

Guam Board of Nurse Examiners

Thursday, March 13, 2025, at 3:00 PM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83082079769?pwd=1NtQymIhdRmvvQw2SSmgli8KH3NjbP.1>

Meeting ID: 830 8207 9769

Passcode: 096099

MINUTES

Item		Discussion		Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
I	Call to Order	Chaired by: Greg Woodard		Chair	1503	Called to Order
	Proof of Publication	Guam Daily Post Ads and Public Portal		HPLO	1503	Confirmed
	Roll Call	GBNE Members: <u>Virtual Attendance:</u> ☑Greg Woodard, APRN-NPC, AOCNP, Chair ☑Anna Varghese, RN, DNP, Vice Chair ☐Charlotte Huntsman, GMRC, Public Member ☑Philip John Calalo, DNP, RN, Treasurer ☑Brenda Manzana, LPN, Secretary ☑Gia Ramos, RN ☑Margarita Gay, Member	Other Attendees: <u>Present at HPLO:</u> Rosemary Carman, HPLO Don Sulat, DPHSS/HPLO <u>Virtual Attendance:</u> Breanna Sablan, HPLO Acting Administrator Relida Sumaylo, DPHSS/Executive Officer Amanda Shelton, DPHSS/Acting Director Joaquin Blaz, DPHSS/Acting Deputy Director Baltazar Hattori III, DPHSS/HPLO	GBNE	1504	Quorum Established
II	Approval of Agenda	<p>G. Ramos addressed a topic from the previous meeting regarding the inclusion of a list of approved licenses in the agenda. She noted that this would allow board members to stay informed about who is being licensed. However, this item was not present in the current agenda. She emphasized that it is part of the board's responsibility to be aware of who is being licensed. She mentioned that the list used to be part of the agenda but had been removed, and recalled that the suggestion to add it back into the agenda had been made during their last meeting. The list would include approved RN, LPN, CNA, and APRN licenses.</p> <p>B. Manzana expressed agreement with the suggestion to include the list of approved licenses, noting that it had been part of the agenda in the past. It was emphasized that having this list would provide clearer guidance on monitoring and tracking licensed individuals. She shared her experience with the board's website, mentioning that when she attempted to locate information about approved licenses, she was unable to find a direct link or a way to view the data for renewals, endorsements, or new applications. R. Sumaylo raised the question of whether the list should include the names of individuals or just the types of licenses approved, such as RN, LPN, APRN, and CNA. It was agreed that the list would be included as an attachment rather than as part of the main publication, allowing board members to stay informed about who is being licensed without having to publish the individual names. She confirmed that she could prepare an attachment containing the number of approvals for each category, including</p>		GBNE	1506	Unanimously Adopted, Discussion on Improving the Structure of the Agenda was Noted

Item	Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
	<p>RN, APRN, CNA, and LPN. The board members acknowledged that this solution was workable and acceptable.</p> <p>G. Ramos also revisited a question raised by M. Gay during the previous meeting regarding the board members no longer signing off on license approvals. It was acknowledged that the EO had assumed this responsibility, but it was also agreed that the board would conduct a random review of 5% of the approved RN licenses. G. Ramos suggested that this review should be incorporated into the agenda moving forward.</p> <p>R. Sumaylo inquired whether the random review of 5% of approved RN licenses was conducted during Z. Pecina's tenure, expressing uncertainty about the process due to being new to the board. It was clarified that while a motion had been made to implement the review, it was unclear whether it had been carried out. It was also noted that there had been no formal report from the office confirming whether the review took place.</p> <p>G. Woodard provided some historical context on the license approval process, explaining that in the past, a lengthy list of professionals needing licensure would be reviewed, and board members would vote to approve or disapprove each individual. This process became cumbersome, so the responsibility was shifted to the EO, particularly for cases where there were no issues such as outstanding court cases that would prevent approval. It was understood that only problematic cases would appear on the board's agenda. The member noted that there was now a desire to change this approach and incorporate random reviews of 5% (or approximately 2.5 individuals) of the licensed professionals to be presented on the agenda, to better track and understand who is being licensed. The concern is that the board might not have a clear overview of the licensing process, suggesting that if this remained a concern, perhaps the board should return to voting on all approvals. G. Woodard acknowledged he may be reiterating points from the previous meeting.</p> <p>R. Sumaylo stated that she would defer to the board's decision on how to proceed with the approval process. She offered two options: the board could either receive a list of all applicants for review and approve them collectively, or she could provide the board with a list of applicants that she anticipated would not be approved and present that in the agenda. She emphasized her willingness to follow whatever decision the board chose.</p> <p>M. Gay raised a concern about the volume of applicants each month, asking whether the number of new applications is high or low, especially during renewal periods. She explained her previous experience as an executive officer, where she would review all applications, approving those that met all requirements, and bringing any questionable cases to the board for further review. In the past, the process involved reviewing only a small number of new applicants, typically five or six, where the entire board would assess the files together, vote on them, and discuss any issues. She expressed a desire to understand the current volume of applications before deciding on the process. She emphasized that the board's responsibility is critical, especially with RN and APRN licenses, which require more careful consideration due to their significance. She acknowledged that if the workload becomes too overwhelming, the board may need to reconsider the approach, but she emphasized the importance of</p>			

