

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BOARD OF CERTIFICATION 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, February 14, 2017
9:30 a.m.

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

Agenda

Time	Item #	Item	Exhibits	Staff Contact
09:30 a.m.	I	Call to Order & Introductions Determination of Quorum Notice of Electronic Recording		Board Chair
	II	Approval of Agenda	Draft Agenda	Board Chair
	III	Conflict of Interest		Board Chair
	IV	Approval of Minutes: January 10, 2016	Draft Minutes	Board Chair
	V	<u>CHW Education & Training Program Application</u> A. Criteria for Review of Application B. Process for Application Review C. Provisional v. Full Approval Chart	Draft Applications	GH RC Board Chair
	VI	<u>Flex Session</u> A. Announcements B. Topics for next agenda		RC
1:00 p.m.	VII	Adjournment: Next meeting scheduled for March 14, 2017.		Board Chair

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BOARD OF CERTIFICATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, February 14, 2017

9:30 a.m.

239 Causeway Street

Room 417

Boston, MA 02114

Board Members

Present: Jean Zotter, DPH, Chair

Joanne Calista, Community Health Worker Training Organization, Representative

Peggy Hogarty, Massachusetts Public Health Association Representative

Denise Lau, Public Member

Steven Bucchianeri, Massachusetts Association of Health Plans Representative

Patricia Edraos, Massachusetts League of Community Health Centers (MLCHC), Representative

Sheila Och, Community Health Worker

Board Members

Not Present: Henrique O. Schmidt, Community Health Worker, Secretary

Catherine Bourassa, Community-Based CHW Employer

Maritza Smidy, Community Health Worker

Staff Present: Roberlyne Cherfils, Executive Director, BHPL

Philip Beattie, Assistant Executive Director, BHPL

Rebecca Ferullo, Office Support Specialist I, BHPL

Mary Strachan, Board Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, DPH

Gail Hirsch, Co-Director, Office of Community Health Workers, DPH

Erica Guimaraes, Office of Community Health Workers, DPH

Visitors: None

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 9:42 a.m.

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

II. Approval of Board Meeting Agenda

The Meeting Agenda was reviewed.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: Ms. Zotter made a motion to approve the agenda as presented; Ms. Hogarty seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Document: February 14, 2017 Board Meeting Agenda

III. Conflict of Interest

Ms. Cherfils asked board members if there were any conflicts of interest in the agenda.

DISCUSSION: Board members stated there were no conflicts of interest.

Board Meeting Agenda February 14, 2017

Board of Certification of Community Health Workers

ACTION: None

Document: None

9:54am Ms. Guimaraes entered, 9:58am Ms. Calista entered.

IV. Approval of January 10, 2017 Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes

The Minutes of the January 10, 2017 Regularly Scheduled Board Meeting were reviewed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Lau stated “2016” should be changed to “2017” in the footer, and after the break correct the plural of competencies.

ACTION: Ms. Zotter made a motion to approve the minutes as amended; Mr. Bucchianeri seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Document: Draft Minutes

10:09am Ms. Strachan entered.

V. CHW Education & Training Program Application

A. Criteria for Review of Application

Board members reviewed the revised draft criteria for reviewing training program applications.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Hirsch reviewed the changes that were made from the last draft. Mr. Bucchianeri noted a typo in domain 1 to be corrected. Ms. Hirsch reminded board members they talked about creating an attestation for items c & d, and revisiting item e after the other domains were reviewed.

In domain 2, Ms. Zotter stated that she had notes saying items b, c, d, e and f were moving to domain 3. Mr. Bucchianeri, Ms. Hogarty and other board members agreed the items should be moved. Board members also agreed that items g and h should be moved to domain 3, and discussed the pros and cons of moving item a to domain 3. Ms. Edraos suggested moving both item a and the heading beginning “Host organization...” to domain 3, and board members agreed. Ms. Calista stated that she would like to see the language adjusted to reflect that a CHW training program may not operate fully independent of a host program, but rather that the core competency training is discreet from other programs. Ms. Strachan offered that the Nursing Board has language stating that host organizations must involve the program faculty before making decisions about or implementing changes to the program curriculum, and that board members may want to include similar language. Board members discussed creating a new domain for this vs. including it in the Content and Design domain. Ms. Zotter suggested creating an “administration domain” to cover these points and others which may not fit into the current four. Ms. Lau asked if the domains originated from the regulations and Ms. Hirsch responded that the idea of domains were created before the regulations to help retain the integrity of CHW training. Board members discussed the importance of keeping CHW training programs discreet from their host organizations, and how to ensure this. Board members decided to include language preventing host entities from making changes to the program without faculty input. Ms. Hogarty asked what “affordable” means within the context of this domain, as it can differ greatly based on each person’s interpretation. Board members discussed the intention of avoiding for-profit organizations putting CHWs greatly in debt. Ms. Edraos stated she felt it should be removed completely to avoid any issues based around the term “affordable.” Ms. Zotter asked if board members removed this and a for-profit organization applied, would that be okay with them. Ms. Och stated that the most important part is to define “affordable” first. Board members talked about how costs are determined and can change over time. Ms. Cherfils suggested asking programs how they determined their fees. Several board members agreed with this suggestion. Ms. Zotter asked that if that was criteria, how would board members properly explain why a program may be rejected. She asked Ms. Strachan to look in how nursing programs handle this, and stated she will do more research on how this would be judged before the Board decides it should be criteria. Board members agreed to hold the decision regarding criteria based on program fees.

