

Indiana Graduate Medical Education Board

February 17, 2017

11:00 am Eastern

101 West Ohio Street

Kent Weldon Board Room

Indianapolis, IN 46204

Meeting Minutes

Board Members Present in-person: James Buchanan, Donald Sefcik, Peter Nalin, Mark Cantieri, Paul Haut, Tricia Hern, Beth Wrobel

Board Members Calling-in: Steven Becker

Commission Staff Present: Eugene Johnson

Other Attendees: Angie Vincent, Tripp Umbach (participated by phone)

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:05a.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The roll call confirmed seven Board members in attendance and one member on the conference call. The seven members in attendance provided a quorum and a quorum was declared by Tricia Hern.

NEW BUSINESS

Tricia Hern asked if there were changes to the prior meeting minutes. Eugene Johnson noted that Peter Nalin and James Buchanan provided changes and the minutes had been updated to reflect. Mark Cantieri asked if those changes were primarily editorial and Eugene Johnson confirmed this was correct. Mark Cantieri moved to approve, Peter Nalin second. All voted to approve.

Tricia Hern moved on to business item and discussed the Development and Expansion Grants. Eugene Johnson went over the grant recipients and the amounts and terms of their awards. He discussed that CHE is the fiscally entity for the grant awards. He stated that the recipients were going to be expected to provide proof of filling funded positions and that proof could be an offer letter to residents or other, similar documentation. He commented that draft contracts had been provided to grant recipients. He stated that the Board would determine the recipients reporting requirements in future meetings. Tricia Hern asked if, along with the signed agreement between the entity and resident, would the Board asked for a list of their entire class roster so they could ensure they are funding an expanded slot. Eugene Johnson stated that this could be part of the reporting requirements the Board requires. Beth Wrobel asked if this could be done before they receive funding and was told this could be done.

Tricia Hern moved on to upcoming expansion grants and community work and asked Peter Nalin to discuss the feasibility study and new program development study grants. Peter Nalin discussed that his subcommittee had a conference call to review the two other expansion grant applications. He stated that the committee made minor timing adjustments they thought would smooth the implementation of those programs. He commented that they reviewed the April due date and made that later, along with making the end of expenditure date to June 30 as opposed to a fall or winter date seemed consistent with the life cycle of the grant. Angie Vincent provided details about the discussion and how some of the regional consortiums are possibly at different stages of their planning and that the April deadline may not be as realistic. She stated they talked about moving the deadline to June with awarding of funds happening in September. She stated that one of the bigger issues for a program is hiring a program director and staff so the applications asked interested entities to show that they have a director in place. She restated she felt the key thing at this point was to discuss changing the deadline. Tricia Hern asked if both would be changed to June. Angie Vincent stated she was not as focused on the feasibility grant, but that the regional forums could mean moving this one back to a June due date as well.

Peter Nalin stated with feasibility, a later due date could allow the Board to do it twice; get some applications in June; if there's an entity that's not ready, the initial applicants aren't waiting for the last one to be ready. Tricia Hern asked for a clarification on the dates; Peter Nalin stated he proposed putting the current April due dates to June; if they only get one application they could potentially put out another call for applications. Angie Vincent stated that if they did the two dates, some who would apply for the feasibility may also apply for program development. Beth Wrobel asked if they were going to state that there would be a second feasibility application; Tricia Hern stated that was up for discussion. Tricia Hern commented they'd wanted to maybe have the regional forums ahead of the applications being released but this may not be feasible. She stated they had forums on the agenda and perhaps the two conversations intersect. Angie Vincent asked Steven Becker for his feedback. Steven Becker stated he felt waiting until June 1 is fine for the program development grant and discussed his groups work and current status. He recommended that if there's a program starting in three years and one starting in two years, the two year one gets preference since there'd be more opportunity for the other program to come back in a year and apply for a full two-year commitment. He stated with feasibility that potentially they could have an April and a November 1st application period during the first year to give those ready now the opportunity to apply and those who'd benefit from attending the regional meetings the opportunity to look at a feasibility study.

Angie Vincent commented about the distribution and starting times and how they correlate with the spending of funding; have to consider where groups are with hiring and starting program. Mark Cantieri asked if they needed to include that in the evaluation criteria. Beth Wrobel asked if this was for the program development grant. Tricia Hern asked if this was for the scoring rubric and stated maybe they could give additional weight for those with a sooner opening of the program. James Buchanan commented they could do something to prioritize. Eugene Johnson commented that they could definitely amend the rubric to prioritize. Peter Nalin stated maybe they could have 5 points for timing of implementation. Tricia Hern confirmed that this would be for program development and this was confirmed. Beth Wrobel asked if an entity could do a feasibility study, get the information, and then move to program development; she commented that when they start is almost built in, so they are someone that likely couldn't start in the next few years. Paul Haut commented that, even if they could move back to back, it doesn't mean they would chose do it or that they could legitimately do it. Beth

Wrobel stated they want to spend the money they have before someone says they haven't done anything; they don't want the money to go. Eugene Johnson commented that with the 25% match requirement, an entity that's in an exploratory phase has to be ready to go.

