

School-Based Wellness Centers Strategic Planning

Infrastructure Implementation Workgroup: Meeting 1 Notes

Virtual Zoom Meeting

Friday, February 12, 2021

1:00 PM – 2:30 PM

Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions
 1. The workgroups met and developed a set of recommendations. This workgroup will help put strategies in place to implement the recommendations.
 2. Participant introductions
2. Overview of Strategic Planning Process
 1. Reviewed process
3. Review of Recommendations
 1. Reviewed recommendations and related considerations
 1. Recommendation 2: Hub and Spoke model
 1. Comment from Gloria James on rec 2 – if districts decide to use hub and spoke model, group will have to work through what that means. The \$350k that is legislatively determined is for 170k each for 2 centers and 5k for equipment. The way that it's in the code, it's an ongoing cost; this language doesn't differentiate between ongoing and one-time cost. The money in the recommendations before re red clay and colonial – the one-time money was assuming 2 high-needs schools every year. So the MOU for this year is for the second two. The code assumes we have established 4 high-need schools already and we haven't. The way Medicaid is set up to reimburse these schools...if people want to do hub and spoke, that's fine, but people need to look at the Medicaid formula and what funding will be ongoing.
 2. Recommendation 3: Sibling option to use SBWC in another school
 1. Jon Cooper comment on Rec 3 – with school choice, it's common for families to have kids in multiple school districts.
 2. Uma Ahluwalia – it was a key point that parents not be eligible for these services.

3. Emily Falcon – clarifying what the options are for children/siblings in a charter for example.
 4. Uma – the district can only be accountable for kids in their district – that constraint needed to exist. And the age limits/implementation details will need to be worked out. How do you operationalize this and what does it mean.
 5. Kristin Dwyer – what does this mean for charter schools?
 6. Uma – we didn't focus on charter schools. If this is an issue to flag, we can look at it.
 7. Jon – we should look at this.
 8. Kristin – there are a lot of high-need charter schools, and they shouldn't be excluded. Not sure how to address siblings at different charters. Whatever we're doing here should apply to charters as well as school districts.
 9. Emily – inter-district relationships – potential access issues/challenges.
 10. Uma – if this creates inequities in a different way, we need to look at that. We will want a lot. We wanted a lot earlier in this process. Budget and reality on the ground is very different. Even with capital budget and siting, the state does very little to support those activities. It will continue to be a balancing act.
 11. Gloria – based on current code, DPH right now has the only authority to certify a SBWC. Having said that, agree with Kristin, fyi – as long as they're certified, they don't have to be funded through public health. As long as people put it in that context, could still have a high needs charter school that's not on that list that's certified by DPH.
 12. Dr. Mpsi – is there a need to assess current SBWCs? (Not talking about eliminating any)
 13. Uma – there wasn't discussion of potentially eliminating any. There was discussion of indicators that would be used, who has the ability to stand up the SBWC, can school accommodate it, these were all issues looked at. It was looking at building new. Focus wasn't on charters.
3. Recommendation 4: SBWC setup
1. Emily – just thinking back to when we were building the Eisenberg wellness center – there was a checklist and that informed the contractors' plans. Was under the impression that was required by DPH.

2. Gloria – at the time that was the minimum. There have been budget cuts since then – that was based on the information and budget available at the time.
3. Uma – this mirrors Eisenberg. We also looked nationally to try to mix and match. This rec will still need to be adapted into a checklist.
4. Kristin – so to these points, these are recommendations, what DPH decides to do with it, which regs need to be changed under DPH but also on DOE side? So that when districts are building a new building or take on a SBWC, even in those regs, it's about finding where it all fits in.
5. Uma – there are discussions of what is the oversight body that will oversee the plan? They're only as good as the implementation.

4. Recommendation 5

1. Important considerations – what does telehealth look like going forward? What do capacity and connectivity

4. Implementation Workgroup Process

1. Process overview and discussion of guardrails/core principles

5. Next Steps & Adjournment

1. We'll send around list of SMEs and pre-populated template for Recommendation 2