

SUMMARY

PEER CERTIFICATION ROAD MAP MEETING

JULY 1, 2014

MEETING OVERVIEW:

Jane Adcock gave an overview of the work and meeting agreements completed to date. The consensus decision from the May 2, 2014 meeting was the primary subject matter for this meeting. Previously, it had been agreed that a larger group needed to be convened to make decisions regarding:

Any (and what type of) statutory process for peer certification

Program oversight (including type of oversight body) for peer certification process and

How to fund the work of any entity working on either of the two above processes.

Documents related to the Background, Summary of the May 2, 2014 meeting as well as an Attachment to each of the agenda items, to foster discussion regarding options available for consideration, were provided with the agenda in preparation for this meeting and were briefly reviewed.

The first two items of business for this meeting were to acknowledge that for purposes of the peer certification process, and these meetings, that peer was defined as “persons with lived experience as a consumer, as a family member or as a caregiver.”

The second item for acknowledgement was that in talking about the certification process, the group agreed that both the curriculum and the certification process will meet the requirements for federal reimbursement.

CONSENSUS DECISIONS:

State Law

With regard to the state law, the group decided to take the time to be fully informed and to have a well thought out legislative process including proposing legislation and finding-an author. Related to this, it was agreed that the peer certification group would simultaneously work with other certification and professional groups in order to secure their support for this process.

July 1, 2014 Meeting Summary

Page two

Program Oversight Body

With regard to the type of body in which to “house” the peer certification process, the group agreed that it could be a governmental entity. Further the group agreed that whatever body was selected, it must have a peer connection. No formal statement as to what that was or how to ensure the peer connection was decided upon at this meeting. Finally, the group agreed that the peer certification work group should connect with HRSA, CMS, DHCS and County Health Plans to determine what they look for and would be comfortable with in terms of authority and structure especially for billing for the work of certified peers.

Funding

The group agreed that a variety of funding sources needed to be obtained. The group agreed that funding was required first to support the group who will complete the development of the detailed elements for a certification process. Thereafter, a dedicated stream of funds would be required to support the operation of all aspects (administration, contracts for curriculum accreditation, certification evaluation, etc), of the ongoing certification process. In the interest of this, the group brainstormed that it could look at federal grants, community college programs, and/or the Mental Health Services Act funds in order to identify which might be the best and most appropriate dedicated funding streams. Finally, since OSHPD is currently working with the Consumer and Family Member Advisory Committee, it will need a “to do” list from the peer certification process group to identify building blocks that can support Consumer/Family Member employment and potentially build on a statewide peer certification (i.e. core competencies, standardized curricula, etc.).

Next Steps

Jane Adcock will convene the original body of subject matter experts (from May 2, 2014 meeting) to review the input from stakeholders at the July 1 meeting as well as their expectations of next steps to be taken including whether the CA Mental Health Planning Council will be invited to have a continuing role.