

MINUTES
of the Sixth Meeting of the
Surgical First Assistants Technical Review Committee

August 28, 2015
9:00 a.m. to Noon
Lower Level A
Nebraska State Office Building

Members Present

Diane Jackson APRN (Chairperson)
Jeff Baldwin, Pharm. D., R.P.
Mary C. Sneckenberg
Ben Greenfield, LP
Judith Lee Kissell, PhD

Members Absent

Michael R. Kinney, J.D.
James Temme, R.T.

Staff Present

Matt Gelvin
Marla Scheer
Ron Briel

I. Call to Order, Roll Call, Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes

Diane Jackson called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The roll was called; a quorum was present. The agenda and Open Meetings Law were posted and the meeting was advertised online at http://dhhs.ne.gov/Pages/reg_admcr.aspx. The committee members approved the agenda for the current meeting and the minutes of the previous meeting, unanimously.

II. Discussion on the Applicant's Proposal

Ms. Sneckenberg asked the applicants what their projections are for the number of Surgical First Assistants would come to practice in Nebraska if the proposal were to pass. An applicant spokesperson responded that they don't have a data-based projection for this but went on to say that anecdotal information from health care facilities in out-state Nebraska indicates that there is a very high demand for this profession in these areas of our state.

Mr. Greenfield asked the applicants why the range of functions provisions were taken out of the proposal. An applicant spokesperson responded that these provisions have not been taken out of the proposal. A representative of the Surgical Technologists argued that the proposal needs to include more detail regarding what is included under the various range of functions, and that these additional details could be added from information from either of the national boards of certification for this profession. An applicant spokesperson responded that his group would provide this detail for the members of the Board of Health during the September 10, 2015 meeting of the Board's Credentialing Review Committee.

Dr. Kissell asked the applicants for clarification as to whether Surgical Technologists who have passed certification requirements would be required to undergo additional assessment procedures. An applicant representative responded that these Surgical Technologists would not be required to undergo any additional assessment.

The committee members discussed which board or boards should administer the credentialing programs being proposed. Mr. Greenfield indicated that the Board of Medicine and Surgery would be the best board for this because of their expertise in the area of surgical procedures. An applicant spokesperson responded that this approach would place those nurses who perform the same procedures as Surgical Technologists under the medical board and that this would not be appropriate.

III. Formulation of Recommendations on the Applicant's Proposal by the Committee Members

Criterion one: Absence of a separate regulated profession creates a situation of harm or danger to the health, safety, or welfare of the public.

Action taken: It was moved and seconded that the proposal satisfies this criterion.

Voting that it does satisfy this criterion were Kissell, Sneckenberg, Baldwin, and Greenfield.

Comments from committee members:

Dr. Baldwin: There is a need for more qualified surgical workers in surgical procedures.

Dr. Kissell: There is a great need for more qualified surgical workers in rural areas of Nebraska.

Ms. Sneckenberg: There is a great need for more qualified surgical workers in rural areas of Nebraska.

Mr. Greenfield: There is a lack of qualified people to assist in surgical procedures.

Criterion two: Creation of a separate regulated profession would not create a significant new danger to the health, safety, or welfare of the public.

Action taken: It was moved and seconded that the proposal satisfies this criterion.

Voting that it does satisfy this criterion were Kissell, Sneckenberg, Baldwin, and Greenfield.

Comments from committee members:

Dr. Baldwin: There would be no new harm stemming from this proposal.

Ms. Sneckenberg: There would be no new harm stemming from this proposal.

Dr. Kissell: The education and training of the personnel under review is of high quality.

Mr. Greenfield: Cooperation between Surgical First Assistants and Surgical Technologists is important to ensure public protection.

Criterion three: Creation of a separate regulated profession would benefit the health, safety, or welfare of the public.

Action taken: It was moved and seconded that the proposal satisfies this criterion.

Voting that it does satisfy this criterion were Kissell, Sneckenberg, Baldwin, and Greenfield.

Comments from committee members:

Ms. Sneckenberg: This is the 'flip' of criterion two; if I support the proposal on criterion two, I also support it on criterion three, as well.

Dr. Baldwin: Indicated his agreement with Ms. Sneckenberg.

Dr. Kissell: Indicated her agreement with Ms. Sneckenberg.

Criterion four: The public cannot be protected by a more effective alternative.

Action taken: It was moved and seconded that the proposal satisfies this criterion.

Voting that it does satisfy this criterion were Kissell, Sneckenberg, and Baldwin.
Voting that it does not satisfy this criterion was Greenfield.

Comments from committee members:

Dr. Kissell: The proposal would address both rural and urban health care needs.

Ms. Sneckenberg: Indicated agreement with Dr. Kissell.

Dr. Baldwin: Indicated that he has not seen a better alternative.

Mr. Greenfield: Indicated that his 'no' vote was because he thinks that Surgical First Assistants and Surgical Technologists should both be licensed.

Action taken on the entire proposal was as follows:

Action taken: It was moved and seconded that the proposal receive a positive recommendation.

Voting that it should receive a positive recommendation were Kissell, Sneckenberg, Baldwin, and Greenfield.

IV. Other Business and Adjournment

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.