

Survey & Certification Unit
 800 NE Oregon Street, Suite 465
 Portland, OR 97232
 Voice: (971) 673-0540
 Fax: (971) 673-0556
 TTY: 711

Oregon Nurse Staffing Advisory Board (NSAB)
 Wednesday, December 9, 2020
 2:00 PM – 2:30 PM

<http://www.healthoregon.org/nursestaffing>
mailbox.nursestaffing@state.or.us

Meeting Minutes

Cochairs	Jennifer Burrows, RN, BN, BSc, MBA; Susan King, MS, RN, CEN, FAAN
Members present	Zennia Ceniza, RN, MA, CCRN, ACNP-BC, NE-BC; Uzo Izunagbara, RN; Debbie Robinson, RN, MSN; Jenni Word, RN; Rick Rhoton, MHA, RN, BSN; Barbara Merrifield, MSN, RN; Carolyn Starnes, ASN, RN
Members absent	Rob Campbell, CP, ADN, RN; Kelsey Betts, RN
PHD staff present	Dana Selover, MD, MPH; Anna Davis, JD; Matt Gilman, MPPA; Kimberly Voelker, MPH;

Guests present	Kaleb Lay; Beth Dimler (Bay Area Hospital); Megan Willgoos (News 10); Danielle Meyer (OAHHS); Brody Debarde
----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Agenda Item 1	<i>Call to Order</i>
The meeting was conducted as an online Zoom meeting with computer or phone audio options. The meeting was called to order and members confirmed their presence on the meeting via roll call. All other individuals present identified themselves.	

Agenda Item 2	<i>Acuity Interpretive Guidance</i>
Board co-chair asked for comments about the draft acuity interpretive guidance.	
Board member suggested changing “address” to “support” for the first sentence in paragraph four.	
Board member suggested removing the reference to charge nurse in the second sentence of the fifth paragraph and suggested using “nursing staff” instead.	

Board member stated that for paragraph five, she was uncertain what examples nursing staff should be prepared to provide and asked whether the sentence should call out workflow.

Board co-chair clarified that workflow was only one component of what nursing staff should be prepared to demonstrate and that intent of the sentence was to have staff be able to demonstrate how the rules are operationalized.

Board member suggested adding “to the questions below” to the second sentence of the fifth paragraph and discussed intent of acuity guidance.

A. Davis agreed that the intention of the interpretive guidance was to guide hospital units in drafting Nurse Staffing Plans that were compliant with acuity and intensity requirements.

Board member highlighted typo in the second sentence of the sixth paragraph and suggested removing questions 6, 7 and 8 because they were related to other nurse staffing rules and not acuity and intensity rules.

Board member suggested keeping those questions since it would help encourage nursing staff members to research evidence-based practices.

Board member stated that there were other requirements in the rules that were not addressed in the acuity interpretive guidance and worried that including these questions could create confusion.

Board member agreed that questions 6, 7 and 8 did not fit with the interpretive guidance for acuity and intensity.

Board member asked if question 6 could remain in the document to address the specialty units that had standards related to acuity and intensity.

Board co-chair stated that most specialty areas didn't have standards specifically related to acuity and intensity and stressed having the guidance as specific as possible so as not to confuse the units trying to apply the guidance to their hospital.

Board member asked whether OHA surveyors would cite the hospital if the hospital hadn't included acuity and intensity standards in their nurse staffing plan. Board member asked what the surveyors would think if question 6 was included.

A. Davis stated that the surveyors would not cite the hospital for not including acuity and intensity standards in their nurse staffing plan. She explained that question 6 seemed to reference a different rule and that the board should consider rephrasing the question to specifically call out acuity and intensity.

Board member suggested narrowing the focus for question 6 by specifically asking about national standards related to acuity and intensity.

Board co-chair asked whether the board wanted to remove questions 6, 7 and 8 from the interpretive guidance.

Board members expressed interest in questions 6, 7 and 8 but wanted to narrow the focus of the questions.

Board member suggested new wording for question 5 so the question would specifically address the interaction between acuity and admissions, discharges and transfers.

Board member highlighted how admissions and discharges have an impact on acuity.

Board co-chair suggested removing question 8 and rephrasing question 5 to address the interaction between acuity and admissions, discharges and transfers, which was supported by the board.

Board co-chair suggested moving the last paragraph below the questions, which was supported by the board.

Board co-chair suggested removing question 7, which was supported by the board.

Board co-chair asked if further work was required for question 6.

Board co-chair suggested rephrasing the question to call out acuity and intensity standards, which was met with agreement from the board.

Board co-chair summarized the proposed edits to the document and asked if there were any further changes needed. The board supported the proposed edits and did not have any additional proposed changes.

Board member asked if the board was permitted to vote on the document via email.

A. Davis was uncertain whether the board bylaws would allow the board to vote via email but that an official vote was not required for OHA to release the interpretive guidance. A. Davis explained that OHA could make the changes and ask for the board's input on the document before the guidance went through OHA's approval process.

Board co-chair asked if it was acceptable to the board that OHA make the final changes and ask board members for their thoughts on the final document via email.

Board members expressed support for the proposed process.

Action Item(s)	
-----------------------	--

- OHA to make edits to the acuity interpretive guidance proposed by the board, then send the guidance to the board for their input on the final document

Agenda Item 3	<i>Summarize action items and upcoming NSAB meetings</i>
K. Voelker reminded the board of the upcoming quarterly meeting on January 27, 2021 from 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM on Zoom and stated that the agenda would be shared mid-January.	
Agenda Item 4	<i>Public Comment</i>
There were no public comments offered.	
Agenda Item 5	<i>Meeting Adjourned</i>

Approved by the NSAB January 27, 2021

If you need this information in an alternate format,
please call our office at (971) 673-0540 or TTY 711.