# STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSE

BOARD OF CERTIFIED DIRECT-ENTRY MIDWIVES 619 E. Ship Creek Ave., Suite 309B Anchorage, AK

August 22-23, 2013

By authority of AS 08.065.020 and in compliance with the provision of AS 44.62, Article 6, a scheduled meeting of the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives was held August 22-23, 2013 at 619 E. Ship Creek Ave., Suite 309B, Anchorage, AK

Thursday August 22, 2013

Agenda Item 1 - Call to Order/Roll Call

Cheryl Corrick called the meeting to order 9:10 a.m. Present, constituting a quorum of the board were:

Cheryl Corrick, CDM, Chair, Fairbanks Mary 'Jennie' Grimwood, Public Member, Secretary, Cordova Sarah Taygan, CNM, Anchorage Deborah Schneider, CDM, Wasilla Peggy Downing, MD, Wasilla Arrived at 9:14 A.M

This meeting was public noticed in the Anchorage Daily News on July 16, 2013.

Present from the Division of Corporations, Business & Professional Licensing:

Don Habeger, Director Sara Chambers, Operations Manager (via Telephone) Jasmin Bautista, Investigator Quinten Warren, Chief Investigator Alvin Kennedy, Investigator Connie Petz, Licensing Examiner

Public members in attendance on August 22, 2013 were: Dana Brown, Madison Nolan, Autumn Loken, Lena Kilic, Iris Caldentey, Susan Terwilliger, Judi Davidson, Darcy Lucey, Rebecca McKimmey, Onica Sprokkreeff and Stella Lyn.

Public members in attendance on August 23, 2013 were: Dana Brown, Stella Lyn, Laura Gore, Lena Kilic, Susie Terwilliger and Judi Davidson.

- 54
- 55 56
- 57 58
- 59 60 61

- 63 64 65
- 66 67 68
- 69 70 71 72
- 74 75 76 77

73

84

- 1: Final Minutes for February 22, 2013 Board Meeting
- 2: Final Minutes for June 24, 2013 Teleconference
- 3: Update for ALSO course
- 4: Regulation Project Part A enacted into law Effective June 29, 2013
- 5: FY13 Annual Report

Cheryl Corrick asked to pull item number 3 regarding the ALSO course from the consent agenda and move it to discussion under agenda item 21.

> ON A MOTION BY JENNIE GRIMWOOD, SECONDED BY DR. DOWNING APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 1, 2, 4 & 5. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

Agenda Item 3 - Review/Approve Agenda

ON A MOTION BY DEBORAH SCHNEIDER, SECONDED BY JENNIE GRIMWOOD APPROVE AGENDA AS DRAFTED. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS

Agenda Item 4 - Ethics Reporting

There were no ethics violations to report by board members.

Agenda Item 5 - FY13 Budget Report

The Board called operations manager, Sara Chambers to discuss the budget. The current budget reflects the 3rd quarter of fiscal year 2013 and the final budget for FY14 will be completed by the end of September. Staff will send that budget report to the board via e-mail.

Sara Chambers explained to the board that the legislature increased the divisions travel funds by 200K and that money is distributed among all programs in the division.

Cheryl asked about the ability to increase licensing fees and asked that the Board recommendation for increase apprentice fees to 50% of a CDM fee be considered.

A follow up letter will be sent to Ms. Chambers reinforcing the boards' authority to recommend a fee increase according to 08.01.065 Establishment of fees.

Ms. Chambers also told the board that they could consider drafting a disciplinary sanctions matrix to assist the investigators in case management. By adopting the matrix it will help the Board to:

- set a standard of expectation for licensees
- meet requirements of Statutes and Regulations
- licensees will understand what will happen when they do not follow their laws
- protection for the Board when they are tasked to uphold the law

Ms. Chambers reminded the Board that they (board members) can be held liable when they veer from what they are required to do by law. In addition, the more inconsistency, the more work is required by staff. Overall, having a matrix will save costs to licensees.

106

107

108

109

110 111

112 113 114

> 115 116 117

118 119 120

121 122

123 124 125

126

127 128

138

144 145 146

143

147 148 149

150 151 152

153 154 155 The final fiscal year budget will be available in September. Staff was tasked to forward the final FY13 budget to all board members via E-mail once available.

Chief Investigator Quinten Warren, investigators Jasmin Bautista and Al Kennedy attended the meeting.

Mr. Kennedy shared the investigative report with the board. At this time there is one open compliant, five open investigations have been moved to department of law and two investigations have been closed.

Case files that are moved to the Department of Law are moved out of the Boards investigative cases, meaning future costs are not being incurred by the licensees. The board will still be consulted as the final authority.

Mr. Warren explained to the Board how the disciplinary sanctions matrix which Ms. Chambers spoke of can be a very good tool to give everyone insight into how the board may want licensing violations managed.

Break off record at 9:56 a.m. and back on record at 10:25 a.m.

Agenda Item 6 - Investigative Report

The board discussed how a disciplinary sanctions matrix could work. Ms. Taygan asked the board to consider what the outcomes would be if the board did not enforce the disciplinary sanctions. Staff explained when people do not follow the regulations then they have broken the law. When the board doesn't address the regulation break then the board has already broken the law as the board. This matrix is a tool which gives the board ability and stability to say this is what happens when you don't follow the law. Two areas staff sees where the law is broken is not submitting to peer review on or before May 1st and not reporting an addition or change of preceptor within 30 days of occurrence. Creating the matrix will outline the consequence of not following the law. This is similar to the fines established for continuing education audits.

A subcommittee of the board (Deborah Schneider and Jennie Grimwood) was formed to work on developing a proposed disciplinary sanctions matrix to present at the next board meeting.

ON A MOTION MADE BY DR. DOWNING AND SECONDED BY TAYGAN. IT WAS RESOLVED TO FORM A SUBCOMMITTEE, DEBORAH SCHNEIDER AND JENNIE GRIMWOOD, TO DEVELOP A DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS MATRIX. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

Agenda Item 7 - Peer Review

Thirty One Midwives renewed their licenses this last renewal period. On March 8, 2013 they were all sent letters to submit a completed Peer Review Report Form to the Peer Review Committee by May 1, 2013 according to: 12 AAC 14.900(c)(1).

Peer Review Committee developed a set of outliers to help them have a system for birth summary reviews and determine which midwives they would request charts from for additional review. It had been their practice to complete their reviews and return the original Peer Review

157 158 159

165 166 167

168

164

173 174 175

176 177

178 179 180

181 182 183

184 185 186

187

188 189 190

191

198 199 200

197

201 202 203

204 205 Report Form along with the completed Peer Review Summary Sheet no later than June 15, 2013 to the Division. This is to allow staff time to compile documentation for the fall board meeting.

Peer review found it difficult to meet the June 15th deadline and they sent a short recap in June to staff of the division. Then peer review summary reports were received in the Juneau office on August 19, 2013. Peer Review Chair, Vanessa Jackson submitted a letter on August 20, 2013 asking the board for additional time for the committee to complete Peer Review and submit to the Board, Ms. Corrick read the letter for the record.

Dear Board Members.

