

**Immunization School Law Advisory Committee
December 9, 2009, Minutes**

Voting Members Present:

Judy Booker, Oregon Association of Child Care Directors
Kathryn Eisenbarth, Pacific University/Oregon College Health Association
Merrily Haas, Oregon Association for the Education of Young Children
Jennifer Hallman, Mount Hood Community College Child Development
Jan Sanderson, Oregon Association of Education Service Districts

Voting Members Joining by Conference Call:

Kim Bartholomew, Oregon School Nurses Association
Ken Carlson (for Jim Lace), Oregon Pediatric Society & Oregon Medical Assoc.
Marilyn Herbst, Eastern Oregon Head Start
Jeanne Kotsakis, Child Care Division
Kelly Martin, Marion County Health Department

Non-Voting Members Present:

Janis Betten, Health Educator, Immunization Section, OPHD
Paul Cieslak, Program Manager, Acute & Communicable Disease Program, OPHD
Stacy de Assis Matthews, Health Educator Immunization Section, OPHD
Lorraine Duncan, Program Manager, Immunization Section, OPHD
Katy King, Intergovernmental Liaison, DHS

Non-Voting Members Joining by Conference Call:

Peggy Hillman, Health Educator, Immunization Section, OPHD

Guests Present:

Marcy Baker, Sanofi Pasteur
Dave Barrows, Merck Vaccines
Jim Gaudino, Immunization Section, OPHD
Nan Heim, Glaxo Smith Kline
Mike Hurley, Glaxo Smith Kline
Juventila Liko, Immunization Section, OPHD
Kim McGee, State WIC, Guest of Dr. Cieslak
Leslie McMillan, Merck Vaccines

Chairperson: Lorraine Duncan

Recorder: Jacki Nixon

Minutes: Minutes from November 13, 2008, were approved.

Updates:

Hib Suspension: More Hib vaccine is now being manufactured, however we are experiencing vaccine supply challenges. Providers do not have enough vaccine to catch up all kids for whom the booster dose of Hib was deferred. Therefore, the requirement for Hib immunization in children's facilities is being temporarily suspended again this year. All schools and children's facilities were notified of the temporary suspension when the reporting packets went out last month.

Legislative Report:

SB549: This bill proposed to do a school flu pilot. A school flu vaccine pilot project was already being conducted, and this bill was dropped.

Religious Exemptions: No bill was introduced, but there was interest from Rep. Galizio. This subject might come up again next session.

HB2794: Bill passed requiring health plans to cover HPV vaccine. Most plans already covered this vaccine.

HB3236: Bill passed lowering the age that pharmacists can immunize down to 11 years. This will not take effect until January 1, 2011. One reason for this time frame is to give sufficient time to get pharmacists reporting to the new immunization information system.

SB716: This bill proposed to require MCV4 vaccine for school, and it did not pass.

SB21: This bill proposed to require objective criteria for school immunization law requirements. The Advisory Committee approved criteria last year, and the bill was dropped.

Religious Exemptions: This past school year's kindergarten religious exemption rate was 4.9% for one or more vaccines. At the Oregon Public Provider Immunization Conference this year there was a discussion about the topic of increasing religious exemptions. The following is a summary of feedback from the conference:

- There was support for the concept of having parents annually or periodically sign for a religious exemption instead of just once. There were different ideas about how to implement this suggestion, and whether religious exemptions should have to be signed at the health department or school.

- There was support for schools looking up students with religious exemptions in ALERT to update records, or to do a one-time parent contact to give parents the opportunity to update their children's records.
- There was support for the idea collecting religious exemption information for specific vaccines. However, there was concern about challenges for data collection and training for local health departments, schools, and children's facilities. Currently, if a child is exempt for one vaccine and incomplete for other vaccines, the child does not receive an exclusion order for incomplete immunizations. School computer systems would have to be reprogrammed to implement these changes, which would require funds.

Reviewing HPV against School/Facility/College Law Criteria:

The Committee reviewed HPV vaccine against the 12 criteria for potential inclusion in OAR 333-050-0050, 333-050-0130 and 333-050-0140. The following comments and changes to the document were made:

- 1) Comment—ACIP's statement about HPV vaccine for males is not a recommendation, but a statement that HPV may be given to males that want to reduce their risk of genital warts. Suggested change—use the language from the ACIP document concerning HPV for males.
- 2) No changes
- 3) Comment—cost-effectiveness models for HPV vaccine differs, and it is unclear how cost-effective this vaccine will be.
- 4) No changes
- 5) No changes
- 6) No changes
- 7) No changes
- 8) Comment—HPV vaccine for males will result in a two-tiered system for vaccine financing. Specifically, HPV vaccine will be covered for males eligible for VFC vaccine, but not for males eligible for 317 vaccine.
- 9) No changes
- 10) No changes
- 11) No changes
- 12) No changes

Other comments: There is no precedent in Oregon for requiring a vaccine for only one gender; one state and Washington D.C. have adopted an HPV requirement for females but we are unsure if these requirements have been implemented yet.

A motion was made to not adopt a school requirement for HPV vaccine. The motion was seconded. The vote was 9-1 in favor of the motion to not adopt a

school requirement for HPV vaccine and the motion passed. (Hallman voted no, all other voting members present voted yes.) This document is expected to be updated in the future, as recommendations for immunization change and new data become available.

Measles College Immunization Requirement:

The Advisory Committee reviewed the table comparing the college measles immunization requirement when it was first implemented in 1992 versus the situation in 2009.

Discussion:

- The law currently allows documentation of only one dose of measles vaccine to be provided if the date is 1989 or later. Many college students today were born after 1989, so the date they are providing is sometimes just their first dose. This provision should be changed so that documentation of one dose in 1989 or later is sufficient only if the student was born prior to 1984, for example.
- Is there a need to keep the two dose measles immunization requirement at the college level because school requirements cover all U.S. students? Is it possible to do a trade-off to tighten requirements for international students (apply the requirement to full and part-time international students) and remove the requirement for other students?
- Students living in dormitories are at higher risk of measles.
- It would be good to get input from community colleges with international students and students living in dormitories.
- The measles immunization requirement also helps provide protection against mumps, and we see more of this disease than measles.
- Oregon's last outbreak of measles in 2007 cost \$170,000 to contain.
- Measles is still endemic in parts of the world.
- School immunization rates for measles are very high—above 95%.
- Is it possible to consider suspending the measles immunization requirement? This would require a statute change.
- Many colleges already apply the measles immunization requirement to both full-time and part-time international students.
- A concern with expanding the measles immunization requirement to part-time students is that it would catch auditors and staff members who possibly only take one class.

- The community college measles requirement only applies to certain programs—this was a compromise when the original legislation was enacted.

The possibility of revising the college measles immunization requirement will be put on the list of legislative concepts to be considered. Next steps will be to get input from the Oregon College Health Association and Oregon Community College Association. Input from these associations will be shared with the Advisory Committee.

Proposed Structure and Guidelines

The Advisory Committee reviewed the proposed Structure and Guidelines document.

Comments:

- Specify that declaration of conflicts of interest will occur at the beginning of each meeting. It was suggested that declaration of conflicts of interest should be added to future agendas.
- Members want to continue meeting on an as needed basis, but with notification more in advance if available.

A motion was made to accept the Structure and Guidelines document with the changes above. The motion was seconded. The Chair asked members to disclose conflicts of interest; no conflicts of interest were declared. The vote was 10-0 in favor of accepting the Structure and Guidelines document.

The next meeting will be scheduled in March. Members will be contacted with potential meeting dates.