Past Event: 2024 NCSBN Annual Meeting **- Measuring Impact Panel Q&A Video Transcript**
©2024 National Council of State Boards of Nursing, Inc.

Event
2024 NCSBN Annual Meeting

More info: https://www.ncsbn.org/past-event/2024-ncsbn-annual-meeting

Presenters
Brendan Martin, PhD, MA, Director, Research,
NCSBN; Richard Smiley, MS, Senior Statistician, Research, NCSBN;
Allison Bradywood, DNP, MN/MPH, RN, NEA-BC, Executive Director, Washington State Board of Nursing;
Goldie Luong, BSC, MBA, Executive Director, Regulatory Programs Transformation, Regulatory Policy & Programs, BC College of Nurses and Midwives;
Gregory Nielsen, JD, President and CEO, Training and Consulting LLC

- [Dr. Martin] With our time being limited and arguably really the importance of this topic today, I really want to dive right into our discussion and train the spotlight on our panelists. So to begin, I will ask each of the panelists, starting with my colleague here, Richard, to introduce themselves and then we're going to dive right into the details.

- [Richard] Hi. I'm Richard Smiley. I'm a senior statistician at NCSBN and I've worked at NCSBN for over 20 years. So it's relevant to what we're talking about. Go ahead.

- [Allison] Good morning. Allison Bradywood. I'm the executive director with the Washington State Board of Nursing. And just as context, our board oversees RNs, LPNs, nurse technicians, ARMPs, and nursing assistant education. And I've been with the board just over a year.

- [Goldie] Good morning, everyone. I am Goldie Luong, the executive director for regulatory program transformation at the British Columbia College of Nurses and Midwives. And so for context, we regulate five designations, so registered nurses, licensed practical nurses, psychiatric nurses, nurse practitioners, and midwives.

- [Craig] My name is Craig Nielsen and I had the privilege of meeting you this morning.

- I was going to say, riffing off of the global success of the Barbie movie, we could just say you're just Greg. So first of all, thank you so much. Thank you, Brendan. Thank you so much for your time and your willingness to share your expertise today. Richard, I wanted to start with you because you do have

that tenure here at NCSBN. And you are familiar pretty intimately with NCSBN's prior performance management system CORE.

And for those in the attendance who might be a little bit less familiar with that program, I was hoping you could kick off the conversation by first helping us understand, it's yet another acronym. I think that this group is fairly well versed with acronyms. But what did CORE stand for and really what was it trying to achieve?

- Okay. Well, CORE stood for commitment to ongoing regulatory excellence. And CORE's, it was an attempt at a performance management system that was put together with the intent to collect a lot of data and see if assessments of boards could be made out of all that data that was collected.

So there was specifically a board survey asking specific questions to the, I think it usually went to the EO or somebody in the board office regarding various inputs in terms of, you know, what was their staffing size, how do they perform various functions.

So we were collecting a lot of data there. And that was supplemented with a survey of nurses, a survey of educational programs, a survey of employers, a survey of nurses who had had a complaint filed against them with the board, a survey of individuals who had made a complaint against a nurse, and a governance survey.

So it was, in scope, it was very comprehensive of what was attempted, what they were attempting to achieve.

- And of particular relevance, I think, to kind of continuing the conversation that Greg started and that even Alicia, when she was talking about member engagement, you know, could you maybe zero in a little bit in your estimation, obviously, what were the core strengths of CORE, it's probably a bad way to word it, and what were some of the main limitations?

Because CORE, for those of you who are not familiar, CORE was formally sunset in 2018. So inevitably there were some limitations.

- Yeah. Well, I think when all is said and done, the strengths of CORE is that it was collecting on, I think, every-other-year basis, some measures of what I'd call customer service data or customer satisfaction data. Okay, perceptions, but still useful, from boards of nursing, from, I mean, well, I mean, from employers about boards of nursing, from educational programs about boards of nursing, from nurses about boards of nursing, in terms of if they had dealings with the boards of nursing, what was the experience like, you know, how did it go?

So just basic customer satisfaction data was collected that I think was effective, and I know some of the states were able to use some of the CORE data to argue in cases for more staffing, and some of that could just simply be that, look, you know, our customer satisfaction is going down, so, you know, here's what's needed here.

But the weaknesses of it, it didn't achieve what it was trying to do. Very specifically, and as Greg taught us in the morning, the outcome measures were simply not defined beforehand, and I think the hope had been that somehow if we collected all this data, the natural outcome measures would appear, but that really didn't happen.

So as a result, the real intent of the data was to not only, that we were going to collect all this data, if we had outcome measures that we said, you know, this is what's good, this is not, you could link that other data and identify, oh, you know, here, this variable is important.

It was intended to provide guidance for what helps boards become effective, and that never went anywhere because the outcome measures weren't really defined, and so, and there were other issues that, like, some of the data was just point-in-time data where really it didn't reflect what was going on.

When I was talking to Brendan about this example I gave was that it was possible for a board to be "performing poorly," recognize it, hire a bunch of staff, and when we sent the survey to them, what we would capture is a higher level of staff than actually had existed when the problems were present.

So you would have these disjointed data capture points like that, and the other thing, yeah.

- And I was going to say, I actually think that this is a perfect segue into what Greg was talking about earlier, which is really making sure that you have that kind of standard framework, those standardized definitions to work from. I'm hoping, Greg, maybe you could jump in here, could you speak to that a little bit?

