

# Welcome to the Healthy Start Virtual Grantees' Meeting













### Please note the following:



 This session is being recorded, and will be archived for future viewing.



All participants are muted upon entry and throughout the session.



 Members are encouraged to participate in the discussion by typing your comment/asking questions using the chat box.






# Connecting to the Audio Conference




- Join Zoom Meeting by clicking Zoom Webinar
   link & launching the Zoom application
- An audio conference box will appear
  - If you do not see the box click the 'Join
     Audio' button
- From the audio conference box: Select to "Phone Call" or "Computer Audio"
- If using the phone:
  - dial the number next to "Dial"
  - You will be prompted to enter the "Webinar ID"
  - Then you will be prompted to enter the "Participant ID"



https://zoom.us/j/237206404










# Ways to Participate: Chat










# #HealthyStartStrong



- Spread the word about #HealthyStartStrong on social media
- Throughout the meeting, post about what you're learning/enjoying about the meeting
- Include the hashtag #HealthyStartStrong and be sure to tag @NICHQ

# We Are #HealthyStartStrong









Healthy Start Virtual Grantees' Meeting

# Updates from HRSA's Federal Office of Rural Health Policy

William England, MS, PhD, JD Kathryn T. Umali, MPH

June 25, 2020





# Agenda



Introductions	Vanessa Lee, MCHB, DHSPS
Updates from HRSA's Federal Office of Rural Health Policy	William English, MS, PhD, JD Kathryn T. Umali, MPH
Closing	Vanessa Lee, MCHB, DHSPS







# William England, PhD



Kathryn T. Umali, MPH











# Office for the Advancement of Telehealth

Healthy Start National Grantee Meeting June 25, 2020

William England, PhD, JD
Director, Office for the Advancement of Telehealth
Federal Office of Rural Health Policy (FORHP)

Vision: Healthy Communities, Healthy People



### **Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)**

**Current Telehealth Activities** 





- 1,370 HRSA awards last year included a telehealth component
- 50 states and 8 federal districts/territories have awards
- Telehealth activities include
  - Supporting distance learning
  - Workforce development
  - Telehealth delivery
  - Infrastructure development
  - Research





# **OAT Programs (FY2020) - \$29 M**

Program	Awardees	Amount
Telehealth Network Grant Program	29	\$8.7 M
Evidence-Based Telebehavioral Health Network Program	14	\$4.7 M
Telehealth Resource Centers	14	\$4.5 M
Licensure Portability Grant Program	2	\$.50 M
Telehealth-Focused Rural Health Research Centers	2	\$1.9 M
Telehealth Centers of Excellence	2	\$6.0 M
Other		\$2.7 M

The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act PL 116-136 3/27/20 reauthorized Office for the Advancement of Telehealth programs.





# **HRSA Funded Telehealth Resource Centers**

### TelehealthResourceCenters.org



TRC's have a mission to serve as a focal point for advancing the effective use of telehealth and support access to telehealth services in rural and underserved communities.







## **2019 TRC Year in Review**





# **Telehealth Policy Resources**















### **TELEHEALTH POLICY CHANGES DUE TO COVID-19**


MEDICARE ISSUE	CHANGE	MEDICAID ISSUE	CHANGE
Geographic Limit	Waived	Modality	Allowing Plain Old Telephone
Site limitation	Waived	Location	Allowing home as site
Distant Provider List	Added FQHC/RHC	Consent	Relaxed requirements to allow oral
Services Eligible	Added additional 80 codes		consent over phone
Visit limits	Waived certain limits	Services	Expanded types of services eligible
Modality	Unchanged, still Live Video		
Supervision requirements	Relaxed some	Providers	Allowed new provider types such as
Licensing	Relaxed payment rules		allied health professionals
Tech-Enabled/Comm-Based (not considered telehealth, but uses	More codes eligible for phone & allowed PTs/OTs/SLPs & other		
telehealth technology)	use	Licensing	Waived some requirements in state based Practice Acts

DEA – Allow teleprescribing without in-person visit. HIPAA –Good faith effort for PHI by televideo (OCR Notice of Enforcement Discretion) Private payer orders range from telehealth coverage to explicit mandates.





### Learn more about telehealth



Get information to help you integrate telehealth, get up to speed on recent COVID-19 related policies, and learn what patients will need to use telehealth.				
▼ Getting started with telehealth	>			
Policy changes during COVID-19	>			
E Planning your telehealth workflow				