Peer Review reviewed 591 summaries that were submitted by Alaska CDMs this year. We developed a list of outliers as criteria to request charts from the MAA summaries submitted by CDMs. As a result, 27 charts were requested from 14 CDMs. This is a time consuming process that might not have been taken into account when time lines for submission of documentation of the peer review process was developed. As a volunteer member of Peer Review and Peer Review Chair, I am writing to request that the deadline for the submission of documentation of the peer review process be postmarked no later than August 15th. This will allow adequate time for the review of charts and response from peer review members.

Sincerely, Vanessa Jackson, CDM, CPM

The board discussed that allowing additional time would be ok. Therefore, all future peer review reporting should be submitted to the division by August 15th with complete summaries.

ON A MOTION MADE BY DR. DOWNING AND SECONDED BY SCHNEIDER. IT WAS APPROVED TO GIVE PEER REVIEW UNTIL AUGUST 15TH TO SUBMIT THEIR REPORT TO BOARD STAFF. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

This year, the summary reports submitted by Peer Review were not fully completed. Staff highlighted all areas that were incomplete on each summary form to assist the Board in review of the report. There were also some discrepancies in reported number of births and the number of summaries received. Staff asked the Board to provide direction on how to proceed.

It was decided to draft a letter to Peer Review to request they go back over and complete all areas on the report forms, contact midwives if needed to clear up birth summary discrepancies. Also, ask them to consider revising some outliers and explain to the board how they (peer review) determines if a midwife is demonstrating competencies in midwifery when they are not practicing in Alaska. Ask peer review to request birth summaries from a licensed midwife who is not currently practicing in AK but who has primary births in another state. Staff drafted a letter during lunch and the board approved it to be sent to Peer Review.

TASK: Forward letter from board to Peer Review along with copies of all incomplete peer documentation requesting completion by peer review.

Agenda Item 8 - Audit Review from Renewal

Four midwives were selected for random audit and the board reviewed the continuing competency and continuing education documentation submitted. At the last board meeting,

207 208 209

210

218

232 233 234

235 236 237

238 239 240

242 243 244

245

246

241

251 252 253

254 255 256

257

two of these licensees were reviewed but they had not been signed off by anyone at the board meetina.

Staff asked the board to consider what constitutes a complete continuing education certificate according to the regulations as it is not clear when reviewing the certificates from MAA.

12 AAC 02.960. AUDIT OF COMPLIANCE WITH CONTINUING COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS (e) A licensee selected for audit under (c) or (d) of this section will be notified by the department. Within 30 days of notification, the licensee shall submit to the department, documentation to verify completion of the continuing competency activities claimed on the statement submitted with the application for license renewal. The documentation must include a valid copy of a certificate or similar verification of satisfactory completion of the continuing competency activities claimed that provides

- (1) the name of the licensee;
- (2) the amount of continuing competency credit awarded;
- (3) a description of the continuing competency activity;
- (4) the dates of actual participation or successful completion; and
- (5) the name, mailing address and signature of the instructor, sponsor, or other verifier.

Deborah Schneider was tasked to draft a letter to MAA and forward to staff by October 1st. Staff will put on state letterhead and send to MAA. The letter to MAA will state what makes a complete continuing education certificate. She will inform MAA the need to update their certificates for Group B Strep and IV Therapy to include the actual date the course is completed and date of expiration.

The Board approved continuing education audits for licensees' number 10, 32 and 51.

ON A MOTION MADE BY TAYGAN, SECONDED BY SCHNEIDER to approve continuing education audits for licensees numbered 10, 32, 51. All in favor, no nays.

Task: staff will send a letter to one midwife requesting additional information for CE's.

Lunch Recess - off record at 11:57 a.m.

Agenda Item 9 - Call to Order/Roll Call

Cheryl Corrick called the meeting to order at 1:16 p.m. All board members were present.

The board continued with Peer Review discussion as they acknowledged they do not have any way to know how someone is maintaining competency when they do not have any peer review.

The board held discussion about how they could know when a certified direct-entry midwife is maintaining competency if they are not currently practicing in Alaska but actively practicing in another state. Do they need to submit primary birth summaries.

It was noted the regulation requires fulfillment of continuing competency and peer review for renewal of a license and the regulation does not state in or out of the state of Alaska for primary responsibility.

12 AAC 14.400. CERTIFICATION RENEWAL REQUIREMENTS. (5) demonstrate continued practical professional competency by verifying (A) fulfillment of the continuing

260 261 262

268

277

283 284 285

286

293 294 295

296

297

292

298 299 300

302 303

301

competency requirements in 12 AAC 14.420 - 12 AAC 14.450; and (B) compliance with the peer review requirements in 12 AAC 14.900.

12 AAC 14.900. PEER REVIEW (c) A certified direct-entry midwife shall submit to the board or, if an organization has been designated under (a) of this section, to that organization the following information: (1) a copy of the summary of birth for each labor and delivery for which the certified direct-entry midwife had primary responsibility during the 12month period that began on April 1 of the preceding year; the copy must be submitted on or before May 1 of each year;.

Susan Terwilliger spoke up saying she holds a license to practice in Texas. She feels the board should defer to the other state by accepting and assuming they are complying in the other state and exhibiting competency in that state when they hold a license.

Ms. Schneider asked Ms. Terwilliger what she was required to do to maintain a Texas license. She said she only needed to take the TX ethics course and there is no peer review in TX, nor is she asked about her births in the state of Alaska.

Dr. Downing told Ms. Terwilliger that the board is very aware that other states do not have the same standards as Alaska. Incoming applicants must meet AK requirements to be issued a license in our state. Dr. Downing said that just showing they hold a license in another state is not showing a person is practicing competently. Perhaps the board needs to find out if the licensee practicing in another state has met peer review in the other state.

The board decided that it is Peer Review who should be reviewing the competency of every licensee. The Board acknowledged it is in the regulations that all birth summaries are to be reviewed by Peer Review.

Staff to add to the letter to peer review, "in addition we would like to have the Peer Review committee consider and explain to the board how they can assure someone who does not report assists or primary births in the state of Alaska is demonstrating competencies in midwifery when they are not practicing in Alaska. The board asks because of the licensee who did not submit summaries because she did not have births in Alaska".

The board determined that they will now ask all licensees to state how many Assists they were involved with on each peer review report.

Task: Staff to send letter approved by the board to Peer Review along with copies of all incomplete peer documentation requesting completion by peer review. In addition, staff will update the peer review report form to include requesting reporting of number of birth assists.

#### Agenda Item 10 - Public Comment

Dana Brown cares about her profession and public safety. She is concerned with the costs being incurred for investigations. She thinks regulation projects are also a big expense and when the department of law shot down the proposed regulations this was a big waste of money. She said the board needs to find a way to avoid spending money and time by finding out how to make changes that meet statute before trying to make changes that will not be allowed.

316 317

318

319

320

321 322

323

324

325

326

327 328

329

330 331

332

333

334

335

336

337 338

339 340

341 342

343

344

345

346 347

348

349

350

351 352

353 354

355

356 357

358 359 360

361

When she was on the board they created a list of approved continuing education providers and she said that the board may want to look at the list of approved providers. The board acknowledged 12 AAC 14.430 identifies those approved. She did not think the list on page 37 (12 AAC 02.960) made sense and thought the board should try to change it. Staff reminded the board this law is from centralized regulations and applies to all professional licensing continuing education certificates.

