

Indiana Graduate Medical Education Board

Friday, October 25, 2019

10:00 am Eastern

101 West Ohio Street, Suite 300

Kent Weldon Board Room

Indianapolis, IN 46204

Meeting Minutes

Board Members Present In-Person: Steven Becker, Paul Haut, Tricia Hern, Michelle Howenstine, Tim Putnam, Tom Sonderman, Rachel Shockley

Board Members Calling-In: Beth Wrobel

Advisory Members Present In-Person:

Commission Staff Present: Eugene Johnson

Board Administrative Service Staff Present: Linda Bratcher

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:00a.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

A roll of six members attending in-person and one member attending via phone were counted and a quorum was confirmed.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW CHE STAFF

Eugene Johnson informed the Board that Courtney Hott was CHE's new Director of Legislation and Program Implementation and had to miss the meeting but would be in attendance at the January 2020 meeting.

REVIEW OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

The Board reviewed the minutes from the July 23, 2019 meeting. No necessary changes were stated. Tim Putnam called for a motion to approve the minutes; Beth Wrobel moved to approve, Rachel Shockley seconded. Motion passed 8-0.

FISCAL UPDATE

Eugene Johnson stated the current GME Fund balance was \$3,741,878.92. He noted that \$15,000 was an expense for the IUSM Administrative Services contract and the \$2.8M in encumbrances were for \$2,520,000 for Southwestern Indiana Graduate Medical Education Consortium (SIGMEC) residencies and \$270,000 for IUSM residencies. He went over how funding is encumbered for GME Fund grants at the

point that the contract is executed and not when it is approved. He noted that he planned to go over the fund balance calculations with the CHE Finance team. Tim Putnam requested the total amount of grant requests before the Board in the current meeting; that amount was \$1.6M. Tim Putnam asked what would have to happen for the Board to not receiving funding; Eugene Johnson stated that he would get an answer to that. Beth Wrobel asked if there's still a state withholding on funding; Eugene Johnson stated that there's been in the past reversions of 2% to 3% back to the General Fund. He noted that currently the GME Fund is non-reverting to the General Fund. Tim Putnam stated that there's a high probability that funding will continue but they can't assume anything. The Board continued discussion on funding availability and ensuring they are able to meet any obligations that would come from approval for funding grants.

Tim Putnam asked the Board to think about as they prepare for 2021 that they started with a baseline number of expansion of residencies in the state and projected a future top-line number of residencies; Steven Becker stated the initial working group, led by the Indiana Hospital Association, presented to the Governor and the Indiana General Assembly and recommended they work towards adding 500 spots in the state as this would get Indiana into the middle of the country, around 25th, instead of 42nd or 43rd for residency spots. Tim Putnam asked to confirm that the definition of a slot is a resident year and this was confirmed. He noted they'd already added over 100 slots and were poised to add significantly more, contingent on funding. He commented that the Board's work showed they could likely get up to 380 slots based on naive hospitals that could receive Medicare funding and other entities that could expand; he noted recent legislation that would allow critical access hospitals to come on board. He commented that if they assume they can get to 400 slots, at maturity it would be an \$18M-\$20M/year outlay to support the increased residencies at \$45,000 per residency year. Tim Putnam stated that this is the question on where the Board stands; does that money go to support and sustain the residencies, or are they funding seed money and hoping that those who start or increase residencies continue to support them. He noted that it's a question whether the state will continue support or if recipients move forward and continue supporting increased slots without state support. He asked the Board what, philosophically, they should be aiming for.

Rachel Shockley stated she was in favor of starting with seed money and then encouraging that they apply for federal dollars as she's nervous about the stability of the state dollars. Steven Becker was in favor of continued funding as long as there's state support to do so; stating when there's not enough funding they have to make tough decisions on where to best spend monies allocated where it's best spent; to keep and programs. He noted that he felt the original legislation was done that way. He noted that it is time to do an economic impact study on how the expansion has affected the areas funded. He also stated he'd like to keep the investment at \$45,000 per resident per year. Tom Sonderman said he felt similar to Steven Becker; to quantify the ROI for the state is important; noting one program with 12 residents times \$45,000 per year would be a serious drain to lose funding for. Steven Becker noted that changes with critical access hospitals could allow for residencies outside of traditional hospitals. Paul Haut commented that there so little margin with critical access hospitals; funding is a crucial component; larger hospitals could absorb it differently; he also liked the idea of an economic impact study. Steven Becker noted that the original Tripp Umbach study didn't include critical access as much because they weren't getting Medicare funding; Tim Putnam noted Tripp Umbach originally said it was a no-go but this was before rules changed.

Tricia Hern stated she feels that if entities can get Medicare dollars it wouldn't be priority to fund them compared to someone who can't get federal dollars. Steven Becker noted the variation in the amount

that each entity gets. Michelle Howenstine commented that the prior comments made a lot of sense; she stated she felt the Board's and priority is to help fix the malalignment in primary care; she noted that the AAMC concern now is mental health and, with an aging population the next thing coming is the need for specialists and surgery. She noted that with retirements, they may have different deficiencies in 5 to 10 years and she'd love to be able to tell legislative stakeholders that primary care is their current mission but these are priorities down the way. Beth Wrobel noted her concern that she thinks they are running out of money. She stated they never really heard what the state was doing with Medicaid money and they need to be cognizant that the \$45,000 will not go forever and find out where the Medicaid dollars are.

