c i n h c   **California Institute for Nursing & Health Care**
Optimizing the Health of Californians through Nursing Excellence

WHITE PAPER:
NURSING EDUCATION REDESIGN FOR CALIFORNIA
(Grant #1046)

Final Report

Submitted to the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation

May, 2008

Prepared by:
Jan Boller, Project Director – Nursing Education Redesign
Deloras Jones, Executive Director
Bob Patterson, Administrative Director
California Institute for Nursing & Health Care

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The need to build educational capacity in schools of nursing has been identified as California's most urgent nursing workforce need. However, in the rush to educate more nurses and build educational capacity, we must ensure that quality is not compromised. The preparation of nurses must evolve consistently with the health care needs of our citizens as well as with ever-changing healthcare delivery system. Nursing education must effectively prepare nurses to provide safe and quality patient care in today's health care settings. Educational systems need to adapt in a timely manner to prepare nurses to practice in tomorrow's healthcare environment.

As the focus on patient safety and preventing medical errors has intensified, with increased regulatory and consumer scrutiny, nurse executives in clinical settings have raised serious concerns regarding the entry-level skills of new graduates and their ability to practice at safe levels, requiring substantial resource investments by health care organizations to train new graduates.

Four additional driving factors are influencing the need to examine nursing education. These factors are converging and driving an imperative to identify the best teaching modalities and develop more effective and efficient methods to educate nursing students.
1. Changing patient demographics and demands from patient care delivery systems requiring new skills and competencies;
2. The impact of clinical simulation, technology, and informatics on nursing education, offering new ways to learn;
3. The nursing shortage requiring new ways to educate nurses; and
4. Renewed interest in collaboration and articulation among nursing education programs for seamless advancement to BSN and graduate levels of education.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The aim of this project grant was to lead a consensus-building process involving key thought leaders throughout the state to produce a White Paper, which examines the need to reshape nursing education in California and to identify strategic priorities and actions for nursing education redesign. Elements of the White Paper include:

- An in-depth investigation of the best and latest thinking on transformation of nursing education and evidence-based education, technology- and simulation-based education, and core competencies for new graduates to make a successful transition to practice, given the complexities of health care in the 21st Century.
- An examination of factors driving the need for redesign as well as enhancing and limiting influences that determine the success of education reform,
- Recommended priorities for action based on intensive consensus-building among key thought leaders throughout California and informed by top experts.
- A strategic action plan that
    - defines the action steps to accomplish the redesign
    - provides plans for building broad-based consensus within the nursing education and practice communities,
    - identifies potential sources of funding to finance the redesign, and
    - educates policy makers and potential funders on the need for redesign.

COSPONSORSHIP

Cosponsors for this project included the California Board of Registered Nursing (BRN), California Association of Colleges of Nursing (CACN), Associate Degree Nursing Directors - North and South (ADN-No/So), Association of California Nurse Leaders (ACNL), and the American Nurses Association\California (ANA\C). The California Institute for Nursing & Health Care (CINHC) was the fiscal sponsor and manager of the project.

SUMMARY OF GRANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Strategic Choices

- N = 30 vs. N = 100

  The size of the Thought Leader Group was increased to be representative of a wider range of key stakeholders (e.g. students to executives; academic, service, policy, professional organization, and funders) from all key regions of the state. This is more consistent with a participatory action science approach to change versus top-down hierarchical decision making by a select group of key executive-level stakeholders. While the process become more complex, the evidence from participatory action research shows that change is more likely to be effective because essential knowledge is provided and is owned by those who are responsible for implementing change at all levels.

- Evidence-based processes for building consensus for transformation versus lower-order change.

  The architecture for consensus-building involved a set of complementary evidence-based models and processes that have been demonstrated to be effective in producing change for improvement: Appreciative Inquiry, World Café, IHI Model for Improvement, Delphi technique Fifth Discipline Model, and Theory U process for leading change in the evolving future; and mixed research methods for building knowledge: quantitative and qualitative data

- Building the community of practice, collaboration, and economic models

  The learning action model formulated by Lave and Wenger suggests that academia and service are in the same "community of practice of nursing". This sets the stage for a more collaborative approach congruent with shared responsibilities to remove the "silos" that impede improvement processes. Additionally, an economic model that involves shared resources to optimize cost/benefit outcomes for all key stakeholders is imperative, given the ineffectiveness of traditional economic models for education and persistent dwindling resources in the traditional model.

