

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, January 10, 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: December 13, 2016	Draft Minutes	Board Chair
	V	<u>DPH Presentation: Victor Ortiz</u> A. Problem Gambling	Presentation	VO
	VI	<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
	VII	<u>Flex Session</u> A. Announcements B. Topics for next agenda		RC
1:00 p.m.	VIII	Adjournment: Next meeting scheduled for February 14, 2017.		Board Chair

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BOARD OF CERTIFICATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

9:30 a.m.

239 Causeway Street

Room 417

Boston, MA 02114

Board Members

Present:

Jean Zotter, DPH, Chair

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

Henrique O. Schmidt, Community Health Worker, Secretary

Board Members

Not Present:

Joanne Calista, Community Health Worker Training Organization,
Representative

Catherine Bourassa, Community-Based CHW Employer

Sheila Och, Community Health Worker

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:

Victor Ortiz, Office of Problem Gambling, and 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 9:42 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; Mr. Bucchianeri seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Document: January 10, 2017 Board Meeting Agenda

III. Conflict of Interest

Ms. Cherfils announced that at the next meeting, a presentation will be given regarding Conflict of Interest law. This will be a standing agenda item going forward.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: None

Document: None

IV. Approval of December 13, 2016 Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes

The Minutes of the December 13, 2016 Regularly Scheduled Board Meeting were reviewed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Lau stated the page numbers needed to be corrected, “2016” should be changed to “2017” in the footer, “M. Och” should be corrected to “Ms. Och,” wherever “CHW’s” is written the apostrophe should be removed, as well in “its” where appropriate. Page 3 should add “often are multilingual” and correct the date of the next meeting.

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

Document: Draft Minutes

V. DPH Presentation: Victor Ortiz

A. Problem Gambling

Victor Ortiz from the Office of Problem Gambling gave a PowerPoint presentation on the gambling laws and the casinos coming to Massachusetts. Mr. Ortiz discussed how this will affect problem gambling and healthcare, especially the work of CHWs.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: None

Document: PowerPoint Presentation

10:00am Ms. Strachan entered.

VI. CHW Education & Training Program Application

A. Criteria for Review of Application

Board members reviewed the draft criteria for reviewing training program applications

DISCUSSION: Ms. Zotter went over the purpose statement. Ms. Hirsch stated there will be a guidance document published on the website when this goes into effect. Ms. Hirsch went over the four domains and formatting changes made to the document since the last meeting, explaining that some of the information listed is required in the Notice of Intent, and others are required in the Application. Ms. Hogarty stated she wanted to emphasize that these are minimum standards, and she already saw some items that she believes are great to aspire to, but should not be requirements. Quality is important, but she does not want the criteria to be overwhelming. She also questioned if all of the criteria listed could be evaluated by an operational standpoint. Ms. Hirsch reviewed criteria #1. Ms. Strachan questioned what the phrase “solid understanding” meant within that criteria. Ms. Zotter stated it would be hard to define and could be removed. Board members agreed it should be removed and the word “solid” should be changed to “quality” in the purpose statement. Ms. Zotter stated “gender” should be added to criteria 1c. Ms. Lau agreed and also added “linguistic.” Ms. Strachan noted the use of “diverse” within criteria and asked how board members would define or judge this. Ms. Hogarty said that a program cannot control who applies/attends and it is impossible to guarantee diversity. Ms. Edraos pointed out that the criteria says “...commitment to maintaining the diverse nature...” which is an important difference. Ms. Strachan asked how this would be shown, operationally. Ms. Cherfils suggested using an attestation to be signed. Ms. Edraos agreed that a signed attestation would be a good solution, as it would be difficult to demonstrate and would therefore weaken the document. Mr. Bucchianeri questioned if “understanding the importance” would be more suitable, because he is concerned “commitment” may be too much. Ms. Zotter explained that the difference being understanding vs. acting on it, which would be her intention. Ms.

