

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**

**Thursday, March 23, 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: February 14, 2016	Draft Minutes	Board Chair
	V	Regulatory Update	Draft Regulations	VB
	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 April 11, 2017.		Board Chair

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BOARD OF CERTIFICATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, March 23, 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
Patricia Edraos, Massachusetts League of Community Health
Centers (MLCHC), Representative
Sheila Och, Community Health Worker
Henrique O. Schmidt, Community Health Worker, Secretary
Maritza Smidy, Community Health Worker

Board Members

Not Present:

Steven Bucchianeri, Massachusetts Association of Health Plans
Representative
Catherine Bourassa, Community-Based CHW Employer
Denise Lau, Public Member

Staff Present:

Roberlyne Cherfils, Executive Director, BHPL
Philip Beattie, Assistant Executive Director, BHPL
Rebecca Ferullo, Office Support Specialist I, BHPL
Vita Berg, Office of the General Counsel, 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 9:40 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. Schmidt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Document: March 23, 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.

ACTION: None

Document: None

IV. Approval of February 14, 2017 Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes

The Minutes of the February 14, 2017 Regularly Scheduled Board Meeting were reviewed.

DISCUSSION: None

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

Document: Draft Minutes

V. Regulatory Update

Ms. Berg reviewed the process of how the regulations were drafted, approved, sent for review by the Secretary's office and returned with edits. A fee package was also reviewed at the same time. She explained the process for public hearings and that Board staff are working on confirming dates in Boston, Worcester and Springfield. Ms. Berg reviewed the changes made to the draft regulations by the Secretary's office.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Zotter asked if the fee proposal will be posted with the regulations for the public to comment on. Ms. Berg confirmed, yes. Ms. Hogarty

asked what the fee will be. Ms. Berg responded that the initial certification and renewal fee were both approved for \$35.

Ms. Berg reviewed the edits to section 2.00 of the draft regulations.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: Ms. Zotter made a motion to approve the edits and publish the draft regulations for public hearing; Ms. Smidy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Berg reviewed the edits to section 3.00 of the draft regulations.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: Ms. Och made a motion to approve the edits and publish the draft regulations for public hearing; Ms. Calista seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Berg reviewed the edits to section 4.00 of the draft regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Zotter asked if the changes allowing the Board to ask for additional documentation could be used if Board members decided they would like additional documentation from all applicants. Ms. Berg responded that while the current language would cover that situation for a short period, the regulations should be updated if Board members would like to change the requirements for licensure.

ACTION: Ms. Hogarty made a motion to approve the edits and publish the draft regulations for public hearing; Mr. Schmidt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Berg reviewed the edits to section 5.00 of the draft regulations.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: Ms. Zotter made a motion to approve the edits and publish the draft regulations for public hearing; Ms. Smidy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Berg reviewed the edits to section 7.00 of the draft regulations.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: Ms. Edraos made a motion to approve the edits and publish the draft regulations for public hearing; Ms. Och seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Berg reviewed the edits to section 8.00 of the draft regulations.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: Mr. Schmidt made a motion to approve the edits and publish the draft regulations for public hearing; Ms. Calista seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Berg reviewed the edits to section 9.00 of the draft regulations.

DISCUSSION: None

ACTION: Ms. Zotter made a motion to approve the edits and publish the draft regulations for public hearing; Ms. Hogarty seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Cherfils announced that a meeting room for June 9th was being held at 250 Washington St. for a public hearing, and staff will continue to work on securing locations and dates in other parts of the state.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Calista suggested using Worcester city hall or the public library, as it is very accessible. Ms. Edraos suggested Springfield Public Library. Ms. Cherfils stated she would check into these suggestions. Ms. Calista asked what to do if contacted by the press regarding the regulations or public hearings. Ms. Cherfils responded that all such inquiries should be directed to her.