Activities Undertaken:
Timeline of Activities Associated with the White Paper and Action Plan Development

October, 2006	• Hired Project Director • Initiated research on issues, trends, best practices • Project executive and director attended OCNE Nursing Education Summit – Eugene, Oregon
November, 2006	• Project executive and director attended NLN Technology in Education Summit – Baltimore, Maryland • Invited Cosponsors who will take a leadership role: advising, planning, raising critical questions, facilitating group dialogue, spreading the word and getting feedback from constituency. Face-to-face, web casts, online. Statewide and regional.

December, 2006	• Project director presented at meeting of Associate Degree Directors – Northern California
	• CINHC Steering Advisory Team Meeting held in Sacramento
	• Cosponsors identified potential Thought Leaders
	• Invitation sent to Thought Leaders
	• Confirmed Thought Leaders
	Criteria for selection:
	  ▪ Leaders representing key entities responsible for education redesign: Education, Service, Licensing/Accreditation
	  ▪ Demonstrated effectiveness in dialogue, building collaborative relationships, innovation and creativity, being open to new ideas, strategic visioning; change agent, quality effectiveness
	• Confirmed meeting dates
	• Press Release distributed

January, 2007	• Developed plan for Thought Leader Gatherings • Developed website • Initiated search for facilitator • Distributed Assessment Survey to Thought Leaders
February, 2007	• Distributed preliminary review materials to Thought Leaders • Hired temporary administrative assistant

March, 2007	• Posted review materials on website
	• Convened Thought Leader Gathering #1 for consensus building (San Diego, March 15 - 17)
	  o Clarified purpose and process of project
	  o Learned from experts
	  o Build consensus to identify key dimensions of action

April – June, 2007	• Action Plan Groups formed and began work on strategic action plan recommendations
	• Involved key stakeholders – presented at numerous local, regional, and national meetings:
	  o California Hospital Association – Northern, Central, Coastal Nurse Executives
	  o Taking the Long View Conference – National meeting of Statewide Nursing Workforce Centers
	• Ongoing literature review and learning from other states, national organizations
	• Prepared for second Thought Leader Gathering
	• Planned for Magic in Teaching Conference
	• News articles written for: ANA/C Newsletter, ACNL Newsletter

June – September, 2007	• Produced and distributed prototypes I & II of recommendations on a prioritized strategic plan - Achievable within the next 1-3 years to inform leaders and policy makers and serve as a strategic plan for collaborative, coordinated education redesign in California
	• Response to consensus document
	   o Continued input from key stakeholders
	   o Delphi Process with Thought Leaders
	• Convened Thought Leader Gatherings #2 (Fremont, July 16, 17) and #3 (Long Beach, August 16) to prioritize final recommendations
	• Presented at regional meetings focus group session in San Francisco
	• Prepared news articles: ACNL, ANA/C

October – December, 2007	• Disseminated final Prototypes for review • Build consensus – Presented at statewide meetings: Taste of Education (Joint meeting of ADN Directors and Deans and Chairs of BSN and Higher Colleges and Universities); CSNA Advisors; Magic in Teaching (academic and clinical educators). • Present to CINHC Board and Steering Committee
January – March, 2008	• Final writing of White Paper. Sent to two writers/editors: Linda Puffer (document); Sherry Kahn (references) • Presentations at ACNL and Magic in Teaching • Presentation: San Diego/Marin ACNL Meeting • Poster presentation at Moore Foundation Summit • Submitted presentation proposals to: O-ADN national meeting and statewide nurse workforce centers meeting
April – June, 2008	• Disseminated White Paper • Presentation to CACN meeting in San Diego • Presentation to CINHC Regional Planning Meeting – Bay Area • Presentation – John Muir Concord Health Center – Celebrating Nurses Week • Developed final report and Action Plan • Poster session – Statewide Nursing Workforce Conference – Colorado • California participates in national nursing education summit

