

# Guam Board of Nurse Examiners

## REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Thursday, July 10, 2025 at 3:00 PM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85894214113?pwd=0XGkYWkaklMFrdBx8bVlrbdFuqkkle.1>

Meeting ID: 858 9421 4113

Passcode: 376082

### MINUTES

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
I	Call to Order	Chaired by: Greg Woodard	Chair	1502	Called to Order
	Proof of Publication	Reviewed and confirmed by: G. Woodard _____	Chair	1502	Confirmed
	Roll Call	<div> <b>GBNE Members:</b>  <u>Virtual Attendance:</u>  <input type="checkbox"/> Margarita Gay, Member  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greg Woodard, APRN-NPC, AOCNP, Chair  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anna Varghese, RN, DNP, Vice Chair  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Philip John Calalo, DNP, RN, Treasurer  <input type="checkbox"/> Gia Ramos, RN  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charlotte Huntsman, GRMC, Public Member  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brenda Manzana, LPN, Secretary </div> <div> <b>Other Attendees:</b>  <u>Virtual Attendance:</u> </div>	GBNE	1502	Quorum Established
II	Adoption of Agenda	<i>Motion to Adopt the Agenda: B. Manzana; 2<sup>nd</sup>: C. Huntsman.</i>	GBNE	1503	Unanimously Adopted,
III	Approval of Minutes	<b>Minutes dated:</b> 06/12/2025 <i>Motion to Approve: G. Woodard; 2<sup>nd</sup>: A. Varghese.</i>	GBNE	1504	Unanimously Approved
IV	Treasurer's Report	No Report.	Dr. Calalo	1504	No Report
V	Committee Reports	<b>Rules and Regulations (Proposed).</b> G. Woodard inquired about the current status within the legislative process, noting his understanding that it had been completed and was pending review by an attorney to determine if any further action was necessary. He expressed that this was his most up-to-date knowledge and invited others to provide any additional insights.	GBNE	1505	Noted
VI	Nursing Education	<b>University of Indiana</b> Dr. Varghese introduced herself as an education member of the GBNE and an assistant professor at the University of Guam, and extended a formal welcome and appreciation to Dr. K. Kuhn and Susan for their attendance and interest in collaborating with the board to support the expansion of nursing education and the local nursing workforce. She emphasized the importance of full regulatory compliance and presented several critical questions and concerns regarding Indiana University's proposed clinical and educational partnerships in Guam.	Dr. Varghese	1507	Noted

Item	Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
	<p>Dr. Varghese sought clarification on the status of a memorandum of understanding referenced in prior communications, specifically involving GRMC and the VA Hospital, asking whether the agreement had been formally established or was still under development. She then questioned the university's plan for faculty oversight, noting that the board's Article 6 regulations require active supervision by credentialed clinical faculty, not just remote oversight by preceptors. She highlighted the need for Indiana University to align with Guam's specific clinical supervision standards, which mandate direct involvement of clinical faculty with proper credentials.</p> <p>She further inquired about licensure outcomes for students completing the LPN to BSN program, initially asking if they would be issued Indiana state licenses. After clarification was provided that students would test in the state where they reside, she reiterated that if students intended to test in Guam, Indiana State University would need to comply fully with the board's Article 6 requirements regarding curriculum and clinical education, including rotations in specialized areas such as medical-surgical nursing, pediatrics, obstetrics, and mental health.</p> <p>Addressing concerns about clinical site availability, she pointed out that the proposed sites—GRMC and the VA—do not cover all the required clinical areas, as services like pediatrics, obstetrics, and mental health care are provided at separate facilities in Guam. She asked for details about how the university plans to structure its curriculum and secure additional MOUs to ensure that all clinical requirements are met. Finally, Dr. Varghese acknowledged the program's ACEN accreditation and reaffirmed the need for alignment with Guam's curriculum and clinical hour standards, regardless of where students test for licensure. She concluded by inviting other board members to contribute additional questions.</p> <p>Dr. Kuhn from Indiana State University clarified that their engagement with Guam originated not from institutional outreach but from student interest on the island. She explained that their university has already completed all internal preparations to support potential students in Guam and emphasized that they operate under the guidance of their own state's Board of Nursing. She acknowledged that while some states may request specific adaptations, the program cannot always meet those if they conflict with their own regulatory framework. Nonetheless, the program has generally been well received across multiple jurisdictions and internationally, treating clinical education with a capstone approach tailored for students who are already licensed as LPNs.</p> <p>Dr. Kuhn highlighted the strength of their student population, noting that most are experienced at the bedside and praised by preceptors for their clinical comfort and competence. The university relies heavily on clinical placements near students' residences and employs a strong placement team to facilitate this. While simulation can account for up to 50% of clinical training under their state board's allowances, they typically use it less extensively. One example noted was the use of simulation to replace real-world placements in psychiatric nursing, allowing students to gain exposure to complex mental health conditions like PTSD, depression, and schizophrenia through virtual learning platforms.</p> <p>She stressed that Indiana State University will not proceed in Guam without the Guam Board of Nurse Examiners' full support and would refrain from contacting hospitals or other institutions unless authorized. She explained that students like one named Andrea have struggled to access local nursing programs, making an online model a vital option. The average student is in their mid-30s, often with</p>			

