



NCSBN
Leading Regulatory Excellence

***2020 NCSBN Nursing Education Approval Guidelines Virtual Conference –
Segment Four Video Transcript***

©2020 National Council of State Boards of Nursing, Inc.

Event

2020 NCSBN Nursing Education Approval Guidelines Virtual Conference

More info: <https://www.ncsbn.org/14298.htm>

Presenter

Brendan Martin, PhD, Associate Director, Research, NCSBN

Nancy Spector, PhD, RN, FAAN, Director, Regulatory Innovations, NCSBN

Janice Hooper, PhD, RN, FRE, CNE, FAAN, ANEF, Nursing Consultant for Education, Texas Board of Nursing

- [Brendan] Hello, everyone, and welcome back. So this is the second session that we've dedicated for the questions that you've submitted. We've been provided with a list of the questions that you have submitted since our last Q&A session.

So I'm actually going to kick things off because the very first question related to the demonstration that I did, and so I thought that this would be an opportunity to kind of see SAS do its magic too. So the specific question was Program number 8 in Illinois had 5 directors over the last 5 years and yet was rated as medium risk, but it had a 95% NCLEX pass rate, is the algorithm actually working?

I think that is an excellent question. So we're going to look at SAS here. So this is what we weren't able to show a little bit earlier, but you can see in SAS we pulled in the raw data. So this is the view that you got. So we're focusing in here on Program 8. What we're going to do, and I think that this is a good reminder of what we're doing with this algorithm, we're going to run essentially all of the data in using the coding that we had and we're going to look at Program 8 specifically.

And the person who submitted this question was absolutely right. So you can see that essentially there were five directors in the last five years. So that would indicate one potential deficiency. But then when you get to NCLEX pass rate, it's 95%. So this is one of the, you know, kind of throughout, I think a common thread for this presentation. We've tried to kind of focus a little bit on moving beyond the NCLEX pass rate. So for this program, NCLEX pass rate would look excellent.

But you can see the very last criteria here is accreditation, and this program is not accredited, so that is the reason why essentially it would be a medium risk. So, you can see as you go along that you can see it

actually threw a flag for number of directors and then it also threw a flag for not being nationally accredited.

So, in this instance, that is why if you pull up the data, you can see essentially that the two deficiencies that are coming up for our performance indicator tier would designate that program as a medium at-risk institution. - [Nancy] And, particularly, I think that five directors on five years is really a big one.

- And I think it's an important reminder to recognize that all of these work in concert with each other, that there's more than one performance indicator and not to maybe put too much emphasis on one.

- Right. And I think that's what this performance indicator does. Or maybe we can call it the PI.

- And Jan made an excellent point, too, off-air that this is also fake data. So, part of this was a little bit manipulated by me to show examples of how you could actually see good examples of the program indicators, quality indicators, but there might be other deficiencies that are important to keep in mind.

- Because remember NCLEX pass rates are lagging. So maybe the next group... - [Janice] It's true.

- ...isn't going to be 95%.

- Correct.

- So if you see those other factors, this would be a good opportunity for this education consultant to talk to the program. So you've had five directors in five years, do you know why they're leaving?

- Correct.

- Do you know what's going on?

- Correct. Yeah. And going back to the whole discussion of this algorithm and the purpose for it, it's meant to inform, it's not meant to necessarily drive one action, or activity, or decision, or another, it's really just for informational purposes and to, hopefully, you know, better facilitate the good work that you're already doing at the board level.

- Great. So the next question is for me. Is there an expense associated with partnering NCSBN on the annual report data collection and analysis? And there is not an expense. So you can feel pretty comfortable doing that free of charge. We really want to work to make your jobs easier or as easy as we possibly can.

And that was one of our reasons for coming up with it. And, you know, we have been asked in the past for a template so that they could already have something in place, but then this, providing a link, I think, is, you know, very helpful to them. And Brendan, I think you're going to take the next one.