Presentations

MONTH/YEAR	LOCATION	GROUP	# ATTEND	PRESENTER
December, 2006	Yountville	A.D.N. Directors - Northern California	30	Jan Boller
December, 2006	Sacramento	CINHC Board of Directors	30	Jan Boller
March, 2007	San Francisco	Moore Foundation Summit	100	Poster
March, 2007	Hayward	Sigma Theta Tau - Nu Xi at Large Chapter	35	Deloras Jones
April, 2007	Oakland	Samuel Merritt-Educator Luncheon	25	Jan Boller
April, 2007	San Francisco	Bay Area Safety Collaborative	60	Jan Boller
May, 2007	Stanford	Carnegie Foundation for the Preparation of the Professions, Nursing Education Study (CINHC participated in thought leader gathering)	50	Jan Boller, Deloras Jones
May, 2007	Sacramento	RHORC (Regional Health Occupations Resource Centers)	15	Jan Boller
May, 2007	Oakland	Samuel Merritt College Faculty Retreat	25	Jan Boller
June, 2007	San Francisco	USF/Dominican College - White Paper Focus Group	16	Jan Boller, Judith Karshmer, Barbara Ganley
June, 2007	San Francisco	Statewide Nursing Workforce Centers	30	Jan Boller
June, 2007	Sacramento	SEIU RN Union Leaders	20	Jan Boller
July, 2007	Teleconference	Northern Coast & Northern Sierra Academic/Service Directors, California Healthcare Association	40	Jan Boller, Pilar De La Cruz Reyes
September, 2007	San Diego	CINHC Board of Directors	30	Jan Boller
September, 2007	Fairfield	A.D.N. Directors - Northern California	30	Nancy Cowan
September, 2007	Sacramento	RHORC (Regional Health Occupations Resource Centers)	15	Jan Boller
October, 2007	Temecula	Taste of Education (CACN/A.D.N. Directors Statewide Meeting	224	Jan Boller
October, 2007	Fremont	California State Nurses Association Advisors	18	Jan Boller
November, 2007	Fremont	Magic in Teaching	400	Jan Boller
November, 2007	Teleconference	TIGER Initiative - Statewide Educators Planning Group (Technology and Informatics Guiding Education Reform)	10	Jan Boller
November, 2007	Walnut Creek	East Bay Education/Service Partnership Council	10	Jan Boller
December, 2007	Sacramento	CINHC Board of Directors	30	Jan Boller & Group Chairs
January, 2008	Sacramento	A.D.N. Directors - Statewide Meeting	100	Jan Boller, Tammy Rice
February, 2008	Rancho Mirage	ACNL Statewide Conference	446	Kathy Harren, Tammy Rice
February, 2008	San Francisco	Moore Foundation Summit	100	Poster
March, 2008	San Francisco	ACNL - SF/Marin Chapter	30	Jan Boller
March, 2008	Los Angeles	Magic in Teaching - Southern California	350	Jan Boller
April, 2008	San Diego	CACN Statewide Meeting	50	Jan Boller
April, 2008	Oakland	CINHC Board of Directors	30	Jan Boller
May, 2008	Oakland	CINHC Bay Area Regional Planning Meeting	25	Jan Boller
May, 2008	Concord	John Muir Concord - Educator Appreciation Luncheon	20	Jan Boller
TOTAL	**31 presentations**		**2394**	

Additionally, Thought Leaders presented the White Paper to their constituencies (See separate attachment: Thought Leader Evaluation report).

Statewide newsletter articles regarding the White Paper were published in:

ANA/C Newsletters
ACNL Newsletter
NurseWeek, and
Advance for Nurses

ACHIEVEMENT OF GRANT PURPOSES

1. **Build statewide consensus in a way that will set the stage to achieve intended results**

   A evidence-based and transparent process for building consensus was used to build consensus throughout the year, not only involving the Thought Leaders but also key stakeholders throughout the state of California and US.

   The evidence-based process involved well-established processes for building consensus, including the following:
   • **World Café, Collaboration** (Brown & Isaacs; Himmelman)
   • **Appreciative Inquiry** (Cooperrider & Whitney)
   • **Nominal Group Process, Delphi** (Delbecq, VandeVen, & Gustafson)
   • **Interactive Audience Response Voting Technology**
   • **IHI Model for Improvement** (IHI; Langley, Nolan, Nolan, Norman, & Provost)
   • **Building Communities of Practice/Participatory Reflection & Action Science/Managing Polarities** (Lave & Wenger; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder; Scott & Cleary)
   • **The "U" Process for Creating Emerging Futures** (Scharmer, Jaworski, Kahane & colleagues)
   • **Learning Organizations/Teams** (Senge & Colleagues)

   Transparency in the consensus process was essential. At every phase, methods for "voting" and soliciting ideas were used, primarily using Likert scales to determine level of agreement on issues and open-ended questions guided by the World Café questions for strategic visioning. Compilations of all survey results were posted on the internal working website for the White Paper project (www.cinhc.org/atWork Name: wp_access; Password: redesign).

   Two early prototype drafts of the White Paper consensus document were distributed in July and September to 225 response panelists from 65 organizations. Additionally, the prototypes were posted for public access on the CINHC website from July though December 2007.