Angie Vincent stated she agreed and it's something the Board would need to consider; if they were going to ask for it to be a consortium they're asking for entities to bring 25% to the table. She asked that in a consortium effort it would be by program? Tricia Hern stated her understanding that the grants were by program and program director and that a consortium could get three of these. Steven Becker stated that if they did it differently it could dis-incentivize consortiums. Board members asked Steven Becker to clarify; he explained that if they only allow the consortium to apply for one grant only, they'd be making a disadvantage to be a consortium versus each of the hospitals doing it allow. Beth Wrobel asked if they could start with setting the feasibility due date. Peter Nalin commented that the turnaround time for their last grant was accelerated; with them almost being near March; to have something due in April would be a rapid turnaround; having something due in May or June would be practical. Beth Wrobel stated that the feasibility study might be more tied to those just getting started so forums might be practical ahead of them; Tricia Hern stated another option would be to have two application calls. Additional discussion took place regarding when the regional forums would need to be scheduled in relation to the grant applications. Eugene Johnson discussed the current fund balances and the potential for additional funding to be available from the Indiana General Assembly in the 2017 Legislative Session. Beth Wrobel asked to clarify how much was available for feasibility; it was confirmed that \$1 million was put aside for feasibility with a \$75,000 maximum grant per applicant. Eugene Johnson also confirmed that funds were carryovers so it wasn't necessarily as "spend or else" situation. Peter Nalin stated that as the Board is still relatively new its likely people understand they are taking this stepwise, and they may not want to over promise. Beth Wrobel asked Angie Vincent if they had it due June 1, they'd know the budget for the next biennium, correct? Angie Vincent stated yes and that if they have two separate times they have one and two year distributions and what the timelines and deadlines by which they would need to have funds spent. She gave examples of the timelines and work of the Southwest Indiana and Northwest Indiana groups, where each of them currently where in their expansion efforts and the respective timeframes of their work, including when they would be applying.

Tricia Hern stated they can work to get to consensus on a due date for both; they have other meetings so they can always reevaluate; they could set the deadline to be due on June 1, bring back to the agenda after they see how many applications they have. James Buchanan stated that would make sense because they don't know what could be coming; they know likely Northwest and Southwest may apply but others may apply. Tricia Hern asked if they wanted to add 5 points for the timing of program opening in the program development grant and remove 5 points from another category. Donald Sefcik stated he didn't know it would be necessary as in both program applications, under 9.2.2 states that applicants are required to provide evidence that they are progressing quickly. James Buchanan asked if, because of state rules, do they need to have this in their scoring rubric if it's something they are going to evaluate. Eugene Johnson stated that he felt it was advisable to do so; he gave an example of someone coming back and asking why one entity received funding over another and the Board being in a position to explain how they prioritized funding. Eugene Johnson also confirmed that the fund was non-reverting. Tricia Hern called for a motion to change the deadlines for both the program feasibility grant and program development grant to June 1. Beth Wrobel moved and Mark Cantieri seconded. All voted in favor to the changes.

Tricia Hern discussed the scoring rubric and a motion to update the rubric for the feasibility grant. Beth Wrobel asked if they could add bonus points for start date. Eugene Johnson stated that CHE has not done bonus points to his knowledge. James Buchanan commented maybe consortium could be reduced from 15 to 10 points. The Board discussed how they would assign weight to programs with earlier starting points. Paul Haut commented that it might be cleaner if they just separate it and others agreed. Peter Nalin stated maybe doing 40 for underserved and 5 for the time of implementation. Other Board members agreed with Peter Nalin. Donald Sefcik asked are they making sure that all categories match to the rubric. Tricia Hern stated if the Board seemed to have agreed to remove 5 points from underserved and add 5 point to the rubric for timeliness of initiation/opening of the program. Eugene Johnson stated he felt that would work and that underserved still represented 40% of the overall weighting. Tricia Hern called for a motion to make the change. Mark Cantieri moved that the Board remove 5 points from the development in underserved areas and create an additional evaluation for 5 that takes into consideration program development and opening. Donald Sefcik seconded. All voted in favor of the motion.

