



INDIANA COMMISSION *for*  
HIGHER EDUCATION

Indiana Graduate Medical Education Board

October 18, 2016

10:00 a.m. Eastern

101 West Ohio Street

CHE Office, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Kent Weldon Board Room

Indianapolis, IN 46204

Meeting Minutes

Board Members Present in-person: James Buchanan, Mark Cantieri, Peter Nalin, Tim Putnam, Donald Sefcik, Beth Wrobel

Board Members Calling-in: Steven Becker

Commission Staff Present: Eugene Johnson

Other Attendees: Beth Paul, Angie Vincent

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Tim Putnam at 11:05am.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes from the prior meeting were approved unanimously.

BUSINESS ITEMS

Committee Reports

Tim Putnam asked Eugene Johnson to discuss the work of the Committees. Eugene Johnson discussed what had been done so far and asked Angie Vincent to discuss the work of each. Tim Putnam reviewed the objectives of each



INDIANA COMMISSION *for*  
HIGHER EDUCATION

Committee. The Legislative Report and Future Funding's work is to ensure the Board met legislative requirements; stating case for future funding if necessary and tell story of GME needs as well as possible. The Application Committee's work is set up grant funding opportunities to best use funds as the Board's appropriately disseminated them. The AHEC's Committee's work is to find out what AHEC's role in GME expansion could be and what roles they'd play in expansion especially regarding pipelining efforts. The Communication Committee's work is to develop how the Board will communicate to potential recipients of the grant as well as other stakeholders.

Angie Vincent stated that in working with the Legislative Report and Future Funding Committee she worked with Steven Becker, Mark Cantieri and Peter Nalin; she shared an application for funding draft based on the Texas model discussed in prior work session and, in focusing in they talked about per resident amounts, planning grants and development grants. Models were discussed and the numbers of residents were discussed as to what the estimates of residents to be supported statewide would be. Angie Vincent stated that her AHEC conversation was good and that the Committee spoke with Jim Ballard along with representatives in North Carolina to discuss development of pipeline strategies. Angie Vincent commented that the Communication Committee's work included the surveys sent to family medicine directors which provided the group feedback on how, if grants were available, how many residencies they could support and the associated line-item costs of those residences. Angie Vincent discussed plan to get the report to the Legislature; Eugene Johnson went over how the Commission planned to get the report to the Legislature.

Beth Wrobel asked if the Board could get on summer sessions for health policy in the House and Senate; Eugene Johnson stated he could check and see. Tim Putnam ask the Legislative Report Committee to determine what the report is so that they official accomplish what they are supposed to. Mark Cantieri stated they need to start at what is the best way to present the report to the Legislature; he stated it should discuss the total number of residents and how they would utilize funding over an eight-year time frame.

Peter Nalin stated he felt the combination of a four-page report and a one-page highlight document would be good. Beth Wrobel and Angie Vincent discussed having a page with infographics that would be reviewed. The Board continued discussion about how to present the report. Steven Becker discussed the strategy used in Southwest Indiana; stating it matched Peter Nalin's suggestion of creating a smaller document to delivery to the Legislature.



INDIANA COMMISSION *for*  
HIGHER EDUCATION

Tim Putnam asked if the Board had copies of the draft four-page document which was sent by Angie Vincent the prior week. Angie Vincent asked for any feedback the Board had; she also stated that Tripp Umbach's team would put together any infographics. Angie Vincent asked the Board as of the current point in the project what do they think is the most important things to get through. Tim Putnam went around the room looking for key points. Beth Wrobel stated starting with the shortage issue; Angie Vincent asked which shortage, residency spots or physicians, was the most important. Jeb Buchanan stated meeting the five requirements in the law was the most important. Peter Nalin discussed what the infographic could look like and how it could be framed based on the amount of funding provided and what outcomes would result based on the amount, i.e. "this amount equals this expansion"; "this amount equals more", etc. Donald Sefcik stated he'd likes to look at distribution by specialty and geographic concentration. The Board and Angie Vincent had additional discussion about what would be required for funding, including James Buchanan asking about putting in economic impact data as it would be good for the Legislature to review. Steven Becker added overall physician shortage, maldistribution and how a state investment, with the state economic impact and with the number physicians that will be produced, will matter to most legislators.

