

STATE OF CONNETICUT
State Innovation Model
Community Health Worker Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, June 6, 2018
9:00am – 11:00am

Design Group 3 – Met via Webinar

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

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.*

In the previous meeting, the following key decision points were discussed, but no final recommendations were made.

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

Reviewed the remaining key decision points to be discussed and decided on today:

- Training vendor criteria
- Instructor qualifications
- How does the training program assess proficiency?
- Determine/develop type of assessment
- What qualifies as continuing education? *

2. Training Vendor Criteria

In the previously meeting, it was suggested to take into consideration the decisions this group has already made towards defining the training vendor criteria, such as the training core competencies,

number of training hours, internship, training modality/methodology and training delivery. These decisions were presented, and then Maggie Litwin reviewed training vendor criteria from Texas, Indiana and Massachusetts. Some questions (in blue font) were then proposed to the group as possible considerations to be looked at as part of training vendor criteria.

Accreditation: Is their organization accredited by The Council for Higher Education Accreditation or similar accreditation body? Yes, felt it is important for someone else to be looking at the training vendor.

Experience: Have they trained or sponsored training over the last 2 years? No, did not think this should be required, might be new training vendors that want to train.

Career Ladder: Is there an “on-ramp” for higher education? No, did not feel like this should be required of all training vendors. Some CHWs may want to be trained, but without the “on-ramp”.

Organization Type: What type of organization are they? (Community College, CBO, Non-Profit, etc.) Yes, should identify what type of organization they are, but training vendors should not be limited to any particular organizations.

Screening: Is there a process for screening students? It was felt the training vendor should explain how they plan to screen students, but did not feel that there should be a standardized method for screening students, and that this should be up to the training vendor. For example, Erika Lynch at Gateway said they require a High School Diploma or GED, not all trainings should have to require this.

Recruitment: How do they plan to recruit people for training? Yes, it was felt that the training vendor should explain how they plan to recruit people for training. This questions can be tied in with the question above.

Cost: How much will the training cost? Yes, this information should be provided as part of the training vendor criteria.

Frequency: How often will this training be provided? Yes, felt training vendor should forecast frequency of training, felt there should at least be one training annually.

Evaluation: Are there clear standards for testing students’ knowledge of the material? The group felt that this information should be provided by the training vendor, and that in the discussion later in this meeting about assessment would help determine the criteria of this further.

Organization: Is this training organized independently of any other education and training program offered by the parent institution? This question did not pertain to anyone participating on the call

Then Maggie Litwin opened it up to the group to express if they felt anything was missing here for training vendor criteria. It was added to include an Educational Materials section that should request what materials are the CHW getting as part of the training such as a binder, textbook, etc.

3. Instructor qualifications

Maggie Litwin reviewed instructor qualifications from Texas, Michigan and Massachusetts. Maggie Litwin then presented the recommendations that were made in the previous meeting and asked the group if they agreed, or if anything should be changed, added, or was missing. The group really liked this recommendation and decided to move forward with this. They liked that it was not too restrictive.

Recommendation:

- “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.

4. How does the training program assess proficiency?

Maggie reviewed how training programs from Capital Community College, Housatonic and Southwestern AHEC assess proficiency. Erika Lynch provided information about how gateway Community College assesses student’s proficiency. This helped the group understand how proficiency is currently being assessed in the CHW training programs in CT.

5. Determine/develop type of assessment

First, the definition of assessment was provided to the group, as well as types of assessments and purposes. Maggie Litwin went through each of the recommendations made in the previous meeting and went through each one:

- **Not just a test** – The group agreed that there should not be just a test to assess the CHWs.
- **Pre and Posttest** – The group agreed that they like the use of pre and posttests to assess the CHWs.
- **Skills assessment** – The group agreed that there should be some assessment of skills, but no specific recommendation as to how this could be done.
- **Capstone Project or Portfolio or some combination** – The group agreed that they liked including either a Capstone Project, Portfolio or some combination of the two.

6. Continuing Education

Went over Design Group 1’s decision to require 20 hours of continuing education every two years for re-certification. Then looked at how Texas, New Mexico and Indiana address continuing education. The group really liked Indiana’s model for, what they refer to as Continuing Education Units (CEUs). Indiana also uses a tracking spreadsheet to track activities and hours: conferences, webinars, workshops, seminars, trainings, presentations, and self-studies. Does not want to call them CEU’s since this is usually connected with some sort of accreditation. Recommended they be called Continuing Education (CE) or Contact Hours, and not called CEUs.

7. Timeline & Next Steps

The next full CHW Advisory Committee in-person meeting is on Tuesday, June 19th from 2:30-4:30pm at the Behavior Health Partnership in Rocky Hill.