Hogarty agreed it should be an attestation. Audience members suggested changing “maintaining” to “supporting” because it better shows a commitment to whoever participates in the program. Board members accepted this suggestion. Ms. Lau noted that throughout the document some points say “CHW workforce” and some just say “workforce,” and this should be consistent throughout. Ms. Edraos asked how “commitment to health equity” is shown. Ms. Hogarty responded that it would be shown in program curriculum. Board members discussed if health equity should be listed in the criteria, and where it would be shown, and decided it should stay in domain 1 of the criteria. Ms. Edraos suggested removing “demonstrated” and requiring an attestation. Ms. Lau asked if item 1e will disqualify brand new programs. Ms. Zotter stated that was the reason “or capacity” was added, but also asked board members if they think the Board should approve programs that have not trained anyone before. Ms. Edraos added that some people may have a lot of experience in the community, such as peer counselors. Ms. Zotter said that she believes most peer counselors may meet the CHW standards and many could be grandfathered in or take core competency training to meet requirements. Ms. Hogarty stated that if a new group without CHW experience is starting a program, she would like to see that they have consulted CHWs and made an effort to know the work. Mr. Bucchianeri stated that this information could be covered in domain 2. Ms. Zotter asked if the idea is covered in another domain, does it need to be a point in domain 1. Board members agreed to leave it in a return to the subject later. Board members reviewed domain 2. Ms. Hogarty stated that the language did not make sense and the meaning is not clear. She also said that the core values of CHW work should be defined somewhere. Ms. Zotter preferred to remove from “teaching philosophy” on in the first sentence. Board members agreed to leave for now and come back to the line. In 2a, “and learning needs” was removed, although not discussed. Ms. Zotter asked if it should be put back in. Ms. Hogarty responded that information is more about learning styles and has nothing to do with demographics. Ms. Cherfils asked what board members would like to know about the demographics. Ms. Zotter replied that programs need to understand their student body. Ms. Guimaraes questioned if the programs should be addressing the populations they are serving. Ms. Hogarty noted that those are two separate issues and there are limits of what a program can do. Ms. Cherfils pointed out that programs may be able to anticipate demographics to an extent, but they will not really know until they have started classes. Ms. Edraos stated she feels programs should be assessing the incoming student classes to allow preparation for their needs. Ms. Hogarty replied that would be ideal, but is not always possible, and in general the population stays the same. Ms. Zotter notes that the Board will not require translation services. Mr. Schmidt stated that he feels it would be impossible to anticipate every student’s needs and accommodate every single language and learning tool. Opening these criteria to so many specifics is too much and the training program should be ensuring the basic skills for CHWs to translate into their work. Board members agreed the language should be changed to clarify that the program should learn about the student body, then agreed 2a should be altogether removed. Mr. Bucchianeri asked how the Board will measure

criteria 2b. Ms. Zotter responded that it could be a question on the application. Ms. Hogarty agreed and said this criterion is easy to demonstrate. She also added that 2c should include language requiring demonstration of using teaching methods that address adult learner needs. Ms. Hirsch asked how board members felt about 2d, which is an optional criteria encouraging programs to use popular teaching methods, i.e. technology. Ms. Hogarty stated she felt it should be taken out as it is not as important as adult learning methods. Board members agreed to strike 2d. Board members discussed criteria 2e, which revolves around the staff of a program creating a supportive environment for students whose primary language is not English. Mr. Bucchianeri asked how that would be shown. Ms. Hogarty said programs could describe the actions they plan to take to create this environment. Ms. Zotter noted that this criterion focused on students whose primary language is not English, but she is concerned about creating a supportive environment for all students. Board members agree to change language to include “all students.”

11:47am Break, 11:59am Return

Ms. Hirsch asked board members if they would like to make rules regarding class size. Mr. Bucchianeri suggested looking at student-teacher ratio more than class size. Ms. Hogarty expressed that her concern is participatory learner and she prefers not to be too restrictive. Ms. Zotter suggested changing 2f to “Program has appropriate class size to facilitate participatory learning.” Ms. Cherfils offered the alternative “Program has appropriate class size with a faculty to student ratio that facilitates participatory learning.” Ms. Hogarty asked if a guidance document could be made for this. Ms. Zotter said that a FAQ or one large guidance document could be made to help with applications. Ms. Lau stated “Roles and Responsibilities” should be a bullet underneath 3. Ms. Hogarty said she felt all of 3 from domain 2 could be moved to domain 3. Ms. Edraos added that 3a, b, i, j, l, and m all relate to faculty and agreed they should be moved. Ms. Hogarty stated 4 is another nice ideal, but not a minimum standard, and should be removed. Board members agree 4a should be removed and 4b will move to domain 4. Criteria 5 requires two learning objectives for each of the ten core competencies. All board members agree that two is a good number for this. Ms. Hirsch asked board members about the time requirement for each individual core competencies. A chart of minimum hours was created in November 2013, which helped determine the 80-hour minimum for training. A grid could be created to be available to the public. Ms. Zotter asked if board members would like to review this grid before approving. Board members said yes. Ms. Hogarty noted that she feels this is another area they may be getting too prescriptive and would like to be cautious about it, but definitely would like to include guidance on this. Ms. Strachan recommended setting a minimum number of hours to help operationally when processing documents. Board members discussed whether or not the wording was too vague. Ms. Edraos suggested leaving somewhat vague language because the programs will need to provide a learning plan. Ms. Zotter requested that in 5c language changed to “specific health topics” to match the regulations. Ms.

