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|  | **SIM Steering Committee****Wednesday, September 25, 2013****10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.****State House, Room 228****Augusta** |

**Attendance:**

Kristine Ossenfort, Anthem

Shaun Alfreds, COO, HIN

Rebecca Ryder, Franklin Memorial Hospital, via phone

Penny Townsend, Wellness Manager, Cianbro

Deb Wigand, DHHS – Maine CDC

Jay Yoe, PhD, DHHS – Continuous Quality Improvement

Randy Chenard, SIM Program Director

Andy Webber, CEO, MHMC

Dr. Kevin Flanigan, Medical Director, DHHS

Dale Hamilton, Executive Director, Community Health and Counseling Services

Frances Jensen, MD, CMMI, Project Officer, via phone

Lisa Letourneau, MD, Maine Quality Counts

Lynn Duby, CEO, Crisis and Counseling Centers

Rhonda Selvin, APRN

Rose Strout

Katie Fullam Harris, VP, Gov. and Emp. Relations, MaineHealth, via phone

Representative Richard Malaby, via phone

Noah Nesin, MD

Sara Sylvester, Administrator, Genesis Healthcare Oak Grove Center

**Absent:**

Eric Cioppa, Superintendent, Bureau of Insurance

Jack Comart, Maine Equal Justice Partners

Stefanie Nadeau, Director, OMS/DHHS

**All meeting documents available at:** [**http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/oms/sim/steering/index.shtml**](http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/oms/sim/steering/index.shtml)

| **Agenda** | **Discussion/Decisions** | **Next Steps** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Welcome and Introductions** | Dr. Flanigan welcomed members with a reminder regarding Microphone use. Introductions were made for the sake of Andy Webber, newly appointed CEO, MHMC. Members extended their thanks to Michael DeLorenzo for his contributions as interim CEO. |  |
| **Discuss and Accept Minutes from 9/11** | Minutes accepted with no changes |  |
| **Opening Comments by Chair*** **Collaboration**
* **Mission Statement**
* **Annual Meeting**
 | Dr. Flanigan thanked Steering Committee members for the hard work and collaboration over the summer. He mentioned that only one agenda item, “Triple AIM Goals”, was carried over to the next meeting. Ultimate goal of the SIM grant is to help transform Maine’s health care system to improve and achieve maximum efficiency, with improved outcomes and be cost appropriate.Dr. Flanigan stated that we need to craft a “Mission Statement” and requested that members bring a copy of their organization’s Mission Statement to the October 9th meeting. He reviewed the “SIM Collaboration Theme”: *If you bring the appropriate people together in constructive ways with good information, they will create authentic visions and sustainable responses to issues and opportunities within their communities and organizations.”* Dr. Flanigan reminded folks that we are approaching the October date for the first annual Steering Committee meeting. The meeting should be scheduled in addition to the regular scheduled meetings towards the end of October. Included in the meeting agenda will be: Grant Report Update and Steering Committee Work to date. |  |
| **CMMI SIM OPERATIONAL PLAN FEEDBACK****CMMI SIM OPERATIONAL PLAN FEEDBACK cont.** | Randy Chenard provided an overview of the “**Requested Clarification for Maine’s SIM Operational Plan”** document. Informing members that the overall amended plan submitted was well received by CMMI. **Some areas need additional information and clarification are:**I. **Accountability Targets** – (set expectations and accountability) clarification of the “tests” being conducted and the test aims to be accomplished. Below are the questions CMMI needs to be able to answer following review of the plan:Does the plan articulate specifically what will be accomplished by the end of SIM?Does the state indicate specifically how it will scale implementation to achieve the goal?What will the state have implemented and ready to be tested on October 1st?II. **Operational Plan: Questions to be Clarified** –The questions were provided in a table format: DRR questions are listed in the first column; specific information or clarification requested for review contained in the second column; and the third column is label AT for Accountability Targets in which “X” indicates that submitting the Accountability Target will satisfy the request. These questions are broken into two categories DRR Questions A requiring response by September 27, 2013 and DRR Questions B requiring response by the end of October. The updates to the Operational plan will be done in “track changes” mode to allow members to review edits and additions.Fran Jensen then extended a thank you, to all, for the impressive work in developing the plan given the tight timeframes. She identified that the most important items CMMI needs to understand is what Maine is testing, what Maine will look like following the grant and how Maine will know when it gets there. She also reassured members that a government shutdown will not affect SIM award funding as the funding is exempt from the shutdown because it is not appropriated in the current fiscal year.**Questions/Discussion:**How are we responding to the questions, such as A1 “Is the project governed by a board with the necessary governance and management structure, decision making authority, board base of stakeholder representation and contractual and/or regulatory arrangements to be accountable for implementation of the proposed innovation model, including having authority over participants required for the project’s success?”, since Maine hasn’t had an opportunity to establish one? Will the information being sent to CMMI by September 27th be available for the “Steering Committee” to review? *Yes, the information will be forward to the Steering Committee as soon as it is available. Any changes suggested by the Steering Committee will be submitted to CMMI following the September 27 deadline.* |  |
| **SIM Accountable Target Work Plan****SIM Accountable Target Work Plan cont.** | Next Randy Chenard shared the template for responding to CMMI requests entitled **“Maine SIM Grant – Executive Level Project with Accountability Targets”**. This spreadsheet identifies the Partner responsible for each of the objectives listed, identifies “key milestones”, how SIM enables the objective, the Milestone timeline and “Accountability Targets” for each of the three years of the SIM grant. Each of the partners: Maine Health Management Coalition, HealthInfoNet, Quality Counts, Maine CDC, and MaineCare, have 5 to 6 “Key Objectives”. **Discussion/Questions:**The “Objectives” outlined will state what we are testing, with quantifiable SMART Metrics, reflected in cost by contracts.The SIM grant will allow Maine to test initiatives already being implemented, i.e. Accountable Care Communities and Health Homes, and allow development of new initiatives.The “Driver Diagrams” developed previously will be used to develop the action steps necessary to meet the goals, and will be the framework to tie the activities together.In some cases in order to respond and clarify objectives it will just take some repackaging and in some cases in will need updating.A core set of metrics to really drive this process needs to be identified. Can the metrics developed, being develop be posted to the SIM web site? *Yes* Some members expressed concern regarding the process. *Reminder – the SIM grant is a testing grant which will allow us to test the various models.* | Metrics will be posted to the SIM Grant Information web page. |
| **Evaluation Update****Evaluation Update cont.** | Jay Yoe walked members through the **“SIM Evaluation Approach”** document**Discussion/Questions:**The Evaluation Subcommittee will consist of providers, stakeholders, and community representatives. The process for evaluation should be close coordination, actionable data, continuous feedback, and identifying core metrics/measures to meeting goals. *Reminder - this is research (test) collaborative, some initiatives will work some will not.*CMMI Cross Evaluation:There will be cross collaboration on evaluation with CMMI and the various SIM grant sites. CMMI will collect data, may conduct focus groups, interview providers to evaluate state models and provide impact evaluation (did it work). Has CMMI hired their expert evaluation partner? *Yes, NORC and they have begun working with Maine*Are we going to be measuring unintended consequences? *Yes, hopefully the developed measures going forward will help identify them.*Maine “Self Evaluation: Core Components* Implementation/Process Evaluation – what happened, how is it working, get regular feedback, the Evaluator may/will attend subcommittees and work group meetings
* Cost Effectiveness Evaluation – this measure added by Maine – study design to be fleshed out as we move forward
* Impact/Effectiveness Evaluation – this will be coordinated with CMMI and will include additional items added by Maine’s evaluation subcommittee