Item	Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
	<p>families and jobs, and thus benefits significantly from flexible, distance-based education. Further details were presented on the program's competitiveness, demographic diversity, and the fact that it is the only fully online LPN-to-BSN program of its kind. Students come from across the United States, and the university has affiliation agreements with numerous healthcare facilities nationwide. Clinical preceptors are typically required to have a minimum of 18 months of experience, and while a bachelor's degree is preferred, it is not mandatory under their state board's rules.</p> <p>Dr. Kuhn elaborated on curriculum structure, noting the recent addition of a pharmacology course and extensive use of platforms like Canvas and Shadow Health for online instruction and skills validation. Each student receives a skills kit for at-home practice, including materials for catheterization, tracheostomy care, and other essential procedures. They also employ telepresence robotics to support remote learning.</p> <p>Finally, she acknowledged that while not every state is currently included in their network—sometimes due to high regulatory costs—their model has proven highly effective, with nearly all graduates securing employment immediately after program completion. The speaker concluded by reaffirming their long-standing involvement with the program and asked whether the information provided helped address some of the board's concerns.</p> <p>Dr. Varghese acknowledged that while some of her questions had been addressed, others remained unresolved. She sought clarification regarding the use of simulation in the Indiana State University program, specifically asking whether clinical experiences for mental health, obstetrics, and pediatrics were conducted entirely through simulation. Dr. Kuhn confirmed this and emphasized the quality and depth of their simulation tools, noting that such methods had proven effective and were well-received by students.</p> <p>she explained that clinical placements in areas such as pediatrics and obstetrics have become increasingly difficult to secure, citing past challenges in Virginia where regulatory changes necessitated face-to-face clinical experiences for those specialties, even for campus-based students. Despite those efforts, the university continues to face difficulties placing students in these fields, leading to a reliance on simulation.</p> <p>Dr. Kuhn reiterated that whether the program moves forward in Guam ultimately depends on the Guam Board of Nurse Examiners' discretion. She expressed a desire for continued dialogue and suggested arranging a direct conversation with Marcy, the program director, who could offer more detailed answers. Due to time zone differences, Dr. Kuhn had opted to attend the meeting in place of Marcy. to respect the board's schedule.</p> <p>In response, Dr. Varghese thanked Dr. K. Kuhn for her participation and invited other board members to pose any additional questions, recognizing the time commitment involved in attending the meeting from a different time zone.</p> <p>Dr. Calalo posed several critical operational questions regarding Indiana State University's program. He began by asking whether students are required to carry malpractice insurance. Dr. Kuhn confirmed that students are indeed insured and that insurance is one of many prerequisites maintained throughout their enrollment.</p> <p>Dr. Calalo also inquired about the university's practice of conducting site visits. It was clarified that the</p>			

