

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVANCED PRACTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
February 28, 2012**

The meeting of the Nevada State Board of Nursing Advanced Practice Advisory Committee was called to order by Debra Scott, MSN, RN, FRE, Executive Director, Chair, at 3:02 p.m. via videoconference at the Board of Nursing, 5011 Meadowood Mall Way, #300, Reno, Nevada, 89502 and the Board of Nursing, 2500 W. Sahara, #207, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89102.

CALL TO ORDER
MEMBERS PRESENT

Debra Scott, MSN, RN, FRE, Executive Director, Chair
Susan VanBeuge, DNP, APN, FNP-BC
Josh Hamilton, DNP, RN-C, FNP-C, MHNP-BC, CNE (via teleconference)
Gregory L. Peistrup, MSN, RN, APN, FNP-C, CFRN, CEN, EMS-RN (via teleconference)
Arthur C. Savignac, CRNA, MHS (via teleconference)
Kate Sheppard, PhD, RN, APN-BC
Matthew Khan, MSN, FNP-BC, APN
Joy Reineck, CNM, MS

OTHERS PRESENT

Fred Olmstead, General Counsel
Doreen Begley, MS, RN, Board Member
Patty Shutt, LPN, Site Operations Supervisor
Gail Trujillo, Executive Assistant
Dianne Crykiel
Susan Fisher, NAPSPAC
Lindsay Knox

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. by D. Scott, committee chair.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: There were no public comments.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 8, 2011 meeting with a correction of committee member Susan VanBeuge's credentials.

B. OLD BUSINESS

1. Report from the September 2011 Board meeting: D. Scott reported the highlights of the January 2012 Board meeting.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. Orientation of new committee members: There were no new committee members; however, D. Scott informed committee members that they are welcome to review the orientation information.
2. Legislative update: F. Olmstead gave a legislative update specific to LCB File R113-11. See agenda item C.4.

3. Review, discussion and action regarding the role of the APN in supervising and delegating to medical assistants: LCB File R112-11 was approved by the Legislative Commission this month, forwarding this file of new regulations to the Secretary of State for codification. One regulation of significance for APNs is that a regulation was changed to allow nurses to delegate nursing tasks to unlicensed assistive personnel as long as the nurse maintains responsibility and accountability for the delegation process as described in NAC 532.222 and 224. That change now allows APNs to delegate nursing tasks to individuals that may have the title of “Medical Assistants”, which allows them to perform tasks under the license of a physician. The MA is not practicing under the APN’s license, but the APN may delegate nursing tasks to the MA under the Board’s new regulations.
4. Review, discussion and action regarding LCB File R113-11: This LCB File of regulations was presented at Public Workshop, approved by the Board at a regularly scheduled Board meeting and was heard at the Interim Legislative Committee on Health Care. D. Scott described the response by the LCHC members who voiced concerns that the change in regulation proposed in this file would broaden the scope of practice of CRNAs and APNs. D. Scott testified that there would be no increase in scope of practice based on the proposed revisions. She provided a copy of a letter from the American Society of Anesthesiologists which had been provided to the LCHC that erroneously stated that under the proposed regulations, “APNs would be allowed to prescribe controlled substances.” D. Scott clarified that APNs have been able to prescribe controlled substances for the last 20 years in Nevada. Another letter submitted to the LCHC from the Nevada State Society of Anesthesiologists stated that, “under this proposal, Nevada would be the first state to allow an advanced practice nurse ...to direct a nurse anesthetist.” Again, this statement was erroneous since the proposed regulations would only allow an APN to “determine” that an anesthetic is necessary for a procedure, test or other treatment. D. Scott summarized the LCHC meeting interactions which indicated the potential for future opposition to allowing APNs and CRNAs to practice to the full extent of their education, expertise, and competence within their nationally recognized scope of practice.
5. Review, discussion and action regarding continuing education audit requirements: Dianne Crykiel presented this agenda item, suggesting that the NSBN consider other requirements for renewal of APN certification in Nevada, other than continuing education hours. There was a general discussion of some of the methods that other states use to document competence of APNs for renewal purposes. D. Scott stated that she would explore other options, circulate a survey to all other states, and see what might be available. She stated that she would bring the specific Nevada regulation to the next meeting for further discussion and review.
6. Discussion of APN survey results: Board staff conducted a survey of the APNs in Nevada, entitled “Collaborative Agreement Survey”. The committee discussed the results. The survey was sent via email to approximately 700 APNs; 292 APNs completed the survey. Survey results were as follows:
 - a. Question 1: Have you read the NRS for APN practice? Yes 78%, No 22%
 - b. Question 2: Do you feel you have a good understanding of the scope of practice and laws for APNs to practice in Nevada? Yes 89%, No 11%
 - c. Question 3: If not, what do you feel are areas you would like to understand better? 24 responses were received
 - d. Question 4: Do you want to be able to practice without a collaborative physician agreement? Yes 82%, No 18%

- e. Question 5: Why or why not? 323 responses were received
- f. Question 6: Have you currently or in the past had difficulty securing a collaborative physician? Yes 32%, No 68%
- g. Question 7: If so, what do you think was the reason? 88 responses received
- h. Question 8: Are you aware of the APRN Consensus Model initiative? Yes 53%, No 47%
- i. Question 9: Do you support changing Nevada law to allow APNs to practice independently? Yes 87%, No 9%, Other 4% (10 responses)
- j. Question 10: If, are you willing to work with other APNs/CRNAs to change Nevada law? Yes 79%, No 21%
- k. Question 11: If so, what are you willing to do? 164 responses received

D. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING: The committee members suggested that the next meeting's agenda include a review of the regulations for APN renewal requirements.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.