Ms. Brown also wanted the board to understand that when other states allow voluntary licensure for midwives they still have regulations. Voluntary only means the midwife voluntarily chooses to hold license so they can bill to insurance companies and to Medicaid.

Susan Terwilliger said she backs up what Ms. Brown said about continuing education and she thinks it is a slippery slope to require the certificate define what was part of any course. The board should just accept that if it's an approving agency then they should not have to define the exact hours on a subject such as 'pharmacology'. Just accept it, not requiring hours stated on the certificate. Staff explained the issue was when a title just says "Mana Conference" it does not identify the content. Ms. Corrick said it is her understanding it is the board who approves the certificates as they are the experts in midwifery.

Stella Lyn asked the board as they go forward with the Medicaid audit to remember their midwifery roots and the NARM job analysis and that they continue to see babies beyond the second PKU test and to be able to bill for this service. Midwives cannot separate follow up with the mother and the baby by not asking about the baby. She was concerned that the post partum care should be mother and baby all the way to 6 weeks.

Ms. Corrick said 6 to 8 weeks is what they want as the standard.

Agenda Item 11 - Nitrous Oxide

Nitrous Oxide was brought up at the February 2013 board meeting. It was decided to look at it during the August board meeting. Information for the Board packet was submitted by Judi Davidson, Certified Direct-Entry Midwife. She is not promoting nitrous oxide but bringing information to the board.

Mary "Jennie" Grimwood, Public Member also provided research and she shared their thoughts saying it would be a good option during delivery. She said she researched the 'abuse of nitrous oxide' and said it's something that is on the rise. In that way, it is very dangerous, it can cause immediate death, or other serious injury. The Board determined they were concerned about the appropriate use not the abuse of it. The board said they would want to make sure it was stated they would only want the 50/50 blend not the pure nitrous oxide.

Susie Terwilliger was concerned that if the board moved towards allowing nitrous oxide and she was not going to use it that the board would require mandatory education for its use.

The Board will continue to pursue discussion on Nitrous Oxide at the next board meeting. They agreed there would need to be both training and protocols for use of Nitrous Oxide.

TASK: Staff to find out if the board has statutory authority to proceed with adding Nitrous Oxide to their regulations.

Agenda Item 12 - Review Applications for Licensure

1: Madison Nolan application by Exam

 ON A MOTION MADE BY DR DOWNING, SECONDED BY SCHNEIDER TO APPROVE Madison Nolan FOR CERTIFIED DIRECT-ENTRY MIDWIFE LICENSE PENDING PASSING NARM EXAM. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

2: Heather Forbes application by Credentials

ON A MOTION MADE BY TAYGAN, SECONDED BY SCHNEIDER APPROVE HEATHER FORBES FOR CERTIFIED DIRECT-ENTRY MIDWIFE LICENSE WITH SUBMISSION OF THE FIVE CONTINUITY OF CARE CLIENTS, INCLUDES SIX PRENATAL VISITS, THE IMMEDIATE NEW BORN EXAM AND IV THERAPY AND GROUP B STREP DOCUMENTATION. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

3: Rebecca McKimmey License # 57 – Reinstatement application - lapsed December 31, 2010

ON A MOTION MADE BY TAYGAN, SECONDED BY SCHNEIDER TO APPROVE FOR REINSTATEMENT OF CERTIFIED DIRECT-ENTRY MIDWIFE LICENSE. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

Agenda Item 13 - Discussion for Preceptor Regulation

The Board decided they will not make any changes in regulations for preceptors at this time.

Cheryl Corrick recessed the meeting at 4:15 p.m., reconvene August 23, 2013 at 9:00 a.m.

Friday - August 23, 2013

Agenda Item 14 - Call to Order/Roll Call

Cheryl Corrick called meeting to order 9:05 a.m. Roll call was taken. Jennie Grimwood, Sarah Taygan, Dr. Downing, Deborah Schneider and Cheryl Corrick were in attendance.

Agenda Item 15 - Xerox Audit

At the June 24, 2013 teleconference, Cheryl Corrick and Deborah Schneider were appointed to work on drafting a letter to submit to Health and Social Services to explain the position of the Board on interpretation of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives law. Cheryl read the entire letter and the position statement of the board to have on the record and in the minutes.

TO:

William J. Streur, Commissioner

410 Margaret Brodie, Director

Division of Health Care Services

412 Health Care Services Officials

413 4501 Business Park Blvd., Bldg. L

Anchorage, AK 99503-7167

Re: Scope of Practice of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives under Alaska's Midwifery Practice Law and Regulations of the Alaska Certified Direct-Entry Midwifery Board

Dear Commissioner Streur and Ms. Brodie:

I write to you in my official capacity as Chairperson of the Alaska Certified Direct-Entry Midwifery Board to provide the enclosed official Position of the Alaska Certified Direct-Entry Midwifery Board ("Board") with respect to the legally-authorized scope of practice of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives (CDMs) under the laws and regulatory program of the State of Alaska.

This Position is being provided because it has come to the attention of the Board that your agency has denied payment for certain services, routinely provided by CDMs in Alaska, under the mistaken impression that these services are not within the state-authorized scope of practice for CDMs. Specifically, our Board has been provided with a Medicaid Compliance Notice (Notice) dated April 22, 2013, which states that the Alaska Medicaid Surveillance and Utilization Review Team (Team) conducted a review of Certified Direct-Entry Midwife (CDM) billing practices in the context of adherence to provider participation requirements. The Board was reliably informed that the issues selected for review by this Team and conducted by your contractor, Xerox State Healthcare, LLC (Xerox), were based upon the Team's limited understanding of CDM scope of practice, giving rise to certain enrollment and billing concerns on the part of Xerox/the Team..

We have also been informed that at least nine (9) CDM's have been audited in connection with this process and subsequently issued a demand that they refund monies paid for certain health care services that they provided. Some or all of these CDM's were also ordered to perform a self-review with respect to prior occasions when the indicated services were provided for Medicaid enrollees, and to refund any payments identified by Xerox as being paid in compensation for one of these identified services. By order of your agency, certain of these demands were voided, but the underlying issues remain unresolved. The other documents provided to the Board in relation to this matter are correspondence from Xerox to the CDMs identified as Findings of Desk Level Reviews (Findings Letter). According to these Findings Letters and the Medicaid Compliance Notice, Xerox and/or the Review Team raised questions about the following:

1. Services provided to enrollees in which an apprentice or student midwife performed **any** services for the client. Xerox claims that the CDM who is acting as the apprentice/student's supervising preceptor is not permitted to bill for services performed by an apprentice or student direct-entry midwife.

2. Services provided for an infant who is older than one week of age. The Findings Letter states that "Alaska Medicaid will not reimburse for services which a direct-entry midwife is prohibited under AS 08.65 from performing, including but not limited to the following diagnoses or conditions: care to an infant beyond one week of age."

3. Services provided for women who are or would be 35 years of age or older at the expected date of delivery. The Findings Letter states that Alaska Medicaid will not reimburse for services which a direct-entry midwife is prohibited under AS 08.65 from performing, including services for a recipient with any condition determined by the board to be of high-risk. The Medicaid Compliance notice does not specifically list this alleged exclusion but, rather, states

"any other condition determined by the board to be of high risk to the woman and/or newborn."

