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NEW YORK STATE NURSES ASSOCIATION
2113 Western Avenue, Guilderland, N.Y. 12084, (518) 458-5371

June 9, 1989

TO: Beth Cathcart
    David Ranck
    Carol Polifroni
    Karen Ponton
    Juanita Hunter
    Madeline Naegle

FROM: Martha Orr

The following is the very rough draft of NYSNA staff responses to the issues which we identified as possibly being raised about the membership of the future associate nurse. This draft has NOT been circulated to anyone else. I have left blank spaces in case any of you would like to add your thoughts and return to me. Then, if you wish, I will be glad to collate your additional suggestions and return them to you at the ESREC meeting for your further use.

ISSUES CONCERNING MEMBERSHIP OF THE FUTURE ASSOCIATE NURSE AND POSSIBLE RESPONSES

1. Denial of membership to associate nurses of the future will alienate registered nurses who currently hold associate degrees and will cause them to oppose entry into practice legislation.
   a. Nurses prepared at the Associate Degree level are divided on this issue. Many have gone on to acquire baccalaureate degrees and strongly support entry. Others are strongly opposed to entry for a variety of reasons. The issue of membership for the associate nurse of the future is just one of those reasons.

2. Inclusion in membership of associate nurses of the future will enable the professional association to exert greater control over their practice.
   a. It is not the role of the professional association to control professional practice. Control over professional practice is a product of state licensure laws.
   b. If the issue of "control" is a part of the deliberations on membership, will not the associate nurses of the future perceive that as limiting their ability to identity, communicate, and address their own concerns?

b. North Dakota's experience is that the Licensed Practical nurses do not feel alienated. Instead, they have sought to establish their own identity and their own professional organization.
3. Inclusion in membership of associate nurses of the future will ensure a much larger membership base in the SNAs; the increased number of members will ensure greater resources of people and finance and will provide a more effective political base.

a. There is no evidence that nurses who currently hold associate degrees have elected to join the professional association in large numbers, nor is there any evidence that they would do so in the future. In fact, research reports suggest that it is the baccalaureate and higher degree nurses who associate membership with the value of professionalism.

b. The issue of resources is a red herring. In fact, if professional and technical nurses are included in the same organization, limited resources will have to be dispersed over a much wider range of interests and priorities. This could, in fact, sharply reduce the resources available to advance the agenda of professional nursing.

4. Denial of membership to associate nurses of the future will be perceived as "elitist", further eroding the image of the ANA and SNAs.

a. The charge of "elitism" is a currently perceived problem; professional associations are often stuck with this label because of their positions on standards.

b. Development and implementation to two distinct and clearly defined careers in nursing will help improve the image of nursing.

5. Denial of membership to associate nurses of the future will jeopardize the collective bargaining programs of SNAs since registered nurses with associate degrees and future associate nurses will choose other bargaining representatives.

a. SNAs have been successful in representation of professional nurses based on their ability to address professional issues. Bargaining units could choose to include both the associate and professional nurse, and would undoubtedly be just as successful.

The principal arguments in support of membership limited to professional nurses continue to be:

a. The profession of nursing needs, and will continue to need, an organization which can focus its energy and resources on addressing the needs of the profession. Inclusion of Associate nurses in the organization will require redefinition of the goals and activities of the Association to meet the needs of two distinct groups of providers.

b. The interests of professional and technical nurses will undoubtedly differ. Professional and technical nurses will want different educational programming. Professional and technical nurses will have different positions on standards and scope of practice. If these two groups are equal participants in the Association, the operative principal will always have to be compromise to a common ground. It is unlikely that the interests of the profession or the public would be best served in that environment.
May 10, 1989

Dear SNA President and Delegate:

The annual meeting of the ANA House of Delegates is rapidly approaching and once again we will be challenged with actions. The COAR report which will have lasting effect on the unity and strength of ANA contains an important recommendation which restores the RN-only criteria for membership. While this recommendation was discussed briefly at the February meeting of the Constituent Forum, it seemed obvious to us that this membership issue continues to pose a real threat to our goal of a strong unified national nursing organization. Since then, we have been searching for a way to preserve unity within our association.

We believe that we must not allow ourselves to be forced to close our options on membership models now. We do know that confusion about the roles of registered nurse and technical nurse could lead to changes in scope of practice between registered nurses and licensed practical nurses with a loss of job security for the RNs. An example is the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania where the State Board of Nursing unilaterally increased the scope of practice for the licensed practical nurse with no change in educational requirements. This change was fought by PNA. If PNA was an occupational association, it could not have attempted to protect professional nursing practice without alienating part of its membership.

We do not know what level of unity will emerge across the discipline of nursing once we have separate roles and licensing laws for professional and technical nurses. Therefore, we can now at best only imagine the future for the practice of nursing, and your guess is as good as ours.

The reality is that we can follow the COAR recommendations and keep our current unity and future options open. This is where we ask you to help. Will you support the COAR recommendations and VOTE to maintain unity within our association? Can we count on you?

(continued over)
If the answer is Yes to any of the above questions, we would appreciate hearing
from you by mail (RR #1, Box 426C, Lebanon, NH 03766), by phone (work: 603-
646-8413 or home: 603-448-2253) or by message at the NHMA office (603-226-7283).
We have an opportunity to avert a crisis and a repeat of the divisive events
which followed the House of Delegates of 1987. Let's keep the focus on ANA
unity and strength, now and in the future. We do hope to hear from you.

