



Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor

Board of Nursing
17938 SW Upper Boones Ferry Rd
Portland, Oregon 97224
Oregon.BN.INFO@osbn.oregon.gov
www.oregon.gov/OSBN

Meeting Topic: OAR Chapter 851 Division 62
Rules Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting

Meeting Date: 7/19/2024

Meeting Time: 8:00 am – 12:00 pm

Location: Electronic Media Only

Facilitator: Barbara Ju

Recorded: Yes

ATTENDEES:

Barbara Ju
Kimberly Goddard
Philip Fox
Selina Redbird
Ashlee O'Meara
Carole Nice
Christina(Tina) Kotson
Kristin Milligan
Lisa Rye
Mary Ann Vaughan
Nicolette Riley
Colby Russell
Debbie Rayburn

AFFILIATION

Oregon State Board of Nursing - Policy Analyst
Oregon State Board of Nursing - Chief of Staff
Oregon State Board of Nursing - Licensing Manager
Oregon State Board of Nursing - Admin. Assistant
Kaiser Permanente – NW Hospitals Regional Director
Dallas Retirement Village NA– Program Director/Instructor
Clatsop Community College (CC) – Interim Dean
Leading Age Oregon - CEO
Mt Hood CC NA/CNA2 – Program Director/Instructor
EMT Associates NA/CNA2 – Owner/CNA2 Program Director
Oregon Health Care Association – Senior VP of Quality
Hillsboro Medical Center – Clinical Education Manager
Leading Age Oregon – Healthcare Consultant

Other Attendees:

None

TOPIC	Comments
Welcome. Attendance, and ground rules for today's RAC meeting	Self-introductions - affiliation and title
RAC member reactions to proposed rule language in draft OAR 851-062	
851-062-0011	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No comments
851-062-0012	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No comments
851-062-0020	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No comments
851-062-0050	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question by Nicolette Riley: is “primary source” defined in Division (Div) 6? Barbara: Good comment, confirmed by Philip primary source is not defined in Div 6. Comment by Kimberly Goddard: Lots of conversations around “primary source”, if it is the best option, and is very interested in what RAC members are saying about it.• Question by Tina Kotson: Does this still allow for students who have finished a first year nursing program to be eligible for CNA certification? Barbara: Yes, further down in new (c). Comments by Tina Kotson: (c) okay.• Comment by Nicolette Riley: If changing to two years for the student nurse, should it be changed to two years for the military in new (2)(b)(B)?

	<p>Barbara: Will review for consistency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question by Nicolette Riley: What is the rationale for changing to “state approved” in (2)(d)(A)? Is there a concern about OBRA standards being insufficient? It adds subjectivity and add more work for OSBN to verify programs in other states to make sure they are meeting the standards. Barbara: Intent is not look at every program outside of Oregon for approval. Two acceptable documents are: certificate of completion that states date of completion or verification from training organization or state regulatory agency on official letterhead. Suggestions? • Comment by Nicolette Riley: Looking for loopholes.... If I go through a training organization in another state and submit a document that I’ve completed their course, will that be acceptable? Barbara: Part of requirement is a certificate with completion date and hours and they have to be on the CNA Registry. • Comment by Lisa Rye: Every state approved NA program knows you have to meet the federal requirement. State approved language is okay. • Comment by Tina Kotson: There needs to be a (A) with the two new ways of showing it and a (B) with the two old ways of showing it. • Comment by Kimberly Goddard: Lots of good conversation happening around this; we should highlight it, come up with some language to come back to this group with. Barbara: will have our OSBN internal group review this again.
851-062-0052	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
851-062-0054	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment by Lisa Rye: Suggest adding “holder” in new (2)(d) to read “when the temporary certificate holder is no longer the spouse or domestic partner of the active duty armed forces member.
851-062-0055	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment by Nicolette Riley: Here’s another area we are referencing and explained primary source in new (1)(b). We need to be consistent to say primary source or actually explain what primary source means. Barbara: Spelled it out to make it clearer because we get questions on what we accept. Will take it back to team.
851-062-0061	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
851-062-0070	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question by Lisa Rye: If a nursing assistant allowed their certification to lapse and does not meet the renewal requirements, can they retest? Barbara: within one year as stated in new (3)....thoughts from group? • Comment by Tina Kotson: a year seems reasonable, two years seems like a lot could be forgotten. A lot of practice and best practice and current information so personally more comfortable with one year instead of two.
851-062-0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
851-062-0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment by Tina Kotson: To make it clear, recommend adding one final statement at the end of renewal section that you have to start over if it’s been more than one year.
851-062-0075	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question by Lisa Rye: Do they have 3 years in theory then after the period of suspension lapse is over and then within three years they could decide to have their certification reinstated?