- Yes. So the next question was, what are your thoughts regarding the indicator multiple sites and how it contributes to a sound program? This is an excellent question. And it's something that we kind of started to address. This is one of those variables that we think it's highly likely is correlated with other

performance indicators. I think that this is really the advantage of standardized data tracking across jurisdictions moving forward.

I think if we had all of this information complete across all of the boards, we would be better able to assess multiple sites while adjusting for other important indicators. You know, without being able to do that, I cannot comment on whether or not that this would stick. But, for instance, we were able to show that essentially those programs with a public standing, those institutions that often were also those institutions that offered multiple programs sites and had larger enrollments.

So we already know that there's some relationships there. The key is moving forward once we have all the data to really understand how they interact once assessed simultaneously.

- Right. Because I will say, I was surprised at that one. You know, usually, you think with, you know, focusing on one site and doing the best from rather having all these.

- Right. Not spreading yourself too thin. Right.

- I mean, I don't know what your experience is.

- Well, I was a director of a program that had a site on the other side of Missouri and that was the biggest stress of my job because it was too hard to know what was going on.

- So the next question is, is calculation of some sticky variables like attrition standardized? And, you know, from my perspective, and Brendan's going to answer this one too, we wanted to get at it. It does not have a standardized definition. Even IPEDS admits that.

For them, they don't consider any of the part-time students, for example. But Brendan, what is your thought?

- Yeah, I really think that this relates to another question that we're going to get regarding, kind of, a data dictionary. I think the key here... I would absolutely echo your comments. I think, when in doubt, try to mirror with the department of education doing, it's not a bad starting point, but I really do think a lot of this, when we're asking these types of variables, education, defining the variable for people proactively, I think that that's really going to benefit us, ultimately.

- Yeah. And, you know, we did... Jo and I were working together to try to find what the IPEDS did and the question that they had just didn't seem to work for us either. So, I mean, right now, we just have what is your attrition rate and we're going to give them that definition. So, we'll see. And, you know, right now, we're putting this together, and everything isn't worked out, and maybe down the line, things will be changed once we get data back.

So we'll just have to see. So the next one is, I know you found a number of quality indicators related to faculty. Was faculty workload beyond student-faculty ratio found to be an issue? Well, if you remember, in the site visit study, it was found to be an issue. It just didn't come out as much to be included in the approval guidelines.

But it did come out to be an issue with those programs that were failing. It's a hard thing because it's hard for boards to get at that, don't you think?

- Yes. We usually ask about faculty workload when we're visiting with faculty, and we get a variety of answers. A discouraging thing to faculty is when the workload expectations are not the same for every faculty member. So there should be a definite workload that everyone is expected, and that workload should be related to their teaching.

So most workload, you look at how many required courses for you to teach, figuring in clinical as a part of that. Because the other work that has to do with teaching is planning your courses, grading, evaluating students, advising students. They all take time.

So you really can't just say 40 hours a week.

- Right. Right. And, you know, you're, kind of, getting into their operations...

- Yes.

- ...and that's difficult too. But I agree with you, being equal. And there are some workload calculations out there that are pretty good, I think, that faculty use.

- And one thing that happens in nursing education is that a lot of the faculty teach overload because it improves their salary, which gets down to the salary. And so they're using up their time teaching a lot of courses, but not having time for other activities involved in their instruction.

- Right. So, this board has had several questions about adding supplemental questions to the annual report. Nancy and Brendan, would you please address the ability to alter the template to add board-specific questions? Well, we've had those questions as well, because remember this is under construction.

If you remember that slide, we're just developing it now. The way I envision...and Brendan you might be different, but the way I envision is that each board that wants to participate will have their own link, we'll build in those separate questions in Qualtrics, we'll put your logo and our logo on it, then we'll send it to you, you'll send it to your programs, and then we'll get all that data back and send you the report.