It appears from these documents that the rejection of payment for these services is based upon Xerox's/the Team's interpretation of the parameters of the legal scope of practice for CDMs under Alaska law and regulations. This matter has been brought to the Board's attention and our position regarding the scope of practice and legally-approved services was requested.

The Board has been advised by its legal counsel, Assistant Attorney General Harriett Dinegar, Esq., that it has the authority to provide a position with respect to the correct interpretation and construction of the statutes and regulations that relate to the scope of practice for CDMs in the State of Alaska. This letter is intended to provide your office and the general public with the enclosed Position that has been published by the Board with respect to each of the three issues set forth above.

The Board will be glad to consult with officials of your agency or representatives of Xerox if you or they have any questions or wish to discuss these matters any further.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours, Cheryl Corrick, CDM, CPM

# POSITION OF ALASKA BOARD OF CERTIFIED DIRECT-ENTRY MIDWIVES

This Position of the Alaska Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives ("Board") is provided to assist officials and staff of the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services ("Department") in making decisions regarding payment for certain Certified Direct-Entry Midwife ("CDM") services. The Board has jurisdiction to do so pursuant to its statutorily-delegated authority with respect to the legally-authorized scope of practice and legally-approved CDM services under the Direct-Entry Midwives Statute (AS 08.65) ("CDM Statute"), and the Regulations promulgated by the Board (12 AAC 14.100 through 12 AAC 14.990) pursuant to that statute.

#### Authority and Expertise of Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives

When the Alaska Legislature established the Alaska Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives by statute [AS 08.65.010] (Board), it also explicitly delegated to this Board the authority to "enforce the provisions of this chapter and adopt regulations necessary to make the provisions of this chapter effective" [AS 08.65.030(6)]. The statute also defines the scope of practice of Certified Direct Entry Midwifery – the "practice of midwifery" under this State's laws – as follows:

08.65.190 Definitions (3) "practice of midwifery" means providing necessary supervision, health care, and education to women during pregnancy, labor, and the postpartum period, conducting deliveries on the midwife's own responsibility, and providing immediate postpartum care of the newborn; "practice of midwifery" includes preventative measures, the identification of physical, social, and emotional needs of the newborn and the woman, and arranging for consultation, referral, and continued involvement when the care required extends beyond the abilities of the midwife, and

the execution of emergency measures in the absence of medical assistance, as specified in regulations adopted by the board (emphasis added).

As the regulatory agency to which the Alaska Legislature has delegated authority over the practice of Direct-Entry Midwifery, as well as the responsibility to make that statute effective, the Board's jurisdiction and expertise are entitled to a high level of deference with respect to its interpretation of the statute it enforces and effectuates and the rules it has promulgated. In accordance with recent state and federal court rulings, an administrative agency's determination of the scope of its own jurisdiction is likewise entitled to deference.

Under the terms of the CDM Statute, as cited above, the Board has explicit authority to enforce the provisions of that Statute, including the scope of practice for CDMs; to develop and promulgate regulations that will make the provisions of the statute effective; and to specify the elements of the "practice of midwifery" scope of practice through regulations [AS 08.65.030(7)], among other powers and responsibilities. The Board has exercised that authority by developing and promulgating regulations and by enforcing the provisions of statute, specifically including defining, regulating, and enforcing CDM scope of practice through creating and carrying out regulations, through disciplinary proceedings, and by closely regulating midwifery education, examinations, and eligibility for certification (AS 08.65.030; 12 AAC Chapter 14]. The Board's authority includes the power to discipline any CDM who has been found to have provided services beyond the Board-approved scope of practice [AS 08.65.030(4); 12 AAC Chapter 14, Articles 5 and 6}.

Thus, as an initial matter, the Board wishes to point out, with respect to all three issues discussed in this Position, that the Board has comprehensive authority to discipline any CDM who might have provided services that would exceed or fall outside of the approved scope of practice for CDMs under the CDM Statute or regulations, or who might have engaged in fraudulent billing practices. No such disciplinary proceedings are on record with respect to any of the issues raised in the Compliance Review or Findings Letter, however, for any CDM at any time, and no such proceedings are presently contemplated against any of the CDMs who have been subject to the present audit. Specifically, the Board does not consider it a violation of the statute or regulation for a CDM who is acting as a supervising preceptor for an apprentice/student midwife to bill for services personally supervised by that CDM as the preceptor in accordance with the statute and relevant rules. Neither would the Board consider it a violation for a CDM to provide services for a newborn who is more than one week old, or to provide midwifery care and services – prenatal, intrapartum, or postpartum – for women over the age of 35. Not only does the board not consider any of these activities a violation of the scope of CDM practice under the statute or regulations, but the Board would like to clarify that it is well within the scope of practice for CDMs to provide services to both the mothers and newborns through the 6 week postpartum period. Each of these issues will be considered separately.

### A. Supervision of services provided by apprentices.

The State of Alaska comprehensively regulates the education of Certified Direct-Entry midwives, including both the academic component and the clinical experience component of that

education. Apprenticeship is one of the required routes to becoming a CDM in Alaska. Section 08.65.030 confers authority on the Board to:

559 560

558

- 561
- 562 563
- 564 565
- 566 567
- 568 569 570
- 571 572 573
- 574 575 576
- 577 578 579

> 584 585 586

587

588 589

590 591 592

593 594

599

600

601

- "issue permits to apprentice direct-entry midwives"
  - "approve curricula and adopt standards for basic education, training, and apprentice programs;"
  - "provide for surveys of the basic direct-entry midwife education programs in the state at the times it considers necessary;"
  - "approve education, training, and apprentice programs that meet the requirements of this chapter [that is, the statute] and of the board, and deny, revoke, or suspend approval of such programs for failure to meet the requirements."

Section 08.65.060 orders the Board to conduct an examination for certifying CDMs at least once a year and specifically directs and empowers it to utilize and approve a national certifying examination of a national certifying body. There is only one such examination and organization at the time the statute was enacted and at present time still - the North American Registry of Midwives, which administers the examination for Certified Professional Midwives, which is the examination we, as the Board, have adopted for Alaska midwives.

Section 08.65.090 authorizes the Board to "issue a permit to practice as an apprentice directentry midwife to a person who satisfies the requirements of AS 08.65.050(1) - (3) and who has been accepted into a program of education, training, and apprenticeship approved by the board under AS 08.65.030." This section of the Statute also requires that a "permit application under this section must include information the board may require. The permit is valid for a term of two years and may be renewed in accordance with regulations adopted by the board." (emphasis added).

Subsection (b) of AS 08.65.090 permits an apprentice direct-entry midwife to "perform all the activities of a certified direct-entry midwife if supervised in a manner prescribed by the board by (1) a certified-direct-entry midwife who has been licensed and practicing in this state for at least two years; [or] (2) a certified direct-entry midwife who has been licensed for at least two years in a state with licensing requirements at least equivalent in scope, quality, and difficulty to those of this state at the time of licensing, who is certified in this state, and who has practiced midwifery for the last two years."