Item	Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
	<p>program does not perform in-person site assessments. Instead, their clinical placement team liaises directly with agencies and nurse educators to evaluate clinical opportunities. The program relies on digital communication and monitoring tools—students must provide timestamped updates upon arrival and departure from clinical sites, submit weekly clinical updates, and maintain open lines of communication with faculty and preceptors throughout the semester. Dr. Kuhn emphasized that this one-to-one preceptor model offers substantial hands-on experience, particularly beneficial given that the students are already practicing LPNs.</p> <p>Questions were also raised about how preceptors are selected. The university uses criteria set by its state Board of Nursing and, despite a recent regulatory change permitting preceptors with zero experience, the university maintains an internal standard requiring at least 18 months of experience. Typically, nurse educators at partner facilities assist in matching students with appropriate preceptors. Preceptors are not obligated to participate but often volunteer, and the university offers certificates and written commendations to support their professional development.</p> <p>Regarding compliance, Dr. Calalo asked about the protocols for drug testing, fingerprinting, and background checks. These were confirmed as mandatory components during student onboarding. In the event of a medication error during clinicals, the university has a formal documentation process in place, with immediate on-site management followed by reporting and internal follow-up.</p> <p>Dr. Calalo then turned to program duration, to which Dr. Kuhn responded that the program is flexible and self-paced. While the fastest path to completion is approximately two and a half years, students can proceed more slowly if needed. A summer session is available but condensed into an 11-week term.</p> <p>He also asked about program outcomes, specifically NCLEX pass rates. Dr. Kuhn confirmed that this data is actively tracked and must meet regulatory standards to maintain accreditation. The program includes a comprehensive NCLEX review course at the end and has consistently demonstrated strong student outcomes. They emphasized the rigor and high standards of the program, noting that many students initially underestimate its difficulty due to its online format.</p> <p>Finally, as Dr. Calalo concluded his line of questioning, G. Woodard began to ask about preceptor compensation, prompting the continuation of the discussion. The discussion addressed whether preceptors are compensated, clarifying that they are not paid and participate voluntarily, with the organization having no authority to compel them to continue if they choose to withdraw. In such cases, a replacement preceptor must be found, which can occasionally cause logistical challenges, though this is rare. The conversation then shifted to comparing board requirements with those of other states, such as Indiana and Oregon, particularly regarding the minimum experience required for preceptors. It was noted that while the board may require more experience, some states have reduced their experience criteria to one year to address difficulty in finding preceptors. The director, Marcy, was suggested as a more appropriate contact for detailed questions on board requirements. Clarification was made distinguishing between preceptors and faculty, highlighting that Guam’s program operates with remote faculty oversight while maintaining close communication and support with on-site preceptors, who are experienced LPNs familiar with hospital practice. The selection criteria for LPN candidates in the program were explained, focusing primarily on GPA in key science courses, years of experience, and educational background, with more points awarded</p>			

