

SB08 - 188 Meeting Minutes
Pilot Program Implementation Committee Meeting
February 2, 2009

Member Attendance:

**Absent*

Colorado Hospital Association

Kathy Harris

Banner Health
Regional Vice President, Clinical Services
Banner Health

**Carolyn Sanders - CoChair*

University of Colorado Hospital
Associate CNO

Colorado Nurses Association

Fran Ricker - CoChair

Colorado Nurses Association
Executive Director

Eve Hoygaard

Colorado Nurses Association
President

Service Employees International Union

**Bernie Patterson, SEIU*

**Judy Hutchinson, SEIU*

Nurse Alliance of SEIU

Colorado Organization of Nurse Leaders

**Colleen Casper*

Clinical & Executive Partnerships

**Kelly Johnson*

Children's Hospital
Vice President and CNO

Colorado Council of Nurse Educators

Linda Stroup

MSCD
Assistant Professor, Department of Nursing

Nancy Smith

Dean and Professor
University of Colorado at Colorado Spring

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

**Ned Calonge*

Chief Medical Officer

Colorado Center for Nursing Excellence

**Sharon Pappas*

Porter Adventist Hospital
Chief Operating Officer/Chief Nursing Officer

Governor's Appointees

Lysa ErkenBrack

Grand Junction

Lydia Handberry

Swedish Medical Center

Interested Parties and Observers

Janet Houser PhD EdS MN - Researcher

Regis University
Associate Dean

Jean Scholz – In coming CEO & President for the Colorado Center for Nursing Excellence

Phyllis Graham - Dickerson

SB08 - 188 Meeting Minutes
Pilot Program Implementation Committee Meeting
February 2, 2009

Introduction of Phyllis Graham-Dickerson

PROCESS

Celebration Date – This committee has done a lot of work and it would be nice to have a celebration of what’s been accomplished so far. It was decided that a weekday lunch might work for most of the members and an email will be sent out soliciting dates.

Plan to Evaluate Funding Opportunities

Brian from the Colorado Center for Nursing Excellence will be working with the Co-Chairs on a final budget.

Phyllis Graham-Dickerson submitted a grant request to Sigma Theta Tau for \$3000 before their deadline.

Jean Scholz has been in contact with the Colorado Trust and they are just waiting to receive the research plan and final budget.

Requirements for Reporting

Fran Ricker reported that there is no six month report mandated by the legislation but there is value in communicating with Senator Betty Boyd and Susan Miller from DORA. It was decided to also send an email with a PDF attachment for the Executive Summary and the Research Plan to the original Governors Task Force on Nurse Workforce and Patient Care.

Budget Update

The Co-Chairs, Janet Houser, and Jean Scholz are working on the final budget and made sure enough has been allotted for the administrative costs.

The final research budget will be sent to the members of the Pilot Program Implementation Committee (PPIC).

RESEARCH PLANNING

Change in Descriptive Variables

There had been some questions concerning the descriptive variables for staffing ratios and matrices and Dr. Houser had a teleconference with nursing administrators from the Colorado Hospital Association to answer their concerns. She assured them of anonymity and that the information would be de-identified and they were more comfortable with that. They did want to get their own data back so they will receive an identification number that will be kept separate from the reporting but which would allow them to receive their data back.

SB08 - 188 Meeting Minutes
Pilot Program Implementation Committee Meeting
February 2, 2009

Since NDNQI data is already reported by hospitals, it was agreed that they would use these indicators and definitions for the staffing data. On page 21 of the Research Plan handout, the four lines of variables for the unit level from 'Staffing matrix' to 'Direct nursing hours per patient day' are the lines affected.

When asked how NDNQI could help this study, it was suggested that they could provide Colorado information.

At this point, a concern was brought up about hospitals who couldn't afford to join NDNQI. Would they still participate if their hospital was one of the sites selected? If these hospitals chose not to participate, the study would be missing some important information. It was felt that those who can't afford to join NDNQI might still participate because of the inherent value of this study.

The Co-Chairs, Janet Houser, Jean Scholz, and Phyllis Graham-Dickerson would like to arrange a meeting with a representative from NDNQI and perhaps the Colorado Hospital Association and the University of Kansas (which administers NDNQI) to see about a contractual relationship with NDNQI. If the study needs to purchase a license, this has not been figured into the research budget.

External Peer Review – see single page handout with heading, Reviewer 1

The three external peer reviewers were all Ph.D. nurse researchers and included Regina Fink, Mary Krugman, and Jennifer Mensek. Dr. Houser said their feedback was very helpful as they can see gaps or changes that need to be made. If two or more reviewers suggested a similar change, then it was recommended that the change be incorporated into the proposal. If a suggestion had been addressed by the committee and a considered decision had been made, it was recommended not to revise. Also if their suggestions for verbiage made the study clearer, these suggestions were used.

