Message from the President

Anne Heyen, DNP, RN, CNE, President

In November, Missouri voters passed Amendment 2 that legalizes medical marijuana in the state. There are two major issues impacting nurses: Nurses who might utilize medical marijuana and nurses caring for the client who is utilizing medical marijuana. Nurses who might utilize medical marijuana need to remember that marijuana in any form remains illegal under federal law. It is a violation of the Missouri Nurse Practice Act to be impaired at work on any controlled substance regardless of whether the substance has been prescribed for them. Employers will have to determine how to manage staff who use and/or possess medical marijuana.

In order to effectively provide care to those who utilize medical marijuana, the National Council of State Boards of Nursing established a marijuana committee that developed Guidelines for Medical Marijuana. These guidelines are included later in this newsletter. All nurses should carefully review the guidelines for nursing care for the patient using medical marijuana. Nurse Practitioners should also review the guidelines for advance practice registered nurses. According to the Missouri amendment, Nurse Practitioners will not be allowed to prescribe medical marijuana, but they will likely have patients who are prescribed medical marijuana and will need to know how to treat those patients. Educators, there is information regarding how to include education about caring for clients taking medical marijuana for pre-licensure and advance practice registered nursing programs. More information will be forthcoming in the next several months as Amendment 2 becomes effective. I encourage all nurses to stay informed on this amendment and its impact on nurses.

Executive Director Report

Registered Nurses Set to Renew in February 2019 – Act Now!

Lori Scheidt, Executive Director

Registered Nurse (RN) renewal postcards with PIN numbers will be mailed in early February 2019. The postcard is mailed to the current address we have on our records. Because you have a legal responsibility to change your name and/or address within 30 days of the change, it is very important that you inform our office, in writing, whenever you have a change in your address. Failure to inform the board of your current residence is cause for license discipline. A change form can be found on the board’s website at https://pr.mo.gov/nursing.

RN licenses expire April 30, 2019. It takes up to four business days, after the renewal is submitted, before the license is renewed. We do not issue license cards. Licensure rules require that nurses enroll in Nursys e-Notify as a condition of license renewal. A nurse must register “As a Nurse” on Nursys e-Notify at https://www.nursys.com/e-notify before continuing with the renewal process. This free service will send the nurse email notifications of changes to his/her license, including when the license is actually renewed, license expiration reminders and changes to any applicable discipline status.

No Grace Period to Renew

There is no grace period to renew. The board’s rules were recently changed to require a nurse to renew three business days prior to the expiration date. Failure to do so may result in the license becoming lapsed, which requires the nurse to complete a reinstatement application, submit additional fees and submit to fingerprint background checks.

Check Your Licensure Status and Where You Can Practice

1. Go to https://nursys.com then click on Nursys
2. Search by your Name, License Number or NCBSN ID.
3. Click “View Report”
4. On Nursys QuickConfirm Report page, click "Where can the nurse practice as an RN and/or PN?"
Moments with Marcus

Tribal Culture

Are you a member of a tribe?

To get on the same page, let’s define what a tribe is. And, of course, since I’m sorta lazy, this is Alex’s definition, not Daniel Webster’s:

Tribes: Any aggregate of people united by ties of descent from a common ancestor, community of customs and traditions, adherence to the same leaders, etc.

When thinking of nursing, the “common ancestor” would, of course, be Florence Nightingale. We’re not talking about a physical lineage, but a philosophy of caregiving that has been handed down over generations. And a community of customs and traditions? Well, anyone who has worked in nursing should be able to recognize that not all nursing teams are the same. Whether it’s a unit in a hospital, a long-term care facility, a professional association, home healthcare company, etc., there are going to be all kinds of different dynamics which arise when groups form. These systems of beliefs and actions add up to what we call “culture.”

In my career, I am able to witness, up close and personal, so many different examples of culture in healthcare. One particular visit to a hospital made me so distressed that, when my work was finished, I practically sprinted out the front door. From leadership to volunteers, it seemed like every single person was doing the very opposite of what they were supposed to be doing. From here on out, I didn’t feel safe. It was like I was the only one willing to actually think about the culture of the tribe.

On the opposite end of that cultural spectrum is another group, Tribe RN. Tribe RN isn’t a facility or a company, like this are rare. With attitudes like this, how on earth can safety and quality be top of mind? Thankfully, instances like this are rare.

Chelsea states that Tribe RN is a drama free zone and asked that, if any member feels attacked, bullied or pressured in any way, let her know - she will handle the complaint.

Putting that out there as a value statement for the group sets the tone. And ya know what? Not only do all the members stick to those guidelines, but they take it a step further. Support. Virtual hugs. "Congrats to you!" type comments… it’s a really beautiful thing to witness.

When thinking of nursing, the “common ancestor” would be Florence Nightingale. We’re not talking about a physical lineage, but a philosophy of caregiving that has been handed down over generations. And a community of customs and traditions? Well, anyone who has worked in nursing should be able to recognize that not all nursing teams are the same. Whether it’s a unit in a hospital, a long-term care facility, a professional association, home healthcare company, etc., there are going to be all kinds of different dynamics which arise when groups form. These systems of beliefs and actions add up to what we call “culture.”

In my career, I am able to witness, up close and personal, so many different examples of culture in healthcare. One particular visit to a hospital made me so distressed that, when my work was finished, I practically sprinted out the front door. From leadership to volunteers, it seemed like every single person was doing the very opposite of what they were supposed to be doing. From here on out, I didn’t feel safe. It was like I was the only one willing to actually think about the culture of the tribe.

On the opposite end of that cultural spectrum is another group, Tribe RN. Tribe RN isn’t a facility or a company, like this are rare. With attitudes like this, how on earth can safety and quality be top of mind? Thankfully, instances like this are rare.

Chelsea states that Tribe RN is a drama free zone and asked that, if any member feels attacked, bullied or pressured in any way, let her know - she will handle the complaint.

Putting that out there as a value statement for the group sets the tone. And ya know what? Not only do all the members stick to those guidelines, but they take it a step further. Support. Virtual hugs. "Congrats to you!" type comments… it’s a really beautiful thing to witness.

Your nursing job may not always give you unconditional love and support. The culture where you work may be the direct opposite. If so, please find a community of support where the culture of the tribe resonates with your soul to make you a better nurse, colleague and person. Then do all the things you can, to pass that supportive culture along. Even if it’s one action at a time.
Looking for RNs & LPNs
Residential positions from June to August at Camp Taum Sauk located on The Beautiful Black River in Lesterville, Missouri. Coed private summer camp ages 8 to 15. Salary plus room and board, family camperships. Swim, canoe, raft, horseback riding, hiking, ropes courses, and more.
For more information call Nick Smith at 314-993-1655, nick@taumsauk.com, www.taumsauk.com

RN Supervisor
Full Time, Evening Shift
What makes us special?
• Positive/Professional Work Environment
• Excellent Quality of Care
• We Work Towards Our Mission Daily
We offer:
403B     Tuition Assistance    Paid Time Off
Applying in Person or send resume to:
Nazareth Living Center
2 Nazareth Lane
St. Louis, MO 63129
Ashley.Voss@bhshealth.org
FAX: 314-649-4669
Are you looking to make a difference?
Come Grow With Us

Inpatient Dialysis RN: We are looking for a full-time experienced dialysis nurse to assist in developing a new inpatient dialysis program. This nurse will work closely with the nephrologist on a continual basis and will help to hire additional nurses after the program is running at full capacity. We need someone who is high energy, conscientious, loves a challenge and desires to have ownership of a program.
Shift: Full-time days
Requirements: RN License (MO) • Minimum 1 year of inpatient dialysis experience or 1 year of ICU experience • BLS and ACLS certification • Excellent communication and interpersonal skills • Positive and professional attitude. Committed to provide excellent customer service.

$8,000 sign-on bonus for full-time.
www.landmarkhospitals.com

Control your schedule. Earn up to $49/hour.

Our Flex RN program offers all the benefits of agency work, with all the comforts of working at Boone Hospital Center.
• Select your commitment level starting at 24 hours per month
• Receive a monthly bonus when minimum working hours are reached
• All shift, weekend and holiday differentials apply
• You decide when you work
For more information or to apply in minutes, visit boone.org/nurse or email our nurse recruiters: kim.fenris@bjc.org or michelle.klethermes@bjc.org
New Board Member Appointments

On October 18, 2018, Governor Parson announced four appointments to the Missouri State Board of Nursing. Dr. Anne Heyen, of Ashland, was reappointed to the Board for another term. Dr. Julie Miller, of California; Dr. Robert Walsh, of Ste. Genevieve; and Dr. Sheila Barrett Ray, of Harrisburg, were appointed as new members.

**Julie Miller, DNP, MBA, FNP-BC, CNOR(E), NEA-BC**

Dr. Julie Miller is a Nurse Practitioner who enjoys her work in a family practice setting in Jefferson City, Missouri. Dr. Miller is also an adjunct instructor for the University of Missouri Sinclair School of Nursing. She is a three-time graduate of the University of Missouri Sinclair School of Nursing having earned a Bachelor of Science, Master of Science, and Doctorate of Nursing Practice. Dr. Miller also has a Master's in Business Administration from William Woods University. She is a licensed Advanced Practice Registered Nurse-Family Nurse Practitioner and holds certifications as a Nurse-Operating Room (emergitus) and a Nurse Executive Advanced. She is a member of the American Nurses Association, Missouri Nurse Association, Association of Missouri Nurse Practitioners, Sigma Theta Tau International Society of Nursing, and the Sinclair School of Nursing Alumni Association. She is president elect of the Sinclair School of Nursing Alumni Board.

Dr. Miller and her husband, Doug, live in California, Missouri. They have two children. Elle is in her second year of dental school at the University of Oklahoma. Mari is in the sixth grade at California Middle School. The family enjoys Mizzou football as well as Mizzou women's basketball and softball. They are also fans of the St. Louis Cardinals. Dr. Miller is a long time and long distance runner having completed over 30 marathons. In addition to running, she enjoys hot yoga and golf.

Dr. Miller is passionate about patient care and the profession of nursing. She is honored to be serving the citizens of the state of Missouri in this capacity.

**Robert Walsh, MBA, MS, PhD, CRNA**

Robert P. Walsh, MBA, MS, PhD, CRNA is Chief Nurse Anesthetist at St. Genevieve County Memorial Hospital in Ste. Genevieve, Missouri. He has more than 35 years of clinical and professional experience.

Walsh obtained a PhD from St. Louis University, an MS in Nurse Anesthesia from Webster University, a BA and MBA from Maryville University, and an AAS degree in both Nursing and Respiratory Therapy from St. Louis Community College.

Walsh serves as adjunct faculty at the Goldfarb School of Nursing at Barnes-Jewish College in St. Louis and is an active member of the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists and Missouri Association of Nurse Anesthetists.

Walsh serves as Chair of the Advisory Board - Respiratory Care at St. Louis Community College at Forest Park and has served on the March of Dimes Nurse of the Year Award Selection Committee since 2017. He was awarded the 2016 March of Dimes Nurse of the Year in the area of Advanced Practice.

Walsh also serves as a board member of the Ste. Genevieve County Memorial Hospital Friends Foundation, a charitable organization which funds healthcare-related projects and programs in the Ste. Genevieve County area.