Additional discussion about providing a one-pager compared to a four-page took place. The Board discussed how they could provide a high-level document(s) that helps people understand the anatomy of getting someone to become a qualified physician and the work that goes into it. Tim Putnam asked if development of four-page document and two-page infographic sounded reasonable to the Board; feedback for this was positive.

Angie Vincent went over discussions about how the report would be provided. The Board discussed strategies on presenting the information to the Legislature including having medical students testify about what impacts their post-medical school decisions and why they want to stay in Indiana. Future funding was discussed; Angie Vincent stated the Board discussed the future funding associated with the per resident amount and that the Board agreed on a \$45,000 per year per resident number for the new or existing slots. Peter Nalin confirmed that \$45,000 was the state portion and this was verified. Angie Vincent explained the delineation between what existing programs would receive and the new program's funding of \$500,000 at startup and then \$45,000 per year once CMS funding came in. She stated that they could discuss matching funds; she's used 25% and 30% matching in initial models. She stated that the percentage match could be discussed. Tim Putnam opened the question of matching amounts for discussion.



## INDIANA COMMISSION *for* HIGHER EDUCATION

The Board discussed the amount of matching funds and what was received from the federal government per resident. Angie Vincent discussed generally explaining associated cost and that the ask is not for all cost, just explaining what cost there are with starting a program. The Board continued discussing how Graduate Medical Education would be explained to potential stakeholders. Tim Putnam went back to the \$45,000 number and asked if the Board felt that number was still, per resident slot, not creating a financial benefit for an organization to start a residency program. Angie Vincent asked Peter Nalin his thoughts on if he felt \$45,000 was incentive enough to expand. Peter Nalin stated that, for an existing program it'd be enough to do so. James Buchanan stated that established program would have less costs than new ones; he stated concern that \$45,000 was too low a number to him; Beth Paul asked if that was too low for existing or new; he stated both. He stated \$45,000 is a good help but still would not cover costs. Angie Vincent stated that virgin sites could get \$500,000 as a startup program development grant for two years, and then would get \$45,000 per year if they applied for that. The Board engaged in more discussion about the amount offered per resident and associated cost for those positions. Tim Putnam stated they needed to nail down somethings but had some general parameters.

Peter Nalin commented that the residency programs today do a very good job of supplying the physician workforce for Indiana; stated there are many forces that don't support the successful introduction of a residency into some geographies because you need a critical mass of everything else that's going on in the education environment; stated it's still a victory for the state of Indiana if existing programs get bigger for the reason that it answers the graduates coming out of Marian and the expansion of the Indiana University School of Medicine (IUSM); those students will go to other states if the programs in Indiana are not bigger. He stated he's acknowledging that the distribution of physicians is still a factor and goal but worse than that is if the graduates of these schools go to residencies in other states, that won't solve the total number and distribution of physicians in Indiana; it's something the regions will figure out if they can create a residency program; if they only tag distribution of physician and programs in certain locations they will be pushing out the delivery of new positions occupied with students and that's his one concern with too many requirements on programs and where they are. Angie Vincent agreed that Peter Nalin's comments were a good point and that's what Tripp Umbach was trying to find a balance on what the end goal was; knowing that the maldistribution is a fact; knowing there's challenges and that where trying to create the planning grants came in. Peter Nalin also commented that expansion of existing program and the creation new programs are in service of the goal of more Hoosier physicians for Indiana. He stated he feels one category is more deliverable sooner than the other.



INDIANA COMMISSION *for*  
HIGHER EDUCATION

Tim Putnam discussed the future funding component of the Boards plan and asked the Board if they want to put funding toward this aspect. The Board discussed the available funding and how long it was available. Angie Vincent asked about the sustainability of funding and how this would factor into an entity's desire to expand. Discussion continued related to how programs could and would be able to expand related to currently available and any future funding. Tim Putnam acknowledged that current funding will get the ball rolling but that the impact may not be felt for a few years. Peter Nalin expressed concern on potentially spending almost \$4 or \$5 million on planning; state that that does not lead to solving the situations of graduates wanting to stay in Indiana right now and they don't want to tell graduates "wait another three years until our planning is done"; if the Board finds a way to increase positions this January and March; the institutions that currently have residencies in Indiana would do everything they could to change match number in January in anticipation of funds.

