

MINUTES
EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES WORK GROUP
October 22, 2007

Conference Call via WISLine 1-800-462-1257 Access code 0685
9:00 - 11:00 am

Those participating include: Sally Lundeen, Sue Dean-Baar, Jo Ann Appleyard, Jessica Allison, Katherine Pakieser-Reed, Nadine Nehls, Nancy Vrabec, Mary Zwuyghart-Stauffacher, Roxie Huebscher and Ellen Kirking.

- D) Call to order/Approval of minutes from May 15, 2007
 - A) The meeting was called to order by Sue Dean-Baar, and the minutes from May 15, 2007 were approved.

- II) Update on *SWIFT* Nurse Educator implementation
 - A) HPEC update
 - 1) Of the 17 students, all but three have graduated.
 - 2) One will graduate in December; two will graduate in May
 - 3) At least 13 of those who graduated are teaching at least part-time

 - B) Employer Sponsor Update
 - 1) The list currently reflects only those employers who have followed through and are supporting candidates.
 - (1) There are 32 candidates being supported from the employer group.
 - (2) Meriter is looking for another candidate to start in Spring or Fall 2008.
 - 2) Milwaukee MATC has two candidates that are applying for the program.
 - (1) Nancy Vrabec gave an update on the process of getting these candidates in the program.
 - (a) MATC has approved a sabbatical for each candidate so that the students can go to school fulltime during that time.
 - (b) It is not certain whether MATC will provide tuition reimbursement, but the candidates will be getting partial-salary while on sabbatical.
 - (c) It was suggested that this idea be discussed at the statewide nursing program meetings to possibly attract other schools as employer sponsors.
 - 3) Madison MATC has also expressed interest in sponsoring a candidate.
 - 4) It has been difficult to get more employers to commit to the *SWIFT* program because there is not the urgency for RNs that there was 5 years ago. We are not projected to have a major nursing shortage again until 2013.

- (1) However, the nursing workforce projections do not include the nurse educator statistics that demonstrate there are not enough educators in the pipeline to teach once the current educators (average age 57) begin to retire.

C) Partnership with Workforce Development Boards

- 1) Our partnership with this group is new and very slow-moving.
 - (1) We had hoped that the WDBs would:
 - (a) Would assist in recruiting employer sponsors.
 - (b) Identify candidates (including non-nurse candidates) to participate.
 - (c) Assist with finding additional funds that the grant would match to provide additional support to *SWIFT* candidates.
 - (d) Work on improving the development of state-wide nursing workforce data.
 - 2) Some progress is occurring with the Milwaukee WDB, which has been reorganized and is now known as the Milwaukee Area Workforce Initiative. Jo Ann will be meeting shortly with their representative and representatives from Aurora Health Care to develop a plan for additional support for Aurora *SWIFT* candidates.
 - 3) The grant money that was earmarked for supporting students has not been utilized because the *SWIFT* candidates are paid too much to qualify for any federal matching money from the WDBs.
 - (1) The Milwaukee WDB has other sources of funding which they could use, which does not have the income restrictions tied to them.
 - 4) We had hoped to create working teams in each of the four areas that included Educators, Employers, WDBs. However, these teams have not been developed yet. We will continue to look at this.
 - (1) It was suggested that the development of such teams this should be placed on the statewide nursing program meeting agenda.

III) Continuing business

A) Current status of WTCS course waiver for educator certification

- 1) We have received official approval for the course that we submitted.
 - (1) We are not sure that any of our other courses would get approved and are still assessing whether any additional courses will be submitted.
- 2) We originally discussed putting a packet together from all of the UWs, but the WCTS Certification board wants the courses submitted individually.
- 3) UW-Madison is still looking at several courses, so they will not be submitting any of their courses at this time.
- 4) UW-Oshkosh also does not plan to submit any of their courses at this time.

B) Progress of currently enrolled *SWIFT* candidates

- 1) When we last talked to the employers, there has been no evidence of the students not being able to manage the load while working full-time. The group was asked whether any *SWIFT* students were experiencing difficulties.

- (1) UW- Oshkosh has concerns that the next semester may be when the problems come up because that is when the clinical starts. Their student is doing both the NP practicum and the Educator practicum.
 - (a) Aurora Health Care is assessing their policy for the full-time requirement during clinical. Their liaison asked for a formal recommendation from the Educational Strategies Work Group regarding whether they should revise their policy.
 - (b) There was discussion that students may be more concerned with losing their benefits and not necessarily *wanting* to work full-time.
- (2) If we recommend that students drop to 0.6 FTE, with the one day of paid time off per week, the students will be paid as 0.8 of their salaries. Students could continue to receive 100% of their salaries if they are able to use vacation time for the other day off per week.
- (3) There was consensus that the Educational Strategies Work Group does recommend that students be allowed to work at 0.6 FTE status during their clinical practicum courses.
- (4) Jo Ann will email the employer group that the recommendation is that for practicum time, the students should be moved down to 0.6 FTE.