	Barbara: Many requirements are specified in a stipulated order after revocation or voluntary surrender. This process takes time, and all the requirements must be met before the Board would consider reinstatement after discipline.
851-062-0080	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
851-062-0090	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question by Nicolette Reilly: Wondering if 3(d) should be two years of application as well for consistency. Barbara: Will highlight for review and consistency throughout the Division. • Comment by Mary Ann Vaughan: Six months is confusing. • Comment by Tina Kotson: Recommend adding 832 hours in parenthesis. • Comment by Mary Ann Vaughan: I think it's hard to show equivalency. If they have completed a program with the hours, then have them pass the exam. • Comment by Lisa Rye: Agrees with Mary Ann's comments. Recommends requiring the Board-approved graduates from Oregon and student nurse to pass the exam within one year. I think it's appropriate to change it to two years for the CNA testing is appropriate in alignment with OBRA requirement but there is no OBRA requirement for CMA testing. Barbara: unanimous agreement from the RAC to remove Board approved equal in content to the Board approved curriculum in this section throughout. • Comment by Tina Kotson: Even as an interim director, I would not feel comfortable writing a letter for a student nurse. Many nursing programs teach pharmacology, medication administration at different paces and different ways, it would be hard for nursing programs to say right at this point, they have completed training that is equivalent to Board approved MA education program. • Comment/Question by Colby Russell: In agreement with Tina, document and proving 832 hours of clinical time as well as 1 on 1 is difficult. • Barbara: Clarify that 832 hours (6 months) is not clinical hours; it's paid worked hours as a CNA. It would be the responsibility of the applicant to provide that proof, not the dean or the employer. • Question by Tina Kotson: How many times a student nurse has had a letter allowing them to do this? • Barbara: Very small number. What does the RAC recommend, should student nurse have be allowed to become a CMA? Lisa Rye, Carol Nice, Nicolette Riley, Ashlee O'Meara in favor: Kristin Milligan neutral: MaryAnn Vaughan in favor of removing.
851-062-0100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
851-062-0110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment by Lisa Rye: Suggest updating language (5) "Employment hours and continuing education is validated through a random audit process by the Board"
851-062-0114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comments
851-062-0115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comments
851-062-0116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comments
RAC Member Input	
1. How will adoption of these rules affect racial equity in Oregon?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments

2. What is the possible cost of compliance for your organizations related to the adoption of these rules?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment by Lisa Rye: I don't see any impact for our institution. It seems these changes are streamlining and making it easier to read the rules.
Additional Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
Public Member Reactions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No public members or comments
Summarize/Wrap up	<p>Barbara: Thank you for your participation on the RAC. We had Div 61 RAC meeting earlier this week and the goal is for all three Divisions 61, 62, and 63 to be approved to go into effect on July 1, 2025. Plan is to present the proposed revisions for Div 61 and 62 at the September Board meeting followed by a public hearing then back to the Board for final approval effective July 1, 2025. A summary of today's RAC meeting will be distributed to the RAC membership and posted to the Board's Upcoming Meetings and Minutes webpage. Meeting adjourned at 9:58 a.m.</p>

Minutes completed by Selina Redbird, Administrative Specialist and Barbara Ju Policy Analyst.