Beth Paul stated that Tripp Umbach was guided to focus on the distribution of slots as part of their work. Discussion continued about whether programs would be comfortable having this funding with no guarantee of future funds. James Buchanan stated that IU may be able to fill quickly but other family residency programs already have budgets figured out and those 10 programs are already at their caps. Peter Nalin noted that the IUSM routinely gets requests for 10-25 residents and/or fellows each year. He noted that more money going to planning isn't helping expansion of slots.

Tim Putnam moved to get the conversation back to how the available \$5.6 million needed to be spent. A question was posed to the Board by Tim Putnam of whether the \$45,000 amount is something the Board is good with. Steven Becker motioned that the Board settle on \$45,000 per residency spot for new and existing programs as suggested amount to report to Legislature. The motion was seconded by Donald Sefcik. Discussion clarified this funding was recommendation for future funding per year per resident; Steven Becker provided clarification on the motion. Mark Cantieri stated he wanted to make sure all stakeholders truly knew the number. Beth Paul stated their preliminary analysis on program costs and CMS revenue expected to go to hospitals; \$45,000 was the gap; she stated it differs by entity. Steven Becker stated the number came from the taskforce that was put together to create the legislation. Tim Putnam clarified the request in the report was \$45,000 per year per slot and the Board is asking for roughly \$16 million in state investment for the expansion of new and existing programs. Motion passed unanimously.



INDIANA COMMISSION *for*  
HIGHER EDUCATION

Tim Putnam asked about recommendation one; feasibility planning grant of \$75,000 per organization or consortium. Eugene Johnson clarified the timeframe of the Board's need to allocate the available funds; he stated funds were part of a non-reverting fund so they would not be "lost"; he stated the timeframe to get the framework in place, numbers finalized and going in front of the Legislature in 2017 to request additional funding was not as urgent as once thought; however the Board should have a plan in place for funds to spent down while requesting continuing funding. Donald Sefcik stated he was pleased that spending is not as urgent as once thought so that he could advise his students correctly in choice of slots. Tim Putnam asked if the \$75,000 amount was a reasonable planning grant amount. Steven Becker stated \$75,000 with whatever local matches were available was enough for required feasibility studies. Tim Putnam asked if the match of 25% or 30% was preferred. Beth Wrobel stated she felt it would be at least 30% and asked if they could build an infrastructure to make it easily; she stated in Northwest Indiana they leveraged what Steven Becker did with the Southwest Indiana consortium. Additional discussion occurred related to the amount available for the planning grant. Tim Putnam confirmed that around \$1.1 million for the grants and \$100,000 for regional forums/training was what the Board felt was sufficient. A motion for \$75,000, 15 grants, up to \$100,000 for training was offered and seconded by Beth Wrobel. The Board discussed the language stating "up to \$75,000". Motion was modified to change language to up to \$75,000. Motion passed unanimously.

The Board next discussed funding to use towards program development grants. Donald Sefcik suggested putting \$1.5 million into the development bucket; stated that there should be enough for the programs that might come in for their consideration. The Board and Tripp Umbach discussed factors related to the expansion included recruiting of a Program Director, faculty and other staff. Paul Haut asked if 15 was an accurate number of potential entities who would eligible to apply for and receive grant funds. He also stated the likelihood of receiving on-going higher level funding from the state would be dependent on putting a process in place that would start showing results. Tim Putnam stated that putting information about available funds and number of grants available; those potentially interested will jump on opportunity and they could be funded. He stated he'd also like to see funds fast track the Gary and Evansville initiatives. The Board discussed who could apply and if it would be possible for one entity to apply for multiple grants; it was determined that this would be allowed. Additional discussion dealt with incentivizing current residency positions as part of the expansion plan. Tim Putnam reviewed the discussion; starting program for funding grant, \$1.1 million; \$2 million for programs going to start; \$2.4 million left to allocate \$150,000 per three-year residence slot for existing programs to expand.



## INDIANA COMMISSION *for* HIGHER EDUCATION

The Board continued discussion of outcomes related to funding and how applicants could rank for the amount of funding they received based on meeting certain requirements as defined in each application's scoring rubric.

