

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
**State Innovation Model**  
***Community Health Worker Advisory Committee***  
**Meeting Summary**  
**Tuesday, May 9, 2018**  
**10:00am-11:00am**

**Location:** Webinar

**Design Group 2 Meeting Minutes, 5/9/18**

**Attendees:** Tiffany Donelson, Lauren Rosato, Migdalia Belliveau, Keturah Kinch, Giselle Carlotta-McDonald, Dana Robinson-Rus, Christian Andresen DPH, Dr. Robert Zavoski, Bruce Gould

**Other Attendees:** Maggie Litwin, Fernando Morales, Fatawu Mahama, Milagrosa Seguinot (10min. to end of call)

**Absent:** Loretta D. Lloyd-Ebron, Nina Holmes

**Facilitators:** Jenna Lupi

**Process**

The group will meet in person at CT Behavioral Health Partnership (CTBHP), 500 Enterprise Drive, Suite 3D, Litchfield Room, Rocky Hill, CT on Tuesday, May 15, 2:30pm-4:30pm.

**Notes**

Jenna Lupi reviewed the Agenda for the meeting before starting the presentation.

Questions raised during the 4/10/2018 call addressed and presented to the group during the webinar.

Jenna Lupi stated that there is an additional decision point included to group two decision points after the last webinar. The sixth decision point will be -Fiscal Impact of implementation

This group's key decisions points are as follows:

- 1) Determine Certifying entity
- 2) Advisory Body ( Previously called CHW Certification Board structure)
- 3) Registry
- 4) Application Process: eligibility and steps
- 5) Who is responsible for Assessment?
- 6) Fiscal Impact of implementation (new)

Design Group 2 confirmed the following recommendations made during the 4/17 webinar:

**Advisory Body**

- The **Certifying Entity** should be responsible for the administrative tasks related to certification including reviewing applications, verifying that requirements have been met, and issuing certificates. This body will also be responsible for the assessment piece of the certification.
- A **separate Advisory Body** should be established to inform the full development of Certification Standards. The Advisory Body would have a more prominent role in the initial development of the Certification Program, and would meet semi-regularly thereafter to assess the need to

**(Continued)**

adjust the Certification Standards and to weigh in on critical questions as identified by the Certifying Entity.

- The Advisory Body should include: 1 representative each from **DPH, DSS, and DMHAS; 6 CHWS; 1 CHW Association of CT representative; 1 community-based CHW training organization representative; 1 Community College representative; 1 Commercial Payer; 1 CHW employer; 1 Health Care Provider** with direct CHW experience; **1 health educator**
- The Advisory Body representatives should be selected through a **neutral appointment process**, such as the process used to select SIM advisory committee members
- The **CHW Association of CT** should serve as the administrative lead for the Advisory Body, including such activities as scheduling meetings and coordinating recommendations.

**Lauren Rosato**, ask for clarity about the differences between a Health care provider and a CHW employer. **Jenna Lopi** differentiated the two advisory group members, explaining that, a healthcare provider will be a person who is a provider and supervises CHWs, whiles a CHW employer will be a person who has direct influence to hiring of CHWs.

**Certification Eligibility**

- There should be **no minimum education level** required for CHW Certification.
- There should be **no residency requirements**.
- There should be **no personality trait requirements**, group discussed about how this requirement could be changed to character reference letters.
- There should be no other eligibility requirements for CHW Certification, such as those related to criminal background checks. Any such requirements should be at the discretion of the employer.

After researching other states requirements, the group did not find any convincing reason to require the above for certification.

**Answers to questions raised from 4/17/18 call**

- What are the legal reasons to require a minimum age for certification eligibility?

*Answer. The group agreed that, since other States do not have a compelling reason for age requirement, the group will leave age requirement out of the eligibility requirements.*

- In Massachusetts, does the Certification Board issue certification, or does the Health Department carry out that administrative task?

*Answer. In Massachusetts, staff of the Department of Public Health CHW office handles the administrative task and the Certification Board will issue CHW Certificates.*

- What is the reasoning for instituting residency requirements in RI and TX?

*Answer. From **Carl Rush**, a national expert of CHW models responded to Jenna Lopi on this subject “I have the impression that these requirements are traditional for any form of occupational regulation. They were not created by statute. No state wants to waste administrative resources processing certification for someone who does not reside in their state. I further have the impression that they may waive the residency requirement for someone employed in Texas who resides in a neighboring state; this is common in the El Paso and Texarkana areas.”*

- Are there CHW registries in Florida and Massachusetts? If so, how are they managed?

*Answer. Group agreed that since certification entity will be issuing certification, this subject should be left to certification entity.*

### **Outstanding Recommendations based on questions raised during call on 4/17/18**

Jenna Lupi encouraged Group members to provide their recommendations through a survey monkey she will send out after the webinar.

#### **Application steps**

**Jenna Lupi** presented on the application steps done in Massachusetts, Texas, Florida and Rhode Island. Group also reviewed Design Group 1 preliminary recommendations. Design group 1 will presents their recommendation during large group meeting on 5/15/18.

**Christian Andresen**, asked if the portfolio in Group 1 recommendations is going to be used as part of a training or will it be a requirement to submit for certification. This Question will be asked of group 1 at 5/15/18 meeting.

In checking the application, **Christian Andresen from DPH and a member of certification entity in CT**, advised that; the certifying entity only check for requirements, not quality of applications for certification.

#### **Methods to Submit Applications for Certification**

This part of the discussion will be reserved for the entity responsible for reviewing application to decide how application will be submitted.

#### **Who submits application components (e.g. References and recommendations?)**

Group agreed that applicant should submit basic application information requested and a third party will submit the verifications (e.g. references, recommendations, transcripts) if required.

**Christian Andresen**, pointed out that, depending on staffing, if all application requirements are met certification are normally issued in 2 weeks.

#### **Questions and decisions**

1. Should Notary Public be required? Group decided on no notary requirement, but will finalize on 5/15/18 meeting.
2. Should copies of original documents be accepted, e.g. Transcripts? Will be finalize on 5/15/18 meeting
3. How can CEU's be submitted? Group agreed that applicant should be prepared to submit CEU's to the certifying entity.

#### **Next Steps**

**Jenna Lupi** will send out a survey monkey to group members to respond about the outstanding recommendations and questions raised during this call. During the 5/15/18 meeting, final decision points to be presented at the 5/15/18 meeting.

**Jenna Lupi** will communicate with group members on the next meeting date and time.  
End.