- Sure, so anytime we're talking about measuring impact, the challenge is always a bit of a Goldilocks challenge that boards are wrestling with, which is balancing the quantity of data that we're collecting with the quality of data that we're collecting. Sometimes boards make a mistake of thinking that if we do more, if we ask more questions, gather more data, that is automatically going to lead to a better outcome, and the reality is we're looking for an effective balance between what is the quantity of data that we can collect, but do it in a way that is sustainable, that is effective within the capacity of the organization, and a way to approach that, as you mentioned, Brendan, is to start with really strong definitions.

What is it that the, what do we hope the outcome of this project is going to be? What do we think the important inputs would be that would tell us whether we're moving towards that outcome or not? Simplicity is sometimes your best friend.

- One of the things that we wanted to do with this panel, too, is to really ground some of this conversation in the day-to-day reality that you all live as regulators. I'd like to bring in Allison and Goldie into this conversation. Your board and college, respectively, recently undertook a similar process to measure what we have been kind of terming regulatory performance or impact.

Allison, starting with you, I was hoping maybe you could give us a bit of background on your experience to date. What ultimately kind of kicked this off, and what were you hoping to achieve through this process?

- Sure. Because I've been in for such a short term, I'll just give you a rough timeline. Within the first week of starting last May, I received the results of an auditor's audit on our licensing performance that dated back from 2021 where we were at 10 weeks. Within that first week, it was immediately clear that performance mattered and other people were looking.

Fast forward to July, and we had to sign a joint operating agreement with the Department of Health that we worked closely with on how we're going to maintain our independence versus what's shared. Within that, we also needed to define performance metrics. The impetus for this was kind of both immediately obvious and necessary to move forward with. By December, we had to have that first meeting with the

Department of Health saying where we were going and what our work plan was around our performance metrics.

Then by midyear, we were starting to get questions about, or the midyear meeting, questions about our authority. The legislature and the governor's office asking questions about, really, can you do that as an independent board? Should you be doing that? And so, I wanted to make sure that we could say yes, we should be, and that there was data to back that up.

I think we heard at the March midyear meeting as well from other boards that they were in similar stead of having those questions asked. Wanting to both play from a defensive position of maintaining our status and then looking forward to the future.

We did kick off that work and defined a few metrics that I'll talk about later, making a work plan. I think what really helped us move forward was bringing in an expert on data visualization. So, her focus was not just what is the data, but how do you show it in a way that tells your story? That was an easier discussion with our staff to say you're doing great work and we want to make sure that the value of that work is shown to our board and externally.

I think it set up the conversation a little bit differently in terms of really owning that story, owning the value, and making sure that others understood it.

- I think that's a really important point. That's something that we were discussing just over break. Moving from a reactive position to a proactive position where you're building an impact narrative, where you're building your case absent some external pressure being brought to bear. Before we get to that, we'll circle back to that. Goldie, very similar question.

What were the goals for your college when you started this process? Can you briefly provide some background?

- Sure. For some of you, BCCNM is actually only four years old, fourth birthday coming in September. Previously we had undergone two amalgamations. As a result of that, you can imagine we were bringing in other organizations that may be at different journeys in their data collection point. We currently have a legacy CRM and we're undergoing what we're calling business transformation.

Under business transformation, we are trying to build some foundation that will serve us better in the future so that we can continue to transform. Providing that context, where we have and what was very exciting to see in Greg's talk about having the strategic plan, the vision, all of that, we actually have been doing that work.

With our business transformation, it's directly aligned with our strategic plan. It's also aligned with our regulatory philosophy. Having all that groundwork put in place serves us well to move forward. Having said that, there's actually two key things that are also happening in parallel. One is what we call a measurement and evaluation strategic framework, which is again around each of the program areas, whether you're registration, whether you're inquiry, discipline and monitoring.

We need to develop what's called the program logic. If you remember Greg's slide on the definitions of the inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impact, that's exactly what we're trying to define in each of the program areas. That work is what I would call operational but ongoing performance improvement. The

second piece of work under transformation is the benefits realization. We've actually spent a lot longer than I thought it would take to create the framework, and I can talk a little bit more about it.

But it's almost reverse engineering. Back to Richard's point around metrics and are we getting the outcomes/impacts that we thought, as we are going to be building a new CRM to create, pulling that foundation together, we actually are reverse engineering. We're looking at what are our future benefits, what are our visions, what are desired outcomes in each of those categories.

That's why that exercise took quite a long time because it's actually even harder because to look at what those desired outcomes can be and then from those desired outcomes, we map out our indicators in each of the areas of the initiatives.

- I think that's a nice segue from your comments this morning, Greg, about starting with your outputs, your operational kind of elements, but then also thinking about your why. What are the outcomes? What's driving this? What's your impact? What is the impact that you hope to realize?

- I love what Allison said a minute ago, which is that shift from reactive to proactive and that ability to be empowering for our staff members. As boards, as executives, we want to give our staff members the tools and the resources in order to explain and understand the value of exactly what they're doing. I think there's a lot of value in being able to transition from a reactive mode to a proactive mode.

Then Goldie sitting up here, I have to tell you, sitting next to Goldie and looking at her strategic framework and the way the data ties to it, the word that comes to mind is alignment, right? That ability to align who we are, where we're going, and what data and metrics are going to tell us whether we're successfully moving in that direction is a really powerful story to tell and gives you the opportunity to shift that narrative from defense, defending who we are, why we exist, why we do what we do, to a more proactive posture of look at the value, look at what would the community look like without us if we weren't standing in this space that we hold, what would that look like?

It's powerful.

- And so, Allison, rubber meets the road. You mentioned it. Metrics. So as you're in this process, you're new to this role, as you said. You've been engaged in this process, I think, very actively for the past, what, six months now, how time flies. What sort of metrics have you identified as important to track in this process and kind of why?