Possible test questions discussed:Does the test model lead to changes in services utilization patterns, reduction in costs, improved care coordination, improved processes of care and to what extent does the model integrate physical and behavioral health care, etc.? The evaluation questions will be discussed in more detail by the established evaluation subcommittee.**Evaluation Work Plan Highlights/Timeline**1. **Draft RFP for Evaluation Contractor** – which has been drafted for review and should be issued by the first week in October, hoping to have contract executed by November – one of the first tasks of the Evaluator will be to develop logic model, map it out building off of the driver diagrams.
2. **Identify and convene Evaluation subcommittee in November**
3. **Review and Refine evaluation logic model with partners and stakeholder** - in addition to the evaluation subcommittee, we are looking to convene a larger stakeholder advisory group
4. **Identify core quality/performance metrics by December**
5. **January through March develop study design, data**
6. **January through April work with CMMS develop and test standardized data collection and evaluation protocols**
7. **July Implement data collection and impact evaluation component**

Question:Is there some flexibility with these timeframes? *Yes* |  |
| **Subcommittee Sourcing Process****Subcommittee Sourcing Process cont.** | Next Dr. Flanigan discussed the **“SIM Grant Subcommittee Selection Processes”** and the **“Maine Innovation Model Subcommittee Nominees”** documents.**Discussion/Questions**The “Selection Processes” document outlines the selection methods used by each Subcommittee Chair in the appointment/invitation of the subcommittee core members. Consensus was reached to post this particular document.Concern was expressed by members that too many provider and larger organizations were represented in the core seats. It was suggested that the group consider the addition of the Ombudsman office as a core member. Others felt that this could be a continuous process of reviewing core members in order to include representatives from various groups and stakeholders.Concern was also expressed that the size of the subcommittees has become unworkable.Members expressed interest in the development of a standardized process for the appointment of “Ad Hoc” members and outlining the process for “Interested Parties” to provide input. Concern was also expressed that ad hoc members not be appointed based just on their affiliation with the partners or larger organizations.Through consensus of the Steering Committee members it was agreed that the Subcommittee Chairs and Core work group would develop a standard process for appointment of ad hoc members. Members also agreed that by reviewing the rules for public meetings, a process document should be developed to ensure involvement, participation and input by interested parties to be reviewed by the Steering Committee during the October 9th meeting, Acceptance of the **“Maine Innovation Model Subcommittee Nominees”** has been tabled until the October 9th Steering Committee meeting. | Standardized process document will be reviewed during the October 9th Steering Committee meeting. |
| **Subcommittee Update from each Chair** | **Data Infrastructure Subcommittee**– Katie Sendze, reassured members that the subcommittee will be meeting frequently and reviewing ways to appoint “Ad Hoc” members and involve “Interested Parties”, particularly folks with “boots on the ground”. She suggested that it may be helpful to the Steering Committee to have the “Interested Parties” and “Ad Hoc” member lists on the SIM web site. **Payment Reform** - Frank Johnson – agreed with Katie and reiterated the concern expressed regarding the size of the work group.**System Redesign** - Lisa Tuttle –also expressed concerned regarding the manageable size of the subcommittee and encouraging the involvement of the ad hoc and interested party members. |  |
| **Public Input** | None  |  |
| **Next Meeting** | The next meeting of the Steering Committee is scheduled for October 9, 10:00 am. – 12:00 p.m., Room 126, State House (Capitol Bldg.), Transportation Committee room. Audio Link is: <http://www.maine.gov/legis/ofpr/appropriations_committee/audio/> | Meeting reminder and materials will be sent and posted (if available) by Denise prior to the meeting. |