



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: June 4, 2015
Meeting Time: 9:00 am to 12:00 pm

Location: Legacy Meridian Park
Facilitator: Joy Ingwerson
Recorded: No

NAME

Debra Buck
Michele Decker
Debbie Henry
Joy Ingwerson
Heather Lary (for Troy Larkin)
Marilyn McGuire-Sessions
Joanne Noone
Ginger Simmons
Cynthia Stegner

AFFILIATION

Oregon State Board of Nursing
Central Oregon Community College
Legacy Health & Student MAX Connections
Oregon State Board of Nursing
Providence – Oregon Region
Portland Community College
OHSU SON – Ashland
Oregon State Board of Nursing
Samaritan Health Services

Excused: Sheryl Caddy, Beverly Epeneter
Mallie Kozy, Gerry Sullivan, Linda Wagner,
Diane Waldo
Guests: Barbara Lew, Lynda Rowell, Kim
Schmaltz

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
Approval of May Minutes	The minutes of the May 7, 2015 NEAG meetings were reviewed.	The May 7, 2015 meeting minutes were approved as presented.
Membership Applications Update	J Ingwerson announced she would be sending out application packets for prospective NEAG members with a general call to any interested parties. Once posted on the OSBN website, the application information will be sent to contact names of those involved in placements in healthcare facilities that group members provided. The group currently has more members representing nursing programs than clinical agencies. The original charter allowed for up to fifteen members.	J Ingwerson to send out NEAG application packets to contacts and post info on the OSBN website.
Approaches for Mining Current Data on Clinical Placements	J Ingwerson opened the discussion on the facility clinical placement survey by summarizing her concerns and those expressed during the May meeting. The group's discussion included the following:	J Ingwerson and D Henry to meet with Alex to look at ACEMAPP. J Ingwerson to request

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Verify the data ACEMAPP already has on the facilities and use it as a model to obtain additional info (not only acute care data) and to include those facilities outside the greater Portland area. By building on the existing ACEMAPP data, those who are already utilizing and providing information might see the request for additional data as value added versus having to complete a separate survey for the Board of Nursing.</p> <p>A meeting with Alex Asbury to look at unit profiles in ACEMAPP may be helpful.</p> <p>Jana Britton from OCN offered to take all of the data provided by the programs on clinical placements for 2014/2015 and input it into a spreadsheet. The group agreed that with 32 nursing programs, it was a doable option.</p> <p>One of the most useful benefits from this survey would be the creation of benchmarks: number of beds on the unit with the numbers of nurses equals x number of students (or cohorts) on days and x number of students on nights (acknowledging compounding variables).</p> <p>The information and the analysis of the data could be utilized to open up communication with the facilities and help them become more aware of the issues caused by a lack of available clinical placements in Oregon. Some programs had already had to contemplate stopping student progression because of a short-notice change in clinical placements.</p>	<p>clinical placement data from programs and share with J Britton to test use in capturing placement figures from 2014/2015.</p>
<p>Focused Questions for Clinical Facilities</p>	<p>The group reviewed and discussed the draft of the facility on-line survey questions which included the following suggested revisions:</p> <p>Clinical placements handled through a centralized department/individual would need to have two separate questions: one for cohort placements and one for precepted/practicum placements.</p> <p>Priority matrixes might exist, but facilities might not be willing to share. The question needs to ask whether the facilities have a matrix (yes/no) and include a space to attach or download the document. Disclaimers would explain that the info would only be shared with the Board of Nursing in</p>	<p>J Ingwerson to consult with OCN/B Morris regarding the reasons for denials question.</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
	<p>aggregate and not with facility identifiers. Also have the disclaimer about use of data in the aggregate at the beginning of the survey. Emphasize the importance of the survey in creating solutions to clinical placement issues.</p> <p>The question regarding reasons placements were denied needs the caveat “in the last year” and include a request for the top three and/or other factors. A checklist of reasons should be provided, such as: census too low for number of placements requested; staff overload with hosting students; conflicted with other student placements; orientation of new staff; and dissatisfaction with nursing program, etc. Seek input on whether a priority list or a top three choice is better for analysis.</p> <p>Provide a list of non-nursing placement types that possibly reduced the capacity of a facility to accept nursing students.</p> <p>Query whether the total hours in the shifts were used to the full capacity. Example, a unit is blocked for an eight hour placement, but the students are placed only for four hours.</p>	
OCAP Query	<p>Group considered reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities. Discussions included creating best practices include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A nursing program liaison who works with disability services. (Current titles in place at some colleges include Student Access Coordinator or Program Accommodation Liaison) - A document that clearly defines the nursing program’s expectations of a disabled student. The document would be sent to the student and the disabilities coordinator. <p>J Noone described a study being conducted by a PhD student on how graduates with disabilities function in the workforce.</p>	<p>In a future NEAG meeting, group to create a nursing program best practice related to reasonable accommodations.</p> <p>J Noone to share research results on the outcomes of graduates with disabilities in the workforce.</p>
National Council Update	J Ingwerson announced that National Council is currently reviewing the model rules related to simulation, e.g., appropriate simulation scenarios and maximum simulation hours. Once the review is	N/A

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
	<p>completed, the NEAG might want to consider their recommendations when updating Division 21 and/or creating an advisory statement to present to the Board.</p>	
<p>High Stakes Testing</p>	<p>The group reviewed the following documents related to High Stakes Testing: Texas Education Guideline for Standardized Testing, NLN's Fair Testing Paper, and North Carolina's Position Statement. The discussions included:</p> <p>The definition of the term High Stakes Testing: when a program use an outside vendor prepared standardized exam within the curriculum in a way that students might not be able to progress unless they reach a certain passing standard on that exam. Examples include a year one benchmark that could block progression to year two of a program or a major portion of a course grade allocated to the standardized exam result such that failing the standardized exam would mean a failing grade in the course.</p> <p>The vendors who created standardized exams did not design them for this purpose and do not recommend using them in this manner.</p> <p>The group agreed to develop a High Stakes Testing interpretive statement during future NEAG meetings with the goal of presenting a draft at the October Deans and Directors meeting.</p> <p>The group would like to review more references on the topic to inform the development of an interpretive statement or position statement.</p>	<p>NEAG group to draft a High Stakes Testing interpretive statement/position statement.</p> <p>High States Testing to be on the agenda for the Deans and Directors meeting in October.</p> <p>J Ingwerson to research and send out additional references on High Stakes Testing.</p>
<p>Instructor Test Bank Security</p>	<p>The group discussed current concerns related to students accessing test banks designed by publishers for instructors (ITBs). These test banks differ from those that are intended for students to access as practice questions. The ITB's are intended for instructors only and many faculty use these test banks for the majority of course exam content. There are websites that sell the ITBs to anyone.</p> <p>In discussion with publishers present at a recent statewide educator's meeting, PearsonVue noted the have full-time staff searching for these types of websites and if found, they issue a cease and desist notice. Some websites have been closed</p>	<p>Instructor Test Bank Security will be on the agenda for the Deans and Directors meeting in October.</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
	<p>down only to be seen again a few days later under a slightly altered URL.</p> <p>Instructors need to be advised to use test bank questions only for a portion of an exam or as a source of ideas to develop their own questions. It may be advisable to include information in student handbooks and school catalogs linking this issue to the student academic integrity.</p>	
Next Meeting	Thursday, July 2, 2015 at Legacy Meridian Park Community Health Education Center.	Agenda and June 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.