- Sure. So we outline three metrics for all of our work units. Volume, turnaround time, and then customer experience. And part of the reason that we did that, particularly the customer experience, is because we were getting questions from some of our community partners about, you know, as a new ED, everyone wants to bend your ear of you could really do this better.

And so I needed to validate, is that really the truth in managing that perception that was mentioned, or is that different from the truth? And then how do we raise transparency around what is truth? And so that actually allowed us, with our nursing programs, which are an example there, who are saying that we were taking too long to turn around their program approval, I said, let's take a look at it.

And we were measuring very specific pieces of when we have a complete package to when it was turned around, which was fantastic turnaround time. But when we looked at the customer experience, that was much longer, because they were measuring it from their first submission, not all the back and forth in

between. And so we were able to elevate the data and make it visible and external facing, and then also have the conversation of how do we communicate better and reduce the burdens that you're experiencing on that upstream piece so that the first submission is the perfect submission.

So building relationships, transparency of data, and it tells us how we're doing. And when you start looking at these things, you can't unknow them. So you get that urgency in the team to feel like you do need to move them forward and make a difference and make change.

- And I think that that dovetails nicely with our kind of the way we kick this off, with that standardized definition, which at the end of the day, you need to be transparent. What are we measuring? And how does it tie to that output of interest? And how does that inform the outcome, ultimately, the value proposition? Goldie, I'd like to turn to you with this next question first, but then Allison and Greg, I'd like you both to chime in as well.

What are the challenges, right? Because I think we're kind of talking about shifting from reactive to more proactive and kind of that impact narrative. I think that that's the end goal, right? But maybe the current state is we're kind of in a challenging environment. What are some of the challenges that you have encountered as your college has embarked on this process?

- So as I mentioned earlier, because we have undergone two amalgamations, our goal is to get everybody onto one platform. And so getting there, like this work sounds fancy, but when you actually have to do it, it's quite hard. And some of it is even like going down to do we have the right data definitions? Do we have a data dictionary?

And we want to make sure that when we say time to registration, that when you start the timestamp to the end of status granted, are we saying the same timestamps? Are we starting from the same starting point? Is it at the point of submission of an application or what part of that process is? So one of the first pieces that we are unpacking is really identifying all the data definitions. And then really in our new scenario, we want to build a robust, standardized data dictionary.

That's one of the goals we want to do. But even digging in what we have takes a long time, right? So that's number one. Number two, I would say that engagement at the right levels is really important. So I actually want to have a shout out to our senior leadership team because they really are committed to this work. And because we've gone through amalgamation and we want to have apples to apples and oranges to oranges, it's having commitment at the right levels.

And even when we create our benefits framework, we engaged at the senior leadership level, the executive director level, even the directors and staff to co-create this. So while it took longer than I anticipated, one of the things that the benefit of it, though, is that we are coming out with a set of agreed-upon framework, agreed-upon outcomes, and then each initiative underneath would have their indicators that map back.

So that, the engagement took longer than I thought, but it was necessary. And coming out, too, we're coming out as a stronger team because it's more holistic. And then the third piece of challenges, I would say, is helping staff understand what does this mean? Because we have a research and evaluation team and they understand the academic terms and the data, etc.

We have our IS team who is trying to bridge those gaps. What does it actually mean when we're talking about what we're trying to measure? And I think, like Allison said, keeping it simple is very helpful and then connecting those dots.

- And I wonder if that ties back to, Greg, your comment about kind of a different angle on some of the back and forth with the audience earlier this morning, but that consensus building. It's not necessarily like consensus building around a definition, which we're going to come back to, Allison, but it's consensus building from the point of view of getting buy-in almost.

- Absolutely. I think you always have to start with the why. Why are we doing this? What is the... Before we can get into what the specific definitions are, just generating that organization-wide buy-in. And I love the way Goldie mentioned just different levels of the organization, different stakeholder groups, different employee levels of the organization, understanding that this is not something that is being done to us.

This is something that we are doing proactively as an organization for our own vitality, for our own value proposition.

- So Allison, you had mentioned in particular – you gave one, I think, very relevant, tangible example where you're thinking about, like, well, where does that timeline start? Right? What were the other challenges that maybe you have confronted thus far, right? And potentially what other challenges might you envision as your board proceeds down this path?

- Yeah, I think the elephant in the room is really time and resource. So even with... We have a dedicated research team with some data analytics, which is hugely helpful. And even, you know, I'll out myself as a data geek, with this as a very high priority for me, you have to balance everything else and what the board's looking at. And so just finding the space and time to move that forward and maintain it is needed.

I think the other piece is that there's so much data. We have so many data points that how do you figure out exactly that data definition and what needs to be measured? And then while we have a lot, we also don't have clear thresholds and targets. And so the data definition is the first piece, but then eventually it would be great to say, well, is this good or not, right, compared to others?

So looking forward to having more of those conversations.

- And so I would be remiss if I did not, you know, with time flies, right? So we have six more minutes for the panel. What I would really like to do is to pivot a little bit and to think about those benefits. Like what do we envision as the value add associated with this process, right? Because I think you've all done a very good job of showing, of indicating that, you know, this is hard work, right?

Conceptually it's hard work. Practically it's hard work. It takes resources, it takes time, it takes staff, etc. What are the benefits that you hope to realize? And I'd like the whole panel to kind of jump in on this. You know, Richard, maybe I'll start with you. You know, kind of coming back to the limitations of CORE, you know, how can we overcome some of those early limitations if we're able to get this right?

- Well, if we got this right, I mean, the benefit would be protecting the public. That you would have an opportunity to use data proactively to identify if there's something, you know, that was lacking in a board's performance, that they could take proactive measures to say, hey, this isn't right.