**Sheila Ray, DNP, CRNA, APN**

Sheila Ray, DNP, CRNA, APN, is a graduate of the University of South Carolina 1977 Associate Degree in Nursing program, followed by Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Bachelor of Arts in English, and Bachelor of Arts in History. She was recognized on the President and Dean's List for academic excellence. Dr. Ray is also a 1991 Graduate of Richland Memorial Nurse Anesthesia Program, and 2016 Doctorate of Nursing Practice program of the University of Missouri Kansas City. Dr. Ray has nursing experience in private, academic, and government healthcare facilities as a contractor, clinical preceptor, and employee. She is currently practicing as an Advanced Practice Registered Nurse, Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetist, at the University of Missouri, School of Medicine providing anesthesia to a high-risk obstetric population. In 2015, Dr. Ray was honored by colleagues and received the Sigma Theta Tau International Award for Clinical Excellence. She is an active member of the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists and Missouri Association of Nurse Anesthetists. Dr. Ray is a published researcher and innovator that developed an anesthetic safety device to reduce adverse patient outcomes.

During the past forty years, Dr. Ray has witnessed the resilience, integrity, professionalism, and compassion of nurses in healthcare environments that encounter challenges and rewards associated with our profession. The ability to provide exceptional care to a child bravely facing a devastating illness, alleviating the pain of a veteran experiencing posttraumatic stress syndrome, optimizing outcomes for a pregnant heroin addict, or supporting patients and family members during life and death challenges have provided nurses with the opportunity to be powerful advocates for vulnerable populations. She is honored to serve on the Missouri Board of Nursing.
Reflections from Outgoing Board Members

Alyson Weter, RN

Alyson Weter, RN, served on the Board of Nursing as the LPN member from 2014 until 2018. She also served as Secretary of the Board from 2015 until 2017. After her departure from the Board, we followed up with Alyson on her thoughts about her service as a Board member.

What/who/why (any of those) encouraged you to join the Board of Nursing?

I applied to be a part of the Board of Nursing because I felt strongly about being a part of the protection of the public. As someone who has come in contact with unsafe healthcare providers both as a patient and as a nurse, it was something I wanted to be a part of.

During the time you’ve spent on the Board, what would you describe as your most important contributions to public protection?

I believe my most important contribution to public protection would be my ability to see each case as its own entity. I think it is so important to look through every case as if it were the first one you had ever read and base your decision solely on its merits. When we say that we handle everything on a case by case basis, it’s true! One of the biggest things I learned as a practicing nurse on the Board is that no one in this world will ever care about your nursing license more than you do. It is up to you to protect your license.

As you complete your time with the Board, what would you say to someone who is considering a Board appointment?

I came onto the Board a little naive as to how much hard work, time, and dedication the Board of Nursing puts into the safety of each and every citizen who seeks healthcare in Missouri. I would tell anyone considering applying for a Board appointment that you have to come into each case with an open mind, and the time and energy necessary and you have to truly care about protecting the public. I don’t think most people have any idea the time commitment and the dedication it takes to be able to read through each case for every single conference call and every single Board meeting with an unbiased opinion, try to sort out the facts, and make the best decision possible for the public. There is a heavy weight that comes with each decision you make that affects someone else’s life, whether it be the nurse or the patient.

Would you recommend Board membership to others?

I would highly recommend Board membership to anyone who feels strongly about keeping patients in Missouri safe. I think that it’s humbling to see how your hard work, time, and dedication the Board of Nursing commitment for the work you apply for a Board appointment that you have to commit a significant amount of time for the work necessary and you have to truly care about protecting the public. I don’t think most people have any idea the time commitment and the dedication it takes to be able to read through each case for every single conference call and every single Board meeting with an unbiased opinion, try to sort out the facts, and make the best decision possible for the public. There is a heavy weight that comes with each decision you make that affects someone else’s life, whether it be the nurse or the patient.

We thank Alyson for her service as a Board member and wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

Rhonda Shimmens, RN-C, BSN, MBA

Rhonda Shimmens, RN-C, BSN, MBA, served on the Board as an RN member from 2009 until 2018 and as President of the Board from 2014 until 2016. The following are her reflections regarding her service on the Board:

I still recall the day in 2009, working in my office, when I received a call from the Governor’s office, asking if I would be interested in applying to be a member of the Missouri State Board of Nursing. At the time, I was working full time and just beginning my Master’s Program. I sought advice from a few individuals, and most of the feedback I received encouraged me not to begin both at the same time. Generally, I appreciate the insight. However, in this situation, I decided to go with my heart, and say yes to the application process. After a nomination, appointment by the Governor, and confirmation from the Senate, I began my service as a board member. I also served as President for two years, and was able to participate on the National Council for State Board of Nursing. It was one of the best decisions I have made.

I recently completed my service, and as I reflect on this experience, I am thankful to have been given the opportunity to serve the citizens of Missouri. With the guidance of Lori Scheidt, Executive Director, I have had the privilege of working with an amazing team of board staff. They are committed to the safety and quality of the nursing profession, and truly have the mission of protecting the public in their best interest at all times. In addition, I have shared this journey with many very bright, talented, and passionate members who have devoted their time and energy to serve on the board. I am grateful for the friendships made, and the respect shown as we discussed important topics and issues facing the future of nursing. It has certainly been a learning opportunity for me, and I gained a new perspective on the role of the board, and the challenges they respond to on a day to day basis.

I would like to thank SSM Health, St. Mary’s Hospital Jefferson City for supporting this appointment, and allowing me to fulfill the commitment to serve. As my term concludes, I would like to welcome and congratulate the new board members, and wish them continued success in the future.

CENTER FOR BEHAVIORAL MEDICINE

Center for Behavioral Medicine (CBM) formerly Western Missouri Mental Health Center is an agency for the Department of Mental Health. The facility is located on Hospital Hill in the heart of Kansas City and provides comprehensive psychiatric care to patients from Kansas City and the seven surrounding counties. CBM currently operates 65 adult acute beds and 25 adult residential beds.

NOW RECRUITING for REGISTERED NURSES

Current MO licensure required. Psychiatric/Mental health experience a plus but not required.

You may fax or email your résumé to (816) 512-7415 or email cbm.hr@dmh.mo.gov.

Applications are accepted in Human Resources at:

Center for Behavioral Medicine
1000 East 24th Street | Kansas City, MO 64108

A Drug-Free/Smoke-Free Workplace | EOE

Center for Legal Nurse Consultants

May 4 & 5

Nashville:

May 4 & 5

St. Louis:

Apr 6 & 7

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT THE SCHOOL OF NURSING

nursing@ucmo.edu
Background

- The NLC allows a nurse (registered nurses [RNs] and licensed practical/vocational nurses [LPNs/VNs]) to have one multistate license in the primary state of residence (the home state) and practice in other compact states (remote states), while subject to each state’s practice laws and discipline.

- Lawful practice requires that a nurse be licensed or have the privilege to practice in the state where the patient is located at the time care is directed or service is provided. This pertains to in-person or telehealth practice.

Employer Confirmation of a Nurse’s Licensure Status

- Employers can confirm a nurse’s license and receive a Nursys QuickReport confirm at www.nursys.com at no cost. The report will contain the nurse’s name, jurisdiction, license type, license number, compact status, license status, expiration date, discipline against license and discipline against privilege to practice. Employers can also view an individualized authorization to practice map which displays the states where a nurse can legally practice.

- All NLC states provide licensure and discipline data to Nursys® directly from the board of nursing (BON) licensure systems. Nursys is primary source equivalent.

- To confirm APRN and temporary licenses, visit the issuing BON website. A temporary license issued by a compact state is valid in that state only and does not carry multistate status.

Licensure and Privileges

- A nurse licensed in a compact state must meet the uniform licensure requirements in the primary state of residence (home state). When practicing on a privilege in a remote state, the nurse is accountable for complying with the nurse practice act of that state.

- A single state license may be issued to an applicant residing in a noncompact state. A license issued by a noncompact state is valid only in that state.

- The NLC permits a nurse to hold one active multistate license issued by the primary state of residence.

- When a nurse is hired in a remote state for a temporary position or commits to the remote state from the primary state of residence (usually an adjacent state), employers cannot require the nurse to apply for licensure in the remote state when the nurse has lawfully declared another state as the primary state of residence. This is based on whether the nurse pays federal income tax, votes or holds a driver’s license. The BON cannot issue a license to a nurse who has declared another compact state as the primary state of residence unless the nurse doesn’t meet the multistate license requirements and is limited to a single state license.

Moving to Another State

Noncompact to Compact:

- The nurse is responsible for applying for licensure by endorsement in the new state of residence. The nurse may apply before or after the move. The multistate license of the former NLC state is changed to a single state license upon changing legal residency to a noncompact state. The nurse is responsible for notifying the board of nursing (BON) in the former NLC state of the new address.

Compact to Noncompact:

- When moving (changing primary state of legal residency) to a new NLC state, it is the nurse’s responsibility to apply for licensure by endorsement. This should be completed upon moving and the nurse should not delay. There is a 90 day grace period. The nurse may practice on the former home state license until the multistate license in the new NLC home state is issued. Proof of residency such as a driver’s license may be required. Upon issuance of a new multistate license, the former license is inactivated.

Definitions

- Compact: An interstate agreement between two or more states established for the purpose of remedying a particular problem of multistate practice. Compact states include: California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin.

- Compact State: Any state that has adopted the NLC.

- Home State: The compact state that serves as the nurse’s primary state of residence.

- Remote State: A compact state other than the home state where the patient is located at the time nursing care is provided or, in the case of the practice of nursing not involving a patient, a compact state where the recipient of nursing practice is located.

- Primary State of Residence (PSOR): The state (also known as the home state) in which a nurse declares a primary residence for legal purposes.

- Noncompact to Compact: The nurse declares a primary residence for legal purposes. Sources used to verify a nurse’s primary residence may include driver’s license, federal income tax return or voter registration. PSOR refers to legal residence status and does not pertain to home or property ownership. Only one state can be identified as the primary state of legal residence for NLC purposes.

- Nurse: This database (www.nursys.com) provides licensure and disciplinary information of all RNs and LPNs/VNs, as contributed by compact states. The public can access Nursys for free to look up a nurse’s license and discipline status.

- Discipline: The responsibility of the nurse to notify the employer of any action taken by the BON against his or her license. Under most circumstances, when a license is disciplined, multistate privileges are removed, restricting the nurses’ practice to the home state.

- Employers may confirm the nurse’s license and disciplinary information of all RNs and LPNs/VNs through the NLC website at www.nursys.com at no cost. Employers will receive e-notifications of disciplinary action taken on any license the nurse holds in the U.S.

- Nurses holding a multistate license are allowed to practice across state lines in other NLC states. However, a multistate license may be converted to a single state license when practice is limited to the home state due to a restriction on the license or some level of disciplinary action.

- Advanced practice registered nurses (APRNs) are not included in this compact. APRNs must apply for APRN licensure in each state in which they practice, unless exempted when employed in a federal facility.
Q1: I live in a noncompact state. How do I get a compact multistate license?

If your legal residence is in a state that joined the compact as of Jan. 19, 2018 (Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and Wyoming), and you hold a single state license in that state, then you should complete the application for a multistate license on your BON website.

Q2: Where is the compact application and what is the application fee?

The state board of nursing (BON) application for licensure by examination or by endorsement, as found on your BON's website. Licensure fees vary by state. If your legal residence is in a state that joined the compact as of Jan. 19, 2018, and you have a current compact license, you may apply for the current compact license by following the steps below.

Q3: I live in a compact state and have a license. How do I know if my license is multistate? How do I get a compact license?