Sincerely,

The Coalition for Credible Compromise

Lorraine A. Bourque
Elizabeth J. Arthur
Jodi L. Cheremisoff
Susanita Hunter

Margaret Burke
C. Carole Barwinek
Anne Paul Licci
DATE: June 9, 1989
TO: Juanita K. Hunter
Madeline A. Naegle
FROM: Martha L. Orr

Enclosed for your information and use are:
2. Draft of NYSNA staff responses to issues re membership of future associate nurse. This memo was mailed to other coalition participants, as requested.
3. Confirmation list of participants in June 19 conference call.

MLD/Her
Enclosures

June 9, 1989
TO: Juanita K. Hunter
Madeline Naegle
FROM: Martha L. Orr
RE: Coalition for Credible Compromise
Conference Call, June 5, 1989

For your information and use in reporting to the Board, the following are my notes of the most recent conference call between representatives of the Coalition for Credible Compromise, June 5.

Participants on call:

PNA: Beth Cathcart
David Ranck
CNA: Karen Ponton
NYSNA: Madeline Naegle
Martha Orr
Elizabeth Carter

Reports:

M. Naegle: California NA will be having a mini convention prior to the House of Delegates. Information concerning their COAR positions may be available after that meeting.

** The group suggested that Juanita call Marilyn Rodgers when JKH returns from ICN.

B. Cathcart: Rhode Island is also planning a mini convention to deal with COAR. Beth will call Sylvia.

B. Cathcart: Peggy Hart (OK) is to call her after their delegate meeting on June 5.
Further actions/plans:

The group discussed any further actions to be taken at this time and concurred that since there was only one additional signatory to the Coalition letter that a follow-up letter to delegates would not be mailed.

In lieu of that letter, a handout for use at convention will be prepared. Carol Polifrani is drafting. This handout will not include the list of objections to the RN membership and the possible answers because of the possibility of providing negative "fuel" for those who object.

Beth suggested that Linda Cronenwett be asked to chair the Coalition meeting at convention in order to support recognition of the Coalition as broader than PNA/CNA/NYSNA. Subsequent to the conference call, David Ranck has let me know that Linda will not be in Kansas City in time for the meeting. Beth then suggested that Carol Polifrani be asked to chair. I am to contact Carol.

The group discussed the format for the meeting and suggested that it should be informal, and should begin with a focus on the nature of the compromises built into the COAR report. It should be made clear that New York and PNA have also compromised.

Attached is the draft of questions and answers which was prepared by NYGNA staff. It was agreed that Beth, Carol, and Juanita would have the draft for their possible use, even though it would not be used in the handout.

The groups then scheduled the final conference call and agreed that the other SNA presidents who signed the letter from the Coalition would be invited to participate in the call. The call is scheduled for 4:00 PM, Monday June 19. The list of expected participants is attached.
COALITION FOR A CREDIBLE COMPROMISE

FACT SHEET IN SUPPORT OF COAR

COAR REPRESENTS A COMPROMISE FOR EVERY CONSTITUENT SNA.

COAR IS A CAREFULLY AND SKILLFULLY STRUCTURED WHOLE WHOSE INDIVIDUAL PARTS ARE INTRICATELY INTERWOVEN.

COAR ENSURES THAT ANY NURSE WHO IS CURRENTLY PRACTICING AS AN RN IN ANY OF OUR 43 CONSTITUENTS WILL ALWAYS BE ELIGIBLE FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN NURSES' ASSOCIATION.

COAR RECOMMENDS THAT ONLY REGISTERED NURSES BELONG TO A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION.

COAR PROVIDES FOR FORMAL INTERACTION AND SHARING OF INFORMATION BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL NURSES THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS.

TECHNICAL NURSES, CURRENTLY PRACTICING AS SUCH, ARE NOT INTERESTED IN MEMBERSHIP IN THE ANA.

NO ONE IS ABLE TO OR HAS THE RIGHT TO PREDICT WITH WHOM THE ASSOCIATE/TECHNICAL NURSES OF THE FUTURE WILL WANT TO ASSOCIATE.

IT IS PREMATURE TO MAKE DECISIONS WITH MAJOR CONSEQUENCES TO OUR CURRENT MEMBERS IN FAVOR OF A FUTURE CADRE OF INDIVIDUALS WHO DO NOT EVEN EXIST TODAY.

WE NOW KNOW WHAT THE CONSEQUENCES OF AN OCCUPATIONAL MODEL WILL BE FOR ANA. ANA WILL LOSE AND WHEN ANA LOSES, EVERY CONSTITUENT LOSES.

A PROFESSIONAL MODEL IS THE ONLY VIABLE MODEL FOR THE ANA IN 1989 AND THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

COAR'S AUTHORS DEBATED ALL ASPECTS OF THE MEMBERSHIP ISSUE, AND CRAFTED IT AS A COMPROMISE. WE URGE YOU TO VOTE FOR THIS COMPROMISE, BE PROUD OF AND PART OF A WINNING ORGANIZATION!!
CREDIBLE COALITION

Lorraine A. Bourgeois, BS, PCA, RN
President
North Dakota Nurses' Association

Elizabeth Z. Cathcart, MPH, CNAA, RN
President
Pennsylvania Nurses Association

Linda R. Cronenwett, PhD, RN
President
New Hampshire Nurses' Association

Juanita Hunter, EdD, RN
President
New York State Nurses Association

Margaret Luce, MSN, RN
President
Vermont State Nurses' Association, Inc.

E. Carol Polifroni, EdD, RN
President
Connecticut Nurses' Association

Anna Pearl Rains, MSN, RN
President
Texas Nurses Association

Thomas E. Stenvig, MPH, CNAA, RN
President
South Dakota Nurses' Association

Concetta Tyan, MA, CNAA, RN
President
Arizona Nurses' Association