   Response panelists were invited to share the drafts with their constituencies. The opportunity for input and feedback was extensive. More than thirty written responses were returned from a wide range of stakeholders, from chief executives, to nurse

educators and clinicians. All written responses were posted on the internal section of the CINHC website so that all Thought Leaders could read them in their entirety.

One faculty member from a community college in Southern California who attended the Magic in Teaching conference reported that she had read every draft and that it had changed her thinking about teaching and about the importance of her career. The White Paper gave her a chance to learn about the "big picture" of nursing education and she was excited about the changes ahead.

Technology proved to be critical in the consensus-building process. In addition to paper voting and written comments as well as small group and large group dialogue, interactive audience response technology was used at the August Thought Leader meeting and at three statewide meetings in which the White Paper recommendations were presented to key stakeholders. Samuel Merritt College and Turning Technologies, LLC. provided TurningPoint audience response keypads for use at these meetings, giving participants an opportunity to get immediate feedback on areas of agreement and disagreement.

At the final Thought Leader gathering, this technology was pivotal in helping us focus on key areas for dialogue, where there was still disagreement. Much of the disagreement was around semantics, not concepts and dialogue helped us resolve many of these issues in a timely manner.

At the larger stakeholder meetings, a Taste of Education (joint CACN/ADN Directors statewide meeting), Magic in Teaching – Northern California, and California State Nurses Association Advisors meeting, the audience voting allowed us to see how close those audiences were in agreement with the White Paper recommendations. The highest level of agreement with the recommendations was demonstrated by the nurse educators who attended the Magic in Teaching conference. Unfortunately, the voting data from that session was not saved, but several Thought Leaders attended that meeting and were able to see the strong support from the 400+ nurse educators who attended that meeting. The graphics for the voting response from the August Thought Leader gathering, Taste of Education conference, and California State Nurses Association Faculty Advisors is provided in a separate attachment: *Nursing Education Redesign for California: Building Consensus: TurningPoint Technology Audience Response Voting*.

2. **White Paper that makes the case for education redesign and outlines the plan of action**

    The following documents were disseminated and posted on the CINHC website (www.CINHC/atWork)

    - *Nursing Education Redesign for California: White Paper and Strategic Action Plan Recommendations* (24 pages)
    - *Appendix A: Consensus-Building Process: Summary of Highlights and Findings* (17 pages)
    - *Appendix B: Strategic Action Plan Recommendations* (31 pages)

- *Appendix C: Nursing Education Redesign References, Organized by Topic Area* (16 pages)
- *Appendix D: Review Panel* (8 pages)
- *Summary Report* (8 pages)

Additionally, a PowerPoint presentation and handouts were developed for use by Thought Leaders and will be continued to be refined for ongoing use, if funds can be generated.

The initial date for posting and distribution was set for December, 2007. However, since the final Synthesis Advisory meeting and subsequent presentation to the CINHC Board of Directors was in early December, we renegotiated a January 31st deadline. Due to Dr. Boller's academic responsibilities through the end of December, final writing of the White Paper commenced in until early January. The final draft was submitted to the editor/finishing writer at the end of January. The editor made major formatting revisions, returning the paper to the Project Director mid March. The extensive reference listing was sent to a separate editor in February and revisions were submitted in late March. The revised White Paper was posted and distributed to Thought Leaders in early April. Suggested revisions and edits were submitted and the final revised version was posted and distributed to Thought Leaders May 2nd. Distribution to the Response Panel and other key stakeholders took place beginning the week of May 12th.

3. **Funding to actualize Action Plan Recommendations**

A call for Request for Proposals (RFP) to develop collaborative models of nursing education between ADN education programs and BSN programs has been issued by CINHC. The RFP is sponsored by Kaiser Permanente/East Bay Community Foundation, through funding from Kaiser Permanente Northern California, and the Foundation for California Community Colleges (FCCC), through the WellPoint Endowment held by FCCC. The intent of this RFP is to develop demonstration models of collaboration that seamlessly provide a baccalaureate degree to nurses educated in the ADN pre-licensure programs. This $2 million grant is informed by the White Paper and includes processes to build consensus on core competencies for pre-RN licensure graduates. Additionally, The California Community College Chancellor's Office has issued a $300,000 grant opportunity for the development of collaborative education agreements between ADN and BSN or MSN programs.

