

Guam Board of Nurse Examiners

Thursday, June 13, 2024 at 3:00 PM

Join Zoom Meeting <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82811825591?pwd=7fIQ60XcHWFOLdokdhKaJVb7Grqauk.1>

Meeting ID: 828 1182 5591 Passcode: 584717

MINUTES

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status	
I	Call to Order	Chaired by: Greg Woodard	Chair	1506	Called to Order	
II	Proof of Publication	Guam Daily Post Ads and Public Portal; June 6 and June 11	HPLO	1506	Confirmed	
III	Roll Call	<p>GBNE Members: <u>Physically Present at HPLO:</u> None <u>Virtual Attendance:</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greg Woodard, APRN-NPC, AOCNP, Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anna Varghese, RN, DNP, Vice-Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charlotte Huntsman, GMRC, Public Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Philip John Calalo, DNP, RN, Secretary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brenda Manzana, LPN, Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gia Ramos, RN, Treasurer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Margarita Gay</p>	<p>Other Attendees: <u>Physically Present at HPLO:</u> Zennia Pecina, HPLO Administrator Rosemary Carman-HPLO Dorothy Duenas, Member from GCC <u>Virtual Attendance:</u> Krystal Takai Breanna Sablan, HPLO</p>	GBNE	1508	Quorum Established
IV	Adoption of the Agenda	<i>Motion to adopt: G. Woodard; 2nd: G. Ramos</i>	GBNE	1509	Unanimously Adopted	
V	Approval of Minutes	Minutes dated 05/09/2024. <i>Motion to approve as amended: G. Woodard; 2nd: G. Ramos.</i>	GBNE	1512	Unanimously Approved	
VI	Treasurer's Report	No Report.	G. Ramos	1513	No Report	
VII	Committee Reports	Rules and Regulations (Proposed). Rules and Regulations have been moved forward for proposed changes from the OAG.	GBNE	1513	Tabled	
VIII	Nursing Education	A. Associate Degree Nursing (ADN) Program Proposal – GCC G. Woodard inquired about the accreditation plans for the ADN program at GCC, specifically which body would accredit the program. The GCC ADN program team explained that the initial step is to obtain approval from the regulatory body, GBNE, which involves a comprehensive approval process in accordance with GBNE's rules and regulations. After securing initial approval, the program would then need to be accredited by an educational accrediting body such as ACEN or CCNE, with this process typically taking about two years. After the program's two-year approval and completion, the NCSBN would permit those RNs to take the NCLEX exam.	A. Varghese	1529	Unanimously Conditionally Approved Pending Breakdown of Lecture and Clinical Hours. Process of Initial Approval may Now Begin	

Item	Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
	<p>Gia Ramos mentioned that part of the accreditation process involves evaluating the pass rates of the first cohort, as these rates reflect the program's effectiveness. The accreditation process involves a period of data collection and typically takes two to four years, students would still be eligible to take the NCLEX after completing two years of the program. The discussion concluded with an affirmation that the Board's approval would be beneficial, considering these factors.</p> <p>A. Varghese reiterated the importance of adhering to standard six, emphasizing that the entire process from initial to continual approval is critical for any accrediting body. This standard applies to all nursing programs, whether LPN, CNA, ADN, or BSN. She agreed with Z. Pecina that the accreditation process may take a minimum of four to five years due to the need to evaluate outcomes.</p> <p>Z. Pecina asked the GCC team for clarification on whether D. Duenas was seeking approval for instructors with bachelor's degrees, as the Board prefers educators at the master's level. In response, a member of the GCC team explained that while both D. Duenas and the respondent are master's prepared, and there is interest from several master's prepared adjuncts, some regular faculty only have bachelor's degrees. They mentioned their ongoing efforts to recruit more qualified instructors.</p> <p>M. Gay commented on the review process, explaining that before approval, there is usually a review and an on-site visit to the clinical area where discussions with assigned adjuncts or professors take place; this includes a detailed curriculum review. Emphasizing the importance of evaluating first-year outcomes and pass rates, M. Gay noted that these factors are crucial for final approval. The process involves not just reviewing the presented proposal but also conducting site visits, asking pertinent questions, and observing the program's progress. A. Varghese concurred with M. Gay and clarified that the proposal is meant for Board members to ask questions initially. Following this, the Board will proceed through the standard process, which includes notifying the team about conducting site visits. These visits will cover clinical sites and review MOUs, among other factors. The goal isn't immediate approval but to provide an opportunity for the GCC team to respond to any questions from the Board members. A. Varghese reiterated the need for a core team to handle this process, emphasizing adherence to established standards.</p> <p>P. Calalo inquired whether the ADN program would be a transition from LPN to ADN or if recent high school graduates could directly enter the program. It was clarified that the initial intent was for students to complete the LPN program first and then transition to the RN program, creating a ladder system. However, G. Ramos mentioned that students could also enter the program directly from high school after completing the necessary prerequisites. It was noted that the goal was initially to have LPN graduates in the first cohorts to ensure higher pass rates and establish the program, there would be a mix of students, including those directly from high school. In addition, it was reported that D. Duenas had considered including a few external LPN students to diversify the cohort.</p>			