Additionally, subsection (5) of section 08.65.110, Grounds for Discipline, would require the Board to discipline a licensee who had "intentionally engaged in or permitted performance of client care by a person under the CDM's supervision that does not conform to standards." Additionally, under section 08.65.170, it is an explicitly prohibited practice for "a person who is not certified under this chapter as a certified direct-entry midwife [to] practice midwifery for compensation." Therefore, if the apprentices were actually providing midwifery services – and, thus, practicing midwifery – and the preceptor were being compensated for such services, it would violate this provision, which would then have the unintended effect of making this section

of the statute internally inconsistent with the extensive statutory provisions through the other sections of AS 08.65 that set up, and provide for the regulation of, an apprenticeship-based educational program designed to train CDMs in Alaska.

Clearly, education of apprentice midwives in Alaska is not some casual matter taken on by a CDM to lighten her practice workload. Rather, this program is a comprehensively-regulated component of CDM practice in Alaska, and one that was clearly of great significance to the legislature. As directed by the Legislature [AS 08.65.030(3), (7), (8), (9), and (10)]; 08.65.090], the Board has been diligent in developing regulations governing apprenticeship education, clinical experience, and preceptorship (12 AAC Chapter 14, Article 2), as those subsections of the statute require.

#### Comprehensive Regulation of Apprenticeships and the Apprentice-Preceptor Relationship.

Portions of Article 1 and all of Article 2 of the Board's regulations fulfill the Legislature's directives regarding apprenticeships and education of student midwives, and are based upon the delegated authority conveyed by the Legislature. Rule 12 AAC 14.110(b) (7) requires applicants for CDM certification to have successfully completed the course of study requirements set forth in section 12 AAC 14.210 of the rules. Section 12 AAC 14.130(c) (5) requires the Board to verify the acceptance of applicants for apprenticeship into "an apprenticeship program the Board has approved." Subsection (d) of that section requires the applicant to provide the Board with "written documentation of a relationship with an apprenticeship program," while subsection (g) defines an "apprenticeship program preceptor" as "an individual who meets the supervisory requirements of AS 08.65.090(b). AS 08.65.090 reads as follows:

- (a) The board shall issue a permit to practice as an apprentice direct-entry midwife to a person who satisfies the requirements of AS 08.65.050(1) (3) and who has been accepted into a program of education, training, and apprenticeship approved by the board under AS 08.65.030. A permit application under this section must include information the board may require. The permit is valid for a term of two years and may be renewed in accordance with regulations adopted by the board.
- (b) An apprentice direct-entry midwife may perform all the activities of a certified directentry midwife if supervised in a manner prescribed by the board by
  - (1) a certified-direct-entry midwife who has been licensed and practicing in this state for at least two years;
  - (2) a certified direct-entry midwife who has been licensed for at least two years in a state with licensing requirements at least equivalent in scope, quality, and difficulty to those of this state at the time of licensing, who is certified in this state, and who has practiced midwifery for the last two years.
  - (3) a physician licensed in this state with an obstetrical practice at the time of undertaking the apprenticeship; or
  - (4) a certified nurse midwife licensed by the Board of Nursing in this state with an obstetrical practice at the time of undertaking the apprenticeship.

Article 2 of the CDM Board regulations, as noted above, provides comprehensive and detailed standards and other requirements which apprentices, preceptors, and apprenticeship programs are required to meet. Rule 12 AAC 14.200 deals with the academic components of

apprentice/student midwife education, while Rule 12 AAC 14.210 specifies the requirements for the apprentice's supervised clinical experience; subsection (a) of this section specifies: "the applicant must have completed all clinical experience requirements of this section under the supervision of a preceptor."

Rule 12 AAC 14.210(b) sets forth the specific minimum numbers of clinical experiences that must be documented by all apprentices, including 100 prenatal visits, 10 labor and delivery observations, 20 assisted labor managements, primary responsibility for 30 labors/deliveries, 30 newborn examinations, and 30 postpartum visits with the mother. Furthermore, all these experiences must be documented on a form provided by the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development, and carry the signature of the supervising preceptor verifying that these experiences were all personally supervised by the preceptor. The Form in question, according to subsection (f) of this rule, "Practical Skills List for Alaska CDM" was adopted by the Board and Department from the list created by the North American Registry of Midwives (NARM) in 2002, and has been explicitly adopted into the CPM regulations by reference. Rule 12 AAC 14.220 sets forth the requirements for an apprenticeship program to qualify for approval by the Board.

As the statute and rules make clear, the mandated clinical experience requirements for apprentices regulated under these rules must all be directly supervised by a CDM who has been approved as a preceptor. Within this comprehensive regulatory program, the Board views the supervising preceptor as the provider of midwifery services, not the apprentice or student. The terms "preceptor" and "supervision" are defined as follows in rule 12 AAC 14.990 (4) and (5):

- (4) "Preceptor" means a person qualified under AS 08.65.090(b) or 12 AAC 14.210(a) who supervises a person training to be a direct-entry midwife or supervises a lapsed certificate holder in the process of reinstatement under 12 AAC 14.470(b) (6) (B);
- (5) "supervision" means the direct observation and evaluation by the preceptor of the clinical experiences and technical skills of the apprentice direct-entry midwife or other supervised person while present with the supervised person in the same room"

The Board notes that the Medicaid program itself already recognizes and allows for the fact that a CDM may not always provide services for eligible recipients directly or personally. The Provider Billing Manual for Direct-Entry Midwives, dated May 2, 2013, contains the following provision and explanation:

"Direct-Entry Midwife Services: Alaska Medical Assistance reimburses enrolled providers for medically necessary services for eligible recipients when delivered, ordered or prescribed by a provider within the scope of the provider's license or certification. Services rendered based on a prescription, order or referral is reimbursable only if the prescribing, ordering or referring provider is enrolled as an Alaska Medical Assistance

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A note to this rule offers the information that copies of the Form may be obtained from the Alaska Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development, Division of Corporations, Business & Professional Licensing, Board of CDMs..

This provision runs directly counter to Xerox Health's claim that CDMs cannot be reimbursed for services provided with the involvement of apprentices. The essence of the preceptor/ apprentice relationship is that the preceptor midwife orders the student/apprentice to either observe or provide some aspect of the care and services for the client. Apprentices don't simply take it upon themselves to decide to provide services for the preceptor's client, but are instructed by the preceptor regarding what aspects of care the apprentice might provide and when that care might be provided. The client - the Medicaid enrollee - remains the client of the preceptor at all times and does not become the client of the apprentice. Furthermore, the apprentice may provide care only to the extent instructed by the supervising preceptor and only under direct in-person supervision of the preceptor. This is analogous to CMS rules regarding payment for services provided by medical students, interns, or residents under the direct inperson supervision of a physician. It is also analogous to Medicaid rules governing payment to practitioners for services provided in part by other providers that are "incident to" the services of the practitioner.3

The Position is being provided because it is important, as a matter of public policy, that the two agencies involved in this matter – the Department of Health and Social Services and the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development– find common ground and a common understanding on these issues. Communications from Xerox Health and Medicaid officials appear to be premised upon the belief that the agency is being billed for the services of an apprentice/student midwife. This is not the case, however, because the services being provided and billed for are the services of the Certified Direct-entry Midwife who is in the room directly supervising at all times and who never relinquishes control over the midwife-client relationship to the apprentice. As with "incident to" billing by physicians and by other NPPs, the CDM performs at least part of the care for the client on every occasion. In the great majority of cases, the care is done by the CDM and she directs the apprentice to do some of the care under her supervision.

This is a necessary element of the overall statutory plan to educate certified direct-entry midwives right here within the State of Alaska, as discussed above with respect to the statutory and regulatory background of this program. In this respect, apprentices and apprenticeship

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Alaska Medical Assistance Provider Billing Manuals, Section I: Direct-Entry Midwife Services, Policies and Procedures (Xerox State Healthcare, LLC) (May 2, 2013), p. 1-6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Please see the CMS Fact Sheet: Guidelines for Teaching Physicians, Interns, and Residents (<a href="http://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/Medicare-Learning-Network-MLN/MLNProducts/downloads/gdelinesteachgresfctsht.pdf">http://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/Medicare-Learning-Network-MLN/MLNProducts/downloads/gdelinesteachgresfctsht.pdf</a>); and see also the Medicare Benefits Manual, Chapter 15, Section 60.1, which defines "incident to services "as those furnished as an integral, although incidental, part of the physician's [or non-physician provider's] personal professional services in the course of diagnosis or treatment of an injury or illness." To qualify for "incident to" billing, the services must be medically necessary and appropriate to the clinical setting, and directly supervised by the physician or NPP."

programs are an essential element of regulated CDM practice in Alaska. At the time that CDMs were added to the Alaska State Medicaid Plan, the comprehensive apprenticeship program for midwives had already been in place for several years. If the legislature had wanted to shut it down so that CDMs could not bill Medicaid for services if apprentices were involved, it could easily have repealed or revised the apprenticeship provisions of AS 08.65, but it has not done so. Likewise, HSS should be presumed to have been aware of the scope of practice of CDMs and the statutory regime under which they practice when, in the State Medicaid Plan, it defined CDM services as "care that a Direct-Entry Midwife is authorized to provide under the scope of practice of her state license."

In the short time since then, Medicaid-eligible pregnant women now make up at least fifty percent (50%) of CDM clients in our state. Alaska CDMs provide maternity services in many areas where there are few if any other maternity care providers. If CDMs are not permitted to bill Medicaid for services ordered and supervised by CDMs but observed or participated in by apprentices, the statutory plan for growing additional midwives in-state will break down, with the probable results that CDMs would no longer be able to serve Medicaid clients and that fewer apprentices would be able to qualify as CDMs in Alaska. Each of these results would be contrary to the obvious legislative intent underlying the Direct-Entry Midwifery law, and also contrary to Alaska public policy.

#### B. Care and Services for Newborns

As discussed above, the Alaska Medicaid State Plan defines Direct-Entry Midwife services as "care that a Direct-Entry Midwife is authorized to provide under the scope of practice of her state license." This language is similar to the language of the federal Medicaid laws and rules that were brought to the Board's attention by an expert witness that testified at a Board emergency meeting on June 24, 2013. The federal law, section 1905(a)(6) of the Social Security Act [42 U.S.C. § 1396d (a)(6) includes in the definition of "medical assistance" provided to Medicaid-eligible enrollees, "care recognized under State law furnished by a licensed practitioner within the scope of their practice as defined by State law." This language is echoed by the CMS rule that implements the statute, 42 CFR § 440.60 (a) ("Medical care or any other type of remedial care provided by licensed practitioners" means any medical or remedial care or services, other than physicians' services, provided by licensed practitioners within the scope of practice as defined under State law").

Xerox Health has taken the position that "care to an infant beyond one week of age" is beyond the scope of practice of CDMs under state law. Based upon its interpretation of the Board regulations, Xerox has demanded refunds for past payment for newborn services provided for neonates after that first week. The apparent reason for taking this position is that Xerox health seems to have misinterpreted rule 12 AAC 14.540(e), which reads: "A certified direct-entry midwife shall recommend to the client an evaluation of the infant by a physician within one week of birth or sooner if it becomes apparent that the infant needs medical attention."

This recommendation is just that – a recommendation from the CDM to the client to have the newborn evaluated by a physician by one week of age. The purpose of the rule is simply to advise the parents to schedule an appointment with a physician for the baby and to permit the

family to establish a relationship with a physician. This provision does not, nor was it intended to, preclude the family from deciding to continue care for their infant with the CDM, whether the family chooses to follow the recommendation by also seeking an evaluation by a physician or not. This provision does not mean "make the recommendation and stop providing care" but, rather, simply offers the parents another option for care. The parents are free to accept or reject the recommendation.

The interpretation adopted by Xerox Health is inconsistent with several other provisions of the statute and regulations. These inconsistences include:.

- 1. The definition of midwifery in AS 08.65.190 includes "care of the newborn" and the "practice of midwifery" is defined as including "the identification of physical, social, and emotional needs of the newborn and the woman, and arranging for consultation, referral, and continued involvement when the care required extends beyond the abilities of the midwife." The term "care of the newborn" is expansive, not limited to services during the first week of life; likewise, "the identification of physical, social, and emotional needs of the newborn" could occur at any time during the newborn period. The most significant language in this definition, however, is the provision calling for "continued involvement when the care required extends beyond the abilities of the midwife. The Board interprets this as having its plain meaning, that is, even when a CDM determines it appropriate to seek consultation with another provider or to refer a client to another provider, it remains part of the practice of midwifery to continue to be involved in the care of the referred client.
- 2. AS 08.65-200(5) requires the education of apprentices and student midwives to include the following care and services: A) anatomy and physiology of the newborn as they relate to the newborn's adaptation and stabilization in the first days of life; (B) methods for assessing newborn status including relevant historical data and gestational age; (C) nutritional needs of the newborn; (D) administration of prophylactic treatments commonly used during the neonatal period, including state laws applicable to that administration; (E) common screening tests for the newborn, including indications, risks, benefits, and methods of performing those tests; (F) neonatal abnormalities, including the etiology and assessment of those abnormalities, and the screening and diagnostic tests, emergency measures, appropriate transport, referral, and treatment necessary as a result of those abnormalities. These areas of knowledge, care, and services are not limited to the first week of life. In fact, as required by rule 12 AAC 14.530, certain of these diagnostic tests and prophylactic treatments are not appropriately performed until later in the newborn period.
- 3. Rule 12 AAC 14.530 is entitled "Infant Care" which is a broader term than "newborn". Subsection (d) of this rule requires a CDM to ensure that the baby receives metabolic blood disorder screening in accordance with 7 AAC 27.510 7 AAC 27.580. The first PKU screening is to be done within 24-72 hours of birth and the second is supposed to be done within 7-21 days of birth. CDM's usually perform the second PKU at about 14 days of age, which is the recommendation of pediatricians and the Oregon Public Health Labs who perform the laboratory testing on the samples. At times parents do not make it to the 14 day visit and then CDMs make every effort to get the sample by 21 days.

