

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
State Innovation Model
Healthcare Innovation Steering Committee

Meeting Summary
June 11, 2015

Location: Legislative Office Building, Room 1D, Hartford, CT

Members Present: Patricia Baker; Jeffrey G. Beadle; Mary Bradley; Roderick L. Bremby; Patrick Charmel; David Guttchen (for Anne Foley); Suzanne Lagarde; Alta Lash; Robert McLean; Jane McNichol; Michael Michaud (for Miriam Delphin-Rittmon); Jewel Mullen; Ron Preston (for Bruce Liang); Thomas Raskauskas; Robin Lamott Sparks; Jan VanTassel; Victoria Veltri via conference line; Thomas Woodruff

Members Absent: LG Nancy Wyman; Catherine F. Abercrombie; Tamim Ahmed; Raegan M. Armata; Terry Gerratana; Bernadette Kelleher; Courtland Lewis; Frances Padilla; Katharine Wade; Michael Williams

Other Participants: Ellen Andrews; Karen Buckley-Bates via conference line; Supriyo Chatterjee; Faina Dookh; Kevin Galvin; Robert Kryzs; Kate McEvoy; Kinson Perry; Howard Rifkin; Mark Schaefer; Sheldon Toubman; Fran Turisco via conference line

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. Victoria Veltri chaired the meeting in LG Nancy Wyman's absence via conference line. Mark Schaefer facilitated the meeting conversation. Introductions were deferred until after the public comment.

Public Comment

Supriyo Chatterjee spoke regarding health disparities, distrust of health agencies, and the need for a Code of Ethics to bring more of an equitable way of conducting business. He mentioned that he made a request for copies of two CLAS reports with disclosure declaration statements of Conflict of Interest to the US Health & Human Services- Office of Minority Health and the CT Department of Public Health.

Ellen Andrews, a member of SIM, provided public comment urging SIM to accept the public Code of Ethics. She noted that many boards are not subject to it but have adopted it to instill the public trust. She mentioned being disappointed with the proposal that was posted on the website because it is not sufficient. She noted she would like to sign and be subject to the Code of Ethics. Ms. Andrews mentioned she does not intend to apply for SIM funding or take advantage of public service.

Sheldon Toubman, a staff attorney for New Haven Legal Assistance Association, provided public comment regarding the ethics standard. He mentioned the Office of State Ethics has no jurisdiction because of a loophole but recommends adopting an internal ethics policy to address any conflict of interest. He made references to the proposed Conflict of Interest Safeguards and noted it was inadequate. He said there is no reason for a watered down provision when there is a tried and true Code of Ethics. He noted other boards in Connecticut with appointees under the governor are subject to the Code of Ethics and urges SIM to do this as well.

Kevin Galvin, a member of SIM, provided public comment and stated that SIM is operating without a Code of Ethics. He asked why can't they adopt the State's Code of Ethics.

Dr. Schaefer thanked everyone for their public comment.

Introductions

Members and participants introduced themselves.

Ms. Veltri asked if there was a motion to approve the meeting summary.

Acceptance of May 14th Meeting Summary

Motion: to approve the summary of the May 14, 2015 Healthcare Innovation Steering Committee meeting –Pat Baker; seconded by Jan VanTassel

Discussion: Ms. VanTassel pointed out that the question she raised about the Department of Children and Families' involvement was attributed to Ms. McNichol. Dr. Schaefer apologized and noted that the summary would be revised.

Amendment: that the minutes be amended to reflect Ms. VanTassel instead of Ms. McNichol – Pat Baker; seconded by Jane McNichol

Discussion: No additional discussion.

Vote: All in favor

Motion: to accept the summary of May 14, 2015 as amended- Jewel Mullen; seconded by Alta Lash

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Vote: All in favor

Ms. McNichol asked whether they should be looking at the state's budget changes and the impact on SIM's plan and projects. Dr. Schaefer noted it would be an item for the July meeting and OPM has agreed to be a part of the discussion. Comm. Bremby mentioned once the budget is complete it would be appropriate to have the conversation. Ms. McNichol said she would hope that the conversation would be about the whole SIM budget and not just one element of it so that the Steering Committee can look at how best to use resources. Dr. McLean said he was in favor for looking at the whole budget.

