



**Oregon Health Licensing Agency
Nursing Home Administrators Board
Qualification & Examination Committee Meeting**

Date: July 8, 2010

Committee Members: Faraz Ahmed, Committee Facilitator
Lynn Howe

Staff: Cerynthia Murphy, Qualification Analyst
Janet Bartel, Investigator
Sinnamon Harris, Board Specialist

Public Attendees: None

The Board of Nursing Home Administrators, Qualification & Examination Committee met on July 8, 2010, at 10 am in the Oregon Health Licensing Agency (OHLA), Rhoades Conference Room, 700 Summer St NE, Salem, Oregon.

The purpose of the committee meeting was to review and discuss training objectives, develop new interview questions for the final interview, and review requests for waiver of AIT training. The committee will also review an online program offering for AITs.

Training Waivers

Cerynthia Murphy, Qualification Analyst, presented two requests for waivers for the committee to review. The committee reviewed the recommended training exception waiver criteria voted upon at the last full board meeting held on April 21, 2010. Faraz Ahmed remarked that standardizing waivers with clear criteria and guidelines was necessary to avoid subjectivity and to be fair to all candidates. He also discussed the necessity for a standardized form, which included a job description for candidates, to submit with a waiver request. The recommendations the committee will submit to the board, based on the before-mentioned criteria, are as follows:

- Applicant #090053 – waiver denied
- Applicant #090219 – waiver denied

The committee directed Murphy to draft an issue statement for the next board meeting on July 14, 2010, to defer future request of waivers to agency staff due to specified documentation required to be submitted to substantiate the waiver request and the established amount of hours being waived.

Online AIT Training Program

Murphy offered an AIT training program for the committee to review that was presented to her by Stan Smith of Provider Management Educational Services. Mr. Smith has been in the field for 30 years as both an administrator and a preceptor and was instrumental in developing the program. The program

would be adjunctive to the onsite training already in place. Mr. Smith wishes to request the Nursing Home Administrator Board to **require** this training program. It is a 52-week comprehensive program which costs approximately \$450 for the internet version or \$550 for the hard-copy book version. Murphy remarked the program covers all five domains of the AIT program with guidance and test portions. After discussion, the committee decided that while the program submitted would certainly enhance the AIT's training experience as a study guide, the committee could not recommend **requiring** AITs to purchase the program to the board. The board could list the program as a good resource or tool for training.

Midway & Final Interview Questions

The committee met to review the midway interview questions and during the discussion asked the question: "What benefit is the AIT receiving from meeting with the board for the *final* interview and what benefit is the board receiving from the *final* AIT interview?" Howe remarked the board's purpose is to provide safe and effective administrators and the bigger picture would be the benefit regarding the public concerns about safety. Murphy offered the figures from the April survey question: "Do you feel that your interview with the board was helpful?" Seventy-two percent of midway interviewees responded "very" and 19% responded "somewhat." Of final interviewees, the responses dropped to 39% under "very helpful" and 23% responded "somewhat." Howe remarked the benefits for the AIT at the midway is the acknowledgement of the board viewing and evaluating in the best interest of the public and that there is oversight of the administrators. At this point the AITs have been introduced to the board members and encouraged to contact board members as a resource as they go through the AIT training program and forward with their careers.

The committee also asked if the board has ever disallowed an AIT candidate from becoming licensed. The committee asked Janet Bartel, Investigator, to recall if the board had ever denied licensure to an AIT applicant. Bartel remarked when the AIT had expressed concerns regarding gaps in their training program the board had responded by recommending additional training hours. Generally, Bartel reported, the situation arose from a dysfunctional AIT program, for example, if the preceptor and the AIT were unable to get along or if the preceptor was insensitive to the needs of the AIT. Because the additional hours were only a recommendation from the board, and the AIT usually had completed the required hours for the program, the AIT did not necessarily complete all the additional recommended hours, sometimes just a portion of them.

The committee utilized the role of the board to help determine the need for the final interview, which is to protect the public by developing and enforcing standards. The committee determined enough information is derived during the midway interview and deemed the final interview unnecessary. The committee believes the following information obtained during the midway interview is sufficient without proceeding to a final interview:

- Clarification from the AIT regarding the training program
- Support plan in place when questions, doubts or crisis arise
- The role of their preceptor
- Other suggestions or questions the AIT or board may have

The committee will recommend removal of the final interview process to the board along with proposed midway interview questions covering all pertinent information derived from the previous midway and final interview questions.

Training

The committee met to review and discuss the AIT training program requirements within the domains of practice, the reporting forms, and surveys. Murphy will continue to work with the committee to modify and combine the current training report, log of experience, AIT report tool, and midway AIT program recommendations into one form. The AIT would submit this form twice: once 30 days before their midway interview and again after completion of the AIT program. Ahmed suggested closely scrutinizing the domains of practice to make sure everything is included. Howe mentioned the board dictates the outcomes, not the method used in the AIT training to obtain those outcomes. She suggested removing “methods” from the checklist (form). Murphy remarked she will review the NHA domains of practice to verify if there have been any large domain changes and report back to the committee in the near future.

The committee discussed, because of the varied training cycles, there should be no set hours the AIT has to complete in the program before coming before the board for the midway interview. The committee felt the AIT should not be delayed in the training process by waiting for a board meeting that does not occur but every quarter. The committee also felt that AITs should schedule their midway interview, after registration, for the next closest board meeting.

Murphy informed the committee that an issue statement for the full board would be needed concerning AIT training changes and then those changes would need to go before the Legislation and Rules Committee.

In regards to Domains of Practice, page 3, under “Recommended Visits,” Howe suggested the committee needs some more information. How difficult is it for AITs to go outside their own facilities, for example, to go to a non-profit, or a chain operated facility? She suggested the committee may wish to hear from Janet Bartel, former director of the Nursing Home Administrator Board, for some history surrounding this issue before making a decision to include the recommendation as a requirement.

Surveys for AITs

The committee asked about the AIT surveys concerning their training that used to be distributed. One idea was to have the survey sent along with the license once it was printed out. Murphy informed the committee that any surveys are required to be kept for 25 years. Murphy suggested perhaps a periodic survey may serve the board best. Ahmed remarked the survey’s purpose would be to measure how the AIT program is working and where the board may need to make policy changes.

Janet Bartel was brought into the committee meeting for her expertise on the AIT surveys. Bartel stated the AIT surveys were sent out to the AITs right after the midway interviews and then again after the final interviews. Bartel noted the surveys had ceased being sent out sometime in 2009. Bartel remarked that she kept the results in a database and the full board would annually review the survey responses. A lot of the comments resulted in the board making changes to the AIT program, Bartel stated. Howe suggested just one survey after the completion of the AIT program and an annual review by the full board. Murphy stated that she would see about combining both the midway and final surveys into one survey. The committee remarked that it would like to review and discuss the AIT surveys in a future committee meeting.

The committee meeting adjourned at approximately 1:43 p.m.
Prepared by: Sinnamon Harris, Board Specialist