Item	Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
	<p>In response to a question regarding whether students from the LPN program in Guam or from the U.S. mainland and other countries could apply for the ADN program, the program has an admission policy that applies to all applicants meeting the criteria, regardless of their location. They emphasized the importance of the GBNE core team reviewing the entire process before granting approval, suggesting the need for a workgroup to examine various aspects of the admission policy. It was suggested to compile a comprehensive checklist for the Board to use once GCC's program is approved for submission, providing clear guidelines.</p> <p>In reference to the timeline for opening the ADN program, the Board noted the goal was to start in the upcoming semester, ideally mid-August, but acknowledged that this could be postponed if approval wasn't obtained in time. There was a suggestion to grant conditional approval pending the resolution of outstanding questions to meet the semester start date. The approval process involved submitting the proposal first, followed by a mandatory site visit before granting final approval to open. They recommended giving a preliminary green light and proceeding with the necessary site visit and additional requirements. The team discussed ensuring that GCC was ready to start in August, including having enough faculty to meet the required instructor-to-student ratio. It was noted that D. Duenas had previously indicated readiness to admit 20 to 24 students with the appropriate faculty. The final part of the approval process would involve confirming faculty qualifications and other necessary details during the site visit.</p> <p>G. Woodard inquired if the ADN program would include online classes or if it would be entirely conducted on-site. Another speaker clarified that based on their review of the proposal, all nursing courses would be conducted face-to-face, with only some general education courses being hybrid, not fully online. The Board noted that the clinical components would also be face-to-face. Concerns were expressed about recent issues in Florida where schools faced scrutiny for diploma distribution, attributing responsibility to Board members who had not thoroughly vetted those programs.</p> <p>Before proceeding with conditional approval, a suggestion was raised to clarify if there is a guideline, such as NLN accreditation standards, serving as a basis for the curriculum comparison. Z. Pecina expressed interest in understanding how the proposed curriculum aligns with established accreditation guidelines. It was confirmed that the program aligns with ACEN accreditation standards, similar to UOG's BSN program but distinct in structure, particularly in the final BSN year. It was also confirmed that the ACEN accreditation standards were included in the proposal.</p> <p>Further discussion emphasized the importance for Board members to compare the proposed educational courses with ACEN requirements and suggested presenting a breakdown of educational components in a structured table format. This breakdown typically includes clock hours, lecture hours, lab hours, clinical hours, and credit hours for clarity and comparison. HPLO acknowledged this information was present in the proposal but not in a tabulated form, proposing that Dr. Mafnas could compile and provide this</p>			

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		breakdown during the site visit. G. Ramos agreed that having this structured breakdown would facilitate a clearer understanding of the program's clinical hour allocations. <i>Motion to Conditionally Approve ADN Program: A. Varghese; 2nd: G. Woodard</i>			
		B. School of Nursing The Board clarified that there is still time for schools to submit their annual reports, with the deadline set for 30 June 2024.	GBNE		Noted
IX	Administrator's Report	Z. Pecina stated that the rules and regulations had been sent to the attorney for review. However, the process was still ongoing as amendments were being incorporated into the rules and regulations document. Once this step was completed and reviewed by legal counsel, they planned to submit it to the legislature for adjudication. Z. Pecina mentioned that several Board rules and regulations, including those related to Nursing, were expected to be finalized and submitted by the end of June, ensuring progress on these matters.	Z. Pecina	1549	Noted
		A. Legal Counsel's Update Z. Pecina reported that the Board currently does not have legal counsel. They are awaiting the Attorney General's appointment of a new person. Without legal representation for Nursing and Medical matters, efforts are being made to secure new counsel promptly to facilitate necessary actions, such as finalizing and forwarding rules and regulations to the legislature. The Board sought confirmation from members if they were comfortable proceeding without immediate legal counsel to prevent delays.	OAG		Noted
		B. GBNE Complaints			
		1. GBNE-CO-20-007/1, 2, 3, 4, 6 & 7 Received 9/16/20. This complaint requires review by a legal expert from off-island. The Board is in the process of redoing the procurement to engage this expertise. This case involves a medical complaint and an allied health complaint related to respiratory issues. The respiratory complaint has been resolved, and the medical complaint is nearing closure. The focus will now shift to addressing issues related to Nursing, pending legal recommendations.	G Woodard		Tabled Awaiting Legal Recommendations from Off- Island Attorney
		2. GBNE-CO-23-001. Received 4/3/23. This complaint is under legal review. The Board has already taken action, and the case has been reported to the NPDB (National Practitioner Data Bank) due to its serious nature. It was emphasized that any disciplinary actions involving matters such as termination, suspension, or financial implications must now be reported to NURSIS, which is automatically forwarded to the NPDB. This new process ensures that disciplinary information is immediately accessible to all states and territories, enhancing transparency and regulatory oversight within the nursing profession.	P. Calalo		No Report
3. GBNE-CO-24-001 (B. Manzana) Received 2/6/24. This case concerns Ms. Kohls, who was employed at GMHA without a valid license from September to January. B. Manzana provided the Board members with detailed minutes of the case prior to this Board session. B. Manzana proposed that Ms. Kohls complete CEUs in ethics and leadership, pay a penalty fee totaling \$500 for practicing without a license, and provide a	B. Manzana		Unanimously Approved Investigator's Proposal		

