

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, August 9, 2016
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		
	II.	Approval of Agenda	Draft Agenda	
	III.	Approval of Minutes	Draft Minutes	
	VI.	<u>Speaker:</u> A. Commissioner Monica Bharel, MD, MPH	None	
	VII.	<u>Policy:</u> GMC/Suitability for Certification	Draft Policy	
	VIII.	<u>Application:</u> A. Training Program Application	None	
	IX.	<u>Flex Session</u>	None	
1:00 p.m.	X.	Adjournment		

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BOARD OF CERTIFICATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, August 9, 2016

9:30 a.m.

239 Causeway Street

Room 417

Boston, MA 02114

Board Members

Jean Zotter, DPH, Chair

Present:

Joanne Calista, Community Health Worker Training Organization, Representative

Peggy Hogarty, Massachusetts Public Health Association Representative

Maritza Smidy, Community Health Worker (via phone)

Catherine Bourassa, Community-Based CHW Employer

Henrique O. Schmidt, Community Health Worker, Secretary

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

Board Members

Not Present:

Sheila Och, Community Health Worker

Denise Lau, Public Member

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

Vita Berg, Office of the General Counsel, DPH

James Lavery, Director, BHPL

Monica Bharel, Commissioner, 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. Quorum established.
- II. Approval of Board Meeting Agenda
The Meeting Agenda was reviewed.
- DISCUSSION: None
- ACTION: Ms. Smidy made a motion to approve the agenda; Mr. Schmidt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- Document: August 9, 2016 Board Meeting Agenda
- III. Approval of June 30, 2016 Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes
The Minutes of the June 30, 2016 Regularly Scheduled Board Meeting were reviewed.
- DISCUSSION: On page 2, a board member is listed as “Mr.” and should be “Mrs.”
- ACTION: Mr. Zotter made a motion to approve the minutes as amended; Ms. Hogarty seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- Document: June 30, 2016 Regularly Scheduled Board Meeting Minutes
- IV. Application
A. Training Program Application
- DISCUSSION: Ms. Berg reviewed conflict of interest law and how it affects board members. Although several board members work for training programs, because they are not discussing individual programs it is okay for them to participate. The draft application was reviewed. Board members noted that any place referring to “prerequisite” should be changed to “provisional.” The affidavit should be changed to fit the program application and should be based on the regulations section 5. The first step is notice of intent – board members discussed if this should be part of the application or a separate standard form, and then should the Board create such a form. It was agreed, yes, it should be separate. Board members will take the draft application home to review more thoroughly, mark changes they would like and return with suggestions at the next meeting.
- ACTION: None

Document: Draft Applciation

Ms. Strachan entered 10:06 am

Ms. Bharel entered 10:07 am

V. Speaker

A. Commissioner Monica Bharel, MD, MPH

DISCUSSION: Ms. Bharel introduced herself and provided a summary of her background in healthcare. She has a history of working with patients from low income areas and working with CHWs, making this Board important to her. She invited people to introduce themselves and share anything they would like her to know. Board members stated their names and shared a quick summary of their experience with and the importance of CHW work. Ms. Bharel discussed the goals of DPH, specifically connecting patients with the services they need. Ms. Hogarty discussed the difficulty posed because training programs are not available in all areas of the state, esp. the southeast, and that funding is a major part of this. Audience members also had questions and comments. Lisette of MACHW agreed that more resources need to be available beyond Boston and suggested that DPH work with hospitals to create more options. Jackie of MACHW discussed her desire to “ban the box” and find an alternative to running CORI reports, as well as see more CHW representation on the Board.

Ms. Calista entered 10:25 am

Renee discussed healthcare access and training within schools. Darrel expressed his concern for the level of awareness of CHWs in other divisions of DPH and wants to be sure there is cohesion throughout DPH. Brett discussed reimbursement for CHWs as something that needs to be considered and stated organizations are preparing for it. He wants to make sure both that the healthcare industry is ready for Certified CHWs and that the essence of the work is preserved by the workforce remaining a group of people suited by life experience and not just choosing a career path from school. Ms. Edraos discussed directing funding to CHWs and training, such as the many grants available for social programs could be adjusted to include CHWs and help get payers to recognize the community. Ms. Bharel responded discussing how the good intentions for healthcare often translates to financial gain or savings and as a country we need to do a better job of translating the benefits in order to correctly direct funds. Lisa reminded board members that not all CHWs work in healthcare environments. Janet stated that other states and the federal government are starting to notice CHW work and that her program at Holyoke Community College received a grant from the Dept of Labor and it does a lot to educate people on the profession. Ms. Calista agreed that recognizing all CHWs (healthcare setting or otherwise) is important and that they need to work to both create and then sustain funding.