If your legal residence is in one of the original compact states and you held a multistate license on July 20, 2017, you may already have a compact license due to being grandfathered. If you're unsure of your licensure status, use the Nursys® QuickConfirm tool at www.nursys.com.

Q4: I have a compact license. How long can I work in another compact state?

There is no time limit. As long as you maintain legal residency in the state that issued your multistate license and you remain in good standing, you may practice in other compact states.

Q5: What if I move to another compact state?

When permanently relocating to another compact state, apply for licensure by endorsement and complete the Declaration of Primary State of Residence form within the application, which can be found on your board of nursing's website. Your employer must then apply for the new NLC home state license. You may start the application process prior to the move. A new compact license will not be issued until you provide a Declaration of Primary State of Residence (PSOR) form and proof of residence that may be required by the board of nursing (BON). Some states offer a temporary license; this may enable you to practice before your permanent license is issued. Check with your BON to see if they offer one.

Q6: My primary state of residence is a noncompact state, also where I am licensed. I am applying for licensure in a compact state. Do I have to give up my current license?

No, you may choose to keep and renew your current noncompact state license.

Q7: I live in a compact state where I am licensed. How do I get a license in a noncompact state?

If you are applying for a compact license, you should provide in the application for a compact license in the state where you seek a license. You may be issued a single state license valid only in the state of issuance. Applications can be found on that board of nursing’s website.Visit ncsbn.org for board of nursing contact information.

Q8: I am graduating from a nursing program. Can I take the NCLEX® in a different state?

The NCLEX® is a national exam and can be taken in any state to which you are not eligible for a compact license. If a nurse cannot declare a compact state as his/her PSOR, that nurse is not eligible for a compact license. If you were to take an action (while practicing in another state) that would change your primary state of residence, you may be issued a single state license or your application may be held until you move and have proof of legal residency at which time you may be issued a multistate license.

Q9: I live in a noncompact state, but will be changing my primary state of residence to a compact state in a few months for a job. Can I apply for a license in that state now so I can work immediately after moving?

If you are applied for your authorization to test (ATT) and licensure, whether you were issued your home state license until the multistate license in the new NLC home state is issued.

Q10: I live in a noncompact state, but own property in a compact state. Can I get a compact license?

In order to be eligible for a compact license, your declared primary state of residence must be a compact state. Primary state of residence does not pertain to owning property but rather it refers to your legal residency status. Proof of residence includes obtaining a driver’s license, voting/registering to vote or filing federal taxes with an address in that state. These legal documents should be issued by the same state.

Q11: I have a compact license and have accepted a position in another state. Do I have to give up my current compact license?

Yes. You may start the application process prior to the move. A new compact license will not be issued until you provide a Declaration of Primary State of Residence (PSOR) form and proof of residence that may be required by the board of nursing (BON). Some states offer a temporary license; this may enable you to practice before your permanent license is issued. Check with your BON to see if they offer one.

Q12: How does the compact work for military or military spouses?

See military fact sheet on our Toolkit webpage at www.ncsbn.org/6183.htm for additional information.

Q13: How does the NLC pertain to advanced practice registered nurses (APRNs)?

The NLC pertains to registered nurses and licensed practical/vocational nurses licenses only. An APRN must hold an individual state license in each state of APRN practice. Visit ncsbn.org for BON contact information. Visit aprncompact.com for information on that compact.

Q14: Which nurses are grandfathered into the enhanced Nurse Licensure Compact (eNLC) and what does that mean?

Nurses in eNLC states that were members of the original NLC may be grandfathered into the eNLC. Nurses who held a multistate license on the eNLC effective date of July 20, 2017, in original NLC states, may be grandfathered. You can check if you hold a multistate license and the states in which you have the “authority to practice” by following the steps below.

Q15: How can I get a compact license? How do I know if I need one?

If you do not have a multistate license and you need to change your single state license to a multistate, contact the board of nursing. They may require proof of residence such as a driver’s license prior to issuing you a multistate license.

Q16: What is the difference between a compact license and a multistate license?

There is no difference between a compact license and a multistate license. This terminology is used interchangeably to reference the Nurse Licensure Compact (NLC) license that allows a nurse to have one license, with the ability to practice in all NLC compact states.

Q17: What do I need to do before I move to another state?


Q18: What does Primary State of Residence (PSOR) mean?

For compact purposes, PSOR is not related to property ownership in a given state. It is about your legal residency status. Everyone has a legal domicile and a driver’s license, voter’s card, federal income tax return, military form no. 2058, or W2 form from the PSOR. If a nurse’s PSOR is a compact state, that nurse may be eligible for a multistate (compact) license. If a nurse cannot declare a compact state as his/her PSOR, that nurse is not eligible for a compact license. They may apply for a single state license in any state where they wish to practice.
The odd history of regulated and unregulated use results in a patient group with some unique characteristics. They often have come to cannabis for a treatment as a last resort, and feel stigmatized by the unorthodoxy of their use. Despite this, they are drawn to try something new that might alleviate symptoms of their conditions (Crowell, 2016). Marijuana has some clear adverse effects in children and adolescents, and therefore, use is primarily in the adult population. However, Cannabidiol (CBD), a cannabinoid constituent, can be used in an oil form that is widely used to treat intractable seizures in children for which the benefits of seizure reduction are felt to outweigh the risks of adverse effects of minute amounts, if any, of the psychoactive component (Burns, 2018).

Additionally, new indications have moved use into the elderly population (National Council for Aging Care, 2017). A recent breakthrough in this field includes the development of cannabis-derived substances that have been specifically formulated to reduce their psychoactive properties (i.e. THC) (Americans for Safe Access, 2018). Despite the federal prohibition of marijuana and the continued obstruction of federal funding for research, evidence does exist for particular conditions. The accumulation of evidence was assembled in a 2017 National Academies paper, “The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids,” (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017), and in “NCSBN National Nursing Guidelines for Medical Marijuana,” the July 2018 supplement to the Journal of Nursing Regulation (NCSBN, 2018). The NCSBN Board of Directors recognized that nurses were unsure of their responsibilities in the care of these patients, particularly in states that have adopted medical marijuana programs. An expert committee was convened that assembled current evidence as well as guidance for the care of patients on medical marijuana. Additional guidance is provided for those advanced practice registered nurses (APRNs) who might verify that a patient meets a qualifying condition (i.e. those diseases or disorders that are specifically named in the state’s medical marijuana statute) and suggests expanded analysis of this treatment modality in nursing programs. The guidelines include recommendations for curriculum content to be added in registered nurse (RN) prelicensure or APRN nursing education curricula.

The principles of caring for the patient taking medical marijuana are essentially similar to other treatment modalities. The nurse must be familiar with both the evidence and the lack of it. The nurse must also show compassion and follow the nursing process. A particular challenge for nurses is that marijuana preparations come in many dosing forms (i.e. inhaled, topical, and oral) (Minnesota Department of Health, 2018). In most cases, there is not a specific weight-based dose provided, and the patient must trial and error to effect. State and federal regulations do not allow nurses to administer the agent except in the permitted category of “caregiver,” with specific requirements met.

Additionally, marijuana is not prescribed, but rather dispensed, if state-listed condition requirements are met. Health care providers certify to the qualifying condition, but still have a duty to monitor the condition and the patient’s response to this therapeutic option. Indeed, medical marijuana is not a trial of last resort, and providers should always be considering the care of the patient using medical marijuana because such use was varied, and still federally restricted.

Please visit NCSBN’s Guidelines for Medical Marijuana for more information, including a link to the National Nursing Guidelines for Marijuana, now available free of charge.

REFERENCES
Pursuant to Section 335.066.2 RSMo, the Board “may cause a complaint to be filed with the Administrative Hearing Commission as provided by chapter 621. RSMo, against any holder of any certificate of registration or authority, permit, or license required by sections 335.011 to 335.096 or any person who has failed to renew or has surrendered his certificate of registration or authority, permit or license” for violation of Chapter 335, the Nursing Practice Act.

**The Board of Nursing is requesting contact from the following individuals:**

- Kelly Kean – PN 2007028791
- Kara Jean Israel – RN 2014021870
- Christine Michelle Johnson – PN 2005009292
- Maggie Elizabeth Minnigerode – RN 2013044829
- Katherine Montgomery – PN 2005021096

If anyone has knowledge of their whereabouts, please contact Kristi at 573-751-0082 or send an email to nursing@pr.mo.gov.

**CENSURE**

Whalen, Leiza Dawn Blue Springs, MO
Registered Nurse 2002013531

On December 23, 2013, Licensee arrived to work late. Licensee was the operating room nurse assisting doctor KW with a procedure. While Licensee was supposed to be assisting with Doctor KW’s surgical procedure, Licensee left the operating room while her patient was still in the operating room, and was observed in the locker room applying makeup. Licensee did not request for another nurse to provide coverage in the operating room.

**Disciplinary Actions**

- Martin, Mary L. Neosho, MO
  Registered Nurse 094839
  Licensee practiced nursing in Missouri without a license from May 1, 2017 to June 15, 2018.

- Taylor, Katherine Suzanne Washburn, MO
  Registered Nurse 2016013095
  Licensee discharged a newborn patient from the hospital at approximately 21:00. Licensee documented that she had completed a required congenital heart disease screening on the patient at 19:00 on September 2, 2017. When questioned later by hospital administrators, Licensee stated she had not actually completed the screening. Licensee had the patient return to the hospital on September 3, 2017, and completed the screening on September 3, 2017, at 11:50. Licensee failed to return to work for her scheduled shifts on September 8, 2017 and September 9, 2017, and was subsequently terminated.

- Rowland, Nicholas Glen Sedalia, MO
  Licensed Practical Nurse 2008026192
  Licensee practiced nursing in Missouri without a license from June 1, 2016 to May 9, 2018.

- Griffin, Brenda L. Wathena, KS
  Registered Nurse 112192
  Licensee practiced nursing in Missouri without a license from May 1, 2017 to July 26, 2018.

- Carter, Ruby Denise Saint Louis, MO
  Registered Nurse 2010018730
  During early August 2014, Licensee's co-workers began to notice Licensee’s odd behavior and questionable documentation. On the weekend of August 9-10, 2014, Licensee admitted to employer's senior marketing manager to forcefully administering Vicodin to patient D.K., who was fully alert and oriented. Patient D.K. expressed that he did not want the medication. Licensee retorted that she had done so as she believed it “was for D.K.'s own good.” On August 9, 2014, Licensee admitted knowing patient D.K. had fallen in his room, yet she did nothing until another staff member pointed out to her that he had fallen and that staff member helped him up. Licensee admitted to the Board's investigator that she knew that patient D.K. “consistently fell,” and stated she knew he “was on top of a floor mat, not the floor.” On August 13, 2014, Licensee did not document on patient CB, who was assigned to her, for the entire shift. Licensee subsequently terminated.

- Lamb, Michelle Elizabeth Columbia, MO
  Registered Nurse 2014004469
  Licensee practiced nursing in Missouri without a license from May 1, 2017 to July 27, 2018.

- McMeans, Sherri D Lees Summit, MO
  Licensed Practical Nurse 2002005597
  On September 1, 2017, while working the overnight shift, Licensee was taking care of J.P. During the evening of September 1, 2017, Licensee went to the neighbor’s house to continue her shift. Licensee was observed to be unsteady on her feet, with bloodshot eyes and slurred speech. Previously, Licensee had been instructed on the proper way to administer J.P.’s liquid medication as to prevent choking. On September 1, 2017, Licensee did not follow the neighbor’s instruction and administered the liquid medication with the patient on her back, causing the patient to cough and choke.