IV) Review of Competency Assessment Tool

- A) This was created to develop a way to determine that a *SWIFT* candidate has the core set of educational competencies, no matter which program they came from. We can then have the ability to match them up with the courses in our master's programs on a campus-by-campus basis and determine whether individual students may already meet these competencies by such means as reviewing portfolios, resulting in the possibility that one or more education courses could be waived for certain students.
- B) Discussion focused on whether the assessment tool actually expresses the essential behaviors that indicate the student has achieved the four defined competencies (listed as Nurse Educator Role Outcomes).
 - 1) It was suggested that 1.A be edited, removing the word "processes" and substituting the words "strategies/approaches."
 - 2) The focus of the 4th role outcome is unclear. Is it supposed to be addressing diversity?
 - (1) The focus for the 4th outcome was evaluation of student learning outcomes (students in this case refer to the students being taught by the *SWIFT* candidates).
 - (2) It was suggested we may want to broaden the criteria for these outcomes.
 - (3) The criteria listed in the 4th role outcome address planning and instruction techniques and program outcomes, as well as evaluation of student learning outcomes.
 - (a) The listed criteria perhaps are best demonstrated through a teaching practicum rather than a classroom. (It is believed that the practicum would be the main source for this, but the classroom could, too)

- 3) Sue and Jo Ann will review and revise the document and email out the revisions. Then, the UWs should look at their courses and determine where they fall in the table.
 - (1) From there, we will look at whether or not we have any competencies that are not met by any of our courses. If this is the case, we may need to reassess whether it should be in the outcomes table at all. OR, we may need to look at the courses to see if we need to revise the course(s).
- 4) This table will be very important as it will be one of our products of the grant. It will be published, and we will need to review it closely.

V) New business

A) Evaluation Plan

- 1) We are planning that the evaluation phase will be in implementation by the time the grant is done. We will follow those students that are still in the program after the grant is finished so that we can obtain a complete data set.
- 2) The evaluation plan/process will be submitted to the UWM IRB. If any of the other UWs need to do this, we can assist with the process. Employers don't feel that this will need to go through IRB on their end, but if they do we will help them as well.
 - (1) It seems that the requirement for IRB will be on a campus-by-campus basis
 - (a) Nadine will talk to the IRB people at UW-Madison and let us know how they would like this to work.
 - (2) We will be developing a consent form for the students to sign in order to have access to the student transcript information.
- 3) Our goal is to get this through IRB this semester and begin the evaluation implementation at the beginning of the next semester.
 - (1) We will begin with the HPEC group because they have already finished the program.
 - (2) After that, we will try to look at the other *SWIFT* candidates on a semester basis so that we can see if any changes come up.
- 4) We will also asking each of the UW programs about the effectiveness of the *SWIFT* program.

B) Waiver for *SWIFT* Staff to access student data

- 1) We need to have student course plans from all UWs.
 - (1) We may/may not need to have an ID process in place so that we are not matching records to student names.
 - (2) However, for those programs that have only a few students, we may not be able to do this.
- 2) Nadine and Roxie will be able to send us the course plans for their students.

C) D2L site

- 1) We have set up a D2L site, but it is not being utilized a whole lot.
 - (1) Used for both informational and conversation purposes

- 2) This will not be an effective vehicle among students because they will more than likely not be using it much. It seems that because the students do not know each other, they will be less-likely to converse with each other in this way.
 - (1) Employers have stated that their students are not taking advantage of employer-sponsored things like this.
- 3) We may be able to do this in other ways.
 - (1) Nadine said that they have other sites like this for a few programs at UW-Madison, and the students heavily utilize it.
 - (2) Jo Ann will send out an email to all *SWIFT* candidates to find out how students would prefer to communicate to one another.

D) Future Strategy

- 1) The DOL seems to be more concerned with the products that will come out of this grant.
- 2) They have not expressed concern about us meeting the goal of 120 candidates.

VI) Adjournment

- A) The meeting was adjourned at 10:40am.

Attachments:

1. Minutes May 15, 2007 meeting
2. Employer sponsor summary
3. Competency Assessment Tool
4. Evaluation plan