11:07am Break. 11:21am Return.

Ms. Hogarty asked what the meaning of “roles of faculty are clearly defined” is. She felt “Faculty have demonstrated they have the skills necessary to teach the core competencies” is clearer. Ms. Hirsch stated that it was developed for separation of trainers/co-trainers and administrative staff in regards to the requirement that a certain percentage are certified CHWs. Board members decided to revisit the language later. Ms. Lau noted that “adequate size” in the training location criteria should read “adequate class size” because the institute may be large but the classroom is not. Ms. Lau also suggested that language regarding having AV equipment should be included. Ms. Och noted that this would not apply for online classes. Board members agreed that online learning should be defined. Ms. Lau amended her suggestion to ask for “appropriate teaching tools.” Board members discussed how much online learning is acceptable in a program. Ms. Och asked board members to consider CHWs in remote areas when making this decision. Ms. Strachan suggested basing the amounts on the training hours required by the regulations. Ms. Zotter offered to create draft criteria for this subject to be reviewed at the next meeting; board members agreed. Ms. Hogarty stated she believes participatory learning is important and this should also be considered when

drafting criteria. Ms. Calista added that board members should be aware of CHWs levels of comfortability with English, both speaking and writing, when participating in a class. Ms. Hogarty stated she would like to see the Time Study document again, as after reviewing this criteria and information, she felt it may not be as objective as she originally thought. Board members agreed to remove the criteria requiring programs to foster leadership skills, as it would be difficult to measure and other entities can provide this. In domain 3, Ms. Hogarty felt the terminology was too focused on academic programs, using words such as “students” and “admission materials.” Ms. Zotter offered changing “students” to “participants” and “admission materials” to “application and marketing materials” throughout the document. Board members discussed what requirements for applications and marketing materials should be and agreed that the criteria will be just that programs have them. Mr. Bucchianeri reminded board members that the criteria should be kept as simple as possible, as they do not want to have trouble getting through the review and approval of them. Ms. Calista stated she would like to know programs’ admissions/withdrawal/termination policies. Ms. Hogarty responded that some programs may not have policies like this, and that participants are provided as much time and support as possible to complete the program. Ms. Zotter explained that not having withdrawal or termination would be considered a policy. Board members agree that the required policy should also include information on credit transfers. Board members also agreed that programs will be required to have a documented process of how they will work with participants who are not doing well in the program, track all participant performance and record maintenance, and this documentation must be available upon request. Ms. Och asked how long records should be retained. Ms. Cherfils responded that for other boards, program records should be kept indefinitely. Ms. Hogarty asked what happens if a program closes and records are not available. Ms. Hirsch reminded board members that the lookback period for training is ten years, so this should not be an issue. Board members agreed to strike the criteria requiring programs to have ties with employers in the community. Board members discussed how to judge financial viability, and how this would work operationally. Ms. Cherfils suggested having programs submit independent audits. Board members agreed to accept clean independent audit results for proof of financial viability. The capacity of program staff to administer the program and how to prove this information was discussed. Board members decided to review resumes and move this criterion to the “administrative category” discussed earlier. Mr. Bucchianeri suggested moving items back to domain 2. Ms. Lau asked what “adequate faculty to support” meant, as “adequate” can be relative. Ms. Hogarty responded that this information was already covered in the faculty/student ratio. Board members agreed to remove it. Board members also agreed to remove “CHWs” from the bullet “faculty have experience teaching CHWs,” as someone may have had experience teaching similar skills which would still be beneficial. Ms. Zotter started discussion on domain 4 and explained that the intention is to make sure evaluations are not based on a written exam. Ms. Strachan noted that the current language may be too wordy and if the Board does not want a written exam, they can state that. Ms. Hogarty offered the example of her program, which tested evaluating participants in simulated situations and if someone did not do well, they would continue or repeat the education until they were ready. Board members agreed they would like to see interactive assessments, and programs will need to submit how this will be performed. Board members were unable to come to a decision and Ms. Zotter offered to bring up the regulations regarding evaluation at the next meeting.

ACTION: None

Document: Draft Criteria

VI. Flex Session

A. Topics for Next Meeting

DISCUSSION: Ms. Zotter stated any agenda items not addressed will be added to next month’s agenda.

ACTION: None

Document: None

VII. Adjourn

There being no other business before the Board, Ms. Zotter made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Och seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 1:03 pm.

The next meeting of the Board of Certification of Community Health Workers is scheduled for Tuesday, March 14, 2017, at 9:30 a.m. at 239 Causeway Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted:

Name	Position	Date
------	----------	------