- Fehley, Elizabeth Anne Grafton, WI
  Registered Nurse 2015040187
  While Licensee was giving report on July 7, 2016, she showed the oncoming nurse a picture of a patient’s wound.
Censure continued from page 9

she had taken on her personal cell phone. Licensee had sent the picture of the patient’s wound with a caption to a nurse that had been previously working as well as showed several coworkers. When questioned, Licensee admitted to sending the picture on Snapchat. Licensee’s actions, through taking the picture and sharing with others, violated the patient’s rights, privacy and dignity.

Nigh, Tammy Michelle
Saint Louis, MO
Registered Nurse 2008003335
On or about October 6, 2017, Licensee had called in an unauthorized prescription for Tranxene for a close family member, a parent. Licensee’s family member is not a patient in the care of the Palliative Care program or a patient of Licensee’s collaborating physician. On October 10, 2017, Licensee notified her collaborating physician that she had called in a prescription for Licensee’s mother for Tranxene. As outlined in the Licensee’s collaborative agreement, “ANP shall not prescribe any drugs, medication, device or therapies that Physician is not qualified or authorized to prescribe.”

Jacobs, Terrilyn B
Chesterfield, MO
Registered Nurse 116412
Licensee practiced nursing in Missouri without a license from May 1, 2017 to August 1, 2018.

PROBATION

Littenk, Michelle Kara
Ballwin, MO
Registered Nurse 2004018546
Respondent received warnings for excessive absenteeism from a hospital. Respondent was asked to submit to a for-cause drug screen due, in part, to incorrect documentation for wasting narcotics. Respondent’s drug screen tested positive for marijuana. Probation 09/26/2018 to 09/26/2023

Reuter, Faye Artis
Vilain, MO
Licensed Practical Nurse 2003018575
A resident’s family expressed to nursing home administrators concerns regarding a bill from the pharmacy for a large amount of hydrocodone, when the family had been informed the medication was for personal consumption. Respondent did not have a prescription for, or a lawful reason to possess, morphine or hydrocodone.

Wagner, Elizabeth Ann
Marshfield, MO
Registered Nurse 2014022820
On May 26, 2018, Respondent submitted to a random drug screen, which tested positive for Ethyl Glucuronide (EtG) and Ethyl Sulfate, metabolites of alcohol. Respondent admitted that she had consumed a glass of wine the night before the test. Probation 09/26/2018 to 09/26/2021

Huffman, Janet M
Springfield, MO
Registered Nurse 123513
Respondent admitted that she took morphine and hydromorphone from the hospital and used them for her personal consumption. Respondent did not have a prescription for, or a lawful reason to possess, morphine or hydromorphone.

Drury, Sasha
Ashland, MO
Registered Nurse 2006010191
From July 28, 2015, until the filing of the Complaint, Respondent failed to check in with NTS on one (1) day, August 2, 2016. Further, on July 10, 2015, Respondent checked in with NTS and was advised that she had been selected to provide a urine sample for screening. Respondent failed to report to a collection site to provide the required sample. In addition, on two (2) separate occasions, August 11, 2016 and September 1, 2017, Respondent reported to lab and submitted the required sample which showed a low creatinine reading.

Perez, Erin Shay
Blue Springs, MO
Registered Nurse 2006010191
On August 11, 2016, the low creatinine reading was 13.8. Respondent’s creatinine reading was 16.4 for the September 1, 2017, sample. A creatinine reading below 20.0 is suspicious for a diluted sample. As part of the terms of her disciplinary period, Respondent was required to completely abstain from the use or consumption of alcohol in any form regardless of whether treatment was recommended. On May 11, 2018, Respondent reported to a collection site to provide a sample and the sample tested positive for Ethyl Glucuronide (EtG) and Ethyl Sulfate, metabolites of alcohol. Respondent admitted that she had consumed a glass of wine the night before the test.

Probation 09/26/2018 to 09/26/2021

Bagby, Alan D
Saint Joseph, MO
Registered Nurse 146218
On June 20, 2014, the Kansas State Board of Nursing issued a Summary Order revoking the Kansas nursing license of Licensee for engaging in unprofessional conduct by soliciting prostitution using company email while working as a nurse and failing to respond to that Boards investigator. On December 29, 2015, Licensee and the Nebraska Board of Nursing entered into a Stipulation and Agreed Settlement, which became effective on January 19, 2016. In the Agreed Settlement, Licensees Nebraska nursing license was placed on probation for a period of three years due to Licensees revocation by the Kansas Board. On or about March 17, 2017, Licensee placed his Nebraska nursing license on an inactive status. Licensees Nebraska nursing license was reinstated on or about September 21, 2017, with the period of probation set to continue until August 5, 2019.

Probation 09/24/2018 to 10/05/2019

Perselli, Kathleen M
Lees Summit, MO
Registered Nurse 146564
An investigation into Licensee’s documentation revealed that Licensee documented visits to clients who denied receiving visits, and also documented visits on a client who was deceased. The investigation further revealed that Licensee was not visiting her clients once per week, as required.

Probation 09/25/2018 to 09/25/2020

Perez, Erin Shay
Blue Springs, MO
Registered Nurse 2013028483
Respondent admitted to ingesting waste from the Fentanyl administered to patients. Respondent submitted to the urine drug screen which was positive for Fentanyl and its metabolites. Respondent did not have a prescription for Fentanyl. On September 8, 2014, Respondent submitted to a pre-employment drug screen. Respondent tested positive for Propoxyphene. On June 26, 2015, Respondent stole Oxycodone by taking it from a patient’s purse. Respondent did not have a prescription for oxycodone. On August 24, 2015, Respondent was arrested for Driving While Intoxicated in Jackson County, Missouri. Respondent pled guilty to the Class B misdemeanor of Driving While Intoxicated on December 12, 2016. She was placed on...
Disciplinary Actions**

probation that included 10-days shock incarceration. Prior to becoming a nurse, Respondent was convicted of Driving While Intoxicated on at least two occasions: January 5, 2012 and February 24, 2005.

Probation 10/22/2018 to 10/22/2023

Ives, Nicole Marie
De Soto, MO
Licensed Practical Nurse 2010037179

On or about October 4, 2017, a resident was transferred to another hall within the nursing home with a medication card containing 42 Percocet tablets. The resident's medication card was handed off to Licensee. On or about October 5, 2017, it was noted that a handwritten narcotic count sheet completed by Licensee for the resident only included 11 Percocet tablets. When questioned, Licensee stated she lost the preprinted pharmacy narcotic count sheet so she created a handwritten count sheet. An investigation by administrators revealed multiple preprinted pharmacy narcotic count sheets torn up in a paper recycle bin. One of the torn up count sheets was for Norco for resident I.N., and was last used on September 22, 2017, with 27 tablets remaining. On September 23, 2017, Licensee started a new medication card and narcotic count sheet for Norco for resident I.N., and was last used on September 22, 2017, with 42 tablets remaining. On September 23, 2017, Licensee started a new medication card and narcotic count sheet for Norco for resident D.T., and was last used on September 22, 2017, with 19 tablets remaining. On September 23, 2017, Licensee created a new shift-to-shift narcotic package count sheet that was last used on September 22, 2017, and noted 19 packages. Licensee created a new shift-to-shift narcotic package count sheet on September 23, 2017, which only noted 17 packets. When questioned about the discrepancies, Licensee denied any knowledge of the missing medication.

Probation 09/07/2018 to 09/07/2020

Griffon, Sandra K
Farmington, MO
Licensed Practical Nurse 026792

On July 26, 2017, a Pharmacist called a patient to verify her prescription for Nystatin 10% in a tube and a Z-Pak. The pharmacist stated that the patient was not a patient of J.B., FNP. Licensee had called a pharmacy for a Z-Pak and Clindamycin 2% for the patient using the name of her coworker. Licensee called in unauthorized prescriptions for Clindamycin 2% on April 28, 2017, May 28, 2017, June 29, 2017, and July 25, 2017. Licensee did not have authorization to call in the prescriptions or to use the DEA registration number.

Probation 09/04/2018 to 09/04/2019

Cook, Heather Rochelle
Battlefield, MO
Registered Nurse 2009020149

Licensee admitted that in February of 2015 she was still experiencing pain, and she had become addicted to her pain medicine. It was about this time she started diverting from the hospital, continuing off and on until September 2016. Licensee also admitted to having a dealer from whom she purchased Oxycodone until October 2017. On September 19, 2017, Licensee self-reported to the Missouri Board of Nursing her addiction to opiates and diversion of Oxycodone from her previous employer. Licensee admitted to obtaining Percocet/Oxycodone for patients, while also taking Tylenol that was floor stock for the nurse employees, and replacing the Percocet/Oxycodone with the Tylenol. Licensee admitted to scanning the Percocet/Oxycodone tablets and patient identification wrist bands but giving the patient Tylenol instead of the Percocet/Oxycodone as ordered.

Probation 11/29/2018 to 11/29/2023

Walker, Alvin T
Saint Peters, MO
Licensed Practical Nurse 044721

From February 3, 2016, until the filing of the Complaint, Respondent failed to check in with NTS on twenty-eight (28) days. Further, on September 6, 2016, June 1, 2017, June 22, 2017, June 27, 2017, August 3, 2017, January 5, 2018, February 6, 2018, March 28, 2018, and April 19, 2018, Respondent checked in with NTS and was advised that he had been selected to provide a urine sample for screening. Respondent failed to report to a collection site to provide the requested sample. The Board did not receive an employer evaluation or statement of unemployment by

the documentation due date of February 22, 2018. The Board did not receive proof of continued support group attendance by the documentation due date of August 22, 2017.

Probation 10/22/2018 to 02/22/2020

Gaffney, Jana I
Lees-Summit, MO
Registered Nurse 2002017908

On or about November 30, 2017, emergency medical personnel found a partially used vial of Fentanyl at the residence of a patient, who is documented as Licensee's mother. Emergency medical personnel reported the Fentanyl issue to the Police Department. When questioned by Hospital administrators, Licensee stated that she had accidentally removed a Fentanyl vial from the Hospital in her work jacket and taken it to her mother's home. A review was done of Licensee's Fentanyl transactions for the three months prior to the incident. The review also showed multiple instances of Licensee failing to properly document the waste of Fentanyl.

Probation 10/10/2018 to 10/10/2021

Miller, Jessica Lynn
Saint Louis, MO
Registered Nurse 2018034556

On February 8, 2011 Applicant pled no contest to Operating a Vehicle Impaired (OVI) after testing positive for marijuana and benzodiazepines following an arrest. On April 2, 2014, Applicant was arrested for possession of a controlled substance and destruction of property. The charges were later dismissed. Applicant admitted to possessing heroin, a controlled substance pursuant to delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and a prescription for oxycodone. Applicant entered treatment at Youth House on October 16, 2014, and was successfully discharged on November 16, 2016. Applicant states that she attends 12-step meetings one to two times per week and has had the same sponsor for three years. Applicant states her sobriety date is October 13, 2014.

Probation 09/19/2018 to 09/19/2019

Sweeney, Fay A
Centerview, MO
Licensed Practical Nurse 054198

On October 21, 2016, officials received a complaint, stating a patient had not received treatment of Nystatin powder. Licensee had documents in the Treatment Administration Record (TAR) that she had administered the treatment, but Licensee failed to record in the nursing notes that she had administered the treatment. Licensee admitted that she had planned to do the Nystatin powder treatment and documented it in the TAR in advance

Probation continued on page 12

Bringer

Be the nurse you've always wanted to be.