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<p>ensuring the board remains diligent in its responsibilities.</p> <p>D. Sulat confirmed that the topic of how the board will approve licenses for RNs, APRNs, and CRNAs would be added to the agenda for the next month's meeting. He noted that any changes to the approval process would impact the board's operations and referenced a previous vote that had determined the current operating procedures, as mentioned by G. Woodard. It was clarified that the issue of license approvals would be discussed in detail during the next meeting, as it was not included in the current agenda that was publicized.</p> <p>M. Gay expressed uncertainty, stating that the office should have a clear understanding of the average number of applications coming in and out, as the board currently lacks a listing or clear overview of this information.</p> <p>B. Manzana raised a concern about the agenda being too general, making it difficult to determine what topics could be discussed during the meeting. She suggested that for the next meeting, the board should collaborate with the Chair, the officers, or herself as Secretary to create a more detailed and structured agenda. This would help ensure that discussions stay on track and align with the items listed. She emphasized the need for clearer organization to prevent veering off-topic and to avoid situations where concerns are raised but cannot be addressed because they were not included in the agenda.</p> <p>G. Ramos addressed M. Gay's question, acknowledging that the office does not have information on how many RNs, LPNs, and APRNs had been processed for January and February. With the board already in March, B. Manzana proposed, even though it was not on the agenda, that they start gathering numbers for January as a baseline. She noted that since it was a renewal year, there would likely be a significant influx of applicants. G. Ramos also suggested that it would be helpful to know if any applicants held multiple licenses. B. Manzana reminded that she was unable to retrieve any information from the website, having tried to check the publication.</p> <p>G. Ramos then proposed that a motion be made to add the topic of tracking the number of licenses being processed to the next month's agenda, so that the board could be better informed. Dr. Calalo asked if the team agreed with this suggestion and called for a motion to proceed.</p> <p>R. Carman clarified that the board could not vote on any issues that were not listed on the agenda. She confirmed that the proposed topic would be added to the agenda for the next month, as it was important to address. She explained that while the board could not discuss or vote on items not on the agenda during the current meeting, the issue would be brought to the Chair and included in the next agenda for further discussion.</p> <p>As Secretary of the Board, B. Manzana, requested to work with the staff and the Chair to improve the structure of the agenda for the next meeting, ensuring that it is clearly outlined and organized to prevent</p>			

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		discussions from going off-track. <i>Motion to Approve: G. Woodard; 2nd: Dr. Varghese.</i>			
III	Approval of Minutes	Minutes dated 02/13/2025 <i>Motion to Approve: G. Woodard; 2nd: B. Manzana.</i>	GBNE	1526	Unanimously Approved
IV	Treasurer's Report	Dr. Calalo stated that there were no new updates to report, aside from the financial information that had already been emailed the previous week. He confirmed that the latest financial amounts should have been received by board members via email. G. Woodard acknowledged receiving the email. G. Ramos suggested that, for the next meeting, the office should provide a budget for the current year. G. Woodard asked if G. Ramos was making a formal motion, she confirmed and motioned that the office should provide a budget to be reviewed alongside the treasurer's report at the next meeting. <i>Motion to Request Budget for 2025 at Next Meeting: G. Ramos; 2nd: G. Woodard.</i>	Dr. Calalo	1526	Noted, Budget for 2025 Was Requested by the Board.
V	Committee Reports	<p>Rules and Regulations (Proposed). G. Woodard inquired about updates regarding the attorney reviewing the rules and regulations to ensure they can be approved by the legislature. R. Sumaylo responded that the Rules and Regulations Committee still needed to finalize the inclusion of requirements related to the CDC, as this was necessary for moving forward with the NLC to allow for multi-state licenses. The Executive Officer confirmed that the only remaining issue was updating the rules to include the criminal background check. The committee members, Dr. Varghese and B. Manzana, were identified, and a plan was made for Dr. Varghese to coordinate with R. Sumaylo via email to arrange a meeting once R. Sumaylo returned.</p> <p>G. Ramos reminded the other members that if they wished to propose any additional changes to the rules and regulations during the amendment process, this would be a good time to submit those suggestions to Dr. Varghese and B. Manzana.</p> <p>B. Manzana suggested that, in the past, each board member had been assigned a specific section of the rules and regulations to review in order to divide the workload and make the process more manageable. She proposed that the same approach could be applied this time, allowing board members to take responsibility for different sections and provide additional input, beyond just Dr. Varghese and herself, to ensure a thorough review.</p> <p>G. Woodard confirmed that the process of assigning sections for review had already been completed. Dr. Varghese agreed and clarified that the revisions had been taken care of and that the board was now simply waiting for final approval. She explained that Dr. Calalo had handled the practice section, and the revisions had been shared with all board members, who were given deadlines to complete their review, which had been adhered to. Dr. Varghese noted that she herself had worked on the APRN section, focusing on education and practice.</p> <p>B. Manzana confirmed that the only remaining issue was the fingerprinting portion, which was being</p>	GBNE	1528	Noted, Board is Awaiting Final Approval

