

Council on Naturopathic Medical Education Board of Directors Meeting

Saturday, May 13, 2017 ♦ 8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

The Magnolia Hotel ♦ Denver, Colorado

Call to order and roll call

Board president, Dr. Woolard, called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. The following Board members were present:

- Brian Andrew, JD, MA (Public Member), Chesterfield, Missouri;
- Jasmine Carino, ND (Profession Member), Toronto, Ontario;
- Margot Gregory, ND (Profession Member), Tucson, Arizona;
- Melanie Henriksen, ND (Institutional Member Rep., NCNM), Portland, Oregon;
- Thomas Kruzel, ND (Profession Member), Scottsdale, Arizona;
- John Pecchia, CPA (Public Member), Poughkeepsie, New York;
- Marcia Prenguber, ND (Institutional Member Rep., UBCNM), Bridgeport, Connecticut;
- Steven Rissman, ND (Profession Member), Broomfield, Colorado;
- Leslie Solomonian, ND (Institutional Member Rep., CCNM), Toronto, Ontario;
- Jamey Wallace, ND (Profession Member), Seattle, Washington; and
- Christina Woolard, ND (Profession Member), Murfreesboro, Tennessee.

Members absent:

- Hugh Bonner, PhD, FASAHP (Public Member), Rome, Georgia;

Staff present:

- Daniel Seitz, JD, EdD (Executive Director), Great Barrington, Massachusetts

Guests present during open session:

- No guests were present.

Review of Board meeting agenda

There were no changes to the agenda.

Officer Reports

Secretary's Report

Council secretary Dr. Carino asked the board to review and approve the minutes from the last Council meeting.

Dr. Kruzel moved, and Dr. Gregory seconded, the following motion:

To approve the minutes of the October 16, 2016 Board of Directors meeting, as corrected.

The motion was unanimously approved, with Drs. Stretch and Thompson abstaining since they had not attended the last Council meeting.

Vice President's Report

Council V.P. Dr. Kruzel stated that there was nothing to report.

Treasurer's Report

CNME Treasurer Mr. Pecchia, CPA, reported that FY 2016 was a successful year financially, as we ended the year once again with a small surplus. So far in FY 2017, income and expenditure are tracking fairly closely to budget, and we're likely to have a small surplus. Overall, we're doing well financially, which is why we've been able to keep the fees the same for several years.

President's Report

CNME President Dr. Woolard thanked the CPNME and residency directors for their excellent work revising the Residency Handbook and developing guidelines for residencies. She also thanked the board for the productive strategic planning meeting the previous day.

Executive Director's Report

CNME Executive Director Dr. Seitz reported the following:

- Two universities—Maryland University of Integrative Health and Southern California University of Health Sciences—are continuing to develop ND programs; he anticipates that we will receive their eligibility applications by sometime in 2018 at the latest and maybe as soon as later this year. .
- Reaccreditation visits are coming up in early winter of 2018 for ND programs at the University of Bridgeport and BINM; they will be reviewed by the board at the spring 2018 meeting.

Committee reports and action on committee recommendations

Executive Committee

Committee chair Dr. Woolard noted that the Executive Committee had met once since the last Council meeting to plan this meeting and address a few other issues, including authorizing use of an outside payroll service, which should save a little money on bookkeeping expenses.

Finance Committee

Committee chair Mr. Pecchia, CPA, stated that the Finance Committee had not needed to meet since the last Council meeting, since there were no financial issues needing attention.

Nominations Committee

Committee chair Dr. Carine informed the board about the nominations process:

- Dr. Kruzel's second and last term as a profession member will end at the conclusion of the fall 2017 Council meeting; the committee is aware of one well-qualified ND who is interesting in potentially serving on the CNME and will look into other people who might be potential profession members;
- Dr. Henriksen's term as institutional member representative will also end at the conclusion of the fall 2017 Council meeting; however, she is leaving her position at NUNM in July. She is willing to serve out her term it that if that is okay with the board. The board will consider this option later on today during the closed session of the meeting. FYI, the next institutional member representative will be nominated

by BINM; Dr. Seitz will contact them this summer to ask to nominate someone.