ACTION: None

Document: None

Ms. Bharel left 10:42 am
Break 10:42 am
Return 10:58 am

VI. Policy
A. GMC/Suitability for Certification

DISCUSSION: Ms. Zotter expressed desire to make decisions at this meeting and move forward with the policy. She reviewed the previous presentations and discussions regarding CORI. She feels CORI runs should be used because then the Board has done their due diligence to try to protect the public and prevent something bad from happening. She would like very narrow parameters on the information reviewed by the board. Ms. Calista agreed; she is mostly concerned with recent egregious offenses and is in favor of an employer affidavit option. Ms. Smidy stated that if all the other Boards require a CORI, also having it helps keep the field professional. She would also like strict parameters set to only view recent and relative crimes and allow applicants to speak with the Board. Board members were reminded that an employer affidavit may not be legally possible, as employers may not be able to release that information. Mr. Schmidt stated that he is in favor of the CORI and employer affidavit and wants to make sure that applicants are not unfairly eliminated. Ms. Edraos also agreed with both CORI and employer affidavit and strict guidelines on the information used. Ms. Lavery reminded board members that employer CORIs are different than the state and may not show the same information. Ms. Bourassa stated she was in favor of the CORI and using an employer affidavit as a backup of character in the case of a positive report. Ms. Edraos feels the affidavit could lead to unforeseen consequences and would like the CORI with strict guidelines. Ms. Zotter expressed concern for the employer affidavit as it would be a two tier process that could be unfair. She also feels that many employers are bad at running/reading CORI reports. Ms. Bourassa stated that as an employer she could only attest that she had run a CORI and cannot reveal any information about the results, positive or negative. Mr. Beattie offered that this process could cause more administrative problems and delays for applicants. Board members discussed considering presumption of suitability for those with a criminal history and who have been employed for a period of time and having this done by staff action policy. Ms. Strachan had concerns about listing offenses as it may become too specific to allow discretion. The Board may choose whatever lookback period they would like and could begin seeing cases and then create staff action based on what comes up often. Ms. Bourassa stated that if a CORI is done for everyone, an employer affidavit is not necessary. Ms. Calista would like to check if it is legal as an alternative option. Board members discussed CORIs and renewal. For most Boards, a CORI is not automatically run but GMC questions are asked (relative to the time period since the last renewal only) and may lead to an updated CORI being run if answered yes. The Conviction History Nexus Determination Matrix used in San Francisco was passed out to board members and reviewed to help determine what crimes are relative to the work of CHWs. As all CHWs work with a vulnerable population, almost all crimes would be considered relative to the profession. The process outlined in the policy and the board seats will ensure that future members approach these cases with the same intentions; the matrix worksheet is not needed. Ms. Edraos brought up the subject of truly terrible crimes such as murders and sexual assaults. Most board members are against any kind of blanket ban. If a policy is made for presumption of suitability, it can include that egregious crimes would not qualify for the assumption so board members could review case by case. Mr. Beattie stated that the staff could provide a quarterly report of applications approved by using the presumption policy. Board members discussed what information from CORI runs would be considered by the board and determined that open cases are most important and only CWOFS that end in convictions will be considered. In the draft policy under rehabilitation,

“substance abuse treatment” should be corrected to “addiction treatment.” Board members discussed examples of rehabilitation, such as being clean and sober, AA/NA, support systems. Relapse issues will often be caught during the renewal process or a complaint if it is affecting someone’s job. Individual applications should be clear and provide instruction on an explanation accompanying a yes answer to GMC questions.

James Lavery left 12:35 pm

Ms. Hogarty suggested separating the negative and positive items to be considered when looking at a positive CORI. Board members discussed the possibility of data collection and asking optional race/ethnicity questions. This could lead to incorrect data depending on how many respond and could feel like bias. The audience suggested tracking zip codes and using the demographic information available for each area. If done as a race/ethnicity question, this would likely be optional with an explanation of data collection is for helpful purposes to *not* discriminate, as it may not be legal to require this information.

Ms. Calista left 12:43 pm

Ms. Calista returned 12:45 pm

If zip codes are tracked, this may also provide incorrect data as address of record could be based on employment location or home or other. Asking people to self identify instead of checking off a box may be a better option. Erica of the CHW office offered to develop a training to help future board members understand and continue with the intentions of this board when reviewing GMC/CORI issues.

Some audience members would like to discuss “ban the box” at the next meeting. Board members would like to make sure all GMC questions are treated with the same consideration as those pertaining to criminal history (ie. dishonorable military discharge).

ACTION: None

Document: None

VII. Adjourn

There being no other business before the Board, Ms. Calista made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Schmidt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:56 pm.

The next meeting of the Board of Certification of Community Health Workers is scheduled for Tuesday, September 13, 2016, at 9:30 a.m. at 239 Causeway Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted:

Name

Position

Date