So they'll all be individual. Now, when we do the descriptive report for you, it'll include all your extra questions. However, when Brendan does that aggregate core data analysis, you know, that we're going to do yearly, that will only include the 50 questions from the core data.

So that's the way I see it. Do you have anything else to add to that?

- I completely agree. I have nothing to add.

- Yeah.

- Yeah. I think that the key for the annual statistical analysis will be complete data. And so, when thinking about tailoring and tweaking certain supplemental questions to your jurisdiction, I think that's a good idea. If you think that that information will be useful and can be used proactively. For the purposes of aggregating the data nationally, we more likely than not would not be able to do that unless a sufficient subset of the boards all asked the same supplemental questions.

- Yeah. Right. Yeah. And if they do, we maybe should add it to the template.

- Sure. Sure.

- And remember, we're still working on this, you know, we're going to send that template out to a group of people from boards to have them review it. We're going to be sending you surveys to see when to do this and if you're interested. So it's all very beginning, but we're very excited for it. The next one, I think, is yours, Brendan.

- Sure. So the specific question, this is the one that I alluded to earlier, will there be a data dictionary defining field lengths and formats for responses to the annual report questions? The answer is yes. So this is similar to the expense question. We absolutely will provide that. We'll provide definitions for what type of criteria we're looking for, how it's to be measured, and any format requirements.

So, for instance, if we ask a question where the natural response item would be a numeric field, we would restrict that field to numeric, just as an example.

- The next question is mine. Are there any findings regarding why the for-profit programs have more sanctions? Well, you remember that came in the site visit study, and probably it's because they just didn't meet their rules and regulations, you know, they didn't have their director turn around their faculty qualifications.

Do you have anything to say about...?

- Most boards only place sanctions on programs that are not compliant with our rules.

- That's right.

- Anything outside of that would just be a suggestion, it's not a sanction.

- But, certainly, you know, this was done by Allison Squires, and, you know, and who looked at all the data, and it certainly wasn't anything that was done to get back at for-profit programs. It was just looking at everything. It so happened that they had, you know, they happened to be for-profit.

- And this did dovetail with the quantitative data analysis, too, where we saw that they, for-profit institutions, tended to be less likely to be fully approved and tended to report lower NCLEX pass rates. So, again, I think we're left. You know, the quantitative analysis didn't tell us why either. I think, again, that's the key of getting more data and more data elements so we can see those interactions.

But it was in concert with.

- And that Patricia Pittman national study, you know, that was in JNR, that as well. So there's something there, but we haven't quite gotten to what it is.

- And just to echo your point, you know, it's not as if, you know, we're after for-profit programs. It could very well be if we were able to control for other important criteria, for-profit programs wouldn't be a problem. You know, maybe that's not really what's driving it.

- Well, that's true too. But I think the Pittman study, she did.

- The evidence.

- Yeah. The next question, was there any specific percentage of faculty turnover identified? We had that with the directors, but we looked for that for faculty, we just weren't able to identify that, correct?

- Right. Yeah. And this was, there just weren't enough boards that were collecting that type of information.

- Do you think, in the future, if there are more boards that do that core data template, that we'll be able to, or...?

- Yeah, I think, you know, the key is understanding how all of the different criteria kind of work in concert with each other. And if that's something based on the core data template that we're able to get moving forward, I think that that would be excellent. I think that that's an important criteria too. With the director, it's just a lot easier to track because, typically, the director was identified at the top of each annual report. And so, really, ultimately, what we did for the analysis was we just quantified how many times did that name change?

You know, for faculty, that's a little bit more difficult because you would have to move beyond essentially saying, "We have three full-time faculty this year, four the next year, or five the next year." We would need to know the composition. And so I think that's really the key. We could ask that question directly, but, again, it's not placing too much of a burden on the respondent to then understand and kind of ascertain, you know, are they, the five faculty, year to year, all the same, you know, etc., etc.