After a short break, Tim Putnam reviewed the buckets the Board has allocated funding for; first, \$1.1 million for program feasibility and communication of that; \$2 million for program development for programs that have or in the near future gone thru feasibility planning and will be ramping up in the future. Steven Becker verified that the \$2 million would be geared towards start up areas and asked how that would be split up; Tim Putnam stated that the first four would get \$500,000; he said that discussion needs to happen to clarify that current funding may not fund all that diem themselves feasible; the report to the state should state that the proposed plan is \$45,000 per year per resident plus funding for additional program development over the next few years. Beth Wrobel discussed infrastructure issues of having enough human capital for 15 new programs; she stated recruiting Program Directors is challenging. Steven Becker stated that, over time, once programs are built there will be people who can assume leadership roles.

Timing of making the funding applications available was discussed and how available slots, current setup and availability of CMS funding related to the cap may impact an entities' ability to apply for funds. The Board agreed upon dates for availability of the application and for those applications to be returned, reviewed and grants to be awarded. Tim Putnam asked Tripp Umbach to setup drafts of the applications and the scoring rubric necessary. The Board and Tripp Umbach finalized dates for the delivery of the required report to the Legislature and the initial grant awards. Feasibility and planning grant deadline date was agreed upon to be April 30. Program development grant deadline dead line was discussed. Tripp Umbach commented they were trying to align this grant with planning development funding. Tim Putnam stated he wanted to encourage Gary and Evansville to move forward with their planning; Paul Haut stated that if only those two consortium were being targeted saying the funding is there until it is gone is not his favorite path. Mark Cantieri stated the Board is aiming to target getting the funding out to parties they know are interested; they know of these two but you have to be equitable in getting the information out to everyone at the same time. Tim Putnam stated as a State, they know funding is finite and Gary and Evansville are two programs they are aware of that they can see starting in the next two years. Paul Haut commented they are discussing two consortia who are talking about starting multiple residency programs.



## INDIANA COMMISSION *for* HIGHER EDUCATION

More discussion took place on how the determination of funding amounts would be determined based on what programs and slots consortia would be creating. Beth Paul stated the Board would want to ensure that there's as much program development at one place as possible in order to leverage federal funding. She stated Tripp Umbach has come across one of the biggest barriers being the time between hiring a Program Director, getting the first resident and then getting CMS funding. Beth Wrobel asked for clarification on at what point CMS funding is received; Beth Paul confirmed it is when the program receives its first resident and stated that cost typically one to two million dollars which is why they used the \$500,000 per program estimate.

James Buchanan stated they could do a secondary cap of \$500,000 per program and no more than one per institution per year unless funds are exhausted. He stated they are only aware of Northwest and Southwest now and asked to discuss other potential programs. Angie Vincent commented that Fort Wayne has a program as well and James Buchanan commented that Fort Wayne could be up and going with the program development grant's help as well. Mark Cantieri asked if a program is already up and going do they already have funding? Angie Vincent commented on Evansville's funding available; Mark Cantieri asked if someone already has dollars is providing them with additional grant funds the best use of funding. Paul Haut and Mark Cantieri discussed how providing these entities with funding could help not only produce outcomes sooner but to create new programs.

The Board discussed the parameters that could be used in evaluating grant application and granting funds. James Buchanan asked is the Board had the ability to set their own requirements and Eugene Johnson confirmed they can evaluate applications based on an applicant's current funding and award funds as they see them meeting statutory requirements. The Board again discussed deadlines and plans to ensure funding is applied for and expended during 2017. Tim Putnam asked for a motion to formalize due dates, available grant amounts and financial requirements as discussed. Motion was made to approve the timelines, grant amounts and financial requirements and outcomes for each of the three applications as discussed and was seconded by Paul Haut. Motion passed unanimously.

Eugene Johnson discussed the terms of appointments for Board members including expiring terms and what actions were taking place to get those members re-appointed. Tim Putnam verified the work products due to be delivered to the Board and the Legislature by required deadlines. Tripp Umbach verified they would have the final report and all infographics to the Board for review and final feedback prior to creating the final document to be delivered to the





**INDIANA COMMISSION** *for*  
**HIGHER EDUCATION**

Legislature. He went over tentative deadline dates for draft applications to be available for review and possible posting. Final discussion occurred on meeting dates and times for 2017; Eugene Johnson stated he would provide the Board with a tentative 2017 schedule in the upcoming weeks. Tim Putnam entertained a motion to adjourn; Beth Wrobel made motion to adjourn; seconded by Paul Haut. Meeting adjourned at 2:30p Eastern.