A nurse is smart, resourceful and compassionate. A TMC nurse is all those things plus so much more – brave, calm, professional. Our nurses give exceptional care without exception.

Can you bring it? Apply today for a challenging and rewarding career.
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of the treatment, but then failed to actually administer the treatment and did not modify the TAR. On or about November 25, 2016, CHRC was notified of patient's state, that it did not look well. An official examined patient and found him unresponsive and pale. Through investigation, it was found that the patient had been a patient of the Licensee on November 23 and 24, 2016. Licensee failed to document Cournadin medication and to assess patient for bruising and bleeding, as well as not documenting her assessment of patient's condition. On Pratt (JP) drain site for infection. Further Licensee failed to contact patient's physician to notify him in the change in the patient's condition. On November 30, 2016, a patient was involved in a physical altercation with another resident. Licensee failed to document this altercation in the residents nursing notes, to do a physical assessment of the patient, or to notify the resident's physician of these developments. On January 5, 2017, Licensee documented in the TAR that she had applied prescribed antifungal cream with Tufa dressing on patient. This treatment would not have been possible because there was no antifungal cream in the facility on January 5, 2017. Probation 09/05/2018 to 09/05/2021

Wagner, Michael Thomas
Lawrence, KS
Registered Nurse 2017012690
On or about April 3, 2018, Respondent and the Kansas State Board of Nursing agreed, in a Consent Agreement, to the revocation of Respondent's Kansas nursing license. The original Petition, filed by the Kansas Board on September 20, 2017, found the following: On November 8, 2016 while employed at Hospital, the licensee's co-worker reported that he smelled of alcohol. Per the hospital's policy the licensee was then tested for the presence of alcohol. Two tests were both positive for alcohol in excess of 0.04%. Licensee has refused to enter the KNAP program. Respondent consumed approximately one liter of wine every evening for over a year and had consumed that amount the evening prior to taking the breathalyzer tests. Probation 10/09/2018 to 11/04/2018

Powell, Leigh A
Coffey, MO
Licensed Practical Nurse 041008
Licensee did not appropriately destroy medications and did not appropriately witness another nurses destruction of medications. Licensee admitted to diverting three pills of Nuroc or Percocet on two separate occasions for her own personal use.
Probation 10/19/2018 to 10/19/2023

Chumbley, Amber Michelle
Sullivan, MO
Licensed Practical Nurse 2009031098
On or about June 19, 2017, co-workers reported Licensee exhibiting erratic behavior including failing to give report, failing to do the narcotic count, speaking incoherently, and dozing off. The narcotic count was performed by the Director of Nursing and the Assistant Director of Nursing, and multiple discrepancies were discovered. It was noted that Licensee signed out narcotic medication for three residents (J.K., M.R., and W.H) who did not report pain. Urine drug screens performed on the three residents came back negative for opioids. Licensee was asked to submit to a for-cause drug screen, which was returned negative. On or about June 23, 2017, Licensee was asked to submit to a second drug screen; however, Licensee refused to submit the sample. Licensee was terminated from the nursing home effective June 19, 2017, due to refusing to submit to a for-cause drug screen. Probation 10/17/2018 to 10/17/2021

Probation continued from page 11

Bone, Nicole Marie
Warrenton, MO
Registered Nurse 2011021496
At all times relevant herein, Licensee was employed as a registered nurse in the emergency department at a hospital. On or about February 13, 2017, Licensee's name was listed on the proactive diversion report run by Hospital pharmacy. An investigation by Hospital administration revealed questionable documentation of controlled substances by Licensee. The investigation revealed that Licensee failed to document administration or waste of Hydromorphone on numerous occasions. Probation 09/13/2018 to 09/13/2021

Trumbower, Elisabeth Joan
Columbia, MO
Registered Nurse 2011016690
On March 1, 2018, Respondent pled guilty to the offense of Obtaining a Controlled Substance by Misrepresentation, Fraud, Forgery, Deception or Subterfuge. Probation 10/17/2018 to 10/17/2021

Rollett, Katherine Jo
Miller, MO
Registered Nurse 2009016549
On December 11, 2017, Respondent pled guilty to the class C felony of Domestic Assault - 2nd Degree, in violation of §565.073, RSMo., in the Circuit Court of Lawrence County, Missouri, in case number 16LW-CR00272-01. Probation 10/29/2018 to 10/29/2021

Wagner, Michael Thomas
Lawrence, KS
Registered Nurse 2017012690
Licensee's scheduled shift was from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The Staffing Coordinator was informed that licensee was repeatedly late to work, not staying for the entire shift, and having patient's family sign blank timesheets, which did not include beginning and end times. Licensee's timesheets reported arriving at 8:00 a.m. every day. Licensee was confronted by the Staffing Coordinator regarding the incidents, but denied the allegations. Licensee later sent an email stating she was sorry for her actions and understood that there may be consequences for her actions. On October 13, 2017, Licensee was terminated from the agency due to falsifying timesheets. Probation 10/17/2018 to 10/17/2020

Zellner, Brianna Marie
Saint Joseph, MO
Registered Nurse 2012021851
On or about January 14, 2016, a co-worker reported that one of her patient's medications had been removed from the Pyxis under Licensee's name. Licensee admitted that she had been diverting IV Dilsadin and Fentanyl from the hospital for personal use for approximately one (1) year. Probation 10/06/2018 to 10/06/2023

Galvez, Kathy A
Saint Peters, MO
Registered Nurse 2018033519
On or about December 26, 2014, Licensee was arrested for Operating a Motor Vehicle While Intoxicated. Licensee received outpatient treatment at Connections Counseling from January 7, 2015, until March 2016. From July 25, 2015 until August 22, 2015, Licensee received inpatient treatment. On or about February 22, 2016, Licensee applied for licensure as a Registered Nurse with the Oregon State Board of Nursing. Licensee self-reported her DUI arrest and substance abuse treatment. On June 23, 2016, Licensee signed a Stipulated Order with the Oregon Board withdrawing her application due to failing to meet the Boards minimum 18 month sobriety requirement. The Stipulated Order became effective on July 13, 2016. On or about January 30, 2017, Licensee signed an Agreement to Practice with Conditions with the Washington State Department of Health. Licensees credential to practice as a registered nurse in the State of Washington was approved on February 8, 2017, provided that Licensee participate in the Washington Health Professional Services monitoring program based upon her history of alcohol use. Licensee was additionally granted the credential to practice as an advanced practice registered nurse practitioner in the State of Washington on or about March 6, 2017. On or
Browning, Jennifer Irene  
Auxvasse, MO  
Registered Nurse 2010022745  
On January 4, 2017, a patient’s physician notified officials that patient’s prescription for Percocet was replaced with another prescription. Surveillance showed the prescription was picked up by a pharmacy, and the pharmacy’s user activity report was also reviewed, which showed discrepancies with documentation of administration, waste or return by the Licensee. Licensee also filled a prescription for another patient for Norco, then diverted the medication for her own personal use. Licensee was asked to submit to a for-cause urine drug screen on January 5, 2017. Licensee’s urine sample was confirmed positive for the presence of hydrocodone, hydromorphone, alprazolam, oxycodone, and oxymorphone by the medical review officer on January 14, 2017. Licensee admitted to the Board’s investigator that she had diverted narcotics for her own personal use.  
Probation 09/04/2018 to 09/04/2023

Phillips, Alicia Shannon  
Prairie Village, KS  
Registered Nurse 2009034893  
When questioned by her employer about discrepancies in a client’s file, Respondent admitted to forging the signature of the patients’ mother on three (3) occasions. Respondent stated that she forged the signatures because she was under time constraints and unable to get the signatures at the time of the patient’s visits. Respondent admitted to the Board’s investigator that she had forged the mother’s signature on the three (3) forms.  
Probation 09/26/2018 to 09/26/2019

Carter, Lydia Catherine  
New Madrid, MO  
Licensed Practical Nurse 2009026211  
On or about April 7, 2016, the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) completed an investigation which showed that Licensee had submitted Nursing Visit Reports for multiple patients on multiple occasions for visits that she did not actually perform. The DHSS investigation found the following: Licensee falsified the Nursing Visit Report for patient R.D. on thirteen occasions; Licensee falsified the Nursing Visit Report for patient J.W. on sixteen occasions; Licensee falsified the Nursing Visit Report for patient S.R. on thirteen occasions; Licensee falsified the Nursing Visit Report for patient S.T. on two occasions. When questioned, Respondent failed to complete and submit documentation of the successful completion of the Peer Assistance Program, and Respondent’s Oklahoma nursing license was subsequently revoked for two (2) years, effective December 16, 2013. At the disciplinary hearing, Respondent admitted that she is an alcoholic. At the hearing, Respondent also admitted to consuming alcohol when she travels to Oklahoma to visit her sister.  
Probation 10/22/2018 to 10/22/2023

Winser, Sandra Dawn  
Independence, MO  
Licensed Practical Nurse 2008036737  
On September 24, 2013, Respondent and the Oklahoma State Board of Nursing entered into a Stipulations, Settlement and Order (Order) finding that Respondent’s Oklahoma nursing license was subject to discipline for multiple guilty pleas, including the following: Operating a Motor Vehicle While Under the Influence of Alcohol; Unauthorized Possession of Marihuana; Assault, and; Driving While Intoxicated. Pursuant to the Order, Respondent was granted licensure in Oklahoma, subject to temporary suspension. The temporary suspension was to be set aside upon the Board’s receipt of documentation of Respondent’s acceptance into the Peer Assistance Program within 60 days of the date the Order was provided. If Respondent is not accepted into the Peer Assistance Program within sixty (60) days of licensure, or having been accepted is terminated from the Program for any reason other than successful completion of Respondent’s contract and treatment plan, Respondent’s license is hereby revoked for a period of (2) years. Respondent failed to complete and submit documentation of the successful completion of the Peer Assistance Program, and Respondent’s Oklahoma nursing license was subsequently revoked for two (2) years, effective December 16, 2013. At the disciplinary hearing, Respondent admitted that she is an alcoholic. At the hearing, Respondent also admitted to consuming alcohol when she travels to Oklahoma to visit her sister.  
Probation 10/22/2018 to 10/22/2023

Moore, William DeVery  
Grandview, MO  
Registered Nurse 2018039138  
On or about January 16, 2014, Licensee pled guilty to the felony offense of Bank Fraud. Licensee was given five (5) years probation and ordered to pay $41,908.99 in restitution.  
Probation 10/25/2018 to 10/25/2020

Bernard, Ronald L  
Sturgeon, MO  
Registered Nurse 121378  
Staff reported Licensee may be using narcotics in the workplace. Upon completion of a drug screen and returning to the facility, Licensee admitted to diverting Fentanyl. Licensee’s urine sample was confirmed positive for the presence of Fentanyl. Licensee admitted to the Board’s investigator that he diverted Fentanyl waste for his personal consumption and would waste saline instead of the excess Fentanyl. Licensee did not have a prescription or lawful reason to possess the Fentanyl he diverted.  
Probation 11/09/2018 to 11/13/2018

Nelson, Debra Lynn  
O'Fallon, MO  
Licensed Practical Nurse 2012040150  
On April 5, 2018, Respondent pled guilty to the class D misdemeanor of Stealing, Value Less Than 150.00 dollars, in the Circuit Court of Lincoln County, Missouri. Respondent was given a suspended imposition of
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of sentence with two years of supervised probation. Respondents guilty plea was the result of the Respondent misappropriating medications from her employer.