- Right. The next question is, is there a standard for the teaching workload of a program director? As far as I know, there isn't. I know there isn't from our studies. Do you know of anything?

- We have a limit for our in-program directors, only three hours a week teaching. We do not have that for VN programs. And we started to put something in place, but because of the North Carolina decision, and that this might keep someone from earning money, we did not put anything in place.

- Oh, okay. So, because of the FTC?

- Yes.

- Okay. So, as far as I know, no. Obviously, one state did have something but pulled it out, and I just don't have any more information on that. The next question is for Brendan, I think, more than anything, but will you qualify the definition of an orientation program for new faculty?

There's a difference across programs. The quality of the orientation program can range from poor, such as a simple checklist, to great, formal well-designed program, and if the question is asked on the core report, "Do you have an orientation program for new faculty?" I believe the question needs to be quantified. And I think that's an excellent question.

- It is.

- And we probably should do that.

- Yeah. And the nice thing about this, so programming into Qualtrics and kind of sending out, like, a standardized, like, core data survey. The one real nice advantage of that is we could base this on for those familiar with, like, survey methodology. We could base that on a skip pattern. So, you know, if you say, no, you don't have formal, we don't need to ask you to rate it, obviously.

But if you say yes to that, I think the idea of inserting basically a Likert scale of, you know, grade essentially the quality of that training. I think it is important. And I think that this is an excellent example of, you know, where I think we're really going to look for your feedback moving forward because we have what the kind of the evidence that we are able to aggregate to date suggest is important.

But you, as the end-user, as the practitioners, the people in the field, I think, are really going to be the ones to inform on the template.

- Right. And I think, you know, that is really good feedback, by the way. And I think this is good feedback for the future of going forward with this. And it just shows me that we really need your input in a lot of this because what I'm thinking is maybe we could even change it to a mentorship program with a seasoned faculty for a year.

- Sure.

- That does quantify it a bit.

- Yes. Yes.

- So great question. And well, it's something that we can think about.

- And this may need to be qualified that it's nursing orientation because the college or the university always has an orientation for new faculty, but it's not to the nursing group.

- Right. Good point. Great questions. Our current annual survey reflects the rules on our nurse practice act, are you suggesting we replace that with the NCSBN survey every year? Yes. If it's in your rules and not your statute, that's more easily changed. Is it so specific what you collect on the annual report in your rules?

- No.

- No. So, for some states that could be something they'd have to change?

- But it is in statute that we have the right to collect data.

- That you do an annual report, right. But it's not something that says, "These are the questions that have to be," correct?

- No.

- And in fact, even moving forward, we would recommend not saying, " These are the..." because the idea...

- I know.

- The idea is that this is a living thing, and as we collect more evidence, we'll be able to refine that analysis and then maybe we'll see certain things drop out and others emerge.

- That's exactly right. Based on the information presented, what rule changes or new rules do you think should be made? And I think this might go to a few other questions about the model rules. Will the annual report and site visit template be included in the model rules? And will NCSBN model rule language have been updated to reflect the research findings?

Well, I will tell you this, we did work with a model rules committee. Maryann Alexander, who's been working with us on this as well, and I worked with them to update the education model rules to reflect, especially, some of the evidence that we have found. Because the new model rules that we're going to be...I think you're going to be voting on in August, really they're trying to make them more evidence based.

So, at least I gave direction. I'm not on that committee, but I gave direction about what evidence they may include in there. But for the specific question about, will the site visit template be included in the annual report template and the model rules? No. I think, if anything, they're trying to shorten the model rules, making them real.

Well, not that they're not evidence based, but I don't think you would put a template in the model rules, but maybe just say something like, "Jan said that, you know, 'The board collects an annual report,' and that would be enough that you could, you know, collect the information that you find that you should collect. And then there's a question, where and when we'll be able to find the templates on the NCSBN website.

