



Leadership Council In-Person Meeting CNM Main Campus, JS Bldg Rm 303 – August 4, 2017

Present (voting member)	Shawna Kemper	John Scarbrough	Diane Evans-Prior
Present (ex-officio member)	Judy Liesveld	Jenny Landen	Tricia Maule
Present (staff)	Anita Reinhardt	Judy Hurula	Sabrina Ezzell
Absent	Mary Wright	Becky Dakin	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
-------------	------------	--------

<p>NMBON: NCLEX pass rates for partner schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting began at 12:50. Becky welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda, introducing Dr. Sasha Poole and Demetrius Chapman from the Board of Nursing. • Becky stated that she and Mary checked with the other states that have developed models for academic progression in nursing. No other state has dealt with the questions before us. We are forging new ground and dealing with the complications of innovation. • Demetrius outlined the general concerns/questions regarding co-enrolled partnership BSN cohorts. After much discussion the questions were defined as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which partnership school gets credit for pass rates of the co-enrolled BSN student? 2. Which partnership school is sanctioned for pass rates below 80% of the co-enrolled student? 3. Shall we create standard identifier nomenclature for co-enrolled students? 4. Should NMBON regard the “partnership BSN co-enrolled cohort” as an entity of itself, separate from the coinciding BSN-only and/or ADN-only that is being delivered at the partner schools? Should this “partnership” then have its own NCLEX code from NCSBN? <p>Reporting of Graduates:</p> <p>Sasha shared a grid/table developed by UNM that clearly provided all student information from their school. Sasha would like all NMNEC schools to adopt a grid system like this with each school using the same standardized labeling for student information.</p> <p>LC stated that that could easily be accomplished and we could add it to the MOA as an addendum to require that this form be used. We could also add it to the NMNEC Implementation Guide which is the step-by-</p>	<p>Aug 17 LC will discuss creating standard identifier nomenclature.</p> <p>Aug 17 LC will review how to move forward on these four questions.</p> <p>Aug 31 Demetrius will join the LC ph conf to update us and determine a plan to move forward</p>
--	--	---

step how-to guide that explains curricular change, implementation, and degree conferral.

Question 1 Discussion: pros and cons were discussed acknowledging that the majority of course delivery for the co-enrolled student happens at the community college. It was also stated that a great deal of collaboration and oversight occurs on the part of the university. It was acknowledged that the university is conferring the BSN degree while the community college confers the ADN (upon graduation from the BSN.) It was concluded that both schools are responsible and should receive “credit.” However, Demetrius clarified that we could not give half credit for pass rates.

Question 2 Discussion: It was agreed that both partnership schools are accountable in the delivery of the program but both need to be involved in the development of a plan of action if NCLEX scores fall below 80%. It was also pointed out that the co-enrolled pass rate should not affect the coinciding ADN-only or BSN-only programs offered at those same schools.

Demetrius also shared that the BON is looking closely at “the 80%” ruling and considering broadening that to “1st time pass rate + N” or “2nd time pass rate” or “who passes within the 1st year,” etc. “The 80%” rule is very problematic for very small cohorts which are typical in the rural areas and are also becoming common in partner schools that have both the ADN and BSN option.

Question 3 Discussion: Everyone agreed that it would be incredibly helpful if a standard identified nomenclature was created for co-enrolled students. This would ensure that we were not double counting. This would also allow easy, known identifiers if there was any question. NMNEC will develop this nomenclature. This will be discussed at their next phone conference August 17.

Question 4 Discussion: The group concluded that if we consider the co-enrolled cohorts/partnerships to be a separate entity, this will clear up a lot of confusion. If the “partnership co-enrolled BSN cohorts” are uniquely identified, we wouldn’t mislead the public and have it appear that a student earned his/her BSN degree from a community college. This “partnership co-enrolled BSN cohort” would have its own NCSBN code that would be used for reporting NCLEX results by the NM BON.

We defined that the co-enrolled student is enrolled simultaneously at both the university and the community college during all five of their terms. They are a unique cohort in that their university BSN education is being delivered at the community college (CC).

	<p>There are five specific university courses in the curriculum plus two additional elective courses. The majority of courses are community college courses.</p> <p>The delivery of these courses varies per school and per cohort dependent upon the availability of qualified/available faculty at the community college. The university may hire the CC faculty person, the university may send a faculty person to that location, the university may deliver the course via zoom, etc.</p> <p>Because of these unique circumstances, the BSN co-enrolled partnership cohorts need to be considered a unique partnership cohort, separate from each BSN-only and/or ADN-only coinciding cohort.</p> <p>Demetrius is not sure how NCSBN will view this but he will discuss this with the psychometrician from NCLEX when they attend the same conference next week.</p> <p>Becky mentioned that once these questions are answered, this information can be included in the NMNEC Implementation Guide. The last page currently discusses how the partnering schools receive credit for the conferral of the degrees for the co-enrolled student. This additional information would fit nicely in this “how-to” guide to not only assist NMNEC schools but also act as a guide to the nation.</p> <p>Additional Questions to discuss in future:</p> <p>What about a community college that only has a co-enrolled BSN cohort? What if they have no students in their ADN program for that term/year?</p>	
Approval of minutes from 7.20.17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deferred 	Becky – add to next agenda
Membership status of ENMU-R. List Deming location?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENMU-R has informed us that they will consider implementing the NMNEC curriculum after 2020 after they have gone through re-accreditation. (This is similar to Doña Ana’s status.) Becky asked if this changes their membership status from Full Member to Associate Member since they cannot commit to implementation. She also asked if there any other changes that need to take place. • LC determined that they need to change to an Associate Member. • Their implementation date needs to change on the implementation grid • Their membership status needs to change on the website • Becky asked if the WNMU Deming campus should be listed as a NMNEC location. John determined that this would not be appropriate as this is not a stand-alone program. 	Becky will change ENMU-R to Assoc Member (ltr of notification + MOU); change web listing; change implementation grid and re-post on web