Owens, Terrie L
Union, MO
Registered Nurse 086110
Respondent failed to check in with NTS on ten days. On April 11, 2017; August 15, 2017; October 24, 2017; April 6, 2018; May 15, 2018; and, June 4, 2018, Respondent checked in with NTS and was advised that she had been selected to provide a urine sample for screening. Respondent failed to report to a collection site to provide the requested sample. On February 29, 2016, Respondent reported to a collection site and submitted the required sample which showed a low creatinine reading. The Board did not receive an employer evaluation or statement of unemployment by the documentation due dates of October 16, 2015, January 18, 2016; October 17, 2016; April 17, 2017; July 17, 2017; and June 18, 2016. Additionally, the Board received untimely employer evaluations on January 25, 2017 for the January 16, 2017 due date; on November 15, 2016; and October 16, 2017 due date; and on January 30, 2018 for the January 16, 2018 due date. To date, the Board has only received timely employer evaluations for Respondent's unemployed sample by three of the twelve due dates. On April 11, 2018, the Board received a nursing performance evaluation form for Respondent that indicated the Respondent was counseled to improve but had been held within the past three months. It also indicated that the employer was unsure as to whether Respondent was maintaining abstinence from all mood-altering chemicals, pointing to a counseling session held on April 5, 2018. On April 5, 2018, Respondent received counseling for working while impaired. Respondent was reportedly drooling, had speech problems, had food on her face and in her hands, and had mud on her clothing. She was told not to return to work until she saw her physician.

Brown, Jaundaaine Rochelle
Raymore, MO
Registered Nurse 20009004506
From April 4, 2017 until the filing of the Complaint, Respondent failed to check in with NTS at all on eight days, and failed to check in with NTS within the required time window on fifteen days. In addition, on September 27, 2017, Respondent reported to a lab and submitted the required sample which showed a low creatinine reading. A creatinine reading below 20.0 is deemed diluted sample and considered a false alcohol test by the Board and a violation of the terms of probation. On June 28, 2018, Respondent submitted a urine sample for random drug screening. That sample tested positive for the presence of amphetamine. Respondent did not have a valid prescription or other lawful reason to possess amphetamine when she tested positive on June 28, 2018.

Voluntary Surrender

Bernard, Ronald L
Sturgeon, MO
Registered Nurse 121373
Licensee voluntarily surrendered his license effective November 14, 2018.

Wagner, Michael Thomas
Lawrence, KS
Registered Nurse 2017012690
Licensee voluntarily surrendered his Missouri nursing license effective November 5, 2018.

Love, Daren C
Jefferson City, MO
Registered Nurse 126455
Licensee Voluntarily Surrendered Voluntary Surrender 10/30/2018 to

Snowbush, Arvy
Kansas City, MO
Registered Nurse 2012028386
On or about July 7, 2018, Licensee entered into an Agreed Order (Order) with the Texas Board of Nursing finding that Licensee's privilege to practice was subject to discipline and would be sanctioned. The Order became effective on July 11, 2018.

Roberson, Jamie Lynn
Canton, TX
Licensed Practical Nurse 2013036688
On April 12, 2018, the Iowa Department of Inspections and Appeals, Division of Administrative Hearings, issued its Proposed Decision affirming the decision of the Iowa Department of Inspection and Appeals, Health Facilities Division, placing Licensee's name on the dependent adult abuse registry for exploiting a dependent adult. The Proposed Decision became effective on April 27, 2018.

Rodriquez, Lori A
Gower, MO
Registered Nurse 136272
On March 9, 2016, Respondent withdrew Fentanyl from the Pyxis for a patient who was not assigned to her. Hospital management conducted an investigation into Respondent's narcotic administration for the previous thirty (30) days. On February 11, 2016, Respondent withdrew 100 mcg of Fentanyl for patient WC at 08:29, 08:30, and 10:57 for a total of 300 mcg of Fentanyl. Respondent failed to document the administration, waste, or return of the 100 mcg of Fentanyl. On February 18, 2016, Respondent withdrew 100 mcg of Fentanyl for patient identified as BB.O. at 09:22. Respondent failed to document the administration, waste, or return of the 100 mcg of Fentanyl. On February 18, 2016, Respondent withdrew a Fentanyl/Bupivacaine epidural for patient identified as BB.O. at 08:33. Respondent failed to document the administration, waste, or return of the Fentanyl/Bupivacaine epidural. On February 18, 2016, Respondent withdrew 100 mcg of Fentanyl for patient CO identified as C.R.W. at 12:42. Respondent failed to document the administration, waste, or return of the 100 mcg of Fentanyl. On February 18, 2016, Respondent withdrew 4 mcg of Morphine for patient CO at 13:23. Respondent failed to document the administration, waste, or return of the 4 mcg of Morphine. On February 29, 2016, Respondent withdrew 100 mcg of Fentanyl for patient SW at 14:08. Respondent failed to document the administration, waste, or return of the 100 mcg of Fentanyl. On March 2, 2016, Respondent withdrew 100 mcg of Fentanyl for patient MJ at 13:46. Respondent failed to document the administration, waste, or return of the 100 mcg of Fentanyl. On March 8, 2016, Respondent withdrew 100 mcg of Fentanyl for patient SWR at 11:40. Respondent failed to document the administration, waste, or return of the 100 mcg of Fentanyl. On March 9, 2016, Respondent withdrew 100 mcg of Fentanyl for patient ST at 09:02. Respondent failed to document the administration, waste, or return of the 100 mcg of Fentanyl. Respondent failed to properly document what happened to controlled substances that were in her possession.
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Executive Summary

For the past few decades, the United States has not produced enough primary care physicians. Moreover, too few primary care practitioners in rural and medically underserved areas, and the number of people lacking adequate access to primary care has increased. Meanwhile, studies have piled up pointing to the high-quality care that nurse practitioners (NPs) provide, and increasing numbers of policy-influencing bodies have recommended expanding the use of NPs in primary care. Yet, barriers to the expansion of NPs persist, and, consequently, tens of millions of Americans lack adequate access to primary care services. This report describes and integrates new evidence from a research program focused on the primary care workforce, NPs’ role in primary care, and the potential for NPs to help solve the problem of Americans’ access to quality primary care.

Among other things, the research summarized in this report establishes that it is unrealistic to rely on the physician workforce alone to provide the primary care Americans need, particularly for Americans in rural areas, who are generally older, less educated, poorer, and sicker. Many primary care physicians are expected to retire over the next decade, while demand is increasing for primary care. So current shortages of primary care are projected to worsen, with even fewer physicians practicing in rural areas. And as the proportion of physicians who are married to highly educated spouses increases, the already formidable challenges of attracting physicians to Health Professional Shortage Areas will become even more daunting.

Our findings examine trends in the supply of NPs and physicians, showing that the NP workforce has increased dramatically and is projected to continue growing while the physician workforce will grow minimally. Further, we find, as do other studies, that compared to primary care medical doctors, primary care nurse practitioners (PCPNs) are more likely to practice in rural areas, where the need for primary care is greatest.

Our research shows that people living in states with more restrictive NPs’ scope-of-practice significantly less access to PCPNs. This finding indicates that state regulations have played a role in impeding access to primary care. This alone should be cause for concern among policymakers seeking to improve public health.

Using different data and methods, the studies described in the Executive Summary show that NPs significantly more likely than primary care physicians to care for vulnerable populations. Nonwhites, women, American Indians, the poor and uninsured, people on Medicaid, those living in rural areas, Americans who qualify for Medicare because of a disability, and dual-eligibles are all more likely to receive primary care from NPs than from physicians. NPs, whether they work independently of primary care physicians or with them, are more likely to accept Medicaid recipients, provide care for the uninsured, the medically underserved, and patients who do not work with NPs. Another major finding is that, after controlling for differences in patient severity and hospitalization rates, Medicare beneficiaries by NPs was significantly lower than primary care provided by physicians. Even after accounting for the lower payment NPs receive relative to physicians, the cost of NP-provided care was still significantly lower.

However, the viability of increased reliance on NPs still depends on the simple question at the core of this project: Can NPs provide health care of comparable quality to that provided by primary care physicians? Our studies showed that when beneficiaries who received their primary care from NPs consistently received significantly higher-quality care than physicians’ patients in several respects. While beneficiaries treated by physicians received slightly better services in a few respects, there were discrepancies among the findings of many other studies conducted over the past four decades.

Furthermore, state-level NP scope-of-practice restrictions do not help protect the public from substandard health care. Analysis of different classifications of state-level scope-of-practice restrictions provided no evidence that physicians’ patients had better health outcomes and better-quality care. Some physicians and certain professional medical associations have used the restrictions to limit the share of patients with Medicare assigned the scope-of-practice on the grounds that they are necessary to protect the public from low-quality providers and to assert that physicians must be the leaders of the health care team. We found no evidence to support their claim.

Further, our analysis showed that Medicare beneficiaries living in states with reduced or restricted NP scope-of-practice were more likely to use more resources than were beneficiaries in states without such restrictions. This indicates that these beneficiaries had less access to the positive contributions of NPs.

Detecting the body of evidence, our national survey of primary care clinicians revealed that around one-third of primary care physicians believe increasing the number of NPs would improve the health and ability of physicians. They point to the positive contributions of NPs.

The evidence leads to three recommendations that can increase the supply of primary care physicians and to improve the uneven distribution of primary care physicians throughout the United States and other countries:

1. First, private and public policymakers should remove restrictions on NPs that limit their scope-of-practice.

A Solution To America’s Primary Care Crisis

The doctors are fighting a losing battle. The nurses are like insurgents. They are occasionally beaten back, but they’ll win in the long run. They have economics and common sense on their side.

Uwe Reinhardt, Professor of Economics at Princeton University

Nearly 30 years ago, in 1991, well-known physician and thought leader Gordon Moore wrote in the Journal of the American Medical Association: “Primary care is the most affordable safety net we can offer our citizens.”

The National Academy of Medicine defines primary care as “the first point of contact between the patient and the health care system.”1 Other definitions emphasize the broad range of conditions managed by primary care, the prevention of illness, and the coordination of care among other providers and clinicians. “Primary care services” by clinicians who are accountable for addressing a large majority of personal health care needs, developing a sustained relationship with patients, and managing the comprehensive and coordinated care of individuals across and across the continuum of care.”2

Primary care clinicians typically treat a variety of conditions, including high blood pressure, diabetes, asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and certain professional medical associations have used the restrictions to limit the share of patients with Medicare assigned the scope-of-practice on the grounds that they are necessary to protect the public from low-quality providers and to assert that physicians must be the leaders of the health care team. We found no evidence to support their claim.

Furthermore, state-level NP scope-of-practice restrictions do not help protect the public from substandard health care. Analysis of different classifications of state-level scope-of-practice restrictions provided no evidence that physicians’ patients had better health outcomes and better-quality care. Some physicians and certain professional medical associations have used the restrictions to limit the share of patients with Medicare assigned the scope-of-practice on the grounds that they are necessary to protect the public from low-quality providers and to assert that physicians must be the leaders of the health care team. We found no evidence to support their claim.

Further, our analysis showed that Medicare beneficiaries living in states with reduced or restricted NP scope-of-practice were more likely to use more resources than were beneficiaries in states without such restrictions. This indicates that these beneficiaries had less access to the positive contributions of NPs.