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<p>tracked. She then inquired about the status of the fees, asking whether a proposal had been submitted. G. Woodard responded that a proposed fee increase had already been discussed and voted on, with the fees going up by a certain percentage across the board. B. Manzana acknowledged this and thanked him for the reminder.</p> <p>G. Ramos noted that they were still unsure of the status of the proposal. B. Manzana suggested that keeping ongoing issues, such as the fee proposal, on the agenda until they are fully resolved would be helpful. This approach would ensure that all relevant topics are tracked and addressed until they are closed.</p>			
VI	Nursing Education	No Report	Dr. Varghese	1532	No Report
VII	Administrator's Report	<p>A. GBNE Complaints</p> <p>1. GBNE-CO-20-007/1, 2, 3, 4, 6 & 7 Received 9/16/20.</p> <p>G. Woodard reminded that it was recommended that the complaint be sent to an outside party for assessment outside of Guam, and at one point, funding was being secured to facilitate this review. In the meantime, the complaint remains on the agenda. He acknowledged that the complaint has been pending for a while and attributed the delay to challenges in securing the necessary resources to complete the process.</p> <p>B. Sablan reported the requisition for procuring an off-island consultant to address the complaint has been ongoing for two fiscal years, but efforts to secure this through a small purchase procurement have been rejected by the procurement office, which is managed by the external agency, GSA. As a result, the formal process recommended is a request for proposal, which is a lengthy and detailed procurement process. She mentioned that she, along with, D. Sulat, would be working on this process and expected to provide an update during the April meeting.</p> <p>A question was raised by G. Ramos regarding the minimum budget required for an RFP, specifically asking what the budget threshold would be to outsource the complaint review.</p> <p>In response to the question, B. Sablan clarified that the exact amount cannot yet be determined. The process involves issuing an advertisement and collaborating with the assigned attorney general to define the scope of services. While in the past, an off-island expert or specialist could be procured through a purchase order for amounts between \$3,000 and \$5,000, the rejection of that method now requires going through a formal RFP process, which is managed by the Attorney General's office. She further explained that the process includes working on the scope of services for the investigator, a task being handled with the assigned attorney, M. Schrader. B. Sablan also noted that the contract for legal services expired in the previous fiscal year, and they currently do not have a procured attorney under the Guam Board of Nurse Examiners.</p> <p>G. Ramos expressed concern regarding the perception that the board appears inefficient due to the</p>	B. Sablan	1532	On-Going, Small Purchase Procurement has been Rejected. Request for Proposal Will be Created and Update will be Given Next Meeting

