

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
**State Innovation Model**  
***Community Health Worker Advisory Committee***

**Meeting Summary**  
**Friday, May 4, 2018**  
**11:30am – 1:00pm**

**Design Group 3 – Met via Webinar**

Attendees: Liza Estevez, Grace Damio, Cecil Tengtenga, Milagrosa Seguinot  
Absent: Chioma Ogazi, Erika Lynch, Ashika Brinkley, Michael Corjulo, Linda Guzzo  
Facilitators: Meredith Ferraro, Maggie Litwin,  
Other Participants: Fatawu Mahama, Fernando Morales, Ula Uszynski

Process

The group will meet in person at Value Options on Tuesday, April 17 and Tuesday, May 15, 2:30-4:30. We will schedule phone calls in between each meeting.

1. Introductions & Review decisions from previous meetings

**Content – Identify Core Competencies** \* *Accepted the C3 Core Competencies previously decided on by the CHW Advisory Committee*

**Number of Training Hours** \* *90 hours minimum*

**Internship** \* *Required as part of a CHW Training, minimum of at least 50 hour*

**Training modality/methodology** \* *Based on Adult Learning Principles, should include role play and be interactive*

**Training Delivery** \* *In-person training recommended; hybrid training to include in-person sessions with distance learning in “real-time.” Online training course will not be allowed.*

Reviewed the remaining key decision points for today’s meeting:

- Training vendor criteria
- Instructor qualifications
- How does the training program assess proficiency?
- Determine/develop type of assessment

2. Training Vendor Criteria

Meredith reviewed training vendor criteria from Texas, Indiana and Massachusetts. It was suggested to take into consideration the decisions this group has already made for defining the training vendor criteria, such as the core competencies, number of training hours, internship, training modality/methodology and training delivery. Want to avoid circumstances when training institutions utilize the ability to train CHWs just to make money, without really understanding who CHWs are and what they do and without any experience training CHWs. It was felt that input from the community colleges and Southwestern AHEC was important. Unfortunately, representatives from the community colleges were not on today’s call. The group wants the training vendor criteria to be relevant to what already exists in CT. It was felt the final discussion and decision-making should be tabled until the community colleges were able to participate.

### 3. Instructor qualifications

Meredith reviewed instructor qualifications from Texas, Michigan and Massachusetts. The group like two components from these states. One was the experience requirement from Texas, "Experience – At least 1000 cumulative hours of experience training individuals who provide community health work services including promotores, community health workers, and other health care paraprofessionals and professionals in the previous six (6) years." The other requirement the group liked was from Massachusetts, where "at least 40% of the hours of instruction shall be taught or co-taught by faculty who are Community Health Workers or Community Health Worker Trainers." The group felt that the community colleges voice was missing here. The final discussion and decision-making should be tabled until the community colleges were able to participate.

Recommendation so far:

- "Experience – At least 1000 cumulative hours of experience training individuals who provide community health work services including promotores, community health workers, and other health care paraprofessionals and professionals in the previous six (6) years." Adapted from Texas.
- "At least 40% of the hours of instruction shall be taught or co-taught by faculty who are Community Health Workers or Community Health Worker Trainers." Adapted from Massachusetts.

What still needs to be decided here?

### 4. How does the training program assess proficiency?

Meredith reviewed how training programs from Capital Community College, Housatonic and Southwestern AHEC assess proficiency. This helped the group understand how proficiency is currently being assessed in training programs in CT. Gateway's information was not yet received. Input from all existing training institutions is important. Decision tabled for complete input.

### 5. Determine/develop type of assessment

First, the definition of assessment was provided to the group, as well as types of assessments and purposes. There seemed to be some agreement among the group about liking pre and post tests, as a part of the assessment method. The idea of a capstone project or portfolio, or some combination of the two, came up. The group like these types of assessments, but did not come to any final decision about how to assess proficiency. Again, the group thought the final discussion and decision-making should be tabled until the community colleges were able to participate.

### 6. Timeline & Next Steps

The following are key decision points are to be discussed and decided on with input from the community colleges during the next in-person meeting on Tuesday, May 15th:

Training vendor criteria

Instructor qualifications

How does the training program assess proficiency?

Determine/develop type of assessment

Other Design groups also feel that Design group #3 should look at Continuing Education requirements for renewal.