LESSONS LEARNED

Successes

1. **Thought Leaders commitment and collaboration**

   First and foremost in contributing to the success of this project was the mutual dedication and determination of the Thought Leaders. From enthusiastic early survey responses and the level of energy at the initial meeting, it was clear that these leaders intended to make a difference in nursing education. While there was definitely a diversity of perspectives, the commitment to collaboration by these Thought Leaders carried the momentum for this project.

2. **Consensus process architectural (structural) design and facilitation**

   The consensus process proved to be effective in bringing together key stakeholders with diverse perspectives around redesign. For the past forty years, the nursing community has been engaged in a debate around entry-into-practice (ADN versus BSN) that has divided nurse educators and service executives. By focusing on two key areas of agreement, (1) that we must move our nursing workforce to higher levels of education, regardless of the level of entry, and (2) that all newly licensed nurses must demonstrate essential core professional and clinical competencies, regardless of the program from which they graduate, we were able to rise above the debate and move into generative dialogue (generative = moving beyond conversation to effective action).

   Project Director, Dr. Jan Boller had used these processes successfully in the past, most notably with Dr. Christine Tanner in the late 1980s as they convened consensus-building meeting sponsored by the American Association of Critical-Care Nurses, to explore the ways to bring critical care nursing content into the baccalaureate curriculum (Daly, J., & Boller, J. (1990). <u>Critical care in the nursing curriculum: Linking education and practice</u>. Newport Beach: American Association of Critical-Care Nurses).

   Deloras Jones' determination to not get embroiled in the entry-into-practice debate and demonstrate that we could move forward with quality education in California without resolving that debate, was called to the test repeatedly throughout this project, most notably when the Executive Director of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, provided provocative written feedback to the early draft documents and also attended the third Thought Leader Gathering. Participants engaged in thoughtful dialogue and submitted their conceptualization of an education highway system that could both be accessible for the diverse workforce that is essential and also move this workforce to masters and doctoral levels of education, which is necessary to meet the complex demands of our health care consumers and the complexity of the health care delivery system.

   Madeline Kellner, a seasoned facilitator who had been involved in the earlier work around education capacity-building and redesign was a highly skilled facilitator and strong advocate.

3. **Using an action science approach to cultivate communities of practice**

One of the most significant variances from the initial plan was to engage a wider circle of key stakeholders that not only represented the various decision makers relative to nursing education (deans, directors, chief nurse executives, professional organization executives, and regulatory and policy leaders), but also students, new graduates, front-line staff nurses, nurse educators, advanced practice nurses and nurse faculty. This is in alignment with the philosophical underpinnings of action science (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder. (2002). <u>Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge</u>. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press; and Reason & Bradbury. (2006). <u>Handbook of action research</u>. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications). While this is a much more cumbersome and messy process, requiring that we reveal our imperfections to a wider circle of participants, the critical point is that those who are involved in the process that needs to be transformed, are involved in the planning for that transformation and likely will assure that it succeeds.

Many times during the process, the Project Director was advised by different participants to "just get 30 people in a room to make the recommendations". However, while it would have been more in line with the budget and would have been a simpler process, the likelihood of buy-in for effective reform would have been diminished.

4. **Using multiple sources of collective intelligence and wisdom: cognitive/intellectual, experiential, research-based, aesthetic, emotional, artistic.**

Multiple forms of knowledge were used during the process to generate collective wisdom around redesign. These including direct experience, research and empirical evidence, creative art, reflection, dialogue, and simulation. At all thought leader gatherings, tools for creative art were provided and a nurse artist was used to guide and capture the creative process. The graphic metaphors of the turtle and giraffe provided a way to envision and talk about how the way it needs to be (giraffe) differs from the way it is now (turtle) for new graduates. A graphic representation of lateral violence in the workplace brought home the urgency of changing the work environment to foster optimal learning and transition environments. The Building Blocks and California Highway graphics helped key stakeholders envision the actions from the White paper. Pictures and graphics are an essential form of conveying critical knowledge and generating critical thinking and reflection, and sparking the emotion that is needed to move the redesign agenda forward.

5. **The settings – San Diego and Long Beach**

San Diego and Long Beach were particularly impressive sessions, providing some opportunity for refreshment and renewal at the same time that the Thought Leaders were involved in intensive work.

Opportunities for Improvement

1. **Earlier involvement of Synthesis Advisory Group in engaging Thought Leaders and advising on the consensus-building process.**

   The original plan involved bringing on a project director in July, 2006 and convening a leadership group during the Fall of 2006 to identify and invite Thought Leaders and collectively design the consensus process. The project director was hired in late September. This delayed start-up and the fact that most meetings for the end of the year had already been set and calendars were already full, proved to be a limitation at the beginning of the process for convening group leaders early in the process and identifying and inviting Thought Leaders.

