

SBHC Standards for Certification Review Workgroup

Meeting 1: October 29, 2015

Summary Notes

Attendees: Tammy Alexander (Oregon School-Based Health Alliance), Steve Bardi (Multnomah County Health Department), Jill Daniels (SBHC Consultant), Corina Gabriel (La Clinica), Tamarra Harris (Mosaic Medical), Lynnanne Hayes (Deschutes County Health Department), Alisha Southwick (Umatilla County Health Department), Elise Travertini (La Clinica), Jamie Zentner (Clackamas County Health Department), Rosalyn Liu (SPO), Kate O'Donnell (SPO), Melanie Potter (SPO), Lisa Stember (SPO), Karen Vian (SPO)

Introductions

- This is the first meeting of the workgroup. There will be a total of six meetings.

Workgroup Expectations & Structure

Supporting documents: Standards Word doc; Standards review timeline

- Goals of workgroup:
 1. Identify and address any areas in need of clarification
 2. Update sections to align with current best practice
 3. Continue to adapt Standards to support operations and advance quality healthcare in a school setting
- Six workgroup meetings will be held, each reviewing a different section of Standards. Group will review each section line by line and recommend revisions. SPO will make recommended changes to draft document and send to the members. Group will review changes again at following meeting.
- This meeting will focus on Section B. Section A will be reviewed last, as it's very process heavy and may be difficult for the first meeting.
- Members can email proposed changes to Kate for sections prior to relating meeting. Kate will email out reminders about submitting feedback.
- Spring 2016: Workgroup will present recommended changes, which will be shared for feedback. Field feedback will be incorporated into draft Standards and, if necessary, vetted through workgroup. Recommendations will be shared with Coalition of Local Health Officials (CLHO) for additional feedback.
- Summer/Fall 2016: SPO will initiate rules change process, including convening a Rules Advisory Council (RAC).
- Implementation of new Standards will be two year process:
 - 2016-2017 SY: Final version of Standards will be available to SBHCs. SBHCs will have this school year to bring operations up to new Standards, if necessary.
 - 2017-2018 SY: New Standards will be fully implemented and tied to funding. All sites will be expected to meet the revised Standards.

Background

- First Standards implemented in 2000 after collaborative workgroup process. Revised in 2010 and 2014. Standards represent a statewide, Oregon-specific model for SBHCs. Outline minimum requirements, so anything beyond is local-level decision.
- Intent of workgroup to keep the SBHC model relevant and include the needs of the field. Workgroup participants should think of proposed Standard revisions in relation to their specific SBHC(s) but also at a larger system level. All feedback is welcome.
- Previous versions of Standards have included both requirements and recommendations. Recommendations were removed in 2010 with the intent to pull into a separate Best Practice document, but this was not created due to staff turnover. Current Standards (2014) only outline requirements. Request to group to consider if “best practice” should be a separate document or included as part of new Standards. Will discuss later.
- SPO will send current draft of Best Practices.

Certification Review Field Survey

Supporting documents: Field Feedback Survey Results

- Workgroup reviewed results of baseline field survey. Respondents (n=23) indicated major areas in which they struggle to meet State requirements were staffing (35%) and hours of operation (17%), which is not surprising, although 30% indicated they did not struggle to meet current minimum Standards.

Discussion – Standards Section B

Supporting documents: SPO Standards comments summary doc; Section B Edits Standards

- Participants should keep in mind the following:
 1. What is working: How do current Standards help improve clinical practice? Can we advance requirements in current Standards?
 2. What are challenges: What is missing or needs clarification? Any barriers related to meeting these Standards?
- Suggestion that Section B (Sponsoring agency/Facility) should be two separate sections.
 - Action: Split Section B into Section B (Sponsoring agency) and (new) Section C (Facility).

Section B.1

- B.1(a): Vague language (“sponsor,” “agency,” etc.). SPO said “agency” was deliberately chosen to be sufficiently broad to accommodate different models around the State. Discussion if Standards should require a Lead Sponsorship Agency to be selected and, if so, what are responsibilities and how is this different from LPHA.
 - Action: Add new line to define role of SBHC Coordinator. Intent is the Coordinator (and Coordinator’s agency) to be lead on SBHC operations.
- B.1(b): No changes recommended.

- B.1(c): Standards do not specify Medical Director must be licensed in Oregon. Discussion if SPO would allow other licenses other than those currently specified.
 - Action: Add that Medical Sponsor provides (3) medical oversight. Specify that Medical Director must be licensed in Oregon. Remove “such as” language. Specify that Medical Director is employed by the sponsoring agency. Potentially pull out definition of Medical Director into new bullet.
- B.1(d): Discussion if language should include both sponsor agency/ies and partner agency/ies. Concern that this language would be too broad.
 - Action: Add “Space” under B.1(a), which is not currently specified and is provided by partners (school). Would allow schools to more clearly be considered a sponsoring agency and therefore part of B.1(d).
- B.1(e): Add Health Department Primary Contact title to last sentence.

Section B.2

- B.2(a): “Space located on grounds of a school” language. Discussion of limitations of this requirement (logistics, costs, etc.) and benefit of promoting student access, fidelity to Oregon model. Suggestion that the intent of SBHC model be taken into consideration. Mobile units are not included because they are not permanent spaces.
 - Action: SPO will draft new language and bring to Meeting 2 for review. Language will specify that if SBHC isn’t on school grounds that there must be an MOU with school and property owner outlining intent of SBHC model, specify relationship.
- B.2(b): Adding Notice of Privacy Practices is approved.
- B.2(c): Discussion if (7) two sinks are required. Group decided to leave as is and potentially add it to the best practice document.
- B.2(d): Proposed revision is unclear and duplicative. Request for examples of safety hazards. SPO recommended that specifics would live in Site Visit Review tool. Suggested putting a Safety Audit in Best Practices.
 - Action: Remove secure records/storage and replace with staff/patient safety. Add reference to compliance with state and federal safety laws.
- B.2(e/f): Language is unclear and could be condensed. FTE language is confusing and limiting for sites, especially if providers are <1 FTE.
 - Action: Modify language to specify one room per provider working during operational hours in order to ensure patient confidentiality. Combine B.2.e & f, remove FTE requirement. Bullet individual points.
- B.2(g): No changes recommended.

“Youth friendly” clinic space

- SPO recommended adding language in Standards to encourage clinics to be “youth friendly” in terms of design, policies, etc. Could be outlined in a separate section. Group

concerned that many sites don't have funding, time or capacity to meet "youth friendly" requirements. "Youth friendly" is vague term – how would it be defined in Standards?

- Group suggested that SPO poll field to see how sites currently are/not meeting aspects of "youth friendliness" (clinic design, policies, YAC, etc.). If many are already meeting certain aspects or are close, these elements could be included in Standards.
 - Action: SPO will draft a definition of "youth friendly" and share with group. SPO will create a survey to ask field how currently meeting aspects of this definition and, if not, what are challenges/barriers.

Next Steps

- Next workgroup meeting November 19th, 2P-4P. Workgroup will discuss Section C.
- SPO will make edits outlined today and send out to group prior to the November meeting.
- Homework:
 - Review Section C. Send any edits to Kate by 11/13.
 - Review edits to Section B. Bring feedback to meeting.