Item	Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
	<p>for longer experience and accredited schooling. The program no longer requires an entrance exam due to its cost and limited benefit. While years of nursing experience are considered, it is weighted alongside other factors such as full-time versus part-time work history, with GPA on the five sciences being the most significant predictor of success in the program.</p> <p>Clarification was provided to G. Woodard regarding the relationship between the nursing program and Indiana University, explaining that the institution itself remains based in Indiana. It was confirmed that other state boards of nursing approve students to take the NCLEX exam through their respective states, or students may choose to test through Indiana since that is where they attended school. Concerns were raised about the perception that Indiana University is establishing a new university on Guam, which led to questions about compliance with Guam's regulations for local universities, such as maintaining passing rates to ensure reaccreditation. The conversation highlighted that faculty overseeing students must be compensated, with the program paying faculty based on student groups, even when students are dispersed geographically and clinical experiences occur across different shifts. It was emphasized that board regulations limit clinical group sizes to no more than ten students, regardless of the format. The challenges of online education were also discussed, noting varying board requirements and the evolving nature of remote learning, alongside the need for caution when considering programs without physical campuses. Reference was made to a recent incident in Florida involving questionable online programs, which heightened board vigilance regarding program legitimacy and student outcomes. Despite initial skepticism about online education, it was acknowledged that such formats can provide valuable opportunities for students who face barriers to traditional classroom attendance. The meeting concluded with a mutual understanding that decisions about program approval rest with the board, while the program expressed interest in exploring options to accommodate requests from potential students in Guam. The board expressed appreciation for this engagement.</p> <p>As the meeting neared its conclusion, Dr. Kuhn made a request to G. Woodard to obtain contact information in order to arrange a follow-up meeting while the discussion remained fresh. It was recommended that further communication be directed to either D. Sulat or B. Sablan at the board office via email to coordinate ongoing dialogue.</p> <p>B. Manzana shared her personal perspective as an LPN who had navigated the challenges of advancing her career while managing family and full-time employment responsibilities. She expressed support for the proposed program, recognizing its potential to offer flexible educational opportunities to similarly situated individuals in Guam. While affirming the need to maintain quality and safety standards in nursing education, she voiced appreciation for the innovative approach and potential impact of Indiana State University's program.</p> <p>In response to a question about the effectiveness of simulation-based training compared to traditional clinical experiences, it was explained that internal research showed no significant performance difference in student outcomes across both methods. In fact, in some cases, students exposed to simulation—especially in scenarios difficult to replicate in clinical settings—performed as well or even better, such as male students in Oman who excelled in OB-GYN knowledge through simulation due to cultural restrictions on direct patient care. Dr. Kuhn also shared their extensive involvement in simulation-based</p>			

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<p>learning and development of virtual reality training modules using real human actors to enhance learning outcomes. The board agreed that further discussion could be scheduled offline, emphasizing this meeting as an introduction to the potential partnership and what Indiana State University could offer the Guam nursing community.</p> <p>Before the meeting closed, board members addressed a significant procedural issue: the current rules and regulations in Guam make no distinction between traditional and fully online nursing education programs, nor do they address the use of simulation as a primary clinical training method. As such, the board acknowledged that before considering approval—even conditional—for such a program, the existing regulations would need to be updated to incorporate provisions specific to online education. It was suggested that this would require the addition of a new section to the existing articles governing nursing education, possibly under Article 6. Board members emphasized that this effort would demand time, collaboration, and the formation of a dedicated working group. While recognizing the value and innovation such programs may bring, especially in response to the changing landscape of nursing education and workforce needs post-COVID, the board stressed that approval must be grounded in clear regulatory authority. They concluded that further research, collaboration with Indiana State University, and careful revision of the regulatory framework would be essential before moving forward.</p>			
VII	Executive Officer's Report	<b>A. GBNE Complaints</b>		1553	
		<p><b>1. GBNE-CO-20-007/1, 2, 3, 4, 6 &amp; 7 Received 9/16/20.</b></p> <p>G. Woodard briefly reported that the case is currently under investigation and has been referred to outside legal counsel. He is awaiting the results or feedback from that external review.</p>	G. Woodard		On-Going, Under Investigation
VIII	Old Business	<b>A. Appointment of Advisory Committee</b>	GBNE	1553	Unanimously Approved
		<p>B. Manzana shed light on this item from approximately two months earlier concerning the establishment of an Advisory Committee. The intent behind this proposal was to support incoming board members or executive officers by ensuring continuity in board operations through a structured orientation process. She explained that the concept was modeled on a "right seat, left seat" approach, where outgoing individuals would guide their successors by sharing insights into responsibilities such as disciplinary actions and investigations. The purpose was to facilitate a smoother transition and maintain institutional knowledge. It was clarified that the Advisory Committee would focus specifically on orientation to the GBNE, including the role of the executive officer. As a result, board agreed to rename "Appointment of Advisory Committee" to "Appointment of Advisory Committee on Orientation to GBNE," and it was agreed that further discussion would take place once the updated purpose was clearly reflected in the agenda.</p> <p><i>Motion to Approve: B. Manzana; 2<sup>nd</sup>: G. Woodard.</i></p>			Motion to Remove From Agenda
		<p><b>B. Impaired Provider Program</b></p> <p>G. Woodard noted that development is still in progress. He is currently gathering examples and policy frameworks from other states and boards of nursing to draft a comprehensive proposal for presentation to the board at a later date.</p> <p><b>C. C.N.A License</b></p> <p>Dr. Calalo revisited this topic from the previous month's meeting, as no formal vote had been taken to</p>			