We've got to beef this up.

- To make that case for more staffing.

- More staffing, or yeah, whatever. Staffing resources, approach, it could be anything. One of the things I was going to mention, one of the outcome measures that we kind of had, which is, conceptually you want it to be this, but, like, time to process a discipline case. And the struggles we had with even defining it, because we were working on a committee with many different boards, and even the steps involved in the process, people had definitions that were, some of the boards would use a term, and they were describing maybe three steps in the process.

Another board would use that same term, and they were talking about two steps in the process. So even getting a handle on how could we define that so everybody will understand what we're asking about. And then if you think about that outcome measure, you've got a situation where, you know, pure mathematics isn't necessarily going to work on this, because you've got a situation where, you know, clearly if it's taking you 10 years to process a discipline case, that's not good.

But if it's taking you 10 minutes to process a discipline case, that's not good. So the truth is somewhere in the middle, and that's a little bit harder to just crank out numbers and run.

- And Allison Goldy, this is probably one of those instances where there's quite a bit of overlap between the board and college. You know, where do you see the potential benefits if you're able to basically realize that end goal, human vision?

- Yes, so I think from a philosophical standpoint, nursing continues to struggle with defining value, and for our work with the board, defining our value and efficiency will continue to be important, and probably not just for Washington. I think it's also empowering for our staff to see how we're building that culture of excellence and continuing to strive and value their work on a daily basis.

And then staving off any inquiries that we will undoubtedly get down the road about what are we doing and how are we doing it. And then I guess just finally as a new ED, it would be great to have structure for the next new ED. And so how do we set this up so that somebody can step in easily and clearly articulate performance and know the book of business?

And so hoping to plan for that in eventuality.

- So in terms of our benefits, we actually looked at four areas that we want to achieve through our transformation work, and the first one is service delivery to the public registrants, partners, and then complainants. So looking at enhancing our ability to, enhancing our services and abilities.

So I'll give a really simple example whereby right now when we have applications that come through they're PDF forms that get uploaded. So our future state, what we'd like to see is that we can have direct data online entry by the registrant or licensee to input that data and then it gets stored and we can extract it, But also, if you think about ordering a pizza [inaudible], you can see, okay, the pizza's being made, the pizza's going in the oven, the pizza's being boxed up and now it's being delivered.

So for the applicant, it would be great for the applicant to know, okay, I have created my application form now, it's pending document collection, or, it's under review and it's being reviewed, and then status

granted, for example. So those are some of the benefits. And if you think about that example in itself, if we are able to expedite that time to registration that means this nurse can start working earlier, right?

So that's the impact, having more nurses available in the system to start their career. That's one example. Another one that we looked at, another pillar of benefits is our internal service delivery. So this is really about our staff being able to have operational efficiency, being able to have less spreadsheets, have one single source, one-stop-shop, really, if we could have our new CRM so that increases their efficiency.

Especially with requests for information. Our third pillar of benefits is around data excellence and this is a lot of work in this area, but being able to have data quality, governance, analytical capability... So we're really building towards that. And then last but not least is regulatory agility. So when I talk about that, I'm talking about different ways of being able to respond to regulatory changes.

One of the things that I wanted to mention here as an opportunity or you can see it as a challenge, but in British Columbia, we are really taking cultural safety, cultural humility indigenous-specific anti-racism, as well as equity, diversity, and inclusion. It's one of our priorities, so we have embedded that throughout our organization. And even in the principles and how we do our work, even in this framework, we have to find outcomes specifically around how do we make sure that we are addressing barriers and biases affecting indigenous communities, for example.

So we have that embedded throughout all of our pillars.

- And so, Greg, before we transition here, I'll give you the last word. Based on your breadth of experience, the number of groups that you've worked with, what does that success really look like when you see it done well? Like, what are they able to do, how are they able to, kind of, carry forward their mission or their purpose?

- Brendan, it's a great question. And the value...and it's specific for the attendees in the room here today. Board leadership can be extremely lonely, right? It can be isolating. You know, as I listen to Allison and Goldie and Richard talk about the benefits, they capture the benefits really well. The opportunity for everyone sitting in the room today is being part of a national group, is to learn with and from each other.

No one of us up on the panel has all of the answers, has the ability to do that, but being in a room like this surrounded by peers, surrounded by colleagues, the ability to pick each other's brain during sessions and during breaks, over lunch, over dinner, presents an opportunity, right? It's an opportunity to get out and define what might we be able to do, how might we be able to learn from the lessons, the successes, and the challenges of others.

That peer networking, that peer learning can be extremely powerful. And then it goes to what Allison was talking about a minute ago, which is succession planning. There are very few certainties in life. One of those certainties is that whether I'm an executive director or whether I'm a board member, my tenure is not going to last forever.

How can I create a framework, a structure, in place so that the next person coming in will be put in position to be successful? And I think that's all of our responsibilities, regardless of the role that we hold in the organization.

- And I think I would be remiss if I didn't kind of try to encapsulate your kind of national network comment with one NCSBN. So keep it on theme. But with that, I would hope you would join me in

thanking our panelists. And I'm going to invite Dr. Marianne Alexander to the stage, and I'm going to shift slightly left. I'll ask the panelists to stay.

And the idea with the next 25 to 30 minutes is to really get your feedback, to build on this conversation. If you have questions of the panelists of this process, 100% those are welcome, but to really kind of scaffold on top of what you've heard so far from all of these talks.

- [Dr. Alexander] So now you're going to be part of this presentation. You've heard what was done. You heard how ideally it should be done. Now we want to know as we embark upon this project, what do you need? We want this to be about you and for you and to meet your needs.