Page 18 of 23

- 4. The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) defines "infant" as a baby during the first year (<365 days) of life. The term "infant" is further subdivided into early neonatal (<7 days), late neonatal (7–27 days), neonatal (<28 days), or post-neonatal (28–364 days) periods. Rule 12 AAC 14.530 is entitled "Infant Care." "Newborn" is simply the anglicized word for "neonate" or "neonatal." Thus, according to the acknowledged experts in child health care, an infant can be termed "newborn" for at least the first 28 days of life, not only the first 7.
- 5. Continuity of care is very important during the first 8 weeks of life and CDM's have great success in caring for babies as the new mothers will typically bring their babies when they come in for their own postpartum visits. Thus, midwives are able to continue to observe and care for the mother/baby unit throughout the post-partum period. The importance of monitoring new mothers and babies during this critical adjustment period cannot be overstated. Midwives closely monitor breastfeeding, the infant's weight gain, signs of jaundice, temperature, respirations, and heart rate, and the mother-baby relationship and bonding, as well as detecting possible problems for consultation or referral. It would be unfortunate if women who were Medicaid enrollees and their babies were deprived of this careful oversight that all other midwife clients enjoy simply because of an inaccurate interpretation of the CDM statute and rules by Xerox Health.
- 6. Infant care through at least the first 8 weeks of life is part of the recognized scope of practice of Certified Professional Midwives as determined by the North American Registry of Midwives (NARM) Job Analysis dated January 2010. This Job Analysis was developed and is regularly updated to ensure relevant content for the national NARM examination. Passing this examination is required for certification as an Alaska CDM by Rule 12 AAC 14.300; therefore, all Alaska candidates for that examination must be educated and have relevant clinical experience to comprehend and pass exam questions related to infant care through the 8th week. Section VI B (The Postpartum Period) of the NARM Job Analysis requires, with respect to infant care, the ability to perform a postpartum reevaluation of mother and baby at the following times: day-one to day-two; day-three to day-four; one to two weeks; three to four weeks; and six to eight weeks. Since Alaska CDM candidates are tested on these requirements and are expected to have been educated to provide these services, it would be unreasonable to interpret their scope of practice under Alaska practice law and rules as being limited to only the first week of the infant's life.
- 7. A significant comparative use of language can be found in AS 08.65.140 (a), which states that "a certified direct-entry midwife may not assume the care or delivery of a client unless the certified direct-entry midwife has recommended that the client undergo a physical examination performed by a physician, physician assistant, advance nurse practitioner, or certified nurse midwife, who is licensed in this state." This provision is similar in requiring that the midwife "recommend" to her client an examination by another provider. Although there is here a "recommendation" for the woman to see a physician (or other provider), this provision in no way requires that the midwife discontinue care. In fact, the recommendation is to be made prior to but not instead of assuming care or delivery of the client. Similarly, the mere requirement that the midwife make a "recommendation" for a baby to be examined by another provider does not automatically preclude the midwife continuing care, whether or not the family accepts and acts upon the recommendation. In either case, the woman or family has the

absolute right to decide not to see another provider but to remain with the midwife as the sole provider or, alternatively, to continue parallel care from the midwife and a physician at the same time. The Board believes that Xerox Health has misconstrued the provision regarding newborn examinations and should defer to the Board's interpretation of its own regulations and legislatively-delegated authority.

#### C. Care and Services for Women Aged 35 or Older

Nothing in the plain language of the CDM statute or regulations prohibits CDMs from providing care for women aged 35 or older. Nothing in the statute or regulations defines giving birth at age 35 as "high risk to the pregnant woman and newborn" as that term is used in subsection (d) of AS 08.65.140. This sub-section lists 17 conditions that were identified by the legislature as being beyond the statutory scope of practice of Alaska CDMs. One of these (17) specifically classifies women 16 years or younger as outside that scope. Maternal age of 35 or older is not one of the identified preclusive factors.

Xerox Health is apparently basing its refusal to pay for services provided to women in this category on the language of paragraph (14), which reads as follows: "has any condition determined by the board to be high risk to the pregnant woman and newborn." Significantly, in this paragraph, the legislature explicitly deferred to the Board's expertise, allowing it to determine whether any other "conditions" should be deemed preclusive of CDM-attended out-of-hospital birth. The Board, in all its years of regulating direct-entry midwifery in Alaska, has never considered giving birth at 35 years old, without more explicit conditions or problems, to involve a high-risk of complications. Furthermore, paragraph (14) begins with the phrase "has any condition," but for a woman to have reached the age of 35 is not "having a condition" – it is merely being a particular age. Thus, based upon the language choice and syntax used by the legislature in paragraph (14), it is clear that it did not view any particular age cut-off, other than women 16 or younger, as sufficiently "high risk" to be banned. In fact, by expressing only the "under 16" exclusion, and by using the term "has any condition" for its catch-all delegation to the Board, the legislature has given a strong indication that it did not wish to bar out-of-hospital midwife-attended birth based upon an "older than" factor.

The Board recognizes, of course, that women 35 years and older may be at higher risk of developing certain conditions such as high blood pressure or diabetes, but this is not the case for all 35-year old women across the board. Should one of those conditions develop, the approved CDM scope of practice would permit the CDM to either consult with, or refer the client to, a physician or other health professional, in accordance with AS 08.65.140. The fact is that Board of Certified Direct-entry Midwives has never found it necessary or appropriate to promulgate a rule that would deem 35 years of age or older as being at a high risk for complications during labor and delivery, and it is certain that the Board would not consider or express the fact of reaching a particular age as "having a condition."

**Policy Implications.** If the Xerox Health interpretations or, rather, misinterpretations of the CDM statute and regulations are not corrected and overruled by the Department of Health and Social Services, it is likely to result in highly unfortunate consequences, not only for CDMs but more particularly, for women and babies who use midwifery services in the State of Alaska. Alaska has one of the highest rates of Midwifery care in the country. Midwifery clients, in Alaska

and elsewhere, also have excellent outcomes, with much lower rates of costly medical interventions and C-sections, and extremely high rates of breastfeeding, all of which helps to improve the health of future generations of Alaskans. Midwifery care is an effective, low-cost method to provide quality care for underserved, including rural, populations.

Furthermore, many of the CDMs in Alaska own or work as professional midwife staff members in freestanding birth centers (FSBCs). In 2010, as part of the PPACA, the Congress amended the federal Social Security Act to add FSBC services as a mandated Medicaid service for pregnant women enrolled in Medicaid. Since that time, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services have awarded a grant to the American Association of Birth Centers (AABC), as part of the CMMI Strong Start for Mothers and Newborns Initiative, to determine whether midwife-led prenatal care in FSBCs will improve outcomes for Medicaid enrollees with respect to low birth weight and prematurity. At least four Alaska FSBCs, each of which is owned by or has CDMs on its staff, will participate in this study. If, however, CDMs are arbitrarily precluded from caring for certain categories of Medicaid patients, and if HSS forces these practices to refund payments that were billed in good faith, these FSBCs may be unable to participate.<sup>4</sup>

If HSS adopts and continues to enforce Xerox Health's misinterpretation, it is likely to result in the inability of CDMs to continue to provide care for Medicaid clients, which is what has happened with the Dental profession and others in our state. This would limit access by Medicaid enrollees to affordable mother- and baby-friendly care. Regardless of referrals made by CDMs, the fact is many babies of Medicaid enrollees would not be seen for well-baby visits beyond the first week; many of these infants would fall through the cracks in pediatric care in this State, and have only sporadic, limited care during that important first two months. This would also affect the immunization statistics, as midwives refer clients to pediatricians for continuing care beyond 8 weeks, which is typically when immunizations are begun by pediatricians. Finally, adoption of the Xerox Health misinterpretations would limit or destroy the apprenticeship programs, which would limit the growth of Certified Direct-Entry Midwifery in our State, denying access to midwifery care for future generations of Alaskans. This would ultimately cost Medicaid and the State of Alaska hundreds of thousands of dollars more each year to provide prenatal, intrapartum, and postpartum care to the 500+ women who use the more affordable services of midwives. If we factor in the increase in expensive interventions these women would be subjected to in the hospital, the toll would be in the millions. The Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwifery urges the Department of Health and Social Services and the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development to work collaboratively to resolve this matter.