That's a good question too. One of the things I'm going to do, if some of you, you know, know about the education section on the website, we have a big area there on approval, and that was really based on what we did in 2012, so I'm going to be updating that, and all of this new information will be there and it'll be available there.

But, you know, it isn't available yet. So, again, we're going to send these booklets out to your board. It's going to look something, I don't know if you can see this, but something like this. So something like the template that's up on the PowerPoints, and, again, we're going to pass it out at mid-year, and we'll send the PDF of it out to you. So, definitely be available.

You know, a lot of this we're still kind of working on now, so that's where we are there. I think that's it for the questions unless, Jo...

- One more.

- ...are there any other questions? - [Jo] Yes. Thank you, Nancy. Yes, there is a question, a couple of more questions here. When will the survey be ready for distribution?

- Oh, you know what, I forgot to say anything about that. Well, we are under construction, as I said. My first job, probably next week, will be to send out surveys to find out how many times we should send this out a year? We'd like to do it once, as I said, if we could do it every January, that would be beautiful, but maybe some of you need it at a different time and we could do it twice.

So that's the first thing that we need to do. And then we need to, you know, put it past some of the boards just to review the template and, make the questions, and then we'll probably have to, you know, send those out just to have people test the questions. And I would guess that it would be ready by the summer, but I just can't promise anything because you know how long things take when you...

We thought these approval guidelines would be done. And remember, our committee was a year long. We thought we'd have them, and we just had to do more. So I don't have a specific date, but I'd like it to be ready by the summer so that we could, you know, begin to input the data. We'd also have to get from everybody what your extra questions are.

And, you know, Qiana McIntosh, who does the CEs for this, she'll be doing the whole thing with Qualtrics, so she's going to a special workshop at Qualtrics. They're doing a conference to learn about how, you know, we can do the reports in a way that, you know, you would really find useful.

And I think we might have to talk to each of you as well about what you'd like in the reports. So it's work-intensive for us, but we're hoping, you know, once it gets into a system, it'll go well. I know that was a non-answer, wasn't it?

- Yeah.

- That guy at that conference would've said, "This was a yes or no question." Anything else?

- Yes, yes. Have the quality indicators been mapped to accreditation standards?

- Have the quality indicators, what?

- Been mapped.

- The quality indicators in the approval guidelines, have they been mapped to the accreditation standards? I'm assuming they meant the national nursing accreditation standards.

- And that's a good question as well. What we did and what I'm kind of proud of is that this is really purely regulation. We based everything on the approval or not. So we see these as regulatory guidelines, and so we really didn't feel the need to do a crosswalk because we see that as a separate process.

If you remember our committee in 2012 that recommended accreditation, we still recommended it but thought approval should still be maintained and that boards should have that authority over their programs and be able to step in at different points because it's different. It's a different mission, they're looking at different indicators.

So we had the accreditors on our original cause, but we really didn't crosswalk things because we just see it as regulation.

- And I might just add, too, and not to get too deep into the weeds in research speak, but just the mere fact that we were able to model accreditation, national accreditation as a predictor in the analysis, confirmed for us that there were programs that were not accredited, which were fully approved. So to be able to model something statistically, you have to have, essentially, events and non-events in both sides of your predictor.

So, if you were accredited, you have to have ones that were not approved and approved, and if you were not accredited, you have to have both programs that were approved and not approved. It's the only way that the model will work. So, just the fact that we were able to derive any estimates using national accreditation, we have examples of nationally accredited programs that were not approved, and we have examples of programs that were not accredited, who were approved.

- Yeah.

- So I think, again, you know, to just suggest not over-relying on one criteria. So similar to the NCLEX, you know, I think it is an important piece of the puzzle. I think it's a piece of the puzzle that has to be assessed, and certainly, on an ongoing basis, but never kind of pigeonholing ourselves into one lens or another.

- And the accreditation organizations are very aware of this work. We've talked to them on the phone.

- Oh yes, very aware.

- And they're very interested in the findings.