Practice Transformation Taskforce Nominations

Dr. Schaefer noted one seat was filled in May for the Practice Transformation Taskforce by Laurie Harkness with special emphasis on housing. It turned out that the schedule was unworkable for her, so she nominated Anne Klee from the same organization. Dr. Schaefer said the Consumer Advisory Board has recommended Anne Klee for this position. Mr. Beadle said based on her qualifications he believes she would be an excellent candidate.

Dr. Schaefer said the Personnel Sub-Committee solicited nominations for someone with substantial hospital and care management experience for the Practice Transformation Taskforce. He noted a number of nominations were received and reviewed by the Personnel Sub-Committee this week. The Personnel Sub-Committee recommended Beth Greig of St Francis Hospital for this position.

Motion: to approve the recommendation of the Consumer Advisory Board to appoint Anne Klee and the recommendation of the Personnel Sub-Committee to appoint Beth Greig to the Practice Transformation Taskforce- Jeffrey Beadle; seconded by Thomas Woodruff.

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Vote: All in favor

Conflict of Interest Safeguards

Dr. Schaefer gave an overview of the draft Conflict of Interest Safeguards ([see document here](#)). He noted a few changes that were made to the draft document. He mentioned it will be applicable to the various SIM councils and work groups. Ms. Veltri noted that the conflict of interest standard in this document is the same one that is in the ethics statute. Mr. Woodruff asked why they cannot adopt the state code of ethics if this is the same. Ms. Veltri said the advisory boards are not public officials and are not subject to the state code of ethics so they chose to adopt the conflict of interest standards. She mentioned there are standards for state employees and public officials that don't apply to the advisory boards. Comm. Mullen asked whether there is something in the proposed conflict of interest safeguards that doesn't exist in the state's Code of Ethics. Dr. Schaefer noted the document articulates what pertains to the advisory boards such as the procurement process. It was specifically developed for the SIM initiative. Steering Committee members continued to discuss the proposed Conflict of Interest Safeguards document. Several members suggested the need to take more time to review the document before taking action.

Mr. Guttchen noted that not all state employees have to sign statements of financial interest. He said it is only for certain people, and in this case, it would be for people that are involved in a RFP process. Dr. Schaefer noted there is more work to be done on this between now and July and they will take this as an assignment. Ms. McNichol said she would like additional information with sufficient time to review it.

DPH Population Health Planning Discussion

Commissioner Mullen gave an overview of the DPH Population Health Planning. She thanked everyone for allowing her to speak. She requested that everyone adopt the phrase "SIM Population Health Planning" instead of "DPH Population Health Planning." She suggested that the Steering Committee devote time at upcoming meetings to developing a shared concept of population health as we move away from the notion that population health planning is a DPH activity rather than a SIM or Connecticut initiative.

Conflict of Interest Safeguards

Ms. Veltri asked to revisit the Conflict of Interest discussion. She suggested starting the conflict of interest process now. She noted the proposed conflict of interest standard echoes the ethics standards. Ms. Lash expressed concern that by accepting this now, it would take the urgency off of dealing with the issues. She noted it was incumbent of the PMO to get the information in such a way that they are prepared to make a decision. Ms. Veltri suggested they start using the Conflict of Interest standard and resolve the rest in short order.

Howard Rifkin, policy and legal counsel to the Lt. Governor, apologized for not being at the beginning of the conversations. He said he understands the concerns that have been expressed. Mr. Rifkin mentioned that he does not think the members of the Steering Committee rise to the level of a public official according to the definition in the Code of Ethics. Dr. Schaefer asked Ms. Veltri whether she was suggesting a vote or trying to gauge consensus to proceed in the way she proposed. Ms. Veltri said she was just suggesting that SIM governance operate and abide by the proposed Conflict of Interest standards until the issues under discussion have been resolved.

Motion: for governance to operate and abide under the conflict of interest standards until a final document is developed- Robert McLean; seconded Pat Charmel

Discussion: Robin Lamott Sparks suggested adding a date onto it. Dr. Schaefer mentioned if they ask for something in writing, he would add an end date.