## **Contact Information**



William England, PhD, JD

Director, Office for the Advancement of Telehealth Federal Office of Rural Health Policy Health Resources and Services Administration

wengland@hrsa.gov

301-945-3987

Web: www.hrsa.gov/ruralhealth/





# **Connect with HRSA**

# Learn more about our agency at:

www.HRSA.gov



Sign up for the HRSA eNews

**FOLLOW US:** 

















# Rural Maternity and Obstetrics Management Strategies (RMOMS) Program

Kathryn Umali
Director, Community-Based Division (CBD)
HRSA/FORHP





# **Access to Obstetrics Services**

### POLICY BRIEF April 2017



### State Variability in Access to Hospital-Based Obstetric Services in Rural U.S. Counties

Pelyin Hung, MSPH

aty Kozhimannil, PhD

Michelle Casey, MS

Carrie Henning-Smith, PhD

### **Key Findings**

#### Between 2004 and 2014:

- County-level access to hospital obstetric (OB) services varied considerably across states.
- More than two-thirds of rural counties in Florida (78%), Nevada (69%), and South Dakota (66%) had no in-county hospital OB services.
- Rural counties in South Carolina (25%), Washington (22%), and North Dakota (21%) experienced the greatest decline in hospital OB services.
- North Dakota (15%), Florida (17%), and Virginia (21%) had the lowest percentage of rural counties with continual hospital OB services owing to loss of hospital OB units in rural noncore areas of North Dakota and Virginia, and in micropolitan areas of Florida

rhre umn edi

#### Purpose

The purpose of this policy brief is to describe state variations in 1) the availability of hospital-based obstetric services, and 2) the scope of obstetric unit and hospital closures resulting in the loss of obstetric services in rural U.S. counties from 2004 to 2014.

### Background

The availability of hospital-based obsterric services in rural areas is a policy issue of long-stranding concern to rural community members, clinicians, and policymakers. Previous studies have documented the loss of obsterric services in rural areas of individual states, including Alabama, Florida, and Missouri, and raised concerns about the potential impact of greater distances to travel for obsterric services on maternal and infant outcomes. <sup>33</sup> This study uses national data to examine the availability of obsterric services in all U.S., states with rural counties. This is the second in a series of two policy brief examining the closure of hospital obsterric services in rural areas; a companion policy brief rakes a national perspective, whereas this brief documents state-level variability in access to hospital-based obstetric services in rural counties from 2004-2014.

### Approach

We identified the obsterric service status of each hospital in each year using hospital-reported data on the number of births, provision of obsterric services, level of maternity care, and number of obsterric beds from the 2003-2014 American Hospital Association annual surveys, and data on hospital provision of obstetric services from the Carers for Medicare & Medicaid Societies Provider of Services File. Sew used data from 2003-2014 to identify closures between 2004-2014; the additional year of data (2003-2004) was necessary to identify loss of obstetric services in 2004.

We categorized counties into three groups: 1) no obstetic services since 2004. 2) continual obstetic services since 2004, and 3) full closure of obstetic services from 2004-2014. Counties that had multiple hospitals providing obstetric services but only experienced closure of obstetric services in some of the hospitals were categorized as having continual obstetric services —accounting for 59 counties over the study period. A hospital's county was categorized into micropolitan (counties with a population of 10,000 – 49,999) and rural noncore areas (counties with less than 10,000 residents or other rural

### thic uningdu

Flood

Telling of Seignal Of tests in real receiver areas of Roth Dalete and Veginis, and Prinkshopilitor great of We computed examines seen three groups 11 no objective, are very along 2004. 22 committed objective, express close 2004, and 1 full closure of obtained exercise from 21004-2014. Consistent that had full closure of obtained exercises from 21004-2014. Consistent that had multiple hospitally providing dometric exercise has only experience of chouse of obserted exercises in some of the hospitals were caragonized as herring, contributed obserting exercises. Accounting for 26 countries over the study period. A hospitalise continy was categorized iron misner repoledant Contribute with a population of 10,000 e-30,0300, and rural necessors areas (countries with a population of 10,000 e-30,030), and rural necessors areas (countries with a population of 10,000 ecologicus or other rural necessors areas (countries with less than 10,000 conductor or other rural

wer dan Arm 2011 (2013) to all may chaine hereater 2001-2014. By additional year of dam \$2002-250 At was receivery to shouly horrea.

### Between 2004 and 2014:

- The percent of rural counties with hospital-based obstetrics services declined from 55% to 46%.
- 179 rural counties (9% of all rural counties) lost access to in-county hospital obstetric services.
- Women living in rural noncore counties (areas with less than 10,000 residents) were disproportionately affected by the loss of hospital obstetric services.
- Only 30% of rural noncore counties had continuous hospital obstetric services compared to 78% of micropolitan counties.





# Rural Maternity and Obstetrics Management Strategies (RMOMS) Program

### **Purpose & Focus Areas**

- Improve the *access to and continuity of maternal* and obstetrics care in rural communities through testing models that focus on:
  - 1) Rural Hospital Obstetric Service Aggregation
  - 2) Network Approach to Coordinating a Continuum of Care
  - 3) Leveraging Telehealth and Specialty Care
  - 4) Financial Sustainability

### **Investment**

- Program Start Date: September 1, 2019
- 4-Year Award
  - 1 Planning Year (up to \$600k)
  - 3 Implementation Years (up to \$800k)



### **Awards**

- TX-RMOMS Comprehensive Maternal Care Network
  Bexar County Hospital District (Texas)
- Bootheel Perinatal Network Project
   Saint Francis Medical Center (Missouri)
- Rural OB Access and Maternal Services (ROAMS)
   Network

Taos Health Systems, Inc. (New Mexico)



# **Questions?**

Kathryn Umali kumali@hrsa.gov





# Up Next





# Day 2 Wrap-up