- And we did find in this study that accreditation does matter.

- Yeah, we did.

- So I mean...

- And so they're happy. I know.

- So these results do suggest that accreditation, it does play out when looking at approval. I just think that there are other quality indicators, too, that are important to keep in mind.

- Right. Anything else, Jo?

- No, Nancy. I think at this point, we don't have any more questions.

- Great. So, we are going to move on, and I had asked some of you about, how will your board or NRB use this information? And, you know, I don't think we got any answers for that, did we? So I was just going to throw this to our colleague here, Jan.

- Well, since I was in the committee...

- First of all, do you think you're going to use the annual report template? We need to hear from Jan.

- Yes, we do a massive annual report. But we don't mind doing this because we feel that having national database would be so valuable to us. So...

- So some of you that do have something you're really happy with, maybe do it Jan's way and have, you know, look at this, and so then you can at least look at the aggregate data to see how your...

- Sure, absolutely.

- ... programs compare. Okay. Sorry I interrupted.

- But as far as how we're going to use this, unfortunately, since I've been on the committee and kind of underhandedly already been using the information that we have found when I've evaluated programs. For one thing, it will help us to watch for warning signs because we know specific warning signs.

And also, we will be able to evaluate how programs measure up to the quality indicators because they are statements of quality, and if they don't measure up, we'll recognize that. The findings will provide evidence-based rationales for approval decisions, requirements, recommendations, even suggestions.

So we can say, "The rule says this, the evidence from the program is this, the research shows this, so our requirement is this." So it just gives us a better baseline for writing our sanctions if you want to call them that.

I wondered if they would be useful in writing self-study reports. That's just a question I have for myself, that programs might be able to look at those quality indicators as they're evaluating problems in their own programs. They can guide rulemaking. I think that when we are considering making changes to rules, and most boards have a regular cycle for looking through all the rules, we can refer to that and see, "Do we need a rule for this?"

They will help in considering proposals for new programs. We read a lot of proposals. Since 2006, we've approved 84 new programs. And I think this will help us to see if the program promises to be a success or not.

It will help us respond to programs' questions with evidence. And it will help in identifying factors that may have contributed to pass rate or other negative outcomes for planning corrective measures. So I think they will be very valuable.

- You know, some of you may know that I teach an ICRS course on the role of the education consultant. So, we had this site visit template, and, you know, I presented that, and one of the education consultants was rather new, hadn't made a site visit, and used it for her first visit and really felt like it organized things for her.

I think sometimes those first site visits can be very difficult because they just don't know where to go to first. So...

- You're overwhelmed with information, and you can get lost in the details.

- So I think a site visit document really would be interesting to use for the boards when they orient new education consultants.

- Yes.

- I think the annual report template is going to be...at collection, would be really important if you want to decrease your workload and maybe be a part of that core data. The approval guidelines, like Jan said, just helping you when you're approving, and using them, knowing that you have that data there. Another thing that I think we've alluded to but maybe haven't said outright, remember we've talked about the NCLEX being a lagging kind of indicator?

Well, with some of these indicators and the approval guidelines, you can go in and turn those programs around before they begin to fail. And that, I think, will really make your legislators, your board, everybody happy because nobody wants to close a program. If you can step in and help them make those changes or make those suggestions before they fail, that's really the best way to do it.

And, you know, I know there are programs out there that you make suggestions to and they don't follow through. But for the most part, I mean, like the one that you just made, where she got an assistant.

- Yes. Yes.

- And that was you're...

- But when we make a recommendation or requirement, and I'm sure other boards do this too, we give them a deadline, "You must respond no later than..." And they do.

- Great.

- And, you know, just to kind of build on that, I think we have discussed, you know, in other contexts, the fact that moving forward as programs proactively address some of these deficiencies potentially in real-time, that it actually might level the playing field. So then when we go to doing another analysis, certain indicators might just fall off because boards have done such an effective job at addressing it that it's no longer an issue.