Committee on Postdoctoral Naturopathic Medical Education

Committee chair Dr. Henriksen reported that the CPNME taskforce had met on several occasions since the fall 2017 meeting and had agreed on changes to the *Residency Handbook*. She stated that Dr. Seitz had revised the *Residency Handbook* to reflect the changes agreed upon, and that these revisions were reviewed and adopted by the CPNME at its meeting the previous day. On behalf of the CPNME, she recommended that the board adopt the revised Handbook, a copy of which was provided in the meeting materials.

Dr. Kruzel moved, and Mr. Pecchia, CPA, seconded, the following motion:

To approve the revised *Residency Handbook*.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Dr. Henriksen reported further that the CPNME taskforce completed work on guidelines pertaining to employment conditions of residents and other issues related to residencies, and that Dr. Seitz had drafted a document containing the guidelines, which was also included in the meeting materials. The board agreed that the guidelines are useful, but did not formally approve them since guidelines are not mandatory.

Audit Committee

Committee chair Dr. Kruzel informed the board that in accordance with CNME's usual practice, an audit will be performed for FY 2016.

Committee on Standards, Policies and Procedures

Committee chair Dr. Kruzel noted that no issues are currently under consideration by COSPP and so there is nothing to report.

Strategic Planning Committee

Committee chair Dr. Woolard thanked the board for the productive strategic planning session the previous day. As discussed during the meeting, the plan for moving forward is as follows: (i) Dr. Seitz will draft a strategic plan that reflects the main points the board agreed upon and that includes a timeline, and (ii) the strategic planning committee will meet over the summer to review and finalize the draft plan for presentation to the board at the fall 2017 meeting.

Reports from other naturopathic organizations

Board members involved with other naturopathic organizations provided the following updates:

- **AANMC** (Association of Accredited Naturopathic Colleges): Currently the focus of the AANMC is on marketing the naturopathic profession and ND programs to potential students. Also, AANMC has taken over the responsibility for the residency matching program; this was formerly conducted by the Naturopathic Post-Graduate Association, which has been dissolved as an organization.
- **AANP** (American Association of Naturopathic Physicians): The annual federal legislative effort ("DC FLI") recently took place. The current focus is on trying to get naturopathic medicine to be a covered service under the Veteran's Administration and Medicare.

In-service Presentation

Mr. Pecchia, CPA, made a presentation on how to evaluate an institution's financial soundness based on a review of their financial statements and the standard types of financial ratios/benchmarks.

[The board entered in closed session.]

Interim candidacy hearing on U. del Turabo NMDP; review of 2016 annual reports and focused reports of CNME-accredited and candidate ND programs

Hearing on continued candidacy of U. del Turabo's NMDP

Dr. Woolard asked any board members with a conflict of interest, as defined by the CNME's conflict of interest policy, to leave the meeting room. None of the members had a conflict of interest. Next, she welcomed the representatives from UT in attendance, namely:

- Dr. Nydia Bou, Ed.D. MS-CCC-SLP, Dean & Full Professor, UT School of Health Science
- Frank Valentín Silva, MD, Director, UT Naturopathic Medicine Doctoral Program

Dr. Carino informed the board that she and Dr. Wallace served on the evaluation team that visited UT's Naturopathic Medicine Doctoral Program (NMDP), and that the team was accompanied by Dr. Seitz. She provided a synopsis of the visit and the team's findings. Next, the UT representatives addressed some of the findings and made general remarks to the Council. Next, Council members asked representatives questions regarding the team's findings as well as general questions about UT and the NMDP program. Upon completion of the Q & A portion of the hearing, the UT representatives left the meeting room, and the Council reviewed the evaluation team's recommendations and engaged in deliberation.

