

COUNCIL ON NATUROPATHIC MEDICAL EDUCATION

Meeting of the Committee on Postdoctoral Naturopathic Medical Education (CPNME)

Saturday, October 13, 2018 ♦ 1:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Doubletree Hotel by Hilton ♦ Savannah, Georgia ♦ Amber Room

MINUTES

Call to order and roll call

CPNME chair, Dr. Carino, called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m. The following committee and Board members were present:

- Sarah Beasleigh, ND (Institutional Member Rep., BINM), New Westminster, British Columbia (via conference call);
- Jasmine Carino, ND (Profession Member), Toronto, Ontario (CPNME chair);
- Arvin Jenab, ND (Profession Member), Costa Mesa, California;
- Leslie Solomonian, ND (Institutional Member Rep., CCNM), Toronto, Ontario; and
- Eileen Stretch, ND (Profession Member), Tucson, Arizona (CPNME vice chair);

Staff present:

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

Guests Present:

- Gary Garcia, ND (Bastyr U.); participated via conference call
- Nichole Shiffler, ND (SCNM); participated via conference call
- Dee Saunder, ND (NUNM); participated via conference call
- Fraser Smith, ND (NUHS)

Request for additions or other changes to the agenda

There were no changes to the agenda.

Approval of minutes of the CPNME meeting of May 25, 2018

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

To approve the minutes of the May 25, 2018, CPNME meeting.

The motion was unanimously approved, with correction of typos.

Review of selected approved residency sites

CCNM

Dr. Stretch reviewed selected CCNM residency sites:

- a. CCNM Clinical Residency: The required documents were in place and up-to-date.
- b. CCNM Research Residency: The required documents were in place and up-to-date.
- c. MCNE Residency: Formative and summative evaluations were missing. No quality

assurance information. Some of the documents were outdated. (CCNM residency director Dr. Carino stated that she has found it difficult to keep up with required paperwork, given her other roles at CCNM. The college is planning to hire a residency coordinator for support.)

NUNM

Dr. Jenab reviewed selected NUNM residency sites. He stated that two of the assigned sites—A Family Healing Center and The Equi Institute—were inactive. Dr. Seitz stated that being assigned inactive sites was a glitch; he will contact the CNME administrative assistant to find out what happened. [Note: As it turned out, the two inactive sites were listed as active in September 2018, but were subsequently listed as inactive in October 2018; thus the late change of the operational status caused this problem.]

- a. Lokahi Health Center: The required documents were in place and up-to-date. Paperwork was thorough.

SCNM

Dr. Carino reviewed selected NUNM residency sites.

- a. Integrative Health: Overall, the required documents were in place and up-to-date; however, information on continuing education was missing.
- b. Naturopathic Specialists: Overall, the required documents were in place and up-to-date; however, information on continuing education was missing here as well.
- c. Sedona Wellness Retreat: Overall, the required documents were in place and up-to-date.

(Dr. Carino mentioned that she would contact Dr. Shiffler to provide some additional feedback.)

Bastyr U.

Dr. Beasleigh reviewed selected Bastyr residency sites:

- a. Biologic Integrative Healthcare: All three documents were complete; however, the last affiliation agreement was from 2015. So question: is this document still current?
- b. Eastside Natural Medicine: The required documents were in place and up-to-date.
- c. Pacific Pearl La Jolla: The required documents were in place and up-to-date. Scholarly activity, however, was limited to case study

A general comment: There seems to be some lack of detail in the residency handbook; suggest including the publication date.

Reflections on the review process for spot-checking individual residency sites

A couple reviewers stated that it's sometimes hard to get a good grasp on what's actually happening at individual residency sites, and that a brief (e.g., single page) profile/summary of each residency site would be helpful. It was noted that the "introduction" section of the master document was intended to provide this information. The following needs to be clarified to the programs: either the introduction section of the master documents should provide a profile/summary of the residency experience, or we should require a separate summary document of some sort.

It was suggested that reviewers should review sites from different schools, rather than being assigned just one school. Seeing how different schools address the same requirements would be helpful.

Should we be gathering information on individual residency sites directly from residents to get a better idea of how well the residency is operating? If so, what information would we want to gather? Some schools already gather feedback from residents.

Should the CNME be in charge of ND residencies? What would be the best future direction of in this regard, whether a separate organization takes this over, or the CNME continues to be responsible?

Review draft complaint/grievance policy

The group reviewed the draft complaint/grievance policy that Dr. Seitz had drafted, and agreed that this policy should be adopted.

A question for future discussion was posed: Should residency directors track complaints? If so, for what period of time?

Continued discussion on specialty residencies

The CPNME continued the discussion from the previous meeting on the question of whether it in the CNME's interest—and also achievable on a practical level—to be involved in approving specialty residencies. A number of points were raised:

- We would need to figure out how the CNME, the schools and a specialty society would partner on developing standards and conducting reviews of specialty residency sites.
- Should we put our attention to developing more explicit competencies for general naturopathic residencies before we address the question of specialty residencies?
- If the CNME and schools were involved in overseeing specialty residencies for any specific residency, it would be necessary to develop a checklist with specific criteria for reviewing these residencies since the residency directors would likely not be subject matter experts.
- Should a consortium of specialty societies be created to tackle question of oversight of specialty residencies?
- CNME involvement with overseeing specialty residencies may create political and/or legal issues. For example, there may be competing specialty societies for a given specialty; some licensing jurisdictions may not recognize specialties or may prohibit NDs representing themselves as specialists; NDs without specialty certification that have developed a specialty on their own might resent the CNME endorsing specialty residencies; and other medical fields with similar specialties may use CNME's involvement with specialty residencies to try to discredit the Council.

All agreed that given the potential for political and/or legal issues, the CNME should first raise this topic in the context of the upcoming CNCC and NCC meetings. Dr. Seitz will ask that this topic be included in future CNCC and NCC meeting agendas.

Identify any CPNME priorities and plans for moving ahead on them

Dr. Carino noted several action items resulting from the meeting:

- Informing the board of the CPNME's approval of the draft complaint/grievance policy;
- Raising the issue of CNME becoming involved with oversight of specialty residencies with the NCC and CNCC;
- Requiring a more substantive introduction to individual residency sites as part of the master document so that reviewers have a better idea of what each residency entails;
- Possibly changing the residency site spot-checking process by asking reviewers to review residency sites from three different schools; and

- Addressing other open questions and suggestions that arose during the course of the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.