Mark Cantieri asked about 2.2.3 in the feasibility grant; eligible applicant may only apply for one grant; he asked if that needed to be spelled out any further. Tricia Hern explained she felt the same consortia could apply for multiple grants for different disciplines. James Buchanan commented that he felt they'd made a decision on if applications would be accepted at a programmatic or institutional level. Peter Nalin stated that one way to consider it is that there's a geographic component to it; if one region were to do one feasibility study for each of multiple programs there would be a lot of feasibility monies into one region; at least in this way multiple entities would apply for the feasibility grant. He commented that at least in this way, if someone were purposing six programs would they want to devote \$450,000 to feasibility when one study would be able to look at all of it. James Buchanan stated they built the \$1 million looking at the map of potential applicants based on information from Tripp Umbach and \$75,000 per was per institution and geographic area. Mark Cantieri commented that the language is fine the way it is Tricia Hern commented that the language is consistent.

The Board discussed the regional forums and education on GME. Angie Vincent commented that they'd reserved \$75,000 for an education component and cited what was done in California. The Board discussed having the education piece in Indianapolis and in other parts of the state; Tricia Hern commented that it would be good to have it in other parts of the state where others could learn about GME. Angie Vincent commented ideally having a larger one in Indianapolis and three around the state would be the way to go and bringing in legislators to hear about the Boards work and GME would be best. Eugene Johnson asked about the role of the media in getting the word out and if there would be gains by getting media involved. Angie Vincent commented that Tripp Umbach has done it at a large scale but not in a regional-type setting from a media standpoint; Steven Becker commented to Angie Vincent that Tripp Umbach did indeed do one at the regional level in Southwest Indiana and Angie Vincent commented that he was correct. Steven Becker stated they've done it already in Southwest Indiana and he didn't know if his area would need a forum. Steven Becker commented that he felt the media's role would be critical. He commented that Gary and Fort Wayne would be big areas; Angie Vincent stated she'd taken them off the table because a lot of legwork had been done in those areas already. She stated she felt they'd need to revisit where they'd get the most benefit. Steven Becker stated he was fine with his area being out of regional forums as they could be utilized much better in other areas of the state. The Board discussed the timing and how much time members would be able to

participate with their schedules and geographic limitations. Angie Vincent discussed perhaps doing a webinar; it's been done in other areas; they could do a webinar and then do regional forums after that and Tripp Umbach could analyze and suggest areas. Eugene Johnson asked Angie Vincent who led the forums in other states that Tripp Umbach has worked in. Angie Vincent stated that Tripp Umbach facilitated but a group or association facilitated and Tripp Umbach worked with the director; they worked to determine who to invite; they tried to get local legislative representation there. She stated it was helpful to have some committee member there to speak firsthand about GME. Peter Nalin commented that since Fort Wayne is the largest city with the smallest relative residency footprint; considering the size of the city and its residency program; they have a concentration both leadership and community interest there were a forum could be well-attended. The second could be Indianapolis because of a good mix of primary and secondary constituencies and the third could be maybe Richmond, Bloomington, Batesville or French Lick where a meeting might occur if you had a critical mass.

Mark Cantieri asked about where South Bend would fit in and James Buchanan stated South Bend would be part of a potential Fort Wayne forum. Peter Nalin stated they were looking at areas with opportunities to grow program. Tricia Hern stated they were asking Tripp Umbach to come up with some locations for the Board to have meeting and Angie Vincent stated she was able to come up with some recommendations for the group and, after that, who needs to be involved in the discussions. Paul Haut commented he thought that identifying who the key stakeholders are in the areas (hospitals, legislators) and in reaching out, he appreciated that in Oregon, Tripp Umbach drove a lot of the work but he feels the voice needs to come from the Indiana GME Board; they need to be seen as engaging with Tripp Umbach facilitating with them. Tricia Hern discussed they might want to have a Communications subcommittee meeting in-between working with Tripp Umbach to discuss. Angie Vincent asked what dates the Board wanted to have recommendations and such to the committee/Board. Tricia Hern asked by end of February they could have an outline and then the subcommittee could meet and get that refreshed; Beth Wrobel commented she'd be on it if they didn't have enough members. Angie Vincent stated she'd like to have a webinar in late March and a forum possibly in April. Tricia Hern asked Angie Vincent if a webinar by the end of March was possible and Angie Vincent stated they'd work to try and get that set up.

Paul Haut asked if Tim Putnam had thoughts about the forums; Eugene Johnson stated that Tim Putnam requested that they have prioritize consideration to locations without residency locations currently as locations to hold a forum. Paul Haut stated he felt it was going to have to be a mix; they need to make sure that locations have the appropriate density to make it highly likely they would want to expand; he also stated they needed to be purposeful, be it the webinar or the education portion. Eugene Johnson stated the CHE could put out communications about forums via press releases that have statewide reach. Board member discussed other avenues to get forum information out including list serves they are part of. James Buchanan commented there are three prime groups he'd like to see them work with; first is the IN Hospital Association, the second is the Rural Health Association and FQHCs and the last might be the IN State Medical Association. Paul Haut said considering the physician groups; you can have your residency but you have to have space for residents to be out with the physicians in their office spaces. Angie Vincent stated that for the webinar they might only want to invite the regional leaders who they may want to help schedule the forums; maybe call those leaders out, explain what they are looking to accomplish and what the end goal is; that way they have a bigger support group and then do