Detecting the body of evidence, our national survey of primary care clinicians revealed that around one-third of primary care physicians believe increasing the number of NPs would improve the health and ability of physicians. They point to the positive contributions of NPs.

The evidence leads to three recommendations that can increase the supply of primary care physicians and to improve the uneven distribution of primary care physicians throughout the United States and other countries:

1. First, private and public policymakers should remove restrictions on NPs that limit their scope-of-practice.
They also prescribe medications, including controlled substances, in all 50 states and DC, and 50 percent of all NPs have hospital-admitting privileges. 14

The ANA report that the nation’s 248,000 NPs (87 percent of whom are prepared in primary care) provide one billion patient visits yearly. 15 NPs are prepared in the major primary care specialties—family health (60.6 percent), care of adults and geriatrics (21.3 percent), pediatrics (4.6 percent), and women’s health (3.4 percent)—and provide most of the services that physicians provide, making them a natural solution to the physician shortage. 16 NPs can also specialize outside of the primary care setting in areas such as obstetrics and gynecology, cardiology, orthopedic surgery, neurology, dermatology, and many other specialties. 17

Further, NPs are prepared in fewer than physician assistants for providing the same services. Medicare reimburses NPs at 85 percent of the rate of physicians, and private payers pay NPs less than physicians. 18 On average, NPs earn $105,000 annually. 19 NPs’ role in primary care dates to the mid-1960s, when a team of physicians and nurses at the University of Colorado developed the concept for a new advanced-practice nurse who would help respond to a shortage of primary care at the time. 20 Since then, numerous studies have assessed the quality of care that NPs provide (see Table 1, in Table 1, in 2018, 23 states allowed the full practice of NPs, 16 states reduced certain areas of NP practice, and 12 states were classified as restricting NP practice. 21 The survey also found that 57 percent of NPs reported receiving more patients per day than the average of PCMDs, while 77 percent agreed that NPs should practice to the full extent of their education and training. Additionally, 72.5 percent said having more NPs would improve timeliness of care, and 52 percent reported it would improve access to health care services.

Nevertheless, physicians have met such efforts with mixed response. Many physicians favor the use of NPs, at least in theory. A 2012 national survey of PCMDs found that 41 percent reported more collaborative practice with primary care nurse practitioners (PCNPs) and 77 percent agreed that NPs should practice to the full extent of their education and training. Additionally, 72.5 percent said having more NPs would improve timeliness of care, and 52 percent reported it would improve access to health services.

However, one-third of PCMDs said they believe the expanded use of PCNPs would impair the quality and effectiveness of primary care. 22 The survey also found that 57 percent of physicians were concerned about NPs being able to provide care outside of the primary care setting. While 41 percent of PCMDs provided care with another health care provider in order for the NP to provide patient care, 23 24

Current Restrictions on PCNP Practice

To protect the interests of PCMDs, the American Medical Association (AMA), American Academy of Family Physicians, and some state and county medical associations favor state-level legal restrictions on the scope of practice that an NP can perform. Whether in primary care or acute care delivery settings. In fact, many states impose varying degrees of legal restrictions on NPs, which the AANP has classified as follows: 25

- Full Practice. State practice and licensure laws allow all NPs to evaluate patients, diagnose patients, order and interpret diagnostic tests, and treat patients using existing medical knowledge—excluding prescribing medications and controlled substances—under the exclusive licensure authority of the state board of nursing. 25

- Reduced Practice. State practice and licensure laws reduce NPs’ ability to engage in at least one element of NP practice. State law limits the setting of one or more elements of NP practice or requires a collaborative practice agreement with another healthcare provider in order for the NP to provide patient care. 25

- Restricted Practice. State practice and licensure laws restrict NPs’ ability to engage in at least one element of NP practice. State law restricts career-long supervision, delegation, or team management by another healthcare provider in order for the NP to provide patient care. 25

Table 1. State Level-Scope-of-Practice Regulatory Restrictions on Nurse Practitioners, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Practice</th>
<th>Reduced Practice</th>
<th>Restricted Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Safriet contends that scope-of-practice restrictions on NPs impede ability to provide care to the full extent of their education and training, which is undesirable for both NPs and PCMDs. Eighteen years later, she again argued for removing these regulatory obstacles to allow Americans better access to care at a more affordable cost. This report builds on Safriet’s argument and adds a potential framework for reform that would allow NPs to best practice according to their abilities and allow Americans more affordable access to health care, especially in rural areas.

Research

The concept of expanding the use of NPs and removing restrictions on their practice has gained traction since the ACA was being developed. Health workforce analysts have long been concerned with the shortage of primary care physicians and the persistent inability of graduate medical education programs to produce enough physicians to meet this need. Indeed, the ACA contains many provisions aimed at addressing these and other workforce-supply problems.

One such provision was the establishment of the National Health Care Workforce Commission to advise Congress and the administration on national health workforce policy. I was appointed to the commission and agreed to serve as its chairperson. Anticipating that the commission would be asked to address the shortage of primary care physicians, I assembled teams of investigators to assess the feasibility and desirability of expanding PCNP roles in primary care. The workforce issues discussed most frequently among health policymakers, members of Congress, state legislators, and their staffs concern the quality and costs of NPs and their potential to alleviate the shortage of primary care physicians. These issues guided the assessment of whether NPs can fix the labor supply problems among primary care providers. The specific questions on the minds of the policy community included:

Geographically, where do primary care physicians practice, and where do PCNPs practice?

How large are current shortages of primary care physicians? Will the primary care physician workforce grow in the future? Will the NP workforce grow in the future? Are PCNPs willing to accept people enrolled in Medicaid?

How do the services that PCNPs provide compare to the services that PCMDs provide?

Are there differences in the characteristics of people who are treated by PCNPs and PCMDs?

What is the potential for NPs to increase access to primary care and help alleviate shortages and uneven distribution of primary care physicians?

Do state-level regulatory restrictions placed on NPs limit Americans’ access to primary care?

The answers to the above questions will help bring us toward a framework for more effective primary care. This report describes key results of research conducted since 2011 that aimed to answer these questions. It integrates the studies’ findings with the results of other published research and makes recommendations for both public and private policymakers on improving the capacity of the nation’s primary care workforce. The results of these studies are presented as further proof of the benefits of using NPs to provide more Americans in more places with the primary care they need.

Solutions: Study Results

To address these questions, the research was divided into three areas of analysis: (1) assessing the contributions of NPs providing primary care, (2) projecting the supply of physicians and NPs while assessing the geographical disparities of the primary care workforce, and (3) reviewing the policy implications of the primary care workforce. Each area focused on a different element of primary care shortages and how well NPs could address those issues. Each of these areas parallel the questions we set out to answer:

- The analysis of NP contributions identified the types, quantity, costs, and quality of primary care that NPs and physicians provide to Medicare beneficiaries. It also assessed whether state level NP scope-of-practice restrictions affect the quality of primary care that Medicare beneficiaries receive.

- The projections and geographical analyses examined the geographic locations of the primary care physician and NP workforce, investigated barriers physicians face in locating their practice in rural locations, and projected the future supply of physicians and NPs.

Nurse Practitioners continued on page 18

February, March, April 2019  Missouri State Board of Nursing

Missouri State Board of Nursing

The most obvious and crucial question is whether NPs can provide the same quality and types of care that physicians currently provide. Driving down the cost of and increasing accessibility to health care is a worthwhile goal. But if the quality of primary care provided by PCNPs is not up to par, they present a far less attractive remedy.

For these reasons, this report begins with the findings of the NP analysis team, which asked: What are the types, costs, and Access to care of primary care services provided by PCNPs, and how do they compare to the primary care provided by PCMDs? Are there differences in the characteristics of people treated by PCNPs versus PCMDs? And do state-level scope-of-practice restrictions on PCNPs affect the quality of primary care?

While hundreds of studies have assessed different ways that NPs contribute to providing primary care, there are lingering questions about the costs and quality of NP-provided care, questions not fully answered by prior studies. Consequently, it is difficult to generalize the care provided by NPs and physicians. In all, despite ways that NPs contribute to providing primary care, there are questions not fully answered by prior studies. Consequently, it is difficult to generalize the care provided by NPs and physicians. In all, despite.

Costs of Primary Care

Because of Medicare, PCNP-provided primary care will expand rapidly as baby boomers age. Total Medicare spending will increase substantially in the years ahead. Consequently, providing access to health care without bankrupting the Medicare program is a growing concern. The next study used national Medicare claims data from 2010, to assess 16 indicators of the quality of care provided by PCNPs and PCMDs and Medicare beneficiaries. Beneficiaries treated by PCNPs who received such services cost Medicare 10 percent less than the cost of PCMD-provided care. The large differences in costs between PCNPs and PCMDs existed even after taking into account that Medicare pays PCNPs at 85 percent of the rate of physicians for the same services. Due to limitations inherent in using claims data, we could not fully investigate the reasons for the differences in costs. But we believe they may be explained in part by differences in the style of NP practice, as NPs tend to provide more holistic care relative to the more disease-focused care provided by physicians. Preliminary evidence from ongoing analyses also suggests that PCNPs order about one-third fewer services, and they are more likely than physicians to use less expensive services. Of course, if that reflected decreased quality of care, it would be a major problem for a proposal to expand NP practice. As noted in Appendix A, this study is not the first to find that NPs provide cost-effective care.

Quality of Care

While numerous studies have concluded that NP-provided care is comparable and in some cases better than PCMD-provided care (see Appendix A), some of these studies analyzed a limited number of clinical conditions, did not adequately control for patient-selection biases and disease severity, and assessed quality measures over brief time periods, which makes it difficult to generalize results to broader groups of patients. Consequently, the next study used national Medicare claims data from 2012 and 2013 to assess 16 indicators of the quality of primary care that PCNPs and PCMDs provided to Medicare beneficiaries. To include beneficiaries who may have received care by a team of PCNPs and PCMDs, the analysis covered a third group of beneficiaries who had received primary care services from both types of clinicians over a 12-month period. Across all five measures, the study found that the cost of PCNP-provided care ranged between 11 percent and 29 percent less than the cost of PCMD-provided care.

Overall, study findings indicated that specific types of care were better when provided by PCNPs, and others were better for NP and physician care. For example, Medicare beneficiaries who received primary care from PCNPs were less likely than those cared for by PCMDs to have preventable hospital admissions, all-cause hospital readmissions within 30 days of being discharged, inappropriate emergency department visits, and low-value MRIs associated with low back pain. Beneficiaries who had received primary care predominantly from PCNPs were more likely to receive slightly more of recommended chronic management and preventive care (see Appendix A), who have also found that NPs provide primary care to vulnerable populations and that PCNPs are more likely to practice in rural and underserved areas.

Quality of Care Provided to Vulnerable Medicare Beneficiaries

For example, the first study using Medicare claims data found that PCNPs were significantly more likely than PCMDs to provide primary care to beneficiaries who are more likely to have multiple comorbidities, such as diabetes, chronic lung disease, and Alzheimer’s disease, and are more likely to receive potentially inappropriate medications. For all these reasons, the need for effective and cost-efficient solutions for primary care is particularly salient for Medicare beneficiaries who are below the poverty line. People with disabilities are less likely to receive recommended preventive care such as screenings for breast and cervical cancer. On average, people with disabilities receive differential treatment for Medicare services and are more likely to receive potentially inappropriate medications. Low-income patients face significant access barriers to care and receive fewer screenings (such as colonoscopies) and preventive services (such as vaccinations).