Dr. Kruzel moved, and Dr. Wallace seconded, the following *motion, which was unanimously approved*:

1. *To continue the candidacy status of the UT NMDP for a period of up to five years.*
2. *To authorize the UT NMDP to undertake the self-study process for initial accreditation.*
3. *Based on the Council's review of the Evaluation Team Report, UT NMDP's formal institutional response to the report, and today's hearing, to adopt the following commendations, recommendations and areas of interest (note that the Council made some changes to the findings contained in the evaluation team report):*

COMMENDATIONS

Commendation: The team commends UT on the new vision and mission of the NMDP.

Commendation: The Evaluation Team commends the administrative staff at the system, institutional, school and program levels for being committed, responsive to the needs of the NMDP, and able in their roles.

Commendation: The team commends the commitment of the NMDP faculty members: they are enthusiastic about the program and dedicated to their students.

Commendation: The team commends the students for their dedication to the program and their enthusiasm for the field of naturopathic medicine.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation IV-1: The team *is concerned* that while the program has a number of well qualified and dedicated faculty, the overall size and stability of the faculty is insufficient to enable the program to (i) plan academic schedules sufficiently in advance, (ii) ensure that all courses are offered during the term indicated in the curriculum, and (iii) ensure a reasonable diversity of instructors in order to provide different naturopathic perspectives. The team *recommends* that the program increase the size and stability of the faculty in order to ensure adequate coverage of all courses within the curriculum. (Std. IV B.1)

Recommendation IV-2: The team *is concerned* that faculty are not receiving adequate orientation to the NMDP or to the UT campus as a whole. The team *recommends* that the program develop and implement an “on-boarding” process for orienting all new faculty (and existing faculty as a “catch up”)—whether clinical or classroom, ND or non-ND—to the requirements and procedures of the program (in addition this could include appropriate references to NPLEX criteria and blueprint). (Std. IV C.1)

Recommendation IV-3: The program must continue its efforts to ensure that faculty evaluations are carried out consistently in a timely manner, and that evaluation instruments are relevant to the needs and content of the program. (Std. IV C.2)

Recommendation VI-1: The team *is concerned* that the clinic experience is still weighted heavily towards one therapeutic modality. The team *recommends* that the program make sure that a broad range of modalities are consistently utilized, including botanical formulations. (Std. VI C.4)

Recommendation VI-2: The team *is concerned* that documentation in the patient chart does not adequately reflect an internal logic of patient assessment, diagnosis and management. The team *recommends* that the program make sure that patient visits are comprehensively conducted with complete documentation that follows a logical and continuous flow from chief complaint(s) through subjective, objective, assessment, and plan (SOAP) components of the charts. (Std. VI C.4)

Recommendation VI-3: From an inspection of student records (including the records of graduates), the team *is concerned* that not all student clinicians are completing the CNME requirements for primary and secondary patient contacts as well as clinic hours. The team *recommends* that the program establish an effective means for tracking and documenting patient contacts, and ensure that the patient contact requirements and clinic hours are fully met. (Note that it is the program’s responsibility, not the students’, to confirm that all clinical requirements, such as patient contacts, are actually met; these requirements cannot be demonstrated by using estimates or formulas.) (Std. VI C.5.d)

Recommendation VI-4: With the move of the naturopathic clinic to the new School of Health Sciences building and the closing of the NMDP’s previous clinical sites, the team *is concerned* that the number of patients utilizing the naturopathic clinic has decreased greatly, making it more challenging for the program to provide student interns with the CNME-required numbers of patient interactions. The team *recommends* that the program finds ways to expeditiously increase the number of patient visits so that student interns can fulfill their clinical training requirements according to schedule. (Std. VI D.4)

Recommendation VI-5: The team recommends that the medicinary and the clinic areas be adequately stocked on an ongoing basis with a sufficient range of products, resources and supplies (tinctures, bulk herbs, supplements, available copiers, linens, equipment, etc.)—and that access to them be made more convenient—so that the medicinary and the clinic space can more effectively serve the purposes of student instruction and patient care. (Std. VI D.5)