Comments from reviewers with discussion:

Reviewer 1

Comments 2 and 3 – these comments led to a change that there be two proposals prepared—one for researchers and one for lay people. The first will be titled 'Research Proposal' and the second will be titled 'Research Plan'.

It was suggested that there be page of Talking Points for the lay version and it was reported that Talking Points had been suggested during the Communication Plan subcommittee on Jan. 22 and this would be covered later in the meeting. A one page summary (like an abstract) at the front of the study would be good to have as well. It will be called the Executive Summary.

SB08 - 188 Meeting Minutes
Pilot Program Implementation Committee Meeting
February 2, 2009

Comment 5 - Reviewer 1's suggestion to break Aims 1 and 2 from the Research Plan into multiple parts has validity and the Committee agreed so both Aim 1 and 2 were broken down into two parts and Aim 3 was simplified (see wording below). All the aims were then renumbered 1-5:

Aim 1: To determine what involvement in decision-making means to nurses

Aim 2: To describe how direct care nurses want to be involved in decisions regarding patient care, planning for staffing, and the work environment.

Aim 3: To evaluate existing models of nurse involvement

Aim 4: To appraise the evidence supporting the effectiveness of current models

Aim 5: To identify and articulate perceptions of the value of effective direct care nursing involvement in decision making (wording changed at beginning from "To identify, articulate and demonstrate the value...")

Comments 6 and 8 - This reviewer also suggested putting some of the information in table form or in the appendix. It was suggested that pages 2-4 of the Research Plan, covering the Research Model and the Research Approach, be put in an appendix but some felt that they were important enough to include in the body because readers sometimes skip information in appendices. It was decided to use both the model and the approach but treat them differently in each version. In the Research Proposal (for researchers), the Research Model (p. 2 of the current Research Plan) would be included in the main portion and the Research Approach (p. 3-4) would be included in an appendix. In the Research Plan (for lay people), the Research Model would be in the appendix and the Research Approach would be put in table form in the main portion.

Comment 12 – She and another reviewer thought the sampling method was biased but Dr. Houser felt that the process hadn't been explained well. The intent was to ask the CNO for one name for the researchers to contact for additional names rather than to have the CNO suggest all the people to contact. The research study already included fliers for getting others to participate.

Comment 14 – Her suggestion to format the document was valid and that is in the plans. It just hadn't been done yet by the time they read the document. It will be done in APA format.

Reviewer 2

Her comments were positive. It was unclear what the HCUPs were and it was explained that this is an acronym for Health Care Utilization Project. This project gives information on census and bed counts and this was a good suggestion to consider. Dr. Houser will check these to see what data can be pulled to use for qualitative indicators.

SB08 - 188 Meeting Minutes
Pilot Program Implementation Committee Meeting
February 2, 2009

See pages 21 and 22 of the Research Plan for changes implemented to make the distinction more clear between descriptive variables and research variables. In addition to making the following changes, the font size will be increased and the information could be put into two tables to distinguish between the two:

On pg. 21, change 'Variables for data collection' to 'Descriptive/Demographic Variables for Data Collection'

On pg. 22, change 'Outcome Variables' to 'Research Outcome Variables'

Reviewer 3

This reviewer didn't like the qualitative part but she is a quantitative researcher and a lot of thought had been given to that part of the study which helps to inform the quantitative part so it will be kept in this study.

Comment 1 – Executive Summary recommended above will address this

Comment 2 – Dr. Houser will write a catchy title and abstract and add the researchers' curriculum vitae

Comment 3 – The reviewer read the Research Plan but this will be changed into a Research Proposal

Comment 4 – Phyllis Graham-Dickerson has already added to the literature review

Comment 7 – This reviewer's usual audience has been a captive one so gifts or incentives haven't been needed. Dr. Houser and Dr. Verran have used them and have seen their value so thank yous and incentives will be used but not compensation.

2+ Reviewer Comments

Comment 2 – It is a good idea to develop a timeline

Joyce Verran feedback on the peer reviews

Comment 1 – The Executive Summary could include the significance of the study as it has political as well as research significance. It would be a good idea to explain how there isn't a lot of research found on this topic. Dr. Houser said there was a lot on this topic but they used less rigorous methodology.

Comment 2 – The proposal for dual versions of the plan should handle this.

A question was raised as to whether or not incentives should be sent to the peer reviewers for their help. The Colorado Center for Nursing Excellence will send a thank you note to each of them.

SB08 - 188 Meeting Minutes
Pilot Program Implementation Committee Meeting
February 2, 2009

Next Steps

Make revisions to Research Plan
Write proposal to use with funding agencies
The Co-Chairs will write a cover letter to go with the Research Plan

A concern was raised concerning monies available from DORA for this study. Because of possible cuts which might be coming, any bills being held should be submitted now for payment. When a question about encumbering the funds now came up, it was mentioned that the legislation covers this but Fran Ricker will contact Susan Miller and get something in writing.