Could increased practice by PCNPs help remedy this inequity? This question was addressed by using 2012 and 2013 Medicare claims data to identify and compare the quality of care provided by PCNPs and PCMDs and received by beneficiaries in three subpopulations: (1) those who initially qualified for Medicare based on a disability, (2) dually eligible beneficiaries, and (3) beneficiaries who received primary care predominantly from PCNPs. Across all five measures, the study found that the cost of PCNP-provided care ranged between 11 percent and 29 percent less than the cost of PCMD-provided care. Across all five measures, the study found that the cost of PCNP-provided care ranged between 11 percent and 29 percent less than the cost of PCMD-provided care.
Medicare beneficiaries had a lower risk of preventable hospitalizations and emergency department use than those cared for by PCMs. They also used fewer of other health care resources such as low-value imaging for low back pain. Several studies have shown that patients cared for by a characteristic, Medicare beneficiaries in the area of chronic disease management, these beneficiaries were less likely than those treated by PCMs, and that health care services consistent with established guidelines. However, diabetic patients across these subpopulations who were cared for by PCMs were less likely than those cared for by PAs, despite having the same number of uninsured people, particularly in non-Medicare-expanding states. The number of physicians per 100 physicians in patient characteristics, organizational characteristics, and performance incentives that could not be measured and analyzed in the Medicare claims data. The study’s results suggest that increasing PCP involvement in care could be a key policy strategy to expand access to primary care at a lower cost while not compromising quality for Medicare’s most vulnerable beneficiaries.

Forecasts of Primary Care Workforce Supply and Location Findings of the studies we conducted, briefly summarized in this section, are:

- On the eve of the 2014 ACA insurance expansions, rural areas of non-expanding states had 31 percent fewer primary care physicians per 10,000 people than those in non-Medicare-expanding states.
- PCNs, though fewer in number than PCPs, are less likely to practice in rural areas than are physicians.
- People living in states that do not restrict NP scope-of-practice lived in areas with significantly greater geographic access to primary care.
- Between 2016 and 2030, the size of the NP workforce will increase dramatically, growing 6.8 percent annually, compared to 1.1 percent growth of the physician workforce. Combined, the physician and NP workforce will increase by approximately 30 percent. NPs will account for 61 percent of this growth (240,000 workers).
- The number of physicians practicing in rural areas had decreased by 15 percent between 2000 and 2016 and is forecasted to decline further through 2030.
- Can PCPs help remedy the acute shortage of primary care in rural areas? The first study conducted to answer this question focused on identifying the geographic location of primary care physicians, NPs, and PAs—a finding that the ACA’s insurance expansions starting in January 2014. It assessed whether geographic access to primary care changed between 2010 and 2016.

Findings showed that, in 2014, large urban areas had the highest density of primary care physicians, NPs, and PAs, whereas the most rural areas of the country had 357 fewer primary care physicians per 10,000 people than the urban areas. However, in the states that did not expand Medicaid enrollment as of January 2015: Rural areas of non-expanding states averaged 441.1 primary care physicians per 100,000 people. The number of PCPs per 100 physicians will double to about 56.4 by 2030.

In a different study, we focused on the location of the physician workforce, examining a different factor: whether a physician is likely to practice in rural areas and underserved areas.46 Guiding the study was the hypothesis that highly educated dual-career households would more easily accommodate both spouses in large metropolitan areas. Analyzing data going back to 1960, the study found that physicians were increasingly less likely to be married, particularly to physicians in rural areas.

The proportion of physicians married to highly educated spouses has grown dramatically over the past 50 years, and these physicians are significantly less likely to practice in rural shortage areas.

The number of PCPs in rural areas decreased by 15 percent between 2000 and 2016 and is forecasted to decline further through 2030.
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Forecasts of Primary Care Workforce Supply and Location Findings of the studies we conducted, briefly summarized in this section, are:

- On the eve of the 2014 ACA insurance expansions, rural areas of non-expanding states had 31 percent fewer primary care physicians per 10,000 people than those in non-Medicare-expanding states.
- PCNs, though fewer in number than PCPs, are less likely to practice in rural areas than are physicians.
- People living in states that do not restrict NP scope-of-practice lived in areas with significantly greater geographic access to primary care.
- Between 2016 and 2030, the size of the NP workforce will increase dramatically, growing 6.8 percent annually, compared to 1.1 percent growth of the physician workforce. Combined, the physician and NP workforce will increase by approximately 30 percent. NPs will account for 61 percent of this growth (240,000 workers).
- The number of physicians practicing in rural areas had decreased by 15 percent between 2000 and 2016 and is forecasted to decline further through 2030.
- Can PCPs help remedy the acute shortage of primary care in rural areas? The first study conducted to answer this question focused on identifying the geographic location of primary care physicians, NPs, and PAs—a finding that the ACA’s insurance expansions starting in January 2014. It assessed whether geographic access to primary care changed between 2010 and 2016.

Findings showed that, in 2014, large urban areas had the highest density of primary care physicians, NPs, and PAs, whereas the most rural areas of the country had 357 fewer primary care physicians per 10,000 people than the urban areas. However, in the states that did not expand Medicaid enrollment as of January 2015: Rural areas of non-expanding states averaged 441.1 primary care physicians per 100,000 people. The number of PCPs per 100 physicians will double to about 56.4 by 2030.

In a different study, we focused on the location of the physician workforce, examining a different factor: whether a physician is likely to practice in rural areas and underserved areas.46 Guiding the study was the hypothesis that highly educated dual-career households would more easily accommodate both spouses in large metropolitan areas. Analyzing data going back to 1960, the study found that physicians were increasingly less likely to be married, particularly to physicians in rural areas.

The proportion of physicians married to highly educated spouses has grown dramatically over the past 50 years, and these physicians are significantly less likely to practice in rural shortage areas.

The number of PCPs in rural areas decreased by 15 percent between 2000 and 2016 and is forecasted to decline further through 2030.
The Future of Primary Care Providers: Attitudes, Knowledge, and Behavior

Understanding the future of PCMCs and PCNs relies on projections for their fields: What kind of people are and will grow to be, PCMs and PCNPs? Where, how, and for what pay do they work? Our national survey of PCMs and PCMCs (the first national survey of both types of clinicians) provides information to help address these questions. The survey (62.2 percent response rate) gathered information on the practice characteristics of both PCMCs and PCMs. It also collected data on the attitudes, knowledge, and behavior of both types of clinicians toward shortages in the primary care workforce, the impact of expanding the number of PCMCs, PCNPs’ scope-of-practice, quality of care, responsibility for providing specific services and procedures, job satisfaction, willingness to recommend a career in health care, and other issues. Key characteristics of sampled PCMCs and PCNs include:

- On average, PCNs are older but have fewer years of experience than PCMCs.
- PCNs work in a greater variety of health care settings (e.g., offices, schools and universities, offices, parishes, prisons, etc.) than do PCMCs.
- The majority of PCNs (81 percent) reported working with PCMs, while 13 percent work independently of PCMs. Additionally, 41 percent of PCNs said they work with PCMCs.
- On average, PCNs work fewer hours per week than PCMCs (37 hours versus 46 hours) and see fewer patients per week (67 patient visits versus 89 patient visits).
- PCNs, alone and working with PCMCs, are more likely to treat vulnerable populations, including those on Medicaid. PCMCs reported they are more likely to practice in rural areas.
- Both types of primary care clinicians spend their time in nearly identical ways and provide similar services, but 56 percent of PCNs received a financial benefit, such as admitting privileges, or that they should be paid the same as physicians for providing similar services.

PCNs reported that government and local regulations impede their ability to reach patients in hospitals, make hospital rounds on patients, and write treatment orders in hospitals and long-term care facilities.

In several areas, survey results indicated that physicians’ attitudes as individuals do not match their practice behaviors. For example, although most PCMCs (77 percent) agree that PCNs should practice to the full extent of their education and training. However, they do not agree that a primary care practice led by an NP is as effective as one led by a PCMD. In fact, a majority of PCMCs said that NPs should be legally allowed to hospital-admitting privileges, or that they should be paid the same as physicians for providing similar services.

PCMs reported that government and local regulations impede their ability to reach patients in hospitals, make hospital rounds on patients, and write treatment orders in hospitals and long-term care facilities.

In several areas, survey results indicated that physicians’ attitudes as individuals do not match their practice behaviors. For example, although most PCMCs (77 percent) agree that PCNs should practice to the full extent of their education and training. However, they do not agree that a primary care practice led by an NP is as effective as one led by a PCMD. In fact, a majority of PCMCs said that NPs should be legally allowed to hospital-admitting privileges, or that they should be paid the same as physicians for providing similar services.

As large numbers of primary care physicians retire over the next decade and demand increases for primary care, the number of PCMCs and PCNs will grow much more quickly than the physician workforce. The number of PCMCs and PCNs will grow much more quickly than the physician workforce. The number of PCMCs and PCNs will grow much more quickly than the physician workforce. The number of PCMCs and PCNs will grow much more quickly than the physician workforce. The number of PCMCs and PCNs will grow much more quickly than the physician workforce. The number of PCMCs and PCNs will grow much more quickly than the physician workforce. The number of PCMCs and PCNs will grow much more quickly than the physician workforce.
of effective primary care for many Americans who need it. This, plus three recommendations that can help overcome the growing challenges facing the delivery of primary care in the US. Each recommendation is geared toward a different group of policymakers, private payers, PCPs, and PCNs.

1. Private policymakers—including hospital boards of directors, established and emerging integrated health-care–delivery systems (e.g., large hospital-based systems and accountable care organizations), private commercial and not-for-profit insurers, hospital administrators, and patient associations, and education associations, and health foundations—should develop forums to bring PCPs, PCMs, and their respective state and local associations together to engage in meaningful dialogue. Hospital boards and credentialing bodies should allow NPs to practice to the fullest extent of their training and ability. The evidence suggests that this will be a great service to people lacking access to care and to the solvency of Medicare. (Doors as individuals) overwhelmingly favor allowing NPs to practice to the fullest extent of their training and ability. This can become a reality on a hospital-to-hospital, health-care system-to-health-care system basis.

2. Physicians must understand that NPs, too, are providing health care to those in need. NPs focus on relationships and trust, a concept that can better understand each other. It may behoove individual physicians and nurses to discuss how, together, disagreements can be better managed, even if the strategies might not be cost-effective. This will help build a relationship that allows for roles and practices to evolve—that respects each other’s strengths and builds trust. The evidence suggests that this is more important to communities’ health needs, particularly in rural and underserved areas and among vulnerable populations.

3. Policy makers should eliminate the practice of dropping the restrictions on PCPN scope-of-practice. These are regressive policies aimed at ensuring that doctors are not usurped by NPs, which is not a particularly worthwhile public policy concern, especially if it comes at the expense of public health. The evidence presented here suggests that scope-of-practice restrictions do not ensure patients safe. They actually decrease quality of care overall and leave many vulnerable Americans without access to health care. Policy makers are selected for what are they: a capitation of the interests of physicians’ associations.

Conclusion

The evidence discussed in this report points to a commonsense solution to primary care workforce-supply inadequacies. The authors believe that the growth of the primary care physician labor force. NPs are more likely to work in rural areas, which already do and will continue to work with NPs (which is not a particularly worthwhile public policy concern, especially if it comes at the expense of public health. The evidence presented here suggests that scope-of-practice restrictions do not ensure patients safe. They actually decrease quality of care overall and leave many vulnerable Americans without access to health care. Policy makers are selected for what are they: a capitation of the interests of physicians’ associations.
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