Recommendation VII-1: The team is *concerned* that initial NPLEX results have been relatively poor, which may be due in part to the fact that English is not the first language for nearly all if not all students, and that a number of students delayed graduation until the program achieved CNME candidacy status. The team *recommends* that the program continue to explore, develop and implement ways in which to support students in preparing for and passing the NPLEX exam. (Std. VII B.5)

AREAS OF INTEREST

Area of Interest II-1: With the recent hiring of a qualified clinical director, the NMDP now has an appropriately qualified academic leadership team (i.e., Program Director, Clinical Director, and Clinical Coordinator) that works in partnership with the Dean of the School of Health Sciences and other SHS and University staff. With this new leadership team in place, the program and SHS leadership should make sure: (i) that the respective roles and authority of each position are clearly defined so as to effectively utilize the skills and knowledge of each member of the NMDP academic leadership team, and (ii) that each administrator is appropriately empowered to carry out his/her responsibilities. (Std. II B.2)

Area of Interest III-1: Despite any the financial constraints facing the University, the NMDP must be adequately funded to achieve its mission and carry out its educational activities. (Std. III C.1)

Area of Interest IV-1: Faculty perceived a lack of effective avenues of communication with the program and SHS administration. The program and school administration should continue to identify and implement ways to improve communication between administrative staff and faculty. (Std. IV E.1)

Area of Interest IV-2: While there is a curriculum committee for the entire School of Health Sciences that reviews proposed revisions to the NMDP curriculum, there appears to be no committee of NMDP faculty and academic administrators that periodically reviews the NMDP curriculum and develops proposed revisions when needed. The program should ensure that there is some type of process in place to involve NMDP faculty in periodically reviewing the NMDP curriculum and proposed revisions. (Std. IV E.3)

Area of Interest V-1: Students expressed that they are unclear as to the communication processes that are available to them to engage systematically in dialogue with the program administration in order to offer suggestions, provide feedback and express concerns. If it hasn't already, the program should implement a well-defined communication process that provides opportunities to students—individually and/or through student representatives—to periodically provide feedback, suggestions, concerns, etc., to the program, and should make sure that students are informed of the communication process. (Std. V A.3)

Area of Interest VI-1: The program should make sure that any curriculum change involving an increase or decrease in contact hours is appropriately reflected in the credit amount assigned in accordance with accepted practices in higher education. (Std. VI A.2)

Area of Interest VI-2: The team was informed by a number of people it interviewed that on occasion the clinical instructor to student intern ratio greatly exceeded 1 to 6, with as many as 12 or 13 students being assigned to one instructor. While there was no indication that this happens routinely, the program must ensure that, on average, a ratio in the range of 1 to 6 is maintained. (Std. VI C.5.e)

Area of Interest VIII-1: There appears to be some lack of clarity regarding NMDP representation on the School of Health Sciences research committee. This should be clarified: namely, the NMDP should identify a faculty member to serve on the committee, and should ensure his/her regular participation on the committee by providing necessary information and support. (Std. VIII A.2)

Area of Interest X-1: While the new School of Health Sciences building is, overall, an excellent facility in which to house the NMDP, nonetheless NMDP students would benefit greatly if (i) there was more dedicated study space made available to the students, (ii) a dedicated practicum area with multiple tables were provided, and (iii) classes were not held in partitioned classrooms when another class is in session in the adjacent space, as noise from the other class is sometimes an issue. (Std. X B)

Review of CCNM focused and annual reports

Drs. Carino and Solomonian recused themselves from this review and left the meeting room.

Dr. Gregory presented the 2016 annual report to the board and Mr. Pecchia, CPA, provided an analysis of CCNM's financial situation based on the most recent audited financial statement and the information presented in CCNM's focused report.

Dr. Gregory stated that the report was complete and responsive, and that the review team did not see anything that potentially raised any new compliance issues.