And we need to know what are the measures that you need to capture? What are the data that you need? What's the impact that you want to measure? Give us that information so that we know how to begin. And this is not the first and only opportunity that you're going to have, but it's the kickoff to the start.

- I was going to say, yeah, this is kicking off the conversation. And the hope is to continue this over the course of the next 12 months. And I'll plant a seed too. Just going back to the Q&A session with Greg earlier this morning, the member from North Dakota bringing up the political appointment as a potential challenge. So think about the context of your board. Are there additional challenges to what you've heard today that should really be part of that conversation from the get go?

- And, you know, I'm just going to tag on to that for a minute, Brendan. I want to answer how I as an EO handled that when there was a lot of political appointments and I wasn't getting the right board members appointed. I actually did collect data about the board, about some of the inefficiencies and the ineffectiveness of the actual members of the current board.

That was a ton of years ago. So you don't know anybody that I'm talking about.

- But I think, Lector and 11, if my eyes don't deceive me, I think that's Phil. It is.

- Oh, and I'll just finish the story. I went to the governor's office and I gave them a list of the competencies that I needed and said, you know, when you're looking for the board members, here is what I need. And it worked.

Okay, so Phil, please go ahead.

- [Phil] So, one, thank you for the panel. Great discussion. The interesting thing about the panel and the discussion is what I call state-based versus stateless data. And that hasn't really been discussed here because there is a concept that even before you get to, for me, before you get to saying what are the variables that I want to measure, you guys have already got to defining what you're measuring.

Now you're sort of getting, if I understand, Marianne, asking what are the variables that we may want to measure, right?

- Right.

- I would guess that you should take one step back because you have to define a state-based measure for Alabama versus California might be different versus what are we trying to do nationally, which I call stateless data. And they both have an importance, but they are different in terms of their uses and needs and the measurement of the state, right?

Because it goes to something that maybe Richard said, I forget who said it, but it goes to this point of some state may have three steps in this process, some may have two. Our point isn't to change whether they have three or two. It's to give them the data to measure that step process for them to be successful. That's state-based data.

Stateless is how do I compare that? Well, that's a different approach. And so making sure we understand state-based versus stateless is important.

- Absolutely.

- Question three.

- [Joey] Good morning again, and I'm Joey Ridenour from Arizona, and I had the pleasure of working with CORE for many years. And it started out at about 2000 when there was a question from some of the states, one particular state which I won't name, where they were getting constantly the question was, how do you know you're protecting the public?

So that started the whole discussion back over 25 years ago. And so the first step that we took was to meet with the Urban League in Washington, D.C. to see if they could help us come up with the questions. They worked with us for two years but really weren't understanding the work of boards, so we did something else.

And so we employed a different consultant, and we came up with a logic model. Richard, I don't know if you want to comment on that or not, but the logic model for CORE had short-term and long-term outputs and also performance measures. It wasn't just meant to capture something that didn't impact the public protection. So there was five parts to that, and we did it for 18 years until today was the first day that I knew it was sunsetted.

I just knew that we weren't getting data from it. But I would love for you to revisit that, to work with what worked and what didn't work, because many, many years went into that, trying to develop the metrics that were helpful for states. There were some states, and they probably aren't in the room today because we've had turnover of EOs, that used that data to get more staff, but used the data to get more staff so they could see a better outcome.

There are some states that used that data to prevent themselves from coming to the umbrella board, and that particular state is with us today. We never found out all the benefits that the states had from that, but I would love to know that that would be a future attempt to really capture that. But I do really believe that that base work maybe wasn't perfect and maybe it never will be, but that was very helpful to me.

I published it to all the stakeholders in the state because it involved the licensing cycle times and involved the discipline and compliance, which is usually the first question the legislature has about how are you protecting the public through that process. It involved the nursing programs as far as are we doing what you need us to do at the Board of Nursing. And then it also had advocacy, so it was really attempting to be comprehensive, but it was never perfect.

So I just wanted to bring that up and let everyone know because a lot of people in the room probably don't know about it.

- Right.

- And Joey, let me say you all did a tremendous job. I mean, the CORE project was groundbreaking. I don't know of any other board that was even collecting those data at that time. I think what would happen was it started to fade a little bit and we want to invigorate it now. So, and come up with something that it builds upon all the work you did, but certainly we do not discount the tremendous work that you and the committees did over the years.

And I know there are examples. Adrian Guerrero, I know, can speak to the importance of all this data collection because he himself was part of the Kansas Board when they used it.

- I think we started out in the beginning of like 50% of the states participated because they weren't sure of what the benefit really was, but at the end we had almost 80% participation because they could see how they could use the data to help their board do a better job. So I just want to throw that out there.

And the definitions was something we never ever were done with because every time we found that a state was gaming it, we had to come back and redefine it again, but it was really because the state was afraid of what might show in their state and we never forced it on the states. We allowed it to continue to evolve.

- And I think at the risk of being redundant, I don't think it would be an understatement to say that the core framework will be the core of what we envision for the future. I think Richard did a nice job of kind of, I hope, expressing the many strengths of CORE. What we saw, and I think that this actually plays off of Phil's initial comment very nicely, is I think what we saw historically was that it was being used kind of sparingly on a state by state basis and the hope was to build something that was more nationally cohesive.

So you didn't just necessarily make an argument in Arizona or New York, but you were able to then benchmark that against your regional counterparts, against the national standard. And that really starts from a place with Greg's comments of a standardized definition so that we get to that stateless context that Phil is talking about, but we remain true to what you need at the state level. And so I think that that's where core is so good and is actually so impressive.

