

Legislative Health Care Workforce Commission

Meeting 2

August 18, 2015

10:00-12:00

10 State Office Building

Draft Minutes:

Participants: Greg Clausen, Melissa Wiklund, Michelle Benson, Matt Dean, Tara Mack, Laurie Halverson, Joe Schomacker, Jennifer Schultz

1. Call to Order
2. General Commission Business

Dean moves the minutes from July 28th – Motion prevails (voice vote).

Attention to upcoming meeting schedule – Dates available in member’s packets.

Mark Schoenbaum (MDH) solicited feedback for the draft work plan included in member’s packets.

3. **Health Provider Tax Credits** – Nina Manzi (House Research) & Mark Schoenbaum (MDH)

Nina Manzi presented “*Background Briefing on Tax Benefits*” [posted on the Commission’s website]. The presentation briefly reviewed the types of tax incentive tools the Commission could leverage to achieve its desired outcome.

Mr. Schoenbaum presented “Provider Tax Credits” [posted on the Commission’s website]. This presentation reviewed other states that have addressed health care workforce issues through tax incentives. The presentation looked to programs in Georgia, Oregon, New Mexico, and Louisiana.

Furthermore, Mr. Schoenbaum noted that S.F. 1246 from the 2015 Session had a section to implement this type of program but it was not adopted. MDH believed the program as drafted in S.F. 1246 would have required a “fair amount of work” for the Department and would have been “clunky” to administer.

Rep. Mack inquired about the ability to compare tax credits versus direct grants. Ms. Manzi noted that a \$5,000 tax credit would reduce state liability by \$5,000 but decrease federal tax liability by a smaller margin depending on the tax bracket of the person. Ms. Manzi also noted that grants can be more transparent.

Sen. Benson sought clarification on the ultimate objective of the discussion. Rep. Mack indicated that preceptors was her focus but both preceptors and rural health are big challenges. Sen. Benson indicated that her deduction for charity care bill from the 2015 legislative session (not enacted) would complement needed reforms in rural health. Sen. Clausen indicated that he worked to address workforce shortage issues in rural Minnesota through his bill SF 1246 and SF 3. However additional follow up on effectiveness needed to be done. Furthermore he noted that this is a complex issue and the Commission should be open to a variety of options. Sen. Benson noted that loan forgiveness programs are growing but that tax incentives would

impact a different population. She indicated that the Commission needs to look both ends of the workforce spectrum.

Sen. Clausen inquired if there are other programs that assist practicing practitioners and whether the other states discussed have requirements to accept Medicare/Medicaid? Mr. Schoenbaum indicated that no other state incentive is directed at individuals, rather Minnesota's current programs are directed toward organizations. Mr. Schoenbaum also noted that Medicare/Medicaid patients access medical services less frequently than the general population but he was unaware of other states tying acceptance of Medicare/Medicaid to receipt of incentives.

Rep. Halverson inquired regarding whether there was any analysis regarding long-term systematic savings coming from success of these programs. Mr. Schoenbaum indicated that the effects of credits/deductions have been acknowledged as anecdotal. Research is directed at recruitment and retention rather than these related issues of savings on health care costs. Mr. Schoenbaum said he would continue to look to see if such studies exist.

Rep. Mack inquired about how much we actually know about the problem. Mr. Schoenbaum indicated that we know some. For example, because all health professionals need a preceptor at some point there is a significant need for preceptors. Furthermore, educational institutions have reported problems finding and retaining preceptors. Mr. Schoenbaum summarizes that we have pieces of the picture and part of the Commission's decision last year was to continue to improve that picture. Rep. Mack noted that the trigger point is not always financial and one of the tasks of the Commission is to discuss whether financial incentives is the right direction and if so how big do they need to be.

Rep. Schultz noted that timing is very important. In Duluth constraints on teacher resources is a significant problem and finding preceptors is difficult because institutions are being asked to pay for preceptors. She indicated that the Commission needs to look at where we have been successful in the past, such as the Duluth program, and that investing upfront in training will be more advantageous. Mr. Schoenbaum noted that these were excellent points and that challenges and successes of the past can be very informative and provide additional intervention points to consider.

Public Testimony:

Juliana Milhofer, Minnesota Medical Association, testified that providing incentives is very important both during recruitment of preceptors and during service.

Sen. Benson inquired regarding other requirements professionals need to have in order to maintain a license. Ms. Milhofer indicated that CME credits are needed and that some preceptor training does count as CME credits but does not believe this is a standard practice.

Rep. Schultz inquired about whether physicians need approval by their organization to serve as preceptors. Ms. Milhofer indicated they likely would need approval. Rep. Schultz observed that this indicated that organizations then likely will need incentives as well.

4. Education Program Policies on Student Clinical Placements – Liz Biel (The Clinical Coordination Partnership)

Liz Biel presented “*Informal Research Surrounding Advanced Practice Professional (APP) Clinical Experiences*” [posted on the Commission’s website]. The presentation briefly reviewed the results of an informal survey of APP programs and their practices for clinical placement.

Sen. Clausen inquired about why ANP programs do not play a greater role in placement. Ms. Biel indicated that those programs are generally newer and either still setting up a process or do not have enough staff. Sen. Clausen inquired about the likely impact of the legislature requiring programs to provide placements. Ms. Biel indicated that this would likely help the environment but collateral issues are likely to arise.

Sen. Benson inquired about the difference between licensed college’s vs accredited programs and whether there are ways to incentivize private colleges to play a larger role. She noted that the Commission needs to have a better understanding of the accreditation process and environment before moving forward.

Rep. Schultz noted that one of the issues is that higher education institutions need to be adequately funded in order to provide students these placement services. Mr. Schoenbaum responded indicating that currently we do not have a precise handle on the relationship between higher education and this but he will be looking into the issue and will report back. After preliminary research he noted that in the field of psychology there is an accrediting standard that requires programs to document satisfactory progress of their students toward graduation, which becomes a de facto requirement that psychology Ph.D. programs find placements for their students. At masters levels there are similar requirements with some variation.

5. Further discussion of the draft work plan:

Sen. Wiklund indicated that she would like to revisit the preceptor discussion once additional data is available.

6. Adjourn 11:39am