- Yeah.

- It's true.

- Do we have another question?

- Not questions, but we have several comments.

- Oh, several comments.

- Yeah. Yes. A board has said that they've been waiting to write rules and revise their annual report until this information's been available. Another has said that they've already started using director and faculty turnover as risk factors when...

- No?

- ...consultants do site visits.

- Way ahead.

- And, you know, one brought up the important fact that the programs really like to benchmark with each other. And they think that this will be really useful for their state to benchmark with other jurisdictions.

- Right. The benchmark, and that's a great idea.

- Yeah. And this will provide a national benchmark...

- It would.

- ...to your earlier comment too.

- Yes.

- This will be across all boards.

- And, who knows? Internationally, in the future.

- Internationally. Exactly. Exactly.

- That's it?

- Yes.

- Okay. Well, thank you, everybody. So just to kind of wind up here, I just really like this little image that took me...it looks like it was real easy to make, but it took me so long to make, because it kind of puts everything together that we've talked about.

Using the annual report for core data, looking at, you know, the performance indicator from it, which is something new today that we haven't talked about at all before. And I think that is so exciting. And then using that site visit template, as we said, and probably, your seasoned education consultants already know what they do when they go out, but really good for orienting new people.

And then the approval guidelines, of course, where all of this kind of comes together to the guidelines that are all evidence based, and in those guidelines, again, we have where that evidence is. And so, then, if they're evidence based, legally defensible, and, in the end, so at the end of the little arrow there, you know, it will help you to save on your workload, it'll provide a national database, but, I think, almost best of all, that it helps your workload, but also it'll help the boards to be proactive and taking those steps before programs start to fail.

So, using this in the future, building that core data, what do you see as beneficial to nursing and to the boards but to nursing in general?

- Well, I think we're entering a new era with the next-generation NCLEX and greater teaching toward clinical judgment. Now we have tools that will help us evaluate programs and keep them on track. So I expect we'll have a better nursing workforce.

- And aggregate data.

- Yeah, I mean, for me, I wouldn't even broaden it beyond nursing because I think nursing is... I come at most topics from a research bias. I always think, "One more tool in the toolkit." We're not saying you have to use these performance indicators. We're not prescribing what the next steps are.

I think it's one more bit of information. And I have yet to see any industry that couldn't benefit from one more piece of information, at least, to consider. And so, yeah, I think it will be really beneficial. I think, in particular, to have kind of a national standard and to understand, as Jan has mentioned multiple times, you know, how your own jurisdiction might measure up to that.

- So, we will end today with a quote by Florence Nightingale, "Were there none who were discontented with what they have, the world would never reach anything better." And I think that's a very timely quote because, as you know, this was the year of Florence Nightingale's 200th birthday, and, certainly, boards have been discontented in the past.

Actually, when I came in 2002, even then, they were talking about quality indicators, and now we have, really, a multipronged strategy. If you look back at this arrow, a multipronged strategy to look at changing that approval process to being evidenced based and legally defensible.

So, I think we have done what Florence Nightingale wanted us all to do. Remember, we will send you the approval guidelines, all of you who are registered, and if you're not registered, then send us an email, as well as the PowerPoints.

And don't forget, if you want CEs, that's 4.2 CEs, to fill out that evaluation, and if you're not registered, send Qiana the requests that you want CEs. And is there anything else? Any other questions or anything from IS?

- So if you leave discontented, you've done exactly what Florence Nightingale wished.

- Right. Well, thank you.

- But we have the answers.

- Yes, we do. Thank you, everybody, for joining us...

- Thank you, Nancy.

- ...for participating.

- I do want to acknowledge Nancy, and Jo, and Qiana, and Brendan for all the work they've done over the past more than three years in getting this together. It's a tireless job.

- We're very excited, yeah. So, thank you. It's been great working with all of you, and your questions were wonderful.