AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Resolution: 302
(A-23)

Introduced by: Resident and Fellow Section

Subject: Antitrust Legislation Regarding the AAMC, ACGME, NRMP, and Other Relevant Associations or Organizations

Referred to: Reference Committee C

Whereas, The 1980 Sherman Antitrust Act was the first antitrust law to be signed by Congress, and outlaws "every contract, combination, or conspiracy in restraint of trade," and any "monopolization, attempted monopolization, or conspiracy or combination to monopolize"; and

Whereas, The Sherman Antitrust Act was later followed in 1914 by the Federal Trade Commission Act which established the FTC and the Clayton Act which further defined specific practices that the Sherman Act did not ban, thus comprising the three core federal antitrust laws aimed to preserve the process of free market competition; and

Whereas, While these antitrust laws generally prohibit unlawful mergers and monopolistic business practices, it is ultimately left to the courts to ultimately decide case by case basis of legality; and

Whereas, In the current NRMP Match process, all applicants for the same training year are paid the same amount as determined by the hospital system at which they Match; and

Whereas, Following *Jung vs AAMC* and the Pension Funding Equity Act of 2004, there has been little change to the Matching process and residents are using other means to obtain fair wages, safe working environments, and other benefits that are unable to be negotiated within the current system; and

Whereas, Our American Medical Association holds multiple policies (H-383.992, H-383.990, D-383.983, and D-383.990) regarding antitrust in medicine primarily with the goal of preserving clinical autonomy, the patient-physician relationship, and ensuring fairness toward physicians and physician-owned entities in the application of antitrust laws; and

Whereas, The Match poses significant anticompetition concerns and the procompetitive effect of streamlining residency job applications and increasing percentage of position filled needs to be outweighed by the anticompetitive effect of the lack of negotiation power of residents; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That our American Medical Association study alternatives to the current residency and fellowship Match process which would be less restrictive on free market competition for applicants. (Directive to Take Action)

Fiscal Note: TBD

Received: 3/19/23

RELEVANT AMA POLICY

Proposed Revisions to AMA Policy on the Financing of Medical Education Programs D-305.973
Our AMA will work with:
(1) the federal government, including the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and the states, along with other interested parties, to bring about the following outcomes:
(a) ensure adequate Medicaid and Medicare funding for graduate medical education;
(b) ensure adequate Disproportionate Share Hospital funding;
(c) make the Medicare direct medical education per-resident cost figure more equitable across teaching hospitals while assuring adequate funding of all residency positions;
(d) revise the Medicare and Medicaid funding formulas for graduate medical education to recognize the resources utilized for training in non-hospital settings;
(e) stabilize funding for pediatric residency training in children's hospitals;
(f) explore the possibility of extending full direct medical education per-resident payment beyond the time of first board eligibility for specialties/subspecialties in shortage/defined need;
(g) identify funding sources to increase the number of graduate medical education positions, especially in or adjacent to physician shortage/underserved areas and in undersupplied specialties; and
(h) act on existing policy by seeking federal legislation requiring all health insurers to support graduate medical education through an all-payer trust fund created for this purpose; and
(2) other interested parties to ensure adequate funding to support medical school educational programs, including creating mechanisms to fund additional medical school positions.
Citation: (CME Rep. 7, A-05; Reaffirmation I-06; Reaffirmation I-07; Reaffirmed: Res. 921, I-12; Reaffirmation A-13; Reaffirmed: CME Rep. 5, A-13)

National Resident Matching Program Reform D-310.977
Our AMA:
(1) will work with the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) to develop and distribute educational programs to better inform applicants about the NRMP matching process, including the existing NRMP waiver and violations review policies;
(2) will actively participate in the evaluation of, and provide timely comments about, all proposals to modify the NRMP Match;
(3) will request that the NRMP explore the possibility of including the Osteopathic Match in the NRMP Match;
(4) will continue to review the NRMP's policies and procedures and make recommendations for improvements as the need arises, to include making the conditions of the Match agreement more transparent while assuring the confidentiality of the match;
(5) will work with the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) and other appropriate agencies to assure that the terms of employment for resident physicians are fair and equitable and reflect the unique and extensive amount of education and experience acquired by physicians;
(6) does not support the current the "All-In" policy for the Main Residency Match to the extent that it eliminates flexibility within the match process;
(7) will work with the NRMP, and other residency match programs, in revising Match policy, including the secondary match or scramble process to create more standardized rules for all candidates including application timelines and requirements;
(8) will work with the NRMP and other external bodies to develop mechanisms that limit disparities within the residency application process and allow both flexibility and standard rules for applicants;
(9) encourages the National Resident Matching Program to study and publish the effects of implementation of the Supplemental Offer and Acceptance Program on the number of residency spots not filled through the Main Residency Match and include stratified analysis by specialty and other relevant areas;
(10) will work with the NRMP and ACGME to evaluate the challenges in moving from a time-based education framework toward a competency-based system, including: a) analysis of time-based implications of the ACGME milestones for residency programs; b) the impact on the NRMP and entry into residency programs if medical education programs offer variable time lengths based on acquisition of competencies; c) the impact on financial aid for medical students with variable time lengths of medical education programs; d) the implications for interprofessional education and rewarding teamwork; and e)

