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COUNCIL ON CONTINUING EDUCATION
THE NEW YORK STATE NURSES ASSOCIATION
Council on Continuing Education
The Veronica M. Driscoll
Center for Nursing
Guilderland, NY

March 14, 1988
10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

M I N U T E S

I. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m. by Ann Quinn, Chairperson. Gwendilan Smith, a representative from Licensed Practical Nurses and Technicians of New York, Inc. was introduced.

II. ATTENDANCE

NYEN Council on Continuing Education
Ann Quinn, Chairperson
Janice Alli-Ferrone
Barbara Carty
Mary Lou Sparks
Gwendilan Smith

NYEN Staff
Barbara Littel, Associate Director, Nursing Education Program

III. MINUTES
The minutes of December 12, 1987 were accepted as read.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS, REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS
A. Draft of NYEN's Proposal - The Legitimate Role of ANA for Credentialing in Nursing
After review and discussion, Council unanimously voted to endorse the draft proposal.

B. Correspondence to ANA, re: Changes in the Accreditation Process (Attachment 1)
The correspondence was reviewed.

C. Correspondence re: Private Practice, a new TV series with a nurse practitioner.
Members voiced their distress over this new TV series which features a nurse practitioner as a lesbian and suggested that individuals write to the sponsoring network and boycott the program.
D. Correspondence from ANA re: nominations for receipt of the ANA Council on Continuing Education Scholarship Award.

Council members were not able to identify an individual who was both an ANA Council on Continuing Education member and whose doctoral work involved the area of continuing education.

V. BUSINESS

A. Plans for Continuing Education Workshops

1. The April 26 and 27 workshops were finalized.

2. June workshop faculty were identified.

B. ANA Continuing Education Master Plan

The Council discussed the ANA document. Staff was directed to communicate to ANA the following comments and questions:

- A well developed evaluation plan.
- Good ideas.
- What is the nature of requests for continuing education from staff nurses and SNAs?
- According to the 1987 Plan described on page 3, Goal II, what project(s) is/are planned for 1988 and 1989?
- How will SNA's have input into continuing education planning?
- What is the nature of the evaluation process and follow-through?
- Will workshops be conducted on use of the ANA/BOA criteria in light of new developments in this area?

Correspondence will be made to ANA regarding these issues.

C. Appeal Procedure

In the past, sponsors whose applications were "denied approval" were provided with information regarding the appeal process. With implementation of revised criteria in August 1987, "denied approval" as an outcome of review was replaced by a "deferred approval" category. Council requested that all such applications receive information about the appeal procedure.

D. Evaluation Study Results

Council discussed ways to disseminate results of the evaluation study. It was suggested that a letter be sent to the 250 individuals who participated thanking them for their input and describing the salient points of the study. In addition, an article for Report was suggested. Drafts of the letter and article were requested for discussion at the next meeting.

E. Provider Approval

1. Review of Applications

The following applications for provider approval were discussed:

- Quality Care, Inc.
  - St. Vincent's Hospital & Medical Center of New York
  - North Central Bronx Hospital
  - University of Rochester Medical Center

Letters will be sent to the providers informing them of their approval. Additional evidence of evaluation will be requested from Quality Care, Inc.

2. Review of Approval Criteria

The approval criteria were reviewed for provider status. Minor changes were made in titles of headings.

F. Quality Assurance Site Visits

A site visit review of the March of Dimes, L.I. Chapter offering "AIDS, A Challenge for Perinatal Nurses" conducted by Patricia Gorzka (L.I. Review Team) was discussed. Excellent correlation was noted between the offering as presented and submitted application materials.

G. ANA Reaccreditation Process

Council members reviewed philosophy, goal and purpose statements of NYSNA in preparation for a self study report. The Chair charged committee members to review these materials and bring written revisions to the next Council meeting.

VI. NEXT MEETING

The meeting date was changed from May 25, as originally scheduled, to May 17, 1988.

TIME: 10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

PLACE: Veronica M. Driscoll Center for Nursing
2113 Western Avenue
Guilderland, NY 12084

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

[Signature of Chairman]

Ann P. Quinn, RN, MS
Chairman

AQ/BC/gjb
03/31/88
Betty Thomas
Director, Center for Governance
American Nurses' Association
2420 Pershing Road
Kansas City, MO 64108

January 4, 1988

Dear Ms. Thomas:

The New York State Nurses Association's Council on Continuing Education thanks you for affording this opportunity to provide feedback concerning proposed modifications to the governance structure for accreditation of continuing education in nursing. As an accredited provider and approver, a user of the system, the Council is troubled that this opportunity to address concerns and make suggestions is only now being requested at a time when it would appear that implementation of the new governance structure is destined to occur in February 1988. We can only hope that careful consideration be given to our comments.

During its last meeting, the Council on Continuing Education discussed the new ANA governance structure for accreditation with specific emphasis on implications of changes on NYSNA's approval process. Highlights of that discussion follow:

- The Council believes that the accreditation process needs to be a member service. Certainly, efforts should be directed toward developing a cost effective structure through adequate fees and promotion. However, a review of both the ANA Certificate of Incorporation and the Bylaws indicates that providing for the educational advancement of nurses and ensuring a system of credentialing are core elements in the mission of ANA. It is not unreasonable to expect that resources be used to support that mission.

- The Council notes that a new ANA accreditation system was implemented on August 1, 1987. Revisions were made to streamline the accreditation process and increase its use by continuing education sponsors. The full impact of those changes on the fiscal status of ANA are not yet evident. It is, therefore, precipitous to initiate yet further restructuring.
As a user of the accreditation process, these changes have dramatically affected NYSUA's approval process. Council has spent most of its energies in the last year on implementing the new systems, policies, procedures, and criteria. To subject us and our providers with more modifications, before evaluation has occurred of the most recent alterations, is not acceptable. It is, therefore, recommended that no further changes be considered for the calendar year 1988.

It is the perception of the Council that changes proposed in the new governance structure weaken the accreditation process so that quality can no longer be assured. Specific areas of concern are elaborated:

- **Elimination of site visits**

  A peer review site visit is viewed as a stimulating process. It is an ideal opportunity for networking. For small and/or isolated organizations, it may be the principle method by which direct contact is made with experts in the field. Validation of documented material is made possible through the site visit. All other major accreditation systems, including ANA and NLN, use a site visit. The site visit is one of the primary factors which differentiates accreditation from approval. To eliminate this aspect of the process is to create "something other than accreditation which will certainly be viewed as "less than" a quality assurance system.

- **Extension of the accreditation period from four to eight years**

  An eight year time period of accreditation is too lengthy for the field of continuing education. Studies have documented that the average length of employment of directors of continuing education/staff development is less than four years. A structure which requires input every four years provides a safeguard for the continuity of high standards despite changing personnel.

- **Creation of one seven-member national body responsible for both policy making and implementation**

  The Council believes that combining the purposes of the Board on Accreditation with those of the regional accrediting committees raises serious questions of conflict of interests and quality control. The credibility of the entire process is called to question when it is suggested that a seven-member body can provide the same kind of service as the present thirty-one member team.
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