Tim Putnam left the room and passed the Chair position to Rachel Shockley, who noted that they'd had discussion on planning for future funding issues; Tim Putnam returned and Rachel Shockley passed the Chair position back to Tim Putnam.

Paul Haut noted that last meeting they discussed reaching out to Indiana Medicaid and FSSA to find out how funds are allocated. Tim Putnam noted that it differs state by state. Discussion continued on how federal funding could be allocated. Linda Bratcher inquired about the economic impact study and how that would be determined; Steven Becker explained that data would be provided which would provide an analysis of the impact. He discussed how things were done in SW Indiana to support their plan with legislators. Linda Bratcher noted that the IN GME funded slots did not have graduates yet; the Board stated that the impact analysis would provide information on the projected graduates and their impact in Indiana. Tim Putnam asked if they are able to put an RFP out to solicit bids on who could do this type of analysis for the Board; Eugene Johnson confirmed that this is an allowable expense. Tim Putnam asked the Board if an RFP for the impact of the expansion economically would be something that should be done. Continued discussion occurred on how the analysis should be conducted. Tom Sonderman noted that if he were a legislator he'd want to know how many graduated stayed; other conversations centered around being able show the impact for each legislators' district. Tim Putnam stated he felt they should wait until their next meeting to commission a study. Beth Wrobel stated that she wants to make sure that, whatever they used when creating the expansion plan to calculate the economic impact, they are consistent with that. Paul Haut said that they would need a group to specify what they are asking and the major goals he's hearing is 1) how do they continue stating their case for ongoing or increase funding and 2) how does this inform their work and spend; it could shift based on the questions they ask and the data they get. Eugene Johnson noted that the Board may want to take advantage of the ability to again utilize the legislation to hire consultancy. Tim Putnam asked for a vote for the development of an RFP to be developed and brought before the Board at their January meeting. Board members were in agreement with this. Linda Bratcher noted that having graduates will allow more access to data for the Board and staff. Tim Putnam called for a motion to commission an RFP for the economic impact of the GME expansion. Tom Sonderman moved to approved; Rachel Shockley seconded. Beth Wrobel asked about setting a limit; Tim Putnam noted that the Board would discuss this in the January meeting. Motion passed 8-0.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES REPORT

Linda Bratcher stated that the subcommittee had been working on the updated metrics for the Board's RFPs. She stated they've also been working on outcomes and how to evaluate those outcomes and the impact; Tim Putnam that it's upon them to make sure funding is being used what it's intended for which

will be an audit process. Linda Bratcher stated this is something for discussion in the next Board meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Linda Bratcher reported on the Scoring Committee's work which was chaired by Jeffery Rothenberg. Steven Becker led the discussion, noting that the group met three times and had a broad discussion on what the Board should be evaluating. He noted that they weighted underserved and rural areas pretty high along with collaborative efforts being equally rated and finally, if there's not enough funding to support programs long-term, they should give preference, based on a sliding scale, to support a new program, based on their five-year window to set their cap. He noted this would provide support to the new programs versus the old ones and, if they started running low on funding, they could get the new programs up and running. He also noted they discussed using Robert Woods vs. Bowen Center state data and, as long as Bowen Center data is up to date, using it would be preferred.

Discussion took place about the differences between the data; Beth Wrobel noted she felt the Bowen Center data was very similar to the Robert Woods data. Steven Becker commented that there's currently three grants being offered and it may be time for the Board to make a decision on how they prioritize those. He stated they probably won't have feasibility grants in five years but that the \$500,000 startup funding is incredibly valuable to get programs up and running.

The Board continued discussion on the updated evaluation measures and points allocated. A question was posed about finding data on projected gaps by specialty which would allow higher scoring for those specialties. Statewide vs regional needs were also discussed. Each of the three current funds' metrics, Feasibility, Program Development, and Expansion, were updated to add and subtract points and to both consolidate overlapping and duplicative categories. Paul Haut made note that the overall strength of the application, letters of support, desire to move forward with program development; this was accounted for in prior evaluations but that the quality and strength of the application wasn't being accounted for; he stated they'd had some in the past that were neither and those were sent back. The Board agreed to add in a measurement of the strength of the application in their evaluation metrics. Tricia Hern added in an idea of incentivizing areas of the state where residencies don't exist as part of the 25 point metric; this way they are providing proportional ratings to areas of the state where residencies don't exist compared to where they do exist.

Tim Putnam asked for a motion to approve the updated Expansion metrics. Tom Sonderman moved to approve, Tricia Hern seconded. In discussion, Paul Haut confirmed that the Bowen Center data would be used and this was confirmed. Motion passed 7-0.