the regional forums. Eugene Johnson stated that in his opinion they needed to make it as public as possible; they can post it on CHE's webinar as a meeting notice if they don't want to do a full press release but it should be public. Mark Cantieri stated that in the webinar they'd want to go thru the history of the Boards work, what's been done so far, what's out currently and this (webinar) is the next step. Angie Vincent stated she wanted to make sure that the webinar would be different than the regional forums; those forums would give an educational overview and background of GME. Tricia Hern stated that Angie Vincent would give the Board an update by next week and would work with the Communications Committee on the forums and webinar. Eugene Johnson reviewed the members of the Communication Committee. Tricia Hern asked about media releases; Eugene Johnson stated that CHE was holding off on any releases until all agreements were signed.

The Board discussed the number of years, 2 or 3, the grants would be active. The Feasibility Grant was discussed; the Board clarified that the number of payments for this grant was 1. James Buchanan commented on section 10.2; he commented on the language saying "funding may be reduced"; Angie Vincent stated she would correct this language. James Buchanan commented on the \$2 million that was allocated for program development; he asked if they have 5 or 6 applications; do they award to multiple institutions; do they prioritize; how does the scoring impact, etc. Steven Becker stated he felt his group would be applying for three programs; he hopes they get multiple applications as it means they are on their way. Beth Wrobel stated that if they receive additional funding then they will be ok. James Buchanan stated, if they don't have more programs than budget then nonissue; do they want to put any discernment factor to discuss what they'd do if they have more program applicants than funding. The Board discussed strategies to address funding if they have more applications than the amount budget for feasibility grants. Paul Haut commented that they have the flexibility to fund at amounts that match the number of applicants. He discussed that he'd prioritize the quality of the applications as opposed to trying to meet having a program solely in an area of the state that's not covered; he would value quality as opposed to geographic consideration. He stated that's why he feels it's important they use the criteria as outlined and he feels that it's very defensible. The Board continued discussing the funding available. Beth Wrobel stated they could have about \$11 million to spend starting July 1; James Buchanan stated that the buckets they created to use their initial funding are flexible. He stated it sounded like the Board was comfortable with one institution getting several grants based on how they scored within the rubric. Mark Cantieri stated he felt they couldn't anticipate every contingency; their reasonability is to make good judgment and they will do it in the scoring; if they run into a wall they can do it then but they don't want to paint themselves into a corner. The Board agreed to maintain the flexibility to make decision based on available funding and the overall goals and objectives of the GME Board.

Tricia Hern discussed future support services for the Board. Eugene Johnson reported on his conversation with Tim Putnam; he stated that Tim Putnam felt that there is likely a need for additional support services for the GME Board. He asked for the Board's opinion on getting additional support services and if they felt these were necessary. Beth Wrobel asked for a clarification on the definition of "staff" and "the work of the Board". She stated that, if they contract out would CHE staff still be involved? Paul Haut asked would CHE staff stay involved; Eugene Johnson stated that CHE would. Peter Nalin offered a potential presentation by the Indiana Medical Education Board on how they've operated; he stated the Board has no employees but has a managing contract. Eugene Johnson commented that he'd discuss on his end and would need information on what the role of additional

staff would be. Paul Haut stated they needed input on how others have done it and using it to develop what job components they need over what period of time; he stated he feels they'd need input from Dr. Brown and others in the legislature as to how they want support structured in the future. The Board discussed models they could look at as a structure for additional support. Tricia Hern asked Angie Vincent to review and provide other state models for consideration.

Eugene Johnson went over the e-participation policy CHE received from the Attorney General's Office concerning development of an e-participation policy. He confirmed the requirements for quorums and confirmed that all the Board's meetings to date had valid quorums. He told the Board they could take the feedback and determine what type of policy they wanted to craft. Paul Haut asked if they wanted to say that at least once a year; first meeting of the year possibly, they want to have everyone in the room together; he stated that due to their schedules they could have a situation where no one is every together in the room all at once. James Buchanan felt they should clarify where a Board member's participation electronically is considered public versus not; he also asked for clarification on electronic participation counted for quorum and voting. The Board asked for additional clarifications and asked Eugene Johnson to work with Attorney General's Office to get a finalized policy in place. Tricia Hern called for a motion for Eugene Johnson work with the Attorney General's Office. Peter Nalin moved and Mark Cantieri seconded. All voted in favor.

Tricia Hern called for a motion to adjourn. Mark Cantieri moved to adjourn, Donald Sefcik seconded. All voted in favor to adjourn.