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		close the discussion. The matter concerned whether individuals who had not yet passed the NCLEX could pursue certification as CNAs in the interim. Dr. Calalo clarified the need to consult with administration to determine an appropriate action plan for those individuals who may wish to take the CNA examination in the future. The matter was acknowledged to have been addressed already. <i>Motion to Remove from Agenda: G. Woodard; 2<sup>nd</sup>: Dr. Calalo.</i>			
vIX	New Business	A. Approved Applications		1559	
		1. Temporary Grad Licenses	GBNE		
		1. Dorothy Joy Wood Colodro			Approved
		2. Tera Marie Ruder Blas			Approved
		3. Irene Rose Madeline Felizardo Astillero			Approved
		4. Eileen Laureno			Approved
		2. CNA Applications			
		1. Karena Lei Manglona Torres	GBNE		Approved
		3. RN Applications			
		1. Shantai Renei McDermott	GBNE		Approved
		2. Heidi Ritz Burton			Approved
		3. Timothy Eugene Pinkerton			Approved
		4. Dianna Gibson			Approved
		5. Jaybee Dantes			Approved
		6. Denise Loranger			Approved
		7. Noelle Christine Rubico			Approved
		8. Cloudy Rain Rosalita Pareja			Approved
		9. Michelle Yiru Chen			Approved
		10. Charmaine Ann Maravillas Galido			Approved
		11. Meghan Ashley Chaco			Approved
		4. APRN Applications			
		1. Heidi Ritz Burton	GBNE		Approved
		2. Dianna Gibson			Approved
		5. Renewal Applications			
		1. APRN			
		1. Nicole Carson	GBNE		Approved

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		2. Sangwook Wang			Approved
		3. Rhodora Cruz			Approved
		2. LPN			
		1. Kimwell Dimatatac	GBNE		Approved
		2. Elizabeth Camacho			Approved
		3. Temple Grace Decena			Approved
		4. Casey Nicole Santos			Approved
		5. Phillip John Calalo			Approved
		6. Tiffany Juliah Concepcion			Approved
		7. Sherwin Nucum			Approved
		8. Rocelyn Quintal			Approved
		9. Nemia Papelera			Approved
		10. Sean Santiago			Approved
		3. RN			
		1. Christine Joyce Cristobal	GBNE		Approved
		2. John Kelvin Gomez			Approved
		3. Melissa Waibel			Approved
		4. Marietta Ann Padios			Approved
		5. Hye Won Choi			Approved
		6. Leah Landstrom			Approved
		7. Nicole Carson			Approved
		8. Jean Estanislao			Approved
		9. Laura Morrison-Schone			Approved
		10. Margarita Leonen			Approved
		11. Job Macroni Mascardo			Approved
		12. Vanessa Garcia			Approved
		13. Venissa Ann Maramba			Approved
		14. Dennis Cruz			Approved
		15. Maria Silvestre			Approved
		16. Dianne Martinez			Approved



Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		17. Nicole Yim			Approved
		18. Maria Barksdale			Approved
		19. Ralph Samson			Approved
		20. Mayvel Burns			Approved
		21. Princess Gloria Abesamis			Approved
		22. Jerrah Mae Escueta			Approved
		23. Rosemarie Jo Kamiya			Approved
		24. Pamela Quibuyen			Approved
		25. Ma. Lordlyne Martinez			Approved
		26. Jocelyn De Leon			Approved
		27. Robin Denise Torre			Approved
		28. Carla Yvette Pulanco			Approved
		29. Paciencia Dionisio			Approved
		30. Alea Jao			Approved
		31. Ericson Monton			Approved
		32. Estrelita Pakingan			Approved
		33. Artemio Conducto			Approved
		34. Lilibeth Bunda			Approved
		35. Romalie Estoy			Approved
		36. Sar Maye Camaganacan			Approved
		37. Cherry May Tandoc			Approved
		38. Dray Jose Borja			Approved
		39. Wilma de Asis			Approved
		40. Leizl Puno			Approved
		41. Marianne Mae Agaran			Approved
		42. Ruth Anne Nacario			Approved
		43. Monica Villa Bernal			Approved
		44. Zoraida Hito			Approved
		45. Kyle Arevalo			Approved
		46. Jessica Bollinger			Approved

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		47. Dan-Michael Romulo			Approved
		48. Emma Salcedo			Approved
		49. Shanease Marie Tudela			Approved
		50. Aura Jestany Lagmay			Approved
		51. Leah Barbosa			Approved
		52. Carmelito Padiernos			Approved
		53. Pauline Perez			Approved
		54. Katy Rina Stewart			Approved
		55. Michael Stewart			Approved
		56. Jua Son			Approved
		57. Audrey Blas			Approved
		58. Olivia Gonzaga			Approved
		59. Riccay Joslin			Approved
		60. Leslie Evans			Approved
		61. Sheryl De Guzman			Approved
		62. Emiretha Aguilar			Approved
		63. Michelle Ambunan			Approved
		64. Edita Lacson			Approved
		65. Edelyn Navio			Approved
		66. Jean Hongyee			Approved
		67. Noreen Joy Silva			Approved
		68. Analyn Madriaga			Approved
		69. Eva Roque			Approved
		70. Don Don Santos			Approved
		71. Ma. Gwen Yanesa			Approved
		72. Catherine Claire Laxamana			Approved
		73. Sangwook Wang			Approved
		74. Ayako Fulgar			Approved
		75. Charisse Macapagal			Approved
		76. Dann Maury Ragasa			Approved

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		77. Rhodora Cruz			Approved
		78. Shelby Weilbacher			Approved
		79. Jeonseon Lee			Approved
		80. Loreto Dizon			Approved
		81. Jubeline Lucero			Approved
		82. Destiny Covington			Approved
		83. Sandra Naval			Approved
		84. Cynthia Mandell			Approved
		85. Rosewynda Santos			Approved
		86. Phillip John Calalo			Approved
		87. Gemma Paguio			Approved
		88. Aristotle Manaloto			Approved
		89. Mijung Kim			Approved
		90. Maritess Nava			Approved
		91. Jeanette Christine Lumbre			Approved
		92. Joanna Atoigue			Approved
		93. Maria Patricia Cayetano			Approved
		94. Sterlyn Sotomil			Approved
		95. Arra Kay Ronquillo			Approved
		96. Rema Sinen			Approved
		97. Rosario Sils			Approved
		98. Irma Tayag			Approved
		99. Feroza Teresa Vida			Approved
		100. Regine Movida			Approved
		101. Ave Golez			Approved
		102. Maribel Lacsam			Approved
		103. Kate Valerie Capil			Approved
		104. Mariettes Navasca			Approved
		105. Angilie Marie De Alba			Approved
		106. Ligaya Nacianceno			Approved