Amendment: that the motion be amended to include the date of the next meeting so it will have to be dealt with in July- Robin Lamott Sparks; seconded Robert McLean.

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Vote: All in favor

Abstains: Jan VanTassel

HIT Council Charter & Update Presentation

Commissioner Bremby provided an update on the HIT Council Charter ([see presentation here](#)).

Several members raised key points during the discussion. Ms. Lash emphasized the need to have a discussion within the HIT Council about the capacity to implement what currently exists and what is needed. She suggested that some of the money be spent on developing the capacity rather than all of the money be unnecessarily spent on “bells and whistles.” She mentioned not seeing anywhere in the HIT Council’s charter a discussion of that component.

Comm. Bremby noted one of the features not included in the documentation is how to use the technology in any material way. He said the presented plan includes technologies and utilities to connect components to aggregate data. He said as soon as the scope is developed, the pieces can be put together to generate the responses being looking for and the analytics to move forward. Comm. Bremby mentioned the capability to utilize data is also a part of the SIM initiative. He noted they sourced technology and people to do the data analytics. He mentioned some of the technology is from the APCD.

Mr. Raskauskas asked whether there were two systems being looked at without knowing the question they are trying to answer. Comm. Bremby noted the questions were not designed or crafted yet. He said the solutions that are being proposed are a mixture between the APCD, claims data, and utilities. There are anticipated tools that will be utilized but didn’t procure anything. He mentioned technology will not serve the purpose of knowing what is being looking for.

Mr. Woodruff suggested finding out what it is SIM is trying to do and seeking the solution that is available. He mentioned it could be a waste of money without seeking answers to the questions. Comm. Bremby said when identified, the quality measures will become the questions for them to scope the technology. He noted the quality measures are outside of the HIT Council.

Ms. Baker expressed concerns and noted it was critically important for clear decision criteria and principles to be established. She emphasized strong due diligence on multiple solutions, feasibility, and rationale on the options presented. Ms. Baker suggested one of the principles be experience with healthcare technology. She added it would be great if the HIT Council came back with what the phase and scale of things should be such as what is doable in the first and second year. Comm. Bremby said if she would provide some of the comments he would share it with the HIT Council.

Ms. VanTassel expressed the need for the capacity to be included in the workgroup’s charter. She suggested having the criteria and the capacity to do what is expected. Comm. Mullen said she is wondering whether or not there are modules that others are doing that could be looked at. She asked how explicit the questions need to be to start building capabilities. She noted every state that is participating in this initiative is being asked by CMS to address certain conditions and improve certain outcomes. Ms. Largarde mentioned it sounds like there is not a lot of flexibility in the system

and it is limited. Comm. Bremby said it starts with what is the baseline and what would be measured in the system.

Mr. Charmel asked about the feedback received thus far regarding the edge server technology because there was a lot of skepticism at the last presentation to the HISC and whether it has made the cut. He asked whether the state is building the capability to extract. He said why not just figure out a way to aggregate it. Comm. Bremby said if they just want to aggregate and capture what already exists, that sends them in a direction. Mr. Charmel asked where the direction would come from. Comm. Bremby indicated it would come from Quality Council and HISC.

Ms. Baker noted she thinks it's good to hear about there being a healthy skepticism around the technology that was presented to them. Ms. McNichol noted the Steering Committee presented its own charter. She mentioned it feels like the HIT Council is off doing their own thing and not connecting to the Steering Committee in the same way as the other councils. Comm. Bremby said the HIT Council would conform to the things that the others are doing. Dr. Schaefer proposed not acting on the charter today because some of the members didn't receive a copy in advance. He said the HIT Council's charter can be prepared in the format that is similar to the other groups. He noted the comments from today's meeting can be reviewed and considered. He invited further comments over the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Beadle said he is leaving with the understanding that he will receive the Conflict of Interest with information about what to do. Dr. Schaefer noted he will send a note to the Steering Committee about the process.

CT SIM Update: Achievements, Risks, and Dependencies

This was not discussed due to lack of time.

Motion: to adjourn the meeting – Commissioner Jewel Mullen; seconded by Mary Bradley

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Vote: All in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 5:09 p.m.