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<p>prolonged delay in addressing the complaint. She asked for clarification on whether the complaint has been pending for several months or if it has been an issue for years.</p> <p>G. Woodard acknowledged that the complaint has indeed been pending for years, even before the COVID pandemic. He agreed with the sentiment that in order to ensure an unbiased opinion, the review should be conducted off-island. He further noted that while the process within government is slow and arduous, it must be followed, and despite its inefficiency, the government typically reaches the right outcome.</p> <p>B. Sablan reminded the board that while concerns were raised about inefficiency. She emphasized that the board had the option to either adopt the decision made by the off-island investigator or make a different recommendation. However, the current situation is a result of having to adhere to procurement laws, which has led to the delay in moving forward.</p> <p>B. Manzana asked for clarification on the average turnaround time for completing the procurement process so that the board could move forward with hiring an outside investigator. She sought a more concrete timeframe to better understand how long it might take before the procurement could be finalized.</p> <p>B. Sablan explained that they could not provide an exact timeframe but noted that they had been attempting to procure an investigator for two years via a purchase order, which was unsuccessful. After finally receiving a response from GSA, the process now requires a request for proposal, which typically takes between six to nine months. This timeline is further impacted by the need to work with the Office of the Attorney General, specifically the attorney assigned to the board. She mentioned having an idea of the scope of services, but it must be reviewed and approved by the attorney before the contract can be prepared and processed. The contract would also need approval from the director, board chair, and the Attorney General. As a result, the expected timeline for completion is still approximately six to nine months, though efforts are ongoing to move the process forward and provide an update to the complainant.</p>			
		<p>B. NCSBN Travel</p> <p>R. Sumaylo turned to the mid-year travel plans for the NCSBN, with the individuals involved identified as herself, Dr. Calalo, and B. Sablan. G. Woodard referred to the minutes and B. Manzana's comments and suggested that upcoming meetings be listed on the agenda, allowing board members to indicate their intention to attend these meetings.</p> <p>B. Manzana asked B. Sablan, along with R. Sumaylo, to identify the upcoming NCSBN events, as they are responsible for managing the NCSBN passport and tracking travel arrangements. B. Manzana mentioned the upcoming disciplinary meeting and the annual event but was uncertain about the exact dates. She requested information on how many members could attend each event under the waiver and asked for a vote to determine who would be eligible to attend.</p>			Noted, Upcoming NCBSN Travel Updates will be in the Agenda in Order to Select Members to Travel in the GBNE Regular Meetings.

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<p>B. Sablan clarified that they had already provided information about the upcoming NCSBN events to the board in February and via email. She also noted that the general public could access event details on the NCSBN website. For tracking purposes, the 2025 Discipline Case Management Conference is scheduled for April 29th and 30th in Sonoma, California. Initially, the opportunity was offered to four board members, but since they are unavailable, two members can now attend. NCSBN will fund the airfare for two members, but lodging, transportation, and meals will be at the board members' expense. The board will review the available funding to assist with these costs. Regarding other events, the 2025 Executive Officer Summit will take place on June 3rd and 4th, with the location still to be determined, and R. Sumaylo, the executive officer, will be attending. For the 2025 Annual Meeting, scheduled for August 12th to 15th in Chicago, Illinois, the chair, G. Woodard, and the vice chair, Dr. Varghese, are confirmed to attend, and the board can vote on who else should be included. Additionally, for the annual meeting, there may be an option for a third individual to attend with a waiver, though this information is not finalized yet. In the past, up to three attendees have been funded for the annual meeting.</p> <p>B. Manzana expressed her interest in attending the annual conference, highlighting that the NLC would be discussed during the event. She inquired about the process for board approval and how the board would move forward with her request to attend in August. G. Ramos confirmed that G. Woodard and Dr. Varghese are already confirmed to attend the annual conference, and B. Manzana has expressed interest in attending as well. She invited anyone else who might be interested to voice their intentions. If no one else expresses interest, G. Ramos felt that B. Manzana should be able to attend and suggested that the board should ultimately decide who will attend. She emphasized the importance of planning ahead and having such events included in the agenda so that board members can manage their schedules, accordingly, expressing satisfaction that this issue was being addressed ahead of the August conference.</p> <p>B. Sablan reminded the board members of the travel requirements, acknowledging the interest in attending the upcoming annual meeting in August. She emphasized that there are specific requirements outlined in a director's order that she has already shared with the board. B. Sablan also highlighted the importance of clearing up any previous travel arrangements for board conferences or training, noting that failure to do so could prevent future travel for both board members and staff.</p> <p>A question was raised by G. Ramos seeking clarification on what "clearing" means in the context of travel requirements, specifically asking for the definition of "clearing" as mentioned by B. Manzana. B. Sablan explained that "clearing" refers to the process of preparing and submitting the necessary documentation when requesting to travel and represent the government of Guam or the board. This includes providing a justification for the travel, detailing its impact, and submitting fiscal documents. After returning, a trip report must be completed, including boarding passes and a detailed PowerPoint presentation. The presentation should be shared with the board so that members who did not attend can review the information and discuss it at a future board meeting. G. Woodard interjected, pointing out</p>			