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<p>briefing at GMHA's next employee orientation as part of the resolution for her case. P. Calalo suggested Ms. Kohls also complete a government of Guam ethics class, considering the incident occurred at a government hospital.</p> <p>Z. Pecina expressed appreciation to Ms. Kohls for attending the Board meeting and emphasized the importance of the recommendations proposed by the investigator and agreed upon by the Board members. Recognizing the seriousness of working without a license, Z. Pecina highlighted the potential risks involved and acknowledged both human and system errors. Z. Pecina reminded Ms. Kohls of her options to either comply with the recommendations or appeal the decision, ensuring she was aware of the appeal process available to her.</p> <p>B. Manzana proposed the following: a reinstatement fee of \$500, consisting of four months at \$125 each, to be submitted to the HPLO office with assistance from R. Carman. Additionally, Ms. Kohls would be required to complete one CEU in government ethics and one CEU in leadership. Furthermore, she must deliver a presentation at GMH's upcoming employee orientation, coordinating this with the staff nurse training officer or nurse administrator.</p> <p><i>Motion to Approve Investigator's Proposal: G. Woodard; 2nd: C. Huntsman</i></p>			
X	Old Business	A. Reinstatement Application		1558	
		<p>1. Krystal Takai, LPN</p> <p>Z. Pecina provided an update on Krystal Takai, LPN, stating that her license lapsed in December. The Board granted her extensions in January, February, and March pending legal counsel. Due to regulatory limitations allowing only a six-month extension, they were unable to further renew her license. Legal documents are awaited, and Ms. Takai has received a plea agreement. Z. Pecina suggested Ms. Takai speak about her plea agreement and related matters for the Board's understanding.</p> <p>Ms. Takai explained that she had her hearing on 29 April, and the Office of the Attorney General approved a deferred plea agreement. The agreement entails a two-year probation period with monthly in-person check-ins at the probation office. After successfully completing the probation, all charges will be expunged. Additionally, if she successfully completes the first year, the judge indicated that the probation period could be reduced to one year.</p> <p>Z. Pecina explained that Ms. Takai's situation is akin to a deferment program. For example, if someone receives a citation for driving under the influence and their license is revoked, but they subsequently enter a rehabilitation program, it's similar to that context. In Ms. Takai case, the court will monitor her during the two-year probation period outlined in her deferred plea agreement. The Board is now considering whether to reinstate her license based on this information, with a potential review after one year to possibly reduce her probation period and expunge her record.</p>	GBNE		Awaiting Guidance from OAG

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<p>Ms. Takai emphasized that she has diligently fulfilled all court and rehabilitation requirements over nearly three years. She expressed confidence in successfully completing the probation within one year, noting that the family court case was closed last year.</p> <p>P. Calalo clarified that while they need to make a motion for approval now, they won't be involved in any further follow-ups with Ms. Takai. He explained that her renewal is due in September 2025, and if she doesn't apply, it will reflect when she submits her police and court clearance at that time. He expressed confidence in the judicial system to handle any necessary follow-up and emphasized that their role will be limited to assessing her compliance at the time of renewal.</p> <p>B. Manzana asked Ms. Takai if she had provided proof to the Board that she had met the requirements outlined, to which Ms. Takai confirmed that a letter from her attorney and the official deferred plea agreement documents signed by the court had been submitted. B. Manzana sought clarification if these documents had been shared with the Board, and Ms. Takai confirmed that they were emailed to the HPLO office, including specific recipients like R. Carman, Mr. Dunn, and Z. Pecina. <i>Motion to Approve: G. Woodard; 2nd: P. Calalo</i></p>			
XI	New Business	<p>A. I STAT for Nurses Z. Pecina reported on the topic of ISTAT and nursing staff capabilities at GRMC. She commended GRMC's nursing staff for their initiative in exploring point-of-care testing and moderate to high-complexity testing. Based on CLIA regulations and CMS guidelines, nursing staff are authorized to perform point-of-care testing and moderate-complexity testing. However, high-complexity testing remains the domain of laboratory personnel. This development is expected to enhance patient care efficiency by reducing wait times for test results. Z. Pecina confirmed sending an email to GRMC to inform them about these permissions under CLIA, emphasizing the importance of proper training for nursing staff to ensure compliance and competence in conducting these tests. No vote was required on this matter.</p>	Z. Pecina	1610	Noted
XII	Announcements	Next Meeting will be July 11, 2024 at 3PM	GBNE	1612	Set Meeting Date
XIII	Adjournment	<i>Motion to Adjourn: G. Woodard; 2nd; G. Ramos.</i>	GBNE	1613	Adjourned

Minutes Drafted by: FLAME TREE Freedom Center, Inc.

Date Submitted: 7/2/2024

Submitted by the GBNE Secretary:

Date:

Approved by the GBNE with or without changes:

Date:

Certified by or Attested by the Chairperson:

 . APPROVED, AOCNF

Date: 7/11/24