

**STATE OF CONNETICUT**  
**State Innovation Model**  
***Community Health Worker Advisory Committee***  
**Meeting Summary**  
**Tuesday, July 17th, 2018**  
**2:30 pm – 4:30 pm**

**Location:**

Litchfield Room, CT Behavioral Health Partnership, Hartford Room (3<sup>rd</sup> Flr),  
500 Enterprise Drive, Rocky Hill, CT 06067

**Members Present:** Terry Nowakowski, Milagrosa Seguinot, Grace Damio, Thomas Buckley, Darcey Cobbs-Lomax,

**Members on the Phone:** Mayce Torres, Lauren Rosato, Ashika Brinkley, Michael Corjulo, Chioma Ogazi, Liza Estevez, Loretta Ebron

**Members Absent:** Juan Carmona, Migdalia Belliveau, Linda Guzzo, Robert Zavoski, Peter Ellis, Nicholas Peralta, Tiffany Donelson

**Other Participants:** Jenna Lupi, Katharine London, Fernando Morales, Meredith Ferraro, Maggie Litwin, Dashni Sathasivam, Ula Uszynski, Cecil Tengtanga, Keturah Kinch, Randy Domina, Chris Andresen (phone), Giselle Carlotta-McDonald (phone), Dana Robinson Rush (phone), Elena Padin (phone), Supriyo Chatterjee (phone), Nina Holmes (phone), Ken Lalime (phone)

**1. Call to Order and Introductions**

Terry Nowakowski served as Chair and called the meeting to order at 2:36pm.

**2. Public Comments**

No public comments were submitted for discussion.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

Motion: to approve minutes from 6/19/2018

First: Terry Nowakowski

Second: Milagrosa Seguinot

All in favor

**4. Purpose of the meeting:**

Katherine London began the meeting by going over the purpose of today's meeting:

- Review the goals of CT SIM CHW Advisory Committee DRAFT Legislative Report
- Discuss the components of the Report
- Respond to and discuss questions about the Report
- Plan additional meeting to respond to and address additional questions

Katherine then went through the beginning sections of the report and opened it up to the group for any questions and/or comments. Hearing done Katherine moved onto the Committee's recommendations.

*Jenna pointed out to the group that they are a few minor changes to the legislation passed last year. Because of the approval of the Office of Health Strategy, a number of the Bills were renumbered, and language was changed to include the Office of Health Strategy. The legislation content is still the same, but the name and number is changed. This information will be used moving forward concerning the legislation.*

## **5. Review & Discussion of Report to the Legislature on CHW Certification**

Katherine explained that the legislation required this group to establish a certification process. The following recommendations were developed through the CHW Advisory Committee Design Group Process. There were three Design Groups and each Design Group was assigned Key Decision Points to issue recommendations and selected Guiding Principles to help guide the decision-making process. Each Recommendation was supported by the groups Key Considerations.

Jenna reviewed the other big task of the legislation, which was the financial implications of a CHW Certification Program. As possible options as the certifying entity, Design Group 2 looked at the Department of Public Health (DPH), the Community Health Workers Association of CT (CHWACT) and potentially a third-party, and learn about the CT Certification Board as a possible third-party. A discussion regarding the fees for the certification, as well as other costs associated with the certification process had been raised. Ultimately, the certifying entity was decided on based on factors that came down to things other than cost, such as sustainability, how the entity would obtain funds and equity with other healthcare providers. Even though DPH appears to be the most costly options there were other considerations in this decision that weighed more heavily than just the cost.

During discussions a number of questions were brought up including: certification process itself, its value and, the costs associated with getting certified. Jenna Lupi added that other states are using grant funding in order to get certification established.. For this reason, Massachusetts found it difficult to get cost data from other states. Collecting data about costs may be something that would need to be done in the future. Katherine London added that it might be helpful to include in this report that other states have often used grant funding to start their certification.

A question was raised about if we know how many CHWs will go for certification. Since certification is voluntary, it is hard to know how many will go for certification and thus associate a cost with that. But, we do have some numbers from other states in their first year of certification that may help to predict this number for CT.

