



## NMNEC Leadership Council Zoom Meeting June 28, 2018 9:00-11:00am – 2hr

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

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Changes/additions to the agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anita has a short announcement</li> </ul>	
Anita's Annmmt	Anita shared that she will be on sabbatical for the Fall term and does not know if she will return to her present Assoc Dir position. During her sabbatical, she will use her time for research and academic articles. Specifically she will be analyzing data regarding progression/HESI. She will also look at compassion fatigue toward the end of the BSN degree. She will stay on the Leadership Council during this time.	
Approval of Minutes from 5.10.18	Correction: Sabrina shared . . . <b>"direct hands-on</b> planned activities . . .	Becky make changes and post
News from UNM-T	Becky shared that Melissa emailed and wanted to share her excitement that her first 3 NMNEC ADN grads passed their NCLEX	No action
NMBON grant	Becky shared that NMNEC has received grant funds for FY18-19 from NMBON specifically for the purpose of continuing to review the curricular concepts and to support one statewide meeting - \$11,535	No action
Curriculum Committee/concept review update	<p>Mary provided a list of curricular concepts that have been reviewed. She requested LCs approval to accept the changes and re-post the curricular documents. LC approved the changes/review of concepts: Culture, Evidence, Health Policy, Infection, and Inflammation</p> <p>Mary also stated that they need a new Admin to take the minutes for this committee = 1hr meeting + 1hr develop the minutes. Jenny said that she would ask her new Admin to do this.</p>	<p>Mary to re-post these concepts into the curricular documents</p> <p><del>Jenny to ask new Admin to take minutes at Curr Comm mtngs</del></p>
LPN Admission Policy – Task Force update	Sabrina asked LC to review the latest version of the LPN Admission Policy. LC approved as written. LC clarified that there will be a nominal fee for LPNs to take the required online course – less than \$100. CNM will initially offer this course but other schools could do so as well. Becky will send this policy out for a vote to Full Member schools. Becky asked Sabrina to have the TF determine how to "market" this new policy. LC suggested writing an article, having a press release sent throughout the state, informing the LPN programs, etc.	<p>Becky send policy out for a vote.</p> <p>Becky add "marketing" LPN Adm Policy to LC mtng in 1-2mo.</p>

	<p>Sabrina also shared that the TF discussed whether to develop a step-out after Level 3 to allow a nursing student to take the LPN exam. The TF rejected this because of HLC regulations and in the best interest of the nursing students, did not recommend this be developed.</p>	
<p>Guests: Elsevier Lee Henderson and Tamara Myers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LC invited Lee Henderson (content strategist) and Tamara Myers (content director) to join the call to discuss the publishing options pertaining to the NMNEC Curriculum and Partnership Model.</li> <li>• Lee asked LC to clarify their goals for publishing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This is a workable curriculum that can be duplicated.</li> <li>○ We have been struggling to share the highly marketable curriculum.</li> <li>○ We are presenting at the ODEN convention in PA soon and will once again explain that this is not a 2+2.</li> <li>○ Anita shared that she will soon be conducting research to further look at outcomes, specifically looking at the HESI</li> <li>○ We are developing an article that shows early NCLEX outcomes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Lee asked “what does the product look like?” He stated that they have looked at the NMNEC website but that the curricular documents are “locked down.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mary explained that there are standardized syllabi for each course; concepts are outlined; concept map is mapped to specific courses/exemplars; concept documents/overview – essence for key content.</li> <li>○ There are also simulation documents</li> <li>○ 1. Curriculum is concept-based (strength), shared curriculum = seamless transfer, 2. Innovative: ADNs and BSNs sit side-by-side. ADN is a sub-set of the BSN. ADN is 4 terms, BSN is 5 terms plus additional courses during the first four terms.</li> <li>○ The curriculum content is at a BSN level – the ADN courses are a sub-set of the BSN courses.</li> <li>○ The NMNEC Curriculum has increased the ADN level of rigor.</li> <li>○ LC also discussed the University-Community College partnerships that are unique to this model. Students earn a BSN near their rural homes. This model successfully creates more BSNs.</li> <li>○ The NMNEC Curriculum/Model is a total curricular solution similar to the ATI Total Solutions. This would be of interest to other states.</li> <li>○ This model not only offers flexibility for students where they can pick up a missed/failed course at another school, it offers flexibility for faculty as well.</li> <li>○ We have presented nationally and at the state level and have struggled somewhat with communicating our model. It would be easier to share the model if it was a publication of some kind.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Lee asked: Is this a curriculum and a how-to? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The NMNEC Implementation Guide explains the how-to of the entire process</li> <li>○ Tamara mentioned that she had reviewed this and found it to be helpful.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Lee asked who the primary market would be. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ LC unanimously stated, “schools of nursing.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Next Steps: Becky will talk with the copyright attorney again (with the permission of the UNM CON Dean) to revisit/clarify who owns the copyright</p> <p>Mary and Becky will meet to compile a sample of material for LC to consider presenting to Elsevier</p> <p>Becky will add this issue to all upcoming LC agendas.</p> <p>Becky will follow up with everyone restating our next steps</p>