The Board added strength of the application, program strength and resident density as evaluative measures to the Program Development grant. Tim Putnam asked for a motion to approve the updated metrics for Program Development. Rachel Shockley moved to approve; Steven Becker seconded. In discussion, Paul Haut asked if there was any benefit in stress testing the applications. Tim Putnam noted he could ask staff to do this by running a few prior applications thru the updated metrics. Motion passed 7-0.

The Feasibility Grant metrics were discussed and Tim Putnam asked for a motion to approve the updated metrics. Tricia Hern moved to approve; Steven Becker seconded. Motion passed 7-0.

The Board discussed the definition of a new program; Tim Putnam stated he felt this had been vetted out in the discussion of the metrics. Board members discussed applications for funding they'd received including a program where Psychiatry was being added to an existing program but it wasn't clear that it was a new program. Michelle Howenstine stated that the application in question was a hybrid-type. Discussion continued concerning the definition; Steven Becker noted the number of Psychiatry programs that were in place or that would be starting soon, including Community Health and the NW Indiana GME group.

Tim Putnam commented that they would need to have a report ready for the General Assembly in the summer of 2020 highlighting the expansion as the state headed into a budget year in 2021.

NEW BUSINESS

Tim Putnam discussed the Feasibility Study applications from Parkview Health stated he'd spoken with the CEO of about their residency plans; he stated they were confident they were doing it but not clear on which ones they'd be doing, noting that the Board wasn't sure that they were in the feasibility grant phase that they applied for.

Tim Putnam recommended that they communicate to Parkview that the Board encourages the residencies but request feedback on if there is there a possibility of finding economies of scale for doing feasibility studies. He also stated they should determine if they are at the feasibility phase or the program development phase. Steven Becker said he'd like to let them know the Board is ecstatic about their plans and wants them to move forward. Paul Haut asked if they'd inquired about funding before; Eugene Johnson noted that two years prior they'd expressed interest but changes in leadership stopped that plan. Steven Becker stated they came to Evansville to meet with his team several months prior to talk about residency program development. The Board instructed Eugene Johnson to reach out to Parkview to confirm which phase they are in and what grant(s) they should be applying for. Tim Putnam noted that, if they needed to get a response back sooner than the Board's next meeting in January and if feasibility is the phase they are in, the Board could schedule a special meeting to take another look at their grant applications.

The Board reviewed the Development and Expansion Grant applications from the SIGMEC for five, three-year Family Medicine positions and six, four year Psychiatry positions. Tim Putnam asked if any members wished to recuse themselves. Steven Becker and Michelle Howenstine both recused themselves from discussion. Due to the makeup of the Board members in attendance and the need to maintain a quorum to conduct business, Tim Putnam invoked the Rule of Necessity for discussion of the SIGMEC application and stated that Steven Becker and Michelle Howenstine are allowed to remain in the room and discuss the application.

Eugene Johnson announced the SIGMEC Family Medicine Residency program grant application score as 88 out of 100. Tim Putnam asked for motion to approve the application. Tom Sonderman moved to approve; Tricia Hern seconded. Motion passed 7-0.

Eugene Johnson announced the SIGMEC Psychiatry program grant application score as 91 out of 100. Tim Putnam asked for a motion to approve the application. Paul Haut moved to approve; Tricia Hern seconded. Motion passed 7-0.

The Board discussed a request to add two second-year residents to the SIGMEC Internal Medicine Program. Steven Becker stated that with a new program you sometimes get students looking to transfer

in from other schools. He stated it's not common to take second year residents in a mature program; however these students can provide value to a new program to have upper-level residents when they start. He said that the Internal Medicine program would start in 2020 and the two transfer candidates were strong and have Indiana ties, and it was likely the program would move forward with adding them regardless of the Board's final decision. Michelle Howenstine noted that the ACGME has strict standards on transfers and the requirements of the Program Director to vet these residents. The Board continued discussion related to the expansion and decided that these students would not qualify for grant funding.

Tim Putnam passed the Chair position to Rachel Shockley and left the room. Rachel Shockley invited the Board to submit names for the position of Board Chairperson. Board members nominated Tim Putnam to remain in the Chair position. Steven Becker stated that's he thankful that Tim Putnam is willing to remain in the position; Tricia Hern and Paul Haut stated that the continuity is very helpful; it was also stated by Michelle Howenstine that Tim Putnam is very unbiased. Paul Haut also noted the connections he has in his role as CEO is very valuable to talk with others stakeholders about the plan. Rachel Shockley called for motion to approve Tim Putnam as Board Chair for 2020. Tom Sonderman moved to approve; Michelle Howenstine seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

The Board discussed the 2020 meeting schedule and the plans for meetings in Fort Wayne and Gary. The stakeholders who would be invited were discussed along with logistics for each meeting.

The GME Summit was discussed for January 2020 in Denver; members interested in attending were told to contact Eugene Johnson to confirm.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no public testimony.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was announced for Wednesday, January 29, 2020 in Indianapolis.

ADJOURMENT

Tim Putnam asked for a motion to adjourn. Michelle Howenstine moved to adjourn; Tom Sonderman second. Motion passed 6-0. Meeting adjourned at 12:52p.