Permission to Use Instruments

Dr. Houser reported that all three instruments have been approved for use by this research study with no charge. However, they would like a copy of the research study when it is done and Hess and Havens would like to see the raw data as well. She has also received a list of Colorado hospitals for use in sampling.

Review of Communication Plan and Subcommittee Recommendations

A copy of the minutes from the Communication Plan subcommittee was handed out at the meeting but Fran Ricker summarized them for this meeting. It was recommended that the list of attendees be added to the minutes so those who worked on it could be recognized.

In summary, the subcommittee was told that they could publicize the study but that a Power Point presentation would need to be prepared for each member to use for formal presentations. Also, try to get the message out in as many ways as possible. Remember that you can say what this study is looking AT, not what it is looking FOR. For example, 'the study is looking at the relationship of nursing involvement with decision making' but don't say 'the study is looking for how nursing involvement improves decision making'.

The subcommittee recommended that a publicist/media consultant be hired to handle publicity for the study (see Summary of Items Needed from Publicist/Consultant in the subcommittee minutes of 2-22-09). Jean Scholz has been helpful in identifying possible people for this position and had received inquiries from six people so far who are interested. The Co-Chairs and Jean Sholz will check into these soon as the research study will be starting the qualitative phase during the first week in March. It was suggested that Susan Miller and DORA be informed about this as well since they have a publicity person and would need to know.

Consensus: Committee is comfortable with this strategy.

Research End Point

SB08 - 188 Meeting Minutes
Pilot Program Implementation Committee Meeting
February 2, 2009

An article needs to be written on the process followed in beginning this study as it has interest to multiple audiences (nursing and health care policy among others). It would be good to show how disparate groups worked together on the process.

It was cautioned that many articles need to be written concerning the research study as many publications don't want the same articles submitted to more than one journal or proceeding. The process article may be best presented in a policy journal.

At the Communication Plan subcommittee, it was suggested that Sharon Pappas and Bernie Patterson would be good ones to write the process article. If anyone else is interested, please contact Jean Scholz. Dr. Houser wasn't involved in the process part but is willing to write the research methods and results sections for the research publication.

It was mentioned that AONE needs abstract submissions in June for their April meeting and this submission can be under one name initially. This would also be an excellent place to submit on the process. Dr. Houser mentioned that submissions can be made to symposia when the study is finished. However, be careful to have unique submissions. With five aims, there could be five presentations.

It is important to have a central clearinghouse for what is being submitted and who is presenting so that there isn't a lot of confusion. The PPIC will be meeting at intervals after each phase of the study so contact the Colorado Center for Nursing Excellence about various conferences, etc. where it would be good to present the findings. Jean Scholz will contact the Co-Chairs and Dr. Houser with the information and they will bring it to these interval meetings of the PPIC. Dr. Houser and Dr. Graham-Dickerson will write the abstracts but can't send them out because of time constraints. Sigma Theta Tau's website has a list of ten conferences with deadlines coming up.

Consensus: PPIC needs to have another meeting to coordinate presentations, the Communication Plan and discuss sample selection and any questions concerning the qualitative phase. It was decided to meet on Monday, February 23 from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. If a member cannot attend the meeting, it will be arranged to have a call-in option.

A poster developed for use with conferences will list the names and agencies of those involved with the PPIC.

If anyone is interested in helping write the research article (Linda Stroup and Fran Ricker expressed interest), please contact Dr. Houser.

Who Owns the Data?

There is enough data that will be collected from this research study that could be used in a third causal study. If someone would like to use the data from this study for a secondary study, who gives permission? Also, where would the data be housed?

SB08 - 188 Meeting Minutes
Pilot Program Implementation Committee Meeting
February 2, 2009

Once the study is published, it becomes public information so this would need to be clarified legally. DORA will be contacted concerning this issue and something in writing clarifying this would be good to have for the file.

When asked if the Colorado Center for Nursing Excellence could house it and serve as a contact for the research, Jean Scholz said there were models for this and she would check to see how it's been done in the past.

Logo – Committee likes the idea but it may be too costly for the time it would be needed. It was suggested that a public domain logo be used. This will also be checked with DORA.

Meeting Feedback

Committee appreciated having the chance to meet Phyllis Graham-Dickerson and felt it had been a useful meeting which was very productive.

Next Meeting – Monday, February 23 from 10 a.m. - 2 p.m.

Minutes taken and written by: Lynette Christensen

Minutes reviewed by CoChairs: Fran Ricker & Carolyn Sanders

Administration for SB08-188: Colorado Center for Nursing Excellence

Administrative Coordinator: Wendy Krzeczowski