Mr. Pecchia, CPA, stated that the financial audit and a review of the financial ratios of the college indicated that they remain in a difficult financial situation; among other things, the college continues to have operating deficits. The difficult financial situation was also indicated in the notes to the audited financial statement: the section titled "Liquidity Risk" stated that "the Institute is exposed to the risk that it will encounter difficulty in meeting obligations in connection with its financial liabilities."

Based on these considerations, the board adopted the following motion:

Dr. Kruzel moved, and Mr. Andrew, JD, seconded, the following motion:

- **To continue the letter of advisement;**
- **To retain the outstanding recommendation that was adopted in May of 2016, revised as follows to reflect the Council's review of the audited FY 2016 financial statement and related information (note that this recommendation needs to be substantially addressed by May 2018 or CCNM risks more severe sanctions):**
 - Recommendation III-1: As evidenced by the audited FY 2015 and FY 2016 financial statements and the FY 2015 and FY 2016 financial metrics, the Council is concerned about the future financial stability of the institution and its ability to meet operating needs. The program must expeditiously take steps to build its financial resources and restore its financial stability. (Std. III.B.1); and*
- **To require submission of the FY 2016 – 2017 audited financial statement to the Council prior to the fall 2017 Council meeting (note that if an audited statement is not available prior to the meeting, the College should provide a fiscal year-end finance report prior to the meeting and the audited financials as soon as they become available);**

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review of SCNM focused and annual reports

Drs. Gregory and Thompson recused themselves from this review and left the meeting room.

Dr. Stretch presented the 2016 annual report to the board and Mr. Pecchia, CPA, provided an analysis of SCNM's financial situation based on the most recent audited financial statement and the information presented in SCNM's focused report.

Dr. Stretch stated that the 2016 annual report was complete and responsive (except that it would be helpful if brief bios of new board members were provided), and that the review team did not see anything in the report that potentially raised any new compliance issues.

Mr. Pecchia, CPA, stated that the financial audit and a review of the financial ratios of the college indicated that College is no longer in a problematic financial situation, and therefore he recommends removing the outstanding Standard III recommendation.

The board discussed the information provided by SCNM that addressed the one outstanding area of interest (Area of Interest VI-1), and decided that the College had effectively addressed part of that it and thus the current area of interest should be revised.

Dr. Carino moved, and Dr. Woolard seconded, the following motion:

- **To remove the one outstanding recommendation (Recommendation III-1) that was adopted in May of 2015; and**
- **To revise the current area of interest (Area of Interest VI-1) to read as follows:**
Area of Interest VI-1: The Council is concerned that the current overall volume and variety of patients available for purposes of the SCNM's clinical training program may be insufficient to meet the program's needs. The College should continue its efforts to increase patient volume and variety. (Std. VI.C.4.e & C.5.d)

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review of BINM focused and annual reports

Mr. Andrew, JD, presented the 2016 annual report to the board and Mr. Pecchia, CPA, provided an analysis of BINM's financial situation based on the most recent audited financial statement and the information presented in SCNM's focused report.

Mr. Andrew, JD, stated that the 2016 annual report was complete and responsive, and that the review team did not see anything in the report that potentially raised any new compliance issues. He also stated that the annual report review team recommends some changes to the current outstanding finds based on the information provided; the board discussed the review team's recommendations.

Mr. Pecchia, CPA, stated that the financial audit and a review of the financial ratios of the college indicated that College is still experiencing a problematic financial situation and he thinks that based on the information provided the Institute is overly optimistic about their financial situation.