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<p>that GovGuam does not fund travel to these meetings, as the NCSBN covers the expenses. He questioned why GovGuam would have any oversight over the travel arrangements in that case.</p> <p>B. Sablan clarified that even though GovGuam does not fund the travel, there are still protocols and policies that need to be followed within the government of Guam when traveling to represent the board, as outlined by the nursing council and national council of state boards. She explained that regardless of whether the travel costs the government zero dollars or a significant amount, the liability ultimately falls on GovGuam. Therefore, the process must still be followed, which was shared with the board members through the director's order and email.</p> <p>G. Ramos asked whether this is a new process, as it had not been implemented in the past. She mentioned that Z. Pecina had previously been responsible for submitting the travel requests and justifications and asked if that was correct. She also suggested that it might have been the executive officer's responsibility to complete and submit the necessary forms, as no one else appeared to have done so.</p> <p>G. Woodard suggested creating a one-page form that would meet all of GovGuam's travel requirements. This form would be completed by participants after attending a meeting to fulfill the necessary government obligations. He also proposed that a simple PowerPoint slide could be presented during the board meeting to meet the reporting requirement. He acknowledged that, while this process had not been required in the past, he understood that ignorance of the law does not exempt them from it. He expressed appreciation for knowing the executive officer's perspective on this viewpoint and welcomed the input from other board members on the proposal.</p> <p>J. Blas, the Acting Deputy Director and Chief of the General Administration, clarified that it is a requirement for all government representatives, whether traveling with local or federal funds or on zero-funded travel, to complete and have a Tribal Authorization form approved. This is to ensure that the individual is officially representing the government. He explained that in the past, some board members, not necessarily from this board, travelled without this authorization, which could create issues if something were to happen during their travel. The authorization, which must be approved by the Director of Public Health, the Director of BBMR, and the Director of DOA, is intended to protect both the traveler and the department. He also confirmed that B. Sablan's statement about the Budget Act requiring a travel report is correct, and this is something that is sent to the speaker on a quarterly basis. J. Blas noted that although this process had not been followed by this particular board in the past, which was under a different administrator, under the current administration, they are ensuring all travel requirements are met to avoid issues in the event of an audit and to protect the board members.</p> <p>G. Ramos and B. Manzana confirmed that the board had previously addressed the travel authorization process during meetings and that including NCSBN travel on the agenda would provide a forum to discuss and manage travel matters. They expressed no issue with complying with the process and</p>			

Item		Discussion	Responsible Party	Reporting Timeframe	Status
		<p>thanked J. Blas for providing clarification. They also noted that, in the past, Z. Pecina and the staff had handled the TAs and related administrative tasks, with B. Sablan contributing by putting together and submitting the necessary packets.</p> <p>J. Blas acknowledged that some travel authorizations were not completed, as they had checked the report sent to the legislature and could not find certain documents. He informed B. Sablan that moving forward, to protect the board, they would ensure that all required travel authorizations are properly completed. G. Ramos proposed a motion to include NCSBN travel updates in the agenda, allowing the board to decide who will attend the meetings. She suggested that the board would make a recommendation, and then the executive office would submit the necessary forms for compliance, detailing who is attending and the purpose of their trip to the conferences. G. Woodard seconded the motion. B. Manzana suggested that NCSBN travel updates, including any travel authorizations and necessary clearances, be added to the administrator's report. B. Sablan confirmed that she could include these updates in her report moving forward, ensuring that all relevant travel details and authorizations are addressed.</p> <p>R. Sumaylo inquired about the travel process, noting that in the government, even if recommendations are made regarding travel, the director is typically the final authority on who can attend. She asked if this would apply to the board as well, where the board would recommend attendees, but the director would ultimately approve of the travel. B. Sablan confirmed that the board's role is to be recommended, but the director would make the final decision. Once approved, the TA form will then be completed.</p> <p>J. Blas clarified the travel process, stating that the board makes a recommendation on who should attend, and the HPLO office then prepares the travel authorizations. These are forwarded to his office, where they are checked for funding and verified for compliance. Once reviewed, the travel authorizations are sent to the director's office for final approval and signature. The process is similar to that followed by other government employees, with the director's signature being the final step in approving the travel.</p> <p><i>Motion to Add NCSBN Travel Updates to Agenda: G. Ramos: 2nd: G. Woodard</i></p>			
XI	Next Board Meeting	Next Scheduled Meeting will be Thursday, April 17, 2025 at 3pm.	GBNE	1600	Set Meeting Date.
XII	Adjournment	<i>Motion to Adjourn: G. Woodard; 2nd: G. Ramos.</i>	GBNE	1601	Adjourned

Minutes Drafted by: FLAME TREE Freedom Center, Inc.

Date Submitted: 3/13/2025

Submitted by the GBNE Secretary:

Date: 4/14/2025

Approved by the GBNE with or without changes:

 APPROVED, AOC/NF

Date: 4/10/2025

Certified by or Attested by the Chairperson:

 APPROVED, AOC/NF

Date: 4/10/2025