- The consortium model can be used statewide, regionally, or in one school
  - Lee stated that a key element to publication is determining ownership – who has the copyright?
    - Becky clarified that in years past she met with the copyright attorney at UNM. They said that the copyright is collectively owned by the 18 NMNEC schools. She said that the attorney provided an example of another consortium who had this situation. They assigned “management” of the publication to one school but all held equal copyright.
    - Lee agreed that they would have to negotiate with one entity. Lee stated again that copyright is critical. He said that usually the entity transfers the copyright to Elsevier. The entity can also lease the content that involves a licensing fee (do not transfer the copyright) but this option is less tidy for Elsevier. Elsevier would lease the content if the product is valuable to them and they wouldn’t create it in-house.
  - Lee asked for two items: 1. Determine who owns the copyright and who would receive the income, 2. Elsevier needs to “see” what we want to market – they need a sample
  - Tamara asked if they could receive a small sample across all of the documents; perhaps one course that clearly shows how the ADN is elevated to the BSN level. It would be important for Elsevier to be able to show that this curriculum has a difference between the “normal” ADN curriculum and this BSN-level curriculum.
  - Health and Illness III might be a good example.
  - Courses are cross-walked. 100 and 200 level courses at the community college are the same as 300 and 400 courses at the university.
  - Lee asked if the syllabus contains textbook content
  - Each school can choose their own books; they determine their own schedule, readings, testing. The content is common with references for further study
  - LC mentioned that there is room to write a textbook though
  - It was mentioned that the proprietary nursing programs are very interested in getting the entire curriculum
  - Tamara mentioned that Elsevier has lots of resources and asked if NMNEC is okay with Elsevier promoting those with this product?
  - It was mentioned that the issue in deploying the curriculum is that there is not one textbook available that follows or is packaged for it – especially since it is concept-based
- LC restated that NMNEC is not an entity. Copyright is a central issue (the work was developed by state employees and volunteers); Need to determine what we want to share; Need to determine who would be the designated/primary entity.