You can see that the work that went into it, and that will absolutely carry forward.

- And that's a great point, Brendan. The one area that we got to towards the end, maybe the last five years, was what we called promising practices. We could see the high performing boards, we pulled them in for meetings to say, what are you doing that's different than the other states? And we never called them best practices because we didn't know if it was the best practice, but it certainly was a promising practice.

- And that is a perfect, I'm so glad you said that, that encapsulates the whole thing. So CORE was the vehicle to know who to talk to. Our goal is to have a single centralized project instrument, whatever you want to call it, that gives you the answer to the second part, too. It not only identifies who's doing what, but you can see where are the metrics different. How are the inputs varying?

How are the outputs varying?

- And the vision, part of the vision, was that at some point the member board profiles would contain the information that we got from the state report. So the boards could go in at any point and say compare

themselves to whatever they were doing at that point, but it was really a great comparison mechanism. So some of the questions that we added to the member board profiles was from the work of CORE.

- Yeah, I think we all owe you a huge thank you for getting that started because it does lay the groundwork for what we're going to be doing.

- I think microphone two.

- [Rachel] Hello everyone. So Rachel Prusak from Oregon Executive. Oh, whoa. I need those sunglasses right now. So I'm the opposite of Joey from Arizona where I am new. So just hearing all of that is something I had no context of and look forward to. I am just south of Washington and I'm always looking at all the work Allison is doing and trying to emulate that.

And just before here was at the ORBs desk really talking about data and how I can look at Oregon data. But what will be helpful in the context of all this is I think what Philip was saying. We all reach out to each other for surveys. We ask each other questions because we don't know what is happening in other states. And so this will allow me to say I want to collect data and looking to Washington is asking what they were doing and how it's transparent on how many complaints are made.

How many of those complaints become cases. How many of those have final action. What is that final action. And then how can every state look to each other of what that final action is and know where there may need to be education upstream to prevent the harm and protect the public. And so I think the way that we do the surveys and how we collect data is just we just need to see each other's data and understand what we're doing even if each state has different laws so that we can help each other because as a new executive officer sometimes you feel like you're just out alone and you might be doing something that someone else is doing.

So I really appreciate this conversation of how we collect the data. How it's transparent and how we share it and help each other. So thank you for having it.

- And just two really quick questions because I think that this is honestly it's like we planted the questions in a way. You know Joey's comment about member board profiles about core. Your comment about orbs. This is the starting point for us internally looking at all the different places where we already collect data. What works. What's informing best practices. What is helping operational efficiency at the board level forward.

But the key piece if I can say that layers on top of that is understanding your current context across international jurisdictions, all states, the District of Columbia, understanding what else were maybe those different frameworks not adequately capturing and how do we build something that essentially this is the second point that I want to make. How do we build something where as a new EO the onus isn't on you to know what questions to ask.

Right. That you have that succession plan that you have something in place. And so you see all the data that you have available to you already. You know what the Northwest is doing. You know what the entire United States are doing. International jurisdictions. I think the idea is if I can go back to Greg's talk.

That's the vision for this. Build on what we know. Build on the hard work. The theme yesterday, standing on the shoulders of those who have come before us. It's not to recreate the wheel. It's to take all of that intellectual capital and to move it forward. To enhance it.

So that you're in a position for success day one. Is really the goal.

- Thank you.

- Mike Four.

- [Dr. Chidums] Hello. My name is Dr. Patricia Howard Chidums and I'm from the District of Columbia. And what I wanted to ask was are you capturing DEI data as it's associated with discipline. How can we better utilize that data nationwide stateless as Phil said. As well as broken down by state.

And again asking that question in terms of the weight of the complaint.

- You know I might point back to Goldie's comments in the panel. And please if the panel wants to interject and add any comments please feel free. The answer to that is yes. If it's critical to the state. If it's critical to the jurisdictions. If it's critical to the membership. We want that information.

We want to build that information into the existing framework. So that you have the data points that you know are going to inform your outputs. That are going to help you make your case. Your kind of your impact narrative so to speak. It's going to help you proactively state your case to the public. Or whatever other interested informants at your state level or your district level etc. So that you're able to make that case.

So this is where we're really asking you for your input. We can provide the staff. We can provide the resources, the expertise for how to do this, like, the technology. We can get it over the goal line. But if we design it and then try to impose it. It won't be near as useful. And so this is where we ask for your participation.

Not just today. This is the beginning of the conversation as Maryann noted. But moving forward. We're going to engage you. And we're going to hope that you're able to respond and to participate actively. So that this is a useful tool for you.

- Thank you.

- Number three.

- Number six was before me.

- You're delicate. You go.

- No go ahead.

- All right.

- [Carrie] Hi I'm Carrie from Hawaii. I don't have an answer to your question about what metrics we should be collecting. But I do have suggestions for what I think would be helpful for NCSBN to provide. If four states once we have a sort of defined set of metrics. The first one would be a way to actually link the very distal I think outcome of protecting the public to any characteristic or activity of the board.

I think it's really hard to make the argument that a decrease in the number of incompetent to be very blunt nurses is related to some activity or characteristic of the board. So being able to make that link, I think, would be NCSBN has a lot of ability to sort of do the data. Do the research to draw that connection.

I think that would be super useful. The second thing is kind of what Greg was talking about. That theory of data that storytelling about I think we're talking about collecting measures and I think absent a little bit of the story we're trying to make sure the data in form. So what is it we're looking for in the way of what should we be doing as a board. What is the story we're trying to tell with the data.