Based on information presented and discussed, the board adopted the following motion:

Dr. Solomonian moved, and Dr. Kruzel, seconded, the following motion:

- **To continue the letter of advisement;**
- **To remove Recommendation VII-1;**

- **To retain Recommendation III-1 as a recommendation, revised as follows to reflect the Council’s review of the audited FY 2016 financial statement and related information (note that this recommendation needs to be substantially addressed by May 2018 or BINM risks more severe sanctions):**
Recommendation III-1: *As evidenced by the audited FY 2015 and FY 2016 financial statements and the FY 2015 and FY 2016 financial metrics, the Council is concerned about the continued weak financial condition and lack of financial reserves of the Institute. The Institute must take immediate steps to strengthen its financial resources in order achieve financial stability. (Std. III.B.1 & C.1);*
- **To downgrade Recommendation III-2 to an area of interest as follows:**
Area of Interest III-2: *Given BINM’s current unstable financial condition, the Council is concerned that the current strategic plan is still not well-aligned with the financial condition. The Institute must continue work on the strategic plan so that it better reflects the current financial condition and provide realistic action steps and timeframes. (Std. III.A.1)*
- **To remove Area of Interest II-1, which reads as follows:** *“In light of the appointment of new members to the BINM board of governors and in order to ensure the effective functioning of the board, the institution must continue to find ways to develop board member governance skills. (Std. II.A.4).”;*
- **To retain the other two current areas of interest (Areas of Interest IV-2 and VI-1); and**
- **To require submission of the FY 2016 – 2017 audited financial statement to the Council prior to the fall 2017 Council meeting (note that if an audited statement is not available prior to the meeting, the College should provide a fiscal year-end finance report prior to the meeting and the audited financials as soon as they become available);**

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review of U. of Bridgeport, College of Naturopathic Medicine Annual Report

Drs. Gregory and Woolard recused themselves from this review and left the meeting room.

Dr. Carino stated that the 2016 annual report was complete and responsive, and that the review team did not see anything in the report that potentially raised any new compliance issues. Furthermore, the review team recommends that the two outstanding areas of interest be removed based on the documentation provided by the program (there are no outstanding recommendations). The board discussed the review team’s recommendation.

Dr. Carino moved, and Dr. Woolard seconded, the following motion:

- **To remove the two outstanding areas of interest (II-1 and X-1)**

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review of National University of Natural Medicine Annual Report

Drs. Gregory and Henriksen recused themselves from this review and left the meeting room.

Dr. Thompson stated that the 2016 annual report was complete and responsive, and that the review team did not see anything in the report that potentially raised any new compliance issues. Furthermore, the review team recommends the following based on the information and documentation provided: (i) removing outstanding Recommendation IV-1, (ii) revising Recommendation VII-1 to reflect partial remediation of the non-compliance

issues (the issue is that while NUMN provided an ND Program Assessment Plan that outlines in detail the types of assessment data it gathers or plans to gather, it did not demonstrate that it has engaged in the full cycle of assessment—including data analysis and implementation of changes based on assessment findings), and (iii) requiring continued reporting on the Residency Program Area of Interest. The board discussed the review team's recommendations.

Dr. Woolard moved, and Dr. Carino seconded, the following motion:

- **To remove Recommendation IV-1;**
- **To revise outstanding Recommendation VII-1 to read as follows:**
Recommendation VII-1 (to be fully addressed within one year; i.e., by the time of the spring 2018 CNME meeting): The Council recommends that the ND program complete the process of fully implementing its assessment plan—including every aspect of the plan from gathering and reviewing assessment data, to deciding on and implementing changes based on the assessment process—to ensure that the full cycle of the assessment process is carried out. (Std. VII B.1)

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review of National University of Health Sciences Annual Report

Dr. Solomonian stated that the 2016 annual report was complete and responsive, and that the review team did not see anything in the report that potentially raised any new compliance issues. Since NUHS's ND program was reaccredited in October of 2016, they have not had time yet to fully address all of the outstanding recommendations and areas of interest; however, they have generally made good progress on addressing them, and provided evidence that would warrant removing the following findings: Recommendation I-1; Recommendation I-2; and Area of Interest II-1. The board discussed whether to remove these findings.

Dr. Kruzel moved, and Dr. Gregory seconded, the following motion:

- **To remove Recommendation I-1;**
- **To remove Recommendation I-2; and**
- **To remove Area of Interest II-1**

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review of Bastyr University, Naturopathic Medicine Program Annual Report

Dr. Wallace recused himself from this review and left the meeting room.

Dr. Henriksen stated that the 2016 annual report was complete and responsive, and that the review team did not see anything in the report that potentially raised any new compliance issues. There are currently no outstanding findings regarding the ND program. The institution has recently sustained a fair amount of turnover.

Dr. Solomonian moved, and Dr. Kruzel seconded, the following motion:

To accept the 2016 annual report.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review of the U. del Turabo NMDP Annual Report

Dr. Wallace stated that the 2016 annual report was complete and responsive, and that the review team did not see anything in the report that potentially raised any new compliance issues apart from the compliance issues that were identified by the team that conducted the interim candidacy visit. Thus the annual report review team does not recommend any action other than acceptance of the report.

Dr. Woolard moved, and Dr. Stretch seconded, the following motion:

To accept the 2016 annual report.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review of Financial Statements

Mr. Pecchia, CPA, stated that apart from the financial issues that were discussed earlier in the meeting during the review of the financial reports of BINM and CCNM, none of the audited financial statements from the other schools presented issues that the CNME needs to address.

Board member appointments and related matters

Dr. Carino, chair of the nominations committee, informed the board that Dr. Woolard's first term as a profession member ends at the conclusion of this meeting. Dr. Woolard informed the board that she is interested in being considered for reappointment, and then left the meeting so that the board could consider her reappointment. The board voted unanimously by secret ballot to reappoint Dr. Woolard to a second term as a profession member, and expressed their appreciation for her service and willingness to continue serving on the board.

Dr. Carino next informed the board that Dr. Henriksen's three-year term as an institutional member representative is scheduled to end at the conclusion of the fall 2017 Council meeting. However, Dr. Henriksen will be leaving her position at NUNM in July of 2017, though she is willing to complete her term and her doing so is supported by NUNM. Dr. Seitz informed the board that there is nothing in the CNME bylaws that requires an institutional member representative to resign from the CNME board upon leaving his/her position with a CNME-accredited ND program. Dr. Henriksen then left the meeting so that the board could consider her continued service on the board after she leaves NUNM. The board voted unanimously by secret ballot to allow Dr. Henriksen to complete term as an institutional member representative, and expressed their great appreciation for her contributions to the Council.

Discussion on feedback for NABNE for upcoming advisory committee meeting

Dr. Seitz informed the board that he would be representing the CNME at the upcoming NABNE Advisory Committee meeting, and asked board members suggestions of issues to raise during the meeting. Board members offered the following suggestions:

- NABNE should consider offering exam in Spanish, since the CNME has granted candidacy the UT NMDP and their students are experiencing some challenges in passing the exam in English.
- Alert NABNE that under Canadian law, they might have to offer the exam in French at some point in the future.
- Inform NABNE that the NPLEX exam is the CNME's primary (and in some sense only) metric and, indeed, the only metric applied—so it's important for the schools to be able to get specific information on which sections of the exam their students perform poorly.
- Formerly, all of the schools were invited to send a representative to attend NABNE Advisory Committee meetings; recently, this was changed so that the chair of the CCACO (the ND deans committee) represents the schools at these meetings. Given the schools are a primary stakeholder, shouldn't there be additional representation from the school community on the NABNE Advisory Committee?
- There's a concern that there is little turnover on the NABNE board, which may impede necessary change.

- Computerization for purposes of speeding up processing exams would be a great benefit to new graduates and residents, since that would support starting practice sooner.
- There are some concerns and confusion about how the validity of the exam is determined.

Date and site of the fall 2017 Council meeting

Dr. Seitz stated that Dr. Woolard and he have identified a number of potential dates for the fall 2017 meeting, and that the board will be sent a link to a Doodle poll to provide information on their availability. The meeting will likely be on somewhere on the West Coast.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.