VI. 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. Zotter started the discussion with domain 2 section 7. Board members discussed in person vs online training. Ms. Hirsch reviewed a document “Background for Assessment” which outlined what the Board had previously discussed, showing that they had decided online-only training was not acceptable, but no amount was decided on. Board members agreed that they do not want to leave it too vague. Ms. Calista suggested allowing 50% online training. Ms. Och stated that she would like to see a list of the best online learning practices to take into consideration when choosing the requirements. Ms. Hirsch offered a list of Massachusetts programs and the online criteria they use. Ms. Och and Ms. Hogarty agreed they would like to see many states. Ms. Calista noted that board

members should consider geographies when viewing them as criteria may be different in states which are larger and populations are spread out. Ms. Zotter added that they should look at all adult learning, not just CHW programs. Ms. Edraos suggested checking with the Education Department if they have this information available. Ms. Hirsch stated she would look into this information to bring back to board members. She asked if board members would like to see Dawn (regular audience member) present on this, as she is an expert. Ms. Hogarty expressed that she would not be comfortable with this and it could be a conflict; she would like a broader view. Ms. Calista stated that in section 8, “if applicable” in reference to internships was too vague and she would like clearer language. Board members reviewed the time study document provided from a previous advisory group meeting. Ms. Och asked if the hours listed were suggested amounts of time for each competency. Ms. Hirsch reminded board members that the time study document is how the 80 hour requirement was determined. Ms. Zotter stated she would like to create minimum time requirements, but no maximum. Board members discussed blending, when a class may cover two or more subjects and can be difficult to determine, and how different competencies may be focused on more or less by different programs. Ms. Zotter suggested setting a minimum of 4 hours per competency. Ms. Hogarty agreed that this would allow for flexibility. Board members agree to 4 hours.

11:05am Break, 11:17am Return

Ms. Zotter reviewed the changes previously made to domain 3. Ms. Cherfils asked if “key staff” could be defined. Ms. Zotter explained that it was intended for roles such as director and higher administrative staff. Ms. Smidy suggested using “senior leadership at parent institution.” Ms. Edraos stated she felt it was not needed, as it was covered in #3. She also felt #9 was unnecessary. Ms. Och stated that #3 did not cover qualifications, which may be the reason keep the senior leadership line, and asked to define “sufficient.” Ms. Hogarty asked what would be submitted in the application for #3. Ms. Berg offered that the Board is here to exercise discretion and may decide if things are “sufficient,” and would have to be concerned with explaining why something is not sufficient. Board members would need to be very specific if delegating decisions to the staff. Board members agreed to remove the word “sufficient.” Ms. Calista suggested removing the two year minimum from #4, as the independent audit required will cover this. Ms. Och requested that “program” be changed to “parent institution.” Ms. Edraos asked who would be reading the independent audits, and suggested using information from a resource she knows of that provides this information for entities doing business with the State. Board members agreed that this is not necessary and a cover letter with a summary of the findings could be required as part of the audit. Ms. Smidy stated that board members can require institutions to submit audits yearly. Ms. Calista stated she felt this is important because some programs, such as non-profits, can close suddenly leaving their students in a difficult situation. Board members agreed to add the second half of #4 to #3 and then switch their places in the document, and delete #5.

11:56am Ms. Calista leaves, 11:58am Ms. Calista returns

Ms. Edraos suggested removing #6, as it seems to police cost of programs, which can be tricky. Ms. Zotter expressed that it was intended to protect students from predatory practices which may try to take advantage of those in a vulnerable population. Ms. Berg explained that it is not within the Board's authority to do so, and there are other institutions which provide services in such a situation. Ms. Och suggested adding language requiring that programs have their full fee schedule published for transparency; board members agreed and decided to remove #6. Ms. Cherfils also suggested in the annual report requiring that programs disclose any complaints to the Better Business Bureau or similar agencies. Board members agreed to remove #9, as it is unclear where it came from. Board members also agreed to remove #10. Ms. Och stated that in section C, #3 is covered by #1 and #2. Board members agreed to remove #3 and change #2 to "detailed policies."

12:49pm Ms. Berg left.

Ms. Edraos asked if in #2 "ADA compliant" was necessary and would limit programs. Other board members agreed that it was important to include, and they would not want to approve programs which were not accessible to students with disabilities, especially as a state Board.

ACTION: None

Document: Draft Criteria

VII. 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

VIII. Adjourn
There being no other business before the Board, Ms. Zotter 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, March 14, 2017, at 9:30 a.m. at 239 Causeway Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted:

Cantrell

chair

11/12/19

Name

Position

Date