the implications for residents and students who achieve milestones earlier or later than their peers;
(11) will work with the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), American Osteopathic Association (AOA), American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine (AACOM), and National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) to evaluate the current available data or propose new studies that would help us learn how many students graduating from US medical schools each year do not enter into a US residency program; how many never enter into a US residency program; whether there is disproportionate impact on individuals of minority racial and ethnic groups; and what careers are pursued by those with an MD or DO degree who do not enter residency programs;
(12) will work with the AAMC, AOA, AACOM and appropriate licensing boards to study whether US medical school graduates and international medical graduates who do not enter residency programs may be able to serve unmet national health care needs;
(13) will work with the AAMC, AOA, AACOM and the NRMP to evaluate the feasibility of a national tracking system for US medical students who do not initially match into a categorical residency program;
(14) will discuss with the National Resident Matching Program, Association of American Medical Colleges, American Osteopathic Association, Liaison Committee on Medical Education, Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, and other interested bodies potential pathways for reengagement in medicine following an unsuccessful match and report back on the results of those discussions;
(15) encourages the Association of American Medical Colleges to work with U.S. medical schools to identify best practices, including career counseling, used by medical schools to facilitate successful matches for medical school seniors, and reduce the number who do not match;
(16) supports the movement toward a unified and standardized residency application and match system for all non-military residencies;
(17) encourages the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates (ECFMG) and other interested stakeholders to study the personal and financial consequences of ECFMG-certified U.S. IMGs who do not match in the National Resident Matching Program and are therefore unable to get a residency or practice medicine;
(18) encourages the AAMC, AACOM, NRMP, and other key stakeholders to jointly create a no-fee, easily accessible clearinghouse of reliable and valid advice and tools for residency program applicants seeking cost-effective methods for applying to and successfully matching into residency; and
(19) will work with appropriate stakeholders to study options for improving transparency in the resident application process.
Citation: CME Rep. 4, A-05; Appended: Res. 330, A-11; Appended: Res. 920, I-11; Appended: Res. 311, A-14; Appended: Res. 312, A-14; Appended: Res. 304, A-15; Appended: CME Rep. 03, A-16; Reaffirmation: A-16; Appended: CME Rep. 06, A-17; Appended: Res. 306, A-17; Modified: Speakers Rep. 01, A-17; Appended: CME Rep. 3, A-21; Modified: CME Rep. 1, A-22; Appended: Res. 328, A-22;

Collective Bargaining: Antitrust Immunity D-383.983
Our AMA will: (1) continue to pursue an antitrust advocacy strategy, in collaboration with the medical specialty stakeholders in the Antitrust Steering Committee, to urge the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission to amend the "Statements of Antitrust Enforcement Policy in Health Care" (or tacitly approve expansion of the Statements) and adopt new policy statements regarding market concentration that are consistent with AMA policy; and (2) execute a federal legislative strategy.
Citation: BOT Action in response to referred for decision Res. 209, A-07 and Res. 232, A-07; Reaffirmed: Res. 215, A-11; Reaffirmed: Res. 206, A-19;

AMA's Aggressive Pursuit of Antitrust Reform D-383.990
Our AMA will: (1) place a high priority on the level of support provided to AMA's Public and Private Sector Advocacy Units, which are key to successfully addressing the problems physicians face as a result of the current application of federal antitrust laws;
(2) through its private and public sector advocacy efforts, continue to aggressively advocate for a level playing field for negotiations between physicians and health insurers by aggressively pursuing legislative relief at the federal level and providing support to state medical society efforts to pass legislation based on the "state action doctrine";
(3) continue to advocate to the Federal Trade Commission and Department of Justice for more flexible and fair treatment of physicians under the antitrust laws and for greater scrutiny of insurers;
(4) continue to develop and publish objective evidence of the dominance of health insurers through its

comprehensive study, Competition in Health Insurance: Comprehensive Study of US Markets, and other appropriate means;
(5) identify consequences of the concentration of market power by health plans to enlist a Senate sponsor for a bill allowing collective negotiation by physicians; and
(6) develop practical educational resources to help its member physicians better understand and use the currently available, effective modalities by which physician groups may legally negotiate contracts with insurers and health plans.
Citation: Res. 908, I-03; Reaffirmation, A-05; Reaffirmed: BOT Rep. 10, I-05; Reaffirmation A-06; Reaffirmation A-08; Reaffirmed: BOT Rep. 09, A-18; Reaffirmed: Res. 206, A-19;

Antitrust Relief H-383.992
Our AMA will: (1) redouble efforts to make physician antitrust relief a top legislative priority, providing the necessary foundation for fair contract negotiations designed to preserve clinical autonomy and patient interest and to redirect medical decision making to patients and physicians; and (2) affirm its commitment to undertake all appropriate efforts to seek legislative and regulatory reform of state and federal law, including federal antitrust law, to enable physicians to negotiate effectively with health insurers.
Citation: Sub. Res. 905, I-07; Reaffirmation A-08; Reaffirmed: Res. 215, A-11; Reaffirmed: BOT action in response to referred for decision Res. 201, I-12; Reaffirmed in lieu of Res. 218, A-15; Reaffirmed: Res. 206, A-19;