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<b>107.</b> Neil Anne De Guzman			Approved
		<b>108.</b> Patricia Solidum			Approved
		<b>109.</b> Geneffer Raigelig			Approved
		<b>110.</b> Elbeth Magat			Approved
		<b>111.</b> Apple Medina			Approved
		<b>112.</b> Salvador Bolivar			Approved
		<b>113.</b> Diana Rose Bolivar			Approved
		<b>114.</b> Alvin Paul Mendoza			Approved
		<b>115.</b> Shanydee Guia Castro			Approved
		<b>116.</b> Katrina Bugayong			Approved
		<b>117.</b> Caimile Rae Visperas			Approved
		<b>118.</b> Cherrie Visperas			Approved
		<b>119.</b> Gene Philip Erese			Approved
		<b>120.</b> Olivia Rae Elliott			Approved
		<b>121.</b> Reena Blaire Ricafuente			Approved
		<b>122.</b> Joanna Silva			Approved
		<b>123.</b> Hyun Hee Kim			Approved
		<b>124.</b> Lheary Cubacub			Approved
		<b>125.</b> Rosemary Magro			Approved
		<b>126.</b> Angelica Duenas			Approved
		<b>127.</b> Kaysha Janet Leon Guerrero			Approved
		<b>128.</b> Maria Lourdes Adoptante			Approved
		<b>129.</b> Sharon Floyd			Approved
		<b>130.</b> John Raymond Sablan			Approved
		<b>131.</b> Pauline Lizama			Approved
		<b>132.</b> Zannah Togawa			Approved
		<b>133.</b> Valeria Ann Meno			Approved
		<b>134.</b> Connie Echipare			Approved
		<b>135.</b> Cecilia Guiao			Approved
		<b>136.</b> Jarren Bautista			Approved

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		137. Liezel Medrano			Approved
		138. Dinoita Quintanilla			Approved
		139. Cheryll Joyce Quiaoit			Approved
		140. Shirley Cruz			Approved
		141. Melissa Hayes			Approved
		142. Jocelyn Barracoso			Approved
		143. Joanna Catrina Corodva-Panlilio			Approved
		144. Richard Nitoya			Approved
		145. Adrian Echaure			Approved
		146. JonJon Unsay			Approved
		147. Jenny Fernandez			Approved
		148. Helen Grace Donato			Approved
		149. Erica Joyce De Belen			Approved
		150. Roberto Padilla			Approved
		151. Jayson Gozum			Approved
		152. Alvin Dela Cruz			Approved
		153. Richard Vallero			Approved
		154. Delmar Sembrana			Approved
		155. Rosa Segovia			Approved
		156. Eileen Mercado			Approved
		157. Arnie Mariz Yumol			Approved
		158. Maureen Anne Bersaba			Approved
		159. Kimberly Resurreccion			Approved
		160. Suzanne Aquino			Approved
		161. Therese Marie Mejares			Approved
		162. Alvin Resurreccion			Approved
		163. Michelle Wong			Approved
		164. Mary Jay Taimanao			Approved
		165. Maria Teresa Palad			Approved
		166. Catherine Rose Ortaleza			Approved

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<b>167.</b> Areen Cristina Prieto			Approved
		<b>168.</b> Josie Paunte			Approved
		<b>169.</b> Maricel Aguilar			Approved
		<b>170.</b> Alma Gay Siapengco			Approved
		<b>171.</b> Yvonne Damian			Approved
		<b>172.</b> Jasmin Tanglao			Approved
		<b>173.</b> Sherena Rosadino			Approved
		<b>174.</b> Ma. Danica Gianne Bacani			Approved
<b>X</b>	<b>Next Board Meeting</b>	Next Scheduled Meeting will be: Tentative for August 14, 2025	GBNE	1614	Set Meeting Date.
<b>XI</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>	<i>Motion to Adjourn: G. Woodard; 2<sup>nd</sup>: B. Manzana</i>	GBNE	1614	Adjourned

Minutes Drafted by: FLAME TREE Freedom Center, Inc.

Date Submitted:

Submitted by the GBNE Secretary:

Date:

Approved by the GBNE with or without changes:

Date:

Certified by or Attested by the Chairperson:

Date: