

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BOARD OF CERIFICATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS

**THIS AGENDA CONSTITUTES NOTICE OF THE REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF CERTIFICATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS
IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETING LAW, M.G.L. c. 30A, § 20**

**Tuesday, April 14, 2015
9:30 a.m.**

**239 Causeway Street ~ 4th Floor ~ Room 417A/B
Boston, Massachusetts 02114**

Agenda

Time	Item #	Item	Exhibits
9:30 a.m.	I.	Call to Order Determination of Quorum	
	II.	Approval of Agenda	Draft Agenda
	III.	Approval of Minutes	Draft Minutes
	IV.	Update on Status of Draft Regulations	None
	V.	Update on Fees	None
	VI.	Advisory Work Group	None
	VII.	Discussion of Tier 2 CHW Certification	None
	VIII.	Other Business/Announcements	None

1:00 p.m.	IX.	Adjournment	
-----------	------------	--------------------	--

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
BOARD OF CERTIFICATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 14, 2015
9:00 a.m.
239 Causeway Street
Room 417
Boston, MA 02114

Board Members Jean Zotter, DPH, Chair

Present: Patricia Edraos, Massachusetts League of Community Health Centers (MLCHC), Representative
Joanne Calista, Community Health Worker Training Organization, Representative
Sheila Och, Community Health Worker
Henrique O. Schmidt, Community Health Worker, Secretary
Maritza Smidy, Community Health Worker
Peggy Hogarty, Massachusetts Public Health Association Representative
Denise Lau, Public Member

Board Members

Not Present:

Staff Present: Mary Phillips, Executive Director, DHPL
Rebecca Ferullo, Office Support Specialist I, DHPL
Vita Berg, Chief Board Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, DPH
Gail Hirsch, Director, Office of Community Health Workers, DPH

Visitors: Members of the Public

- I. Call to Order and Determination of Quorum
A quorum of the Board was present. Ms. Zotter, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m.

Ms. Zotter invited Board Members, DPH staff, and Public Members in attendance to introduce themselves.

- II. Approval of Board Meeting Agenda
The Meeting Agenda was reviewed.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: Ms. Och made a motion to approve the agenda; Ms. Lau seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Document: April 14, 2015 Board Meeting Agenda

III. Approval of January 13, 2014 Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes

The Minutes of the January 13, 2014 Regularly Scheduled Board Meeting were reviewed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Och noted that the third action on page three needs to be corrected from “Mr.” to “Ms.”

ACTION: Ms. Och made a motion to approve the minutes with changes; Ms. Lau seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Document: January 13, 2014 Regularly Scheduled Board Meeting Minutes

Update on Status of Draft Regulations

DISCUSSION: Ms. Berg presents. Shortly after the last meeting, a change of administration occurred. A “pause” was put on submitting regulations. Review process has changed, more information must be submitted with the regulations. Staff are currently working on a fee proposal. Unsure of timeline at this point, still waiting to hear exactly what is required by new Executive Order. Will continue to update Board.

ACTION: None

Document: None

IV. Update on Fees

DISCUSSION: Staff are currently working on fee proposal; checking what fees are in other states, estimating how many people will be applying. Ms. Edraos asks, Would a quick survey sent to known CHW employers help? May take too long to get back. 2009 survey says there are about 3000 CHWs in the state. Number based on applicants in a year or lifetime? First 2 years, or first (initial influx) year plus the following year. Will there be a fee proposal for Program applications? Ms. Berg will check with the Director if that should be done now or later. Ms. Zotter states she expects “waves” of applications. Once regulations are approved, Training Programs will need some time to apply, be approved and enroll/graduate students, so that pathway may take even a year. Initial applicants will use the grandfathering pathway for certification. Ms. Hogarty states it will be difficult to estimate what applications will be received. People are asking about it, and she is trying to inform as much as possible, but has no timeline. Ms. Edraos states that if the process is going to take time, the Board can use the opportunity to inform potential applicants about what is expected. Ms. Berg suggests doing this after the public hearing, as changes may happen and informing before that could spread misinformation. Ms. Calista states that Ms. Hirsch’s office at DPH has resources and is making efforts to provide information. Members involved in Training Programs can ask and attempt to get an estimate of how many CHWs plan to become certified. Also ask MACHW Ms. Hogarty states most CHWs are employed by community-based organizations and are difficult to survey, but it is important to reach them. Ms. Edraos asks if it is possible to do a web survey, as it would be low cost and an easy way to get the word out. Ms. Och states this is a bit of a catch-22: asking before a fee is decided; the number of applicants may change based on cost. Ms. Berg states that fee proposals factor in earning capacity of the profession. Public has an opportunity to comment on fees. Would providing a salary range be helpful? Yes. Ms. Zotter feels it is not worth it to delay regulations for a survey that may or may not be accurate. Ms. Berg offers a compromise: Put together as much information as possible over the next month and if delay beyond the division’s control happens, info can be updated. Ms. Hogarty asks what is the best way at Programs to gather estimates? The number of new students in the last year or two will give a good estimate of the applicants we will receive after the initial influx.

ACTION: None

Document: None

V. Advisory Work Group

DISCUSSION: There was previously a group advising the Board to help with regulations. It was not a set charge and numbers fluctuated. Would the Board like to continue with a Work Group and set a charge? Important to define who is on the work group, quorum, qualifications, etc.

ACTION: Ms. Edraos made a motion not to formalize an Advisory Work Group.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Hogarty states she feels important work is done by the group, and they did adhere to some open meeting law rules. Did work the Board did not have time to do, and a review of “tiers” is coming up. Ms. Zotter reminds that Board that a group can have a different quorum than the Board and still be open to the public. Ms. Berg reminds the Board not to set quorum too low, as the number of attendees changes a lot and it can be hard to catch people up. The work group would still be a public body subject to Open Meeting Law and must be just as formal as the Board. Ms. Edraos asks, How will members be chosen? Members would be appointed by the Board. If a certain subject needs more attention, the Board can also create a subcommittee to meet separately (still open to public) and return to Board with information and recommendations. Can always get input from the audience without a Work Group. Ms. Hogarty asks, What work needs to be done? This will help decide if a work group is needed. Tier 2 needs a lot of work and Reciprocity may need work in the future.

ACTION: Ms. Calista made a motion to establish a work group; Ms. Hogarty seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION: Would Board members like to think about possible members and return next month?

11:04am Break

11:22am Return

Membership of work group – Is it okay to talk to people about the group? Yes, individual members can ask outside parties about their interest and bring that information back to the next meeting. Be sure to inform potential members that they will need to be careful to follow conflict of interest and Open Meeting Law. Should categories for members be considered (CHWs, Training Programs, employers, medical and community based organizations, etc.) A list of previous work group members will be reviewed. Ms. Edraos states should would like the consistent audience members to be offered seats; has concerns about having seats for certain positions/categories not filled. What is the subject matter to be reviewed by the group? Relevant decisions on who would have input should be made (for Second Tier). Board members will consider potential work group members and discuss at the May meeting. Number of members? Consider 10-20 people, with a quorum being about 40%. Will decide in May after speaking with people. Consider when choosing possible members – CHWs who work for organizations represented by Board members may feel pressure and be unable to participate fully.

ACTION: None

Document: None

VI. Discussion of Tier 2 CHW Certification

DISCUSSION: Tier 2, including but not limited to certified CHWs who are also trainers. Does the Board want to include other tiers/categories? ie. Supervisors and/or chronic disease work (not making regulations yet). Terry, audience member, offers a handout with explanation: Research of tiers from other states. Texas has a “second level” for CHW instructors. Different requirements but same core competencies. Not required to be a CHW first. No other states have levels, shows examples of other occupations/certifications with tiers. Should other tiers be based on specialties? It may be too early to see where the profession is going. Tiers based on experience/years working? Ms. Berg notes that if it will not help a CHWs advancement, the Board does not need to have tiers. Created as an opportunity to ensure CHWs had a place amongst CHW trainers, but not only for certified CHWs. Statute states tiers should be made with the intention of career advancement. “Tier or level...” – not bound to the word “tier.”

12:13 Ms. Phillips leaves

Ms. Hogarty states the trainers in her programs are not able to make a living off individual jobs and do not necessarily make higher salaries. The Board will stick with Trainer and Supervisor tiers for now, and return to discuss specialties during regulations. Consider that trainers may not only work for Training Programs. An Audience member asks how can we guarantee that higher tiers mean advancement/monetary gain? The Board will consider reaching out to employers and more CHWs to see what tiers mean to them. Ms. Berg reviews the statute, reading that the Board may decide tiers are not necessary, if it does not help career advancement. What does that mean to the Board? Also, as it is not a license, there is nothing to force an employer to use certified CHW (or any tier) to do the job. Would specialties be the right path? The value is CHWs is their ability to connect to the Community. CHWs work beyond the medical field. A Community Organizer/Developer tier? Also, how to assess/translate experience into skill and make a tier for that? May need the advisory work group to discuss, will defer until after the group is established.

ACTION: None

Document: None

VII. Other Business/Announcements

DISCUSSION: Board members will send names of potential group members to Ms. Hirsch to compile a list and compare to meeting audience attendance.

ACTION: None

Document: None

VIII. Adjourn

There being no other business before the Board, Ms. Och made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Calista seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:57 pm.

The next meeting of the Board of Certification of Community Health Workers is scheduled for Tuesday, June 9, 2015, at 9:30 a.m. at 239 Causeway Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted:

Name

Position

Date