	<p>Income potential was discussed but no ideas could be formulated because of the outstanding questions.</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Becky will talk with the copyright attorney again (with the permission of the UNM CON Dean) to revisit/clarify who owns the copyright</li> <li>2. Mary and Becky will meet to compile a sample of material for LC to consider presenting to Elsevier</li> <li>3. Becky will add this issue to all upcoming LC agendas</li> <li>4. Becky will follow up with everyone restating our next steps</li> </ol>	
WNMU grad student	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John mentioned that he will have a grad student working with him that he would like to involve in NMNEC. John will talk to the grad student about taking the minutes at the Curriculum Committee.</li> <li>• Mary mentioned that the Program Eval Committee needs someone to take minutes as well. Jenny will ask her new admin if she can do this.</li> </ul>	<p>John ask grad student: minutes at Curr Comm</p> <p>Jenny ask Admin: minutes at Prog Eval Comm</p>
RN-to-BSN Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John shared a proposed MOA. Becky asked if this should be called an "Affiliation Agreement?" She also clarified that any agreement can't come from NMNEC since NMNEC is not an entity. NMNEC can, however, offer a generic form and recommend its use. Jenny clarified that they call it an "Articulation Agreement"</li> <li>• Jenny emailed LC their Articulation Agreement with Highlands and discussed that this is a simple fill-in-the-blank form and less of a formal MOA – this may be preferable/simpler</li> <li>• LC clarified that this agreement would only be for the use of NMNEC ADN students. This agreement would not be appropriate for non-NMNEC ADN grads.</li> <li>• John will revisit the MOA with the TF and show them the Articulation Agreement from Highlands</li> </ul>	<p>RN-to-BSN TF will revisit MOA/Articulation Agreement</p> <p>Mary will set up next RN-to-BSN TF mtng</p>
ACEN poster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mary stated that she and Elizabeth Dickson developed a poster to be presented at the ACEN conference in July in Atlanta. She asked if someone requests a copy of the blank tools used to collect this data, can she take blank surveys for distribution?</li> <li>• LC asked that she take names/contact info of interested individuals and provide the information via email after assuring that the surveys have the NMNEC copyright statement on them.</li> <li>• Mary said that the copyright statement does not appear on the SurveyMonkey surveys online but this could easily be added.</li> </ul>	<p>Mary will gather contact info from interested parties at ACEN conf and provide survey tool with copyright info via email after the conference.</p>
NMNEC Admission Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that there is a slight error on the "NMNEC Admission Criteria." #6 ATI TEAS V is no longer called that. It is called ATI TEAS.</li> <li>• LC gave Becky permission to make this correction and remove the "V."</li> </ul>	<p>Becky, make this correction and re-post</p>
Advertise Faculty Openings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Becky said that Shawna from Clovis asked if NMNEC could spread the word about faculty openings. Becky asked permission to include this in the "What's New w NMNEC?" email that does out every six weeks or so. She would only include a link to the school's listing.</li> <li>• LC unanimously approved to do this moving forward. Several members will send Becky their links to listed openings.</li> </ul>	<p>Becky to include "Faculty Openings" in the "What's New" emails</p>

Tri-fold Brochure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Becky mentioned that the NMNEC tri-fold brochure has been updated. She asked that LC review it on their own and provide Becky with any feedback.</li> </ul>	LC to review brochure
NEPIN Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jenny briefly mentioned that she and Judy attended the first conference call for the NEPIN Alliance and encouraged each member to review the minutes. She stated that the alliance does not have a sub-committee that pertains to our model. They encouraged Jenny to join the ADN programs that are working on RN-to-BSN partnerships.</li> </ul>	LC read minutes on their own
SFCC Con Alma grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jenny shared that there are monies set aside for NMNEC in the SFCC Con Alma grant. LC discussed how these funds would best be used.</li> <li>• Judy stated that we need to look at the NCSBN grant. She thinks there are funds for a statewide meeting there. Becky reminded LC that NMBON has provided funds for one meeting as well.</li> <li>• Judy stated that the greatest need is for funds to help pay the salaries for NMNEC Staff. Currently, UNM CON is paying 100% of Becky and Mary's salaries and benefits.</li> <li>• Jenny stated that the grant funds could be used for this if UNM CON provides an invoice for Consulting Fees for NMNEC. Jenny also mentioned that their Perkins grant would provide partial funds for this.</li> <li>• Judy said that UNM could do this. LC heartily thanked Jenny and SFCC for their support.</li> </ul>	Becky to check with UNM accounting and provide invoice to SFCC.
NLN Response to AACN Vision Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall LC is not pleased with the response. They would like to discuss this at the next meeting</li> </ul>	Deferred
Becky & Mary's Staff Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Becky briefly shared the outline of Becky and Mary's staff duties. The table of duties for each show that they spend more than 50% of their effort on the statewide NMNEC initiative. The next biggest percentage of time for Becky is spent on managing the UNM BSN partners followed by the other grant projects she manages. 26% of Mary's time is spent on the statewide NMNEC initiative followed by her responsibilities for the UNM BSN partners and other faculty duties.</li> </ul>	None
Re-Define LC/stwd goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to Review/re-define goals of the statewide effort – what will be the process to do this?</li> </ul>	Deferred

Meeting Adjourned at 11:00am