This Position is provided on behalf of the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives. Please contact me or the Board staff if you have any questions or would like further clarification.

Cheryl Corrick, CDM, CPM
Chairperson, Board of Certified Direct-entry Midwives

ON A MOTION BY TAYGAN, SECONDED BY SCHNEIDER, RESOLVES THE BOARD HAS STATUTORY AUTHORITY PER 08.65.030 TO INTERPRET REGULATIONS AND DEFINE SCOPE OF PRACTICE FOR CERTIFIED DIRECT-ENTRY MIDWIVES. SCOPE OF PRACTICE INCLUDES CARE FOR WOMEN AGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See <a href="http://innovation.cms.gov/initiatives/strong-start/">http://innovation.cms.gov/initiatives/strong-start/</a>

35 OR OLDER INFANTS THROUGH THE 6 WEEK POSTPARTUM PERIOD AND SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE CDM DURING DIRECT SUPERVISION OF AN APPRENTICE MIDWIFE. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

ON A MOTION BY SCHNEIDER, SECONDED BY TAYGAN, TO ADOPT THE LETTER AS READ DEFINING THE BOARDS POSITION STATEMENT AND TO MAIL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES AS ADDRESSED. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

Director Habeger was in attendance at the meeting and explained to the board why he asked Ms. Dinegar to wrap up her work on the HSS audit. This is due to the costs incurred by the Board and current deficit. He recommends the board contact licensing staff first. The Board understands they may have access to Department of Law in the future.

Task: Staff to forward the above drafted letter and position statement to Health and Social Services and ask Department of Law AAG Dinegar for any correspondence which Ms. Dinegar may have received from attorney Tiemessen or attorney Jenkins and forward to all board members.

# Agenda Item 16 - HB187

Director Habeger attended the meeting to explain House Bill 187 to the board. Current law requires legal fees under investigations to be paid by license fees. Investigative costs can be substantial and cause dramatic license fee increases in any given year.

Director Habeger asked the board to consider supporting the division in HB187.

Break at 11:24 a.m. and back on the record at 11:33 a.m.

The board discussed HB187 and agreed it could be beneficial to licensees and identified three benefits. A recap of House Bill 187:

- Average expenses over a period of licensing cycles to minimize fee spiking for licensees and therefore average out the costs for more licensing cycles. The board understands this requires conversations and input from the board about how their fees could be averaged to absorb the costs incurred. The ability to average costs for an investigation over several licensing periods to avoid an extremely high increase over one licensing period could help a license certified direct-entry midwife to absorb those costs easier.
- 2. Consolidate the over 400 licensing program fees to streamline administrative handling, meaning reducing administrative handling and increasing efficiency and reducing overall licensing costs.
- 3. Asking the legislature for 1.7 million from the general fund to cover costs related to investigations.

ON A MOTION BY DR. DOWNING, SECONDED BY GRIMWOOD RESOLVES TO SUPPORT HOUSE BILL 187. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

Task: Staff will forward this motion for board support of HB187 to Sara Chambers for Director Habeger.

1006 Lunch Recess 12:10 p.m. Reconvene at 1:15 p.m.

Agenda Item 17 - Cheryl called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. Roll call, all board members were in attendance except Dr. Downing who arrived at 1:18 p.m.

Agenda Item 18 - <u>Renewal - Open Book Self Study review</u>

The Board reviewed the open book self study, completed by licensees for renewal of their license. It was determined in the future the board will not need to see the renewal application jurisprudence questions as long as division staff was reviewing and making sure all the questions are fully answered by the renewal applicant.

Agenda Item 19 - Revision of Open Book Self Study

The Board reviewed the Open Book Self Study and revised some of the questions. Staff will update the document and add it to application form 08-4198 (Credentials) and form 08-4590 (Reinstatement).

Agenda Item 20 - On-Line BLS/CPR

The Board reviewed the certificate for on-line BLS and agreed this specific course does not meet the requirement for health care provider. All courses must meet the content equivalent.

Agenda Item 21 - Old Business/New Business/Tasks

Cheryl Corrick explained the response she received for the request for Midwives to be allowed to attend the ALSO course. She learned it was up to the provider of the course to decide who could attend. Ms. Corrick said she has the information on holding a course and it could be worked on if the midwives were interested in asking MAA to host their own course.

The Board again discussed the word Delivery and agreed they do not want to define it.

Staff asked the Board how to handle the applications by exam which are being submitted to the division in pieces and they are not complete. The board agreed that if an applicant does not have a 'complete' application in time to be approved to take the NARM exam (60 days) before the NARM, then they will not be approved to take the NARM.

#### Staff TASKS:

- Post final minutes to web for February 2013 and June 2013 board meetings.
- Forward final FY13 budget to all board members via E-mail once available.
- Sent letter to one audited midwife requesting additional information for CE's.
- Send letter drafted by board to Peer Review along with copies of supporting documentation.
- Update peer review report form to include requesting reporting of number of birth assists.
- Forward letter to MAA on state letterhead once received from Ms. Schneider
- Find out if the board has statutory authority to proceed with adding Nitrous Oxide to their regulations.
- Issue license to all licensees as motioned.
- Forward board drafted letter and position statement to Health and Social Services
- Contact DOL for any correspondence they may have received from attorney Tiemessen or attorney Jenkins and forward to all board members.

- Forward board motion in support of HB187 to Director Habeger.
- Update jurisprudence and add to application forms 08-4198 08-4590

#### **Board Member Tasks:**

Subcommittee - Deborah Schneider and Jennie Grimwood to develop a proposed disciplinary sanctions matrix to present at the next board meeting.

Deborah Schneider draft a letter to MAA providing what makes a complete continuing education certificate and forward to staff by October 1st to put on state letter head. Also request MAA update their certificates for Group B Strep and IV Therapy to include the actual date the course is completed and date of expiration.

## Agenda Item 22 - Schedule Meetings

Ms. Corrick asked the board to consider holding fall meetings after tourist season and to reduce expenses for the board.

February 27-28, 2014 in Anchorage October 2-3, 2014 in Anchorage

ON A MOTION BY SCHNEIDER, SECONDED BY DR. DOWNING NOMINATE CHERYL CORRICK FOR RE-ELECTION AS CHAIR. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

ON A MOTION BY DR. DOWNING, SECONDED BY SCHNEIDER NOMINATE JENNIE GRIMWOOD FOR RE-ELECTION AS SECRETARY. ALL IN FAVOR, NO NAYS.

Agenda Item 23 - Adjourn Meeting

Meeting adjourned and off the record at 2:55 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted:

Cheux Cour

Connie Petz, Licensia Examiner

Cheryl Corrick, CDM Chair