**Commission of Continuing Education Meeting**

**Vision**
Inspire New Hampshire nurses as leaders to expand the impact of the nursing profession to improve the health of the people of New Hampshire.

**Mission**
As a Constituent State Nurses Association (C/SNA) of American Nurses Association (ANA), the New Hampshire Nurses’ Association (NHNA) exists to promote nursing practice and the wellbeing of New Hampshire nurses by providing professional development, fostering nurse innovation and leading in health advocacy to enhance the health of the people in New Hampshire.

**DATE:** December 9, 2019  
**Start Time:** 3:00 pm  
**End Time:** 4:00 pm  
**Location:** Call-in with Skype (audio only)  
**Chair:** Amy Guthrie/Kris Irwin  
**Recorder:** Joan Widmer  
**Members Present:** Amy Guthrie, Kris Irwin, Nancy DeSotto, Karen Tollick, Julie Taylor  
**Guest:** Joan Widmer  
**Members Excused:** Tasha Humphries, Jeanne Hayes  
**Members Absent:** Lynn Lagasse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Topic/Link to Mission and Vision</th>
<th>Discussion Summary</th>
<th>Action / Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and Introduction</td>
<td>Kris and Amy; Jeanne Hayes</td>
<td>Tasha Humphries resigned effective 1-1-2020, Jeanne Hayes had a work conflict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve minutes for September 23, 2019 meeting</td>
<td>Motion made by Karen, then seconded by Amy. Unanimously approved September minutes as presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting November 20</td>
<td>Annual report NEMSD and CCE. Reports posted on NHNA website. Kris noted the “accountability” section in the NEMSD report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Activity and Provider Application Reviews | What areas for revision have been identified? Any trends?  
Nancy: two recent reviews: one an individual activity – chronic problem of a measurable outcomes, but otherwise OK. The other was an approved provider application – a text book application, very thorough.  
Karen: not receiving any requests.  
Amy: measurable outcomes continue to be an issue, question is whether these nurse planners receive any formal training; this problem is mostly with individual activities; not approved providers.  
Nancy and Julie shared this opinion. Some of the nurse planners do not have a strong education background. | | Joan to email NEMSD to have Karen added back to regular emails regarding applications needing to be reviewed.  
Joan to coordinate a meeting with Amy, Kris, Carol Hodges and Kathy Hale to discuss process issues in January. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Topic/Link to Mission and Vision</th>
<th>Discussion Summary</th>
<th>Action / Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ground.                               | - Julie: expressed concerned about applications returned as pending, but never hearing what happens after this. Should we consider having the reviewer contact the planner directly.  
- Nancy: had a similar experience, but reached out to Shelley and said this was not the process.  
- Julie: last four applications have been very sloppy, no follow up to make sure the issues are addressed.  
- Amy maybe at the quarterly trainings there should be a report out: how many pending were finally approved, how were the problems addressed, etc. Could also cc the reviewer when applicant is emailed approval?  
- Kris: she had a series of sloppy issues with a review in July, but this time she did receive a response.  
- Julie: A Grand Rounds application she felt should be declined, and was told they don’t decline anything. How does a reviewer know that applications are not being inappropriately approved? How do we know the important feedback is provided to the applicant? She is concerned with adding her name to an application that is too vague and has far too many problems to be approved, especially an application she suggested should be denied.  
- What is the process that has fixed shortfalls in reviewed applications?  
- Reviewers are raising the issues and Carol resolves them. Per ANCC this gives a consistent voice to problem resolution. But the reviewers need some feedback from the NEMSD on problem resolution. Can do this as a monthly or quarterly report? This information would help improve the application process by providing trending data. |                      |                      |          |
| Outcomes vs Objectives                 | - Discussion with examples  
- One provider app. with no follow up. Carol said if the review is in alignment with the other reviewer then no feedback is provided.  
- Objectives are all over the place |                      |                      |          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Topic/Link to Mission and Vision</th>
<th>Discussion Summary</th>
<th>Action / Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEMSD Updates</td>
<td>• Strategic planning and goals, currently working on this but not yet finalized. Will share when finalized.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>• Defer to March meeting and pending availability of the NEMSD Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Meetings</td>
<td>• Quarterly, some in person, some via conference call. March would be next meeting. 3:00pm OK with Nancy and Karen Dates in March: Monday 3-9 or Wednesday 3-11.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Agenda</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>