2. **Administrative Support**

   At the beginning of this grant, the CINHC office had only one administrative assistant, requiring that additional contracted administrative support for the project. However, because of the nature of the consensus process, it became clear that internal support from the CINHC office was needed. Now that CINHC has an Administrative Director, a structure is in place for future grant projects to plan for administrative support and assure optimal resource utilization to support grants.

3. **Use of interactive electronic audience response systems earlier in the process**

   The consensus-building process could have been enhanced by the use of interactive audience response systems earlier in the process. Early recognition of areas of agreement reduce unnecessary dialogue and debate and allow participants to focus on narrowing the gap in areas of disagreement in a more expeditious manner.

4. **Budgetary variances**

   Funds for the project were spent by the end of December. Both CINHC and AWR_Associates and covered all expenses from January through the end of May, 2008. This in-kind variance is addressed in the final budget report in the next section of this report.

5. **Plan for Professional Writers**

   Professional writers and editors could have been utilized earlier in the process so that the production process was more systematic and more realistic deadlines would be established and met.

Thought Leader Evaluations
See separate attachment summarizing the final evaluations from Thought Leaders
(8 respondents)

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

The attached financial report provides a summary of actual expenses and variances. All of the grant funds were utilized by year-end 2007. Additional expenses and in-kind support from CINHC and Jan Boller (AWR_Associates) covered the additional time and expenses for completing the project. This variance related to the increased numbers of Thought Leaders, time involved in distributing two prototypes, communicating and presenting to a wide circle of stakeholders, and resource support for the consensus meetings, including a facilitator and meeting coordinator.

ACTION PLAN MOVING FORWARD – JUNE – AUGUST, 2008

1. **White Paper: Plan Distribution and Dissemination**
   - Posted on Website – May, 2008
   - Disseminated e-mail with electronic attachment to Thought Leaders and CINHC Board & Steering Committee – May 9th
   - Disseminated e-mail announcement to Response Panel – May 16
   - Disseminated e-mail announcement to national association executives – May 27
   - Post on Statewide Workforce Center Websites – May 30th
   - Press Release Plan – Dan Danzig will distribute early June
   - Send CD and thank you letter to Response Panel – Summer, 2008, (Seeking funding for this).
   - Direct Mail to Thought Leaders, Consulting Experts, and National Organization Representatives – Summer, 2008, (Seeking funding)
     - Letter of Appreciation;
     - Certificate of Appreciation;
     - Flash drive of Website documents and photos to Thought Leaders
   - Plan for & Disseminate to key Policy Makers and Decision Makers – June – August, 2008 (See Separate Attachment – Stakeholders)
   - Publish articles – On going plan:
     o Invite Strategic Action Chairs and Thought Leaders to co-author with CINHC
     o Options: Journal of Nursing Education, JONA, AONE and ACNL publications; Nursing Economics, Nursing,….establish priority list and potential authors. Jan will coordinate publishing plan

2. **Strategic Priorities Action Plan Development/Refinement – June – August 2008**
   - Synthesize Action Plan – reconcile White Paper and Strategic Action Group Recommendations
   - Develop specific plans for
     o Funding
     o Policy
     o Publishing and Presentations
   - Convene meeting of Cosponsor Coalition to
     o Define Coalition moving forward
     o Review/advise on Strategic Priorities Action Plan (See plan in development)
     o Identify potential Champions
     o Review/advise on strategic plan for funding
     o Review/advise on strategic plan for policy
     o Review/advise on strategic plan for publishing
   - Convene Action Plan Work Groups – September 2007 – March 2008
   - Magic in Teaching – November 2008 (No Cal) , March 2009 (SoCal)
   - Coalition Summit Meeting – March 2009 (or in conjunction with ACNL meeting)

Summary and Conclusion

This project has made it possible for California's nursing leaders to collaborate on creating an agenda for high-quality, cost-effective, evidence-based nursing education. Through collaborative dialogue, these leaders have produced a strategic plan for preparing a well-educated nursing workforce who will take the lead in delivering safe and quality health care for Californians. While much work and many challenges lie ahead, strategic priorities have been identified, the energy level is high, and the shared commitment for redesign is evident. We acknowledge and appreciate the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation for making it possible for CINHC to move forward on this important initiative.