And then clearly define that. But I think before we start pursuing specific measures might be a little bit more helpful. At least I mean it would be helpful for me that way. I think the other thing that would be really cool and I'm thinking about Alison you made comment about you guys hired a data visualization person. I've been thinking a lot in the state of Hawaii. I'm also our state's nursing workforce researcher and policy makers are a very weird audience. And they like very particular presentations of data.

And I think that's a skill set that I don't think a lot of boards have is to be able to encapsulate their data in really compelling stories but efficient in the way that lawmakers and policy makers want. And so being able to sort of like provide some guidance to the boards about how to leverage data present the data for specifically the board's benefit. Not just like some random conversation about public protection but that boards can actually leverage for their own protection when making their case about their value to the policy makers etc.

So if you could provide those resources, that'd be amazing.

- Great, well thank you very much.

- And I might actually loop in Greg really quick because one of the things we discussed was the power potentially of like a mixed modes approach to help build that narrative. I don't know if you want to comment.

- Absolutely. You used a phrase a few minutes ago which was impact narrative. And I think the value of data is not just having numbers but also being able to tell the story of what are we learning from that information. How does that benefit the community? How does that inform those that we're trying to work with? So having that impact narrative and just to rephrase a little bit what you just said which is not what story do we want the data to tell but really as a board digesting what story is the data telling us?

How do we share that transparently with the community? And part of that, Brendan, goes to what you just mentioned which is there's a both a quantitative and a qualitative component to data and impact measurement. And a lot of times we focus on numbers and metrics and measurements but as a board we also have access to a lot of anecdotal information.

We have a lot of access to perception information. To what extent does that agree with the numbers that we have? To what extent does it disagree? How do we reconcile those? So I think being able to lay layer the qualitative pieces on top of the metrics is really where the value happens for boards.

- Microphone four.

- [Peggy] Peggy Benson from Alabama. Thinking about the data I think the data is a good idea and is very rich to have that but you need to tie that into the mentorship when you're seeing all of these new EOs. So if you can tie it all together I think you will have a better rounded program to where they all know who are exceeding in the data but they become the mentors and try to strengthen that program from what it is because that's where you're going to share best practices.

That's where you're going to have that one-on-one time at the board meetings and at those different levels. So it's just a thought to consider of how you can bring it all together and link SPEAKER_01: it.

- I think that's an excellent point.

- Thank you.

- Microphone eight.

- [Dr. Rebecca] Hello. Dr. Deb Rebecca from Florida. I think it would be interesting to collect data regarding NCLEX attempts and the reason is some states do not have any limit for NCLEX attempts before requiring something from applicants and I can say from experience we've had is that we have seen people with 27 attempts to come before the board and I think following excessive NCLEX attempts could provide beneficial data regarding various programs of concern and in turn, you know, protect the public.

- So two pieces to that. You know I think this goes back to the DEIB question as well. I think we are open to the conversation of collecting you know any metrics and have certainly having the conversation about what metrics are important. I will just note with the NCLEX attempts this is something that we actually do study and have studied somewhat consistently over the past two years or 10 years just as recently as a few years ago and so we looked at specifically number of NCLEX attempts and tied that to discipline for instance and we did not see an association with that.

So we do do that research actively and I mean that's the benefit of having the research team and the expertise in the NCLEX the examinations division working hand in hand kind of in that one NCSB on ethos but that's not to say that we shouldn't continue to track it and I think that that's where we can have that open conversation about what are the metrics that we need to build in here while recognizing I think at the end of the day when we when we talk about metrics you know there's also a certain burden that has been placed on the board too so this needs to be a kind of an open transparent conversation so that on the back end what we're not trying to do is we're not trying to ask you you know every year could you fill out a 275 page or 275-question, you know, instrument.

And so, I think that that's the balance and I think that that's what we'll look to kind of kick that conversation off.

- And thank you and I think it's important in the light of Operation Nightingale that we have seen this in a different light than the discipline like you're saying I think this is looking at it in a whole different direction.

- Sure.

- Thank you.

- Microphone 11.

- Hi, waiting for it. Hi, so I do not have a statistics background nursing background so do you have any good reputable resources? I guess I'm looking at Greg and I think the answer for me I'm in Washington so I can go to our data guru and our research team to kind of get some tips and stuff but for somebody that's very new to data collection like I understand conceptually how amazing and important it is for us to share our data and get that story out there but just kind of you know on a just starting out like is there a data for dummies sort of book that I should something like that because I see how powerful it is to to tell our story through data and I just want to you know kind of get the footwork because I like I said did not take statistics in college or anything like that so any resources would be helpful.

- I don't know Greg do you have any suggestion for any resources she can look at on this topic?

- I don't have any specific suggestions for you on resources other than I fully appreciate your challenge as someone who is not a statistician myself statistics is actually the one class in college that I dropped before I got into it so it's it's more about understanding the role of data within the organization. I can tell you that a national entity like a board source can that links what is the understanding of the importance of data with governance is usually a really good place to start because that's going to start at that 101 level and build from there.

I don't think you need to be a statistician to be an effective board member and if that's the case we're doing something wrong right we want to make this a practice that's part of the culture of the organization that as there are changes we're not always going to be recruiting statisticians and data folks to serve on the board so it's a has to be in a responsible way.

- Phil?

- Could I just do two real quick comments? So I was just going to say one no offense about the statistics I thought I wanted to be a lawyer and I abandoned that. You know, the other thing that I was going to say is and I hope I'm a broken record with this if you haven't seen me present if you haven't talked to me one on one we are your resource that's the point that's our research department are and many in the examinations we are trained statisticians we are resources at your disposal our door is always open you can email me you can call me you'll find that I'll reply to you at like 10 p.m. on Sunday just because I'm so interested in the topic probably.

