre-licensure RN/BSN throughout the survey. • Did not come to a consensus on questions related to who, individual/department, handles nursing student clinical placements. • Keep the priority matrix or decision-making grid question. Did not reach a consensus on the actual wording of the question. • The facility questions were in alignment with the program questions. • Reasons for placement denials were updated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted there was nothing in the program survey that asked if complaints or denials were due to poor faculty supervision. • Added question relating to factors that prevent a facility from expanding clinical opportunities. <p><u>Untapped Resources</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added question relating to students only utilizing partial shifts and whether a facility would consider placing a second cohort for the remaining shift. • <p><u>Practicum Placements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of practicum needed – previously captured in program survey | <p>Updated facility survey questions for review at next meeting on September 3, 2015.</p> |

| TOPIC | DISCUSSION | DECISION/FOLLOW-UP |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added new question that addresses whether facilities have available clinical placements for alternate placements that aren't used due to them not meeting a very specific request (e.g. placement available in another area that would provide a similar experience). | |
| High Stakes Testing | <p>Group agreed Oregon should provide a statement on High States Testing and will work on draft statement at the next meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about some of the existing definitions; need to make clear that high stakes testing is not just referring to outside agency testing. • Deans and Directors meeting is a possible opportunity to request from the programs any current high stakes testing policies. (Many programs may not have a policy.) | NEAG group agreed to a High Stakes Testing interpretive/position statement for Oregon. Add to a future agenda. |
| Wrap Up and Plan for September | <p>Next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Review of program and facility survey questions → Accommodation → High Stakes Testing | |
| Next Meeting | Thursday, September 3, 2015 at Legacy Meridian Park Community Health Education Center. | Agenda and August minutes will be sent prior to the meeting. |

Minutes completed by Ginger Simmons, Policy Analyst Administrative Assistant, and Joy Ingwerson, Nursing Education & Assessment Policy Analyst.