<p>NMNEC Committee Structure/Recruitment/ Admin Support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several concerns have been mentioned pertaining to the current health of the NMNEC Committees. • We acknowledged that the purpose of the committees has changed from development to maintenance and advisory. Maintenance/Advisory requires a certain level of expertise from the members. The “newbie/learner” does not have a significant role any longer. • Program Eval Committee Chair. Shawna needs to step down now that she is part of the LC. After discussion of different options, LC determined that they would like to appoint Dr. Martha Morales from NMSU. Becky will send her an email expressing this appointment and ask for her acceptance. If she accepts, Becky will send an email to the Co-Chair and members to inform them of this change. Shawna and Martha will work out how to transition. • Program Eval Co-Chair: Mary asked if Siri could continue to be the Co-Chair since she is now full-time faculty at a non-NMNEC school (Highlands University). The LC thought that this would be beneficial but Becky was not sure that this was allowed and Siri will lose her access to the curricular documents. Becky will investigate the rules and report back to LC. • LC discussed that program evaluation data is a challenge. Mary asked if it is the responsibility of the committee volunteers to input and analyze data. Everyone agreed that this was not a volunteer role. Our challenge is that this is an unfunded staff role. Anita has a G.A. that might be able to help. Judy mentioned that we are attempting to fund Elizabeth Dickson (NMNEC’s G.A.) for the Fall term but that she will be gone after that. • John pointed out that the NMNEC survey data needs to be tightened up – that the tools are a real problem. 	<p>Becky send appointment email to Martha.</p> <p>Becky, if Martha accepts, send email to committee members.</p> <p>Becky investigate rules pertaining to non-NMNEC schools being Co-Chair and report back to LC</p>
<p>Committee Recruitment & Staff support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LC discussed that committee recruitment is very difficult. In the past, we asked every Program Director to appoint a member from their faculty. Some schools did this, however participation has still been spotty. • Shawna pointed out that there needs to be a balance between “newbie/learner” committee members and “expert” committee members. Becky wondered if we could be more specific about the recommendations we request from Program Directors. • We determined that the committees desperately needs more support from NMNEC administration – specifically from the Admin Assist. This has not taken place for most of the past two years. Mary has attempted to do this but this is not her responsibility. Mary and Becky will develop this as part of the responsibilities of the new Admin who will hopefully be hired in the next month. Admin support will be in scheduling, minutes, ongoing recruitment, attendance tracking & participation, relationship building/thanking. 	<p>Becky & Mary will develop training/scope for Admin Assist</p>
<p>NMNEC table at the Nursing Excellence Awards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judy shared that grant funds are not available to purchase a NMNEC table of 12 for \$1200. LC discussed that many NMNEC schools purchase their own table. UNM will have two tables and may have 2-3 spots available. NMSU does not purchase a table. SFCC will probably have a table. 	<p>Becky will figure out a way to distribute these buttons for Oct 21 gala.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We brainstormed that perhaps Sandy could add “NMNEC Program/School” verbiage to the table sign. • We determined that it would provide the most visibility if any NMNEC affiliated person/faculty would wear the button “Ask me About NMNEC.” Becky has about 50 of these left. She will figure out some way to distribute these to the NMNEC attendees and ask them to mingle as the “face of NMNEC” during these awards. • Anita reminded us that we need to consider sponsoring a NMNEC award for next year. The cost is \$1600. Becky shared that Joseph will add this to NMCNE’s next agenda to discuss ideas. Anita is on this committee so will let us know what their thoughts are. 	
Sponsor to approach for Nov 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becky asked the LC’s preference for possible sponsor for the November 3rd statewide meeting. Typically, the sponsor pays for lunch and provides a 20-min presentation. We want a topic that will be of interest to the majority of attendees. • LC asked Becky to approach Nursing CAS first and Shadow Health second • LC also challenged Becky to think about sponsorship beyond lunch. Perhaps ask a sponsor to support our table at the awards; sponsor a retreat for leadership; sponsor travel, etc. 	Becky to ask Nursing CAS if they would like to sponsor
Completing Prep Work for L5 clinical courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jenny said that her L4 coordinator has spent all summer coordinating the L5 clinicals for next term on her summer break when she is not being paid. UNM considered this part of the L5 coursework but they also have a full-time admin that coordinates affiliation agreements and professional documentation. Jenny asked if this coordinator was available to the partner schools. Judy said no. • Anita said that NMSU is compensating SFCC an additional two credits for this preparation. 	Partnering community colleges will negotiate this in the future
Continue Brainstorming/goal setting from June 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deferred 	Becky add to next F2F agenda
Review NMNEC Progression Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deferred 	Becky add to next F2F agenda
Review NMNEC Mission/Vision/Goals; relevant terminology; marketing; telling our story	Deferred – Judy pointed out that this discussion needs to take place fairly soon as the Program Evaluation plan is based on the mission/vision/goals and will need to be changed if these change, i.e. Diversity	Becky add to next F2F agenda

Meeting Adjourned 4:45pm