So please, the door is open we are a resource to you and we take that one NCSBN ethos very, very seriously. As Phil mentioned, I thought, very, very nicely and in his address yesterday it's not just staff when we talk about one NCSBN, it's all of us working together and so we are a resource to you. So if you don't feel as though you know where to start, reach out and we'll help to the best of our ability and if we can't get you the answer, we'll help find the person who can.

- Phil?

- So I would also add...whoever was standing... there you are. I would add that that part of the strategic directions that this group voted on was related to licensure reform process. Anyway, the point was for us to build and help you speed up those issues.

One of those things if you remember me talking about it before I was CEO was the AI and the ability to build what I called member board portals that could take the data that Brendan's talking about and present it to you in a variety of different ways i.e. a statistician at a basic level, not tertiary analysis or

something like that, but at a very basic level tell your story, whoever said that up there, level inside what we call the member board portal.

So you're going to start seeing some focus groups about what should be in those member board portals and how it would help you. It's not just about the exam, right? We're building that within the exam but it's not about the exam. It's how does that data help you?

So, as well as having I don't know how many researchers we now have, Brendan, but that, your own personal phone-a- friend you also have the ability to look at some of this on your own in a way that the AI makes it useful for you.

- I think we have time for one last question. lectern three.

- [Dr. Dawson] Well, I'll say good morning good afternoon halfway because I feel like we're on the cusp. I am Dr. Brittany Dawson. I'm vice chair of the Virgin Island state board of nurse licensure. So we are a very tiny and intimate board is what I would like to call us. We do somewhere about like 1,000 RN applications when we do our renewal cycles, so it's not a lot of data...

My question is for smaller boards especially that are looking at measuring our impact when we are we aren't doing astronomical numbers to get output. So data has a lot to do with your numbers and your collection and what you're actually measuring. So when you're coming from a smaller board, if we look at things like I want to say grievances or even disciplinary cases, we're only doing 15 maybe in our year and that's if we're cleaning up the 16 that were left from the board that never addressed them.

So when we're looking at these really small numbers what exactly are we looking at when it comes to measuring impact. I think also I'm not really sure about the ask that we're carrying here. When I say measuring impact I'm like, are we measuring across the board at NCSBN as an entire institution? Are you looking for us to provide you data specifically from the boards and having a clearer understanding of that.

I had a second question after that answer. Can I can I get my second question? Okay, my second question was if we're looking at NCSBN as an organization, I really like to take my time to challenge organizations to measure diversity and impact and what your actual diversity and inclusion looks like in the broader scale, right.

So if we look at health care right now, we know we're dealing with a lot of systemic bias, we're addressing all these things. I'm a midwife by trade, so we talk about black maternal health and we're talking about all these major impact. And I live on an island surrounded by water, so we're looking at rural health and all these impacts and how are we bettering our communities through things like the nurse licensure compact is great, it's a great thing for major states, but when you look at small boards like ourselves launching into the nurse licensure impact actually impacts our income and our ability to pay our board member pay our board staff.

It's because we've entered and now we've lost those licensure fees that we would have gotten prior to nurse licensure compact. So when I look at impact for NCSBN, I'm like, we need to be asking really big questions. Because I'll say it, looking around our organization, I come from a territory that's predominantly black but when I look at our organization it's predominantly white.

But I would like to see more diversity and what we're doing to face that and if we're measuring impact I don't want to just see it on my board's level I want to see what my organization is doing and we have questions and I hear the thing about testing and it took that person 27 times... Congratulations to them for passing because we need nurses and I am a horrible test taker and I failed my exit program for every institution I was a part of.

But if they stuck through and it took them 27 times to pass NCLEX that we as an organization has made harder, does the NCLEX really weigh and does the NCLEX really show us our capability as our nurses if you're a poor test taker that does that make you a poor nurse? It doesn't. I would say it doesn't because I've seen amazing nurses who are friends and mentees that have taken the test 10 times.

And they finally passed and now they're leading organizations. I failed and I'm vice chair of the board of nurse licensure and you have to call me Dr. Dawson. So there's that too.

- Could I just take it? Just real quick rapid fire because I know we're between you and lunch. But I took notes, so I'll take it one at a time. So I think that the the small sample that you're talking about I would just riff off of Greg's earlier comments. The power of the anecdotal, right? I don't think just because, you know, you think of it uniquely as qualitative when it gets very small and at 15 it probably is, but at 1,000 licenses that could you still have a great deal of power quantitatively as well.

So there's still a lot there even if it's a small sample. The other piece is the purpose of this, the vision of this, the goal of this is that you can continue to do that internal state or jurisdiction-level evaluation then you can layer that up to look at regional peers, then you can layer that up and I'll throw this in quotes, that "national baseline." The idea is to amplify and augment what you already do, not to replace what you already do.

So it's really all-encompassing. And then the last piece, and I'll relate this to one of the first questions that we had about DEIB. This conversation should be on the table, we should be talking about these elements. We should be in a position where essentially there's no kind of sacred cow in terms of we're not going to discuss this this possible input.

Because we know with the diversity of our membership that there are a myriad of inputs that affect the outputs and the power of this type of a project is that now you'll be able to look at how those inputs are affecting outputs across the country, across the international membership. And so, I would say in fact it actually amplifies and scales in a way that you would find directly beneficial. So I hope I hit everything, but I would just ask maybe unless you, Marianne, if you have any closing comments just to kind of congratulate the panel?

- Yeah, absolutely. Just to say thank you all for your input, this has been invaluable to us. We're going to be continuing the conversation, continue to think about it, and thank you so much to the panel and Brendan for your leadership.