Jenna provided a reminder that the purpose of this report is for legislative or policy changes within the state. Once approved from the committee, this report will be released for public comment, then it will come back to this group for approval and then will go to the HISC, and hopefully, after that legislation.

- *Certification for a CHW (Design Group 1)*
- *Methods & Administration of a Certification Program (Design Group 2)*
- *Training Curricula (Design Group 3)*

Katherine reviewed the following recommendations:

*Certification for a CHW (Design Group 1) Recommendation 1-7*

**Recommendation 1:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 2:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 3:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 4:** Comment was made about adding a sentence for experienced CHWs moving into the state could seek certification through the experience pathway. Katherine noted that this was addressed in the key considerations.

**Recommendation 5:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 6:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 7:** Millie added that she did some research and found a copy of Code of Ethics from the state of Massachusetts which we can use as a guide. For investigation purposes, we should add some language in the recommendations to allow the hearing officer at DPH to manage disciplinary actions in the CHW profession with the advisory body.

Jenna reviewed the following recommendations:

*Methods & Administration of a Certification Program (Design Group 2) – Recommendation 8-11*

**Recommendation 8:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 9:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 10:** Based on previous discussions, it still needed to be determined whether requiring DSS/DMHAS/Commercial payer representation on the Advisory Body presents a conflict of interest. Jenna raised question to the group if Department of Social Services should be a part of the group and what role would they serve on the Advisory Body. Randy Domina mentioned that he liked that the majority of the group is made up of CHWs. Katherine added that we can add some language that encourages the Advisory Body to seek input from payers when needed, or the idea of non-voting members. Chris Andresen provided input that this is ultimately about the certification of the CHW profession, like a medical board, which is primarily made up of the profession. If it is about the role of the professions, then the Advisory Body should be primarily made up of CHWs. Meredith Ferraro added that it's really about the profession, if it's about payment there may be a separate group for this.

There was discussion as to what the role of the CHWACT is on this Advisory Body, but without burdening CHWACT with all too much. It was discussed that this was already included in recommendation 7 that also included CHW Code of Ethics.

The group had also an extensive discussion whether there should be a recommendation that DPH be authorized to investigate allegations of an ethics violation, with input from the Advisory Body, and submit this to a hearing officer and have the right to investigate and the right to revoke that person's certification. The group agreed to add this to the recommendations.

Jenna mentioned that a consideration is put in place to provide funding to the CHW Association of CT through the Office of Health Strategy.

**Recommendation 11:** No changes recommended.

Meredith Ferraro went over the following recommendations:  
*Training Curricula (Design Group 3) – Recommendation 12-18*

**Recommendation 12:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 13:** Meredith Ferraro explained the wording of this recommendation was reworded to make it clearer. Questions from Tom Buckley, about who recognizes the training programs. Meredith responded that this would be answered in a recommendation that will be explained further.

**Recommendation 14:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 15:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 16:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 17:** No changes recommended.

**Recommendation 18:** No changes recommended.

Motion made by Terry Nowakowski to accept the report with changes and release for public comment:

First: Milagrosa Seguinot

Second: Grace Damio

Abstentions: none

All in favor

## **6. Review & Next Steps**

Jenna reviewed the notes from the meeting to include proposed additions to key considerations outlined above to be included in the recommendations. Jenna added that the Report will be released and open for Public Comment. Southwestern AHEC will conduct a webinar to get additional feedback from CHWs on the Report and Recommendations. CHW Advisory Committee will review public comment and provide feedback and report edits. HISC reviews Report and approves for delivery to the legislature.

Next, Jenna asked for a vote to release the report for public comment with the changes outlined.

Motion made by Terry Nowakowski to release the report for public comment with changes outlined:

First: Milagrosa Seguinot

Second: Grace Damio

Jenna will send out a doodle poll to see if we get a quorum during our August meeting and/or reschedule the date if necessary.

## **7. Adjourn**

Terry Nowakowski made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:30 pm.

Second: Millie Seguinot.

All in Favor

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM