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Logistics for the Webinar

• All participant lines will be muted automatically during today’s webinar
• Use the chat box on your screen to ask a question or leave comment
  – Note: chat box will not be seen if you are in “full screen” mode
  – Please exit out of “full screen” mode to participate in polling questions
• Please complete the evaluation in the pop-up box after the webinar to help us continue to improve your experience
Welcome

Karen LLanos
Poll #1

• Please select the type of organization you are representing.
  – State Medicaid Agency
  – State Agency other than Medicaid Agency
  – Managed Care Organization
  – Healthcare Provider
  – Consultant
  – Other
Welcome

- BCN track of IAP has worked with five states since Oct 2015 on issues such as:
  - Identification and stratification of Medicaid BCNs
  - Effective care management strategies for Medicaid BCNs
  - Factoring social determinants of health into strategies that impact Medicaid BCNs
  - Applying alternative payment strategies for Medicaid BCNs
IAP BCN Participating State Teams

- District of Columbia
- New Jersey
- Oregon
- Texas
- Virginia
Today’s Agenda

• Overview: Care Management and Implications for Targeted BCN efforts
  — Lynn Dierker, BSN, RN, PCMH CCE, Health Management Associates

• Perspectives from the Field
  — Art Jones, MD, HMA, CMO Medical Home Network, former CEO Lawndale Christian Health Center
  — Tom Curtis, Director, MI SIM Project, Michigan Department of Community Health

• Reflections from an IAP BCN State
  — Leslie Clement, Director of Health Policy and Analytics, Oregon Health Authority

• Q&A

• Wrap Up and Closing Remarks
Overview: Care Management for Beneficiaries with Complex Care Needs and High Costs

Lynn Dierker
Review of the Evidence about Care Models: Attributes of Effective Care Management

- **Target patients** likely to benefit from the intervention;
- **Complete a comprehensive assessment** of the patient’s health conditions, treatments, behaviors, risks, supports, resources, values, needs and preferences;
- **Use evidence-based care planning and monitoring** to meet the patient’s health-related needs and preferences;
- **Promote patient and family active engagement** in self-care;
- **Encourage coordination and communication** among all the professionals engaged in a patient’s care, especially to facilitate transitions from the hospital, referrals to community resources and appropriate care in accordance with patients’ preferences.
Core PCMH Principles as Foundation for Primary Care/Care Management Programs

• **Data driven**
  – Profile relative health risks and needs of patient panel
  – Use registry to monitor key variables to assess progress and adjust care
  – Support shared, single care plan among primary/specialty care via Health IT

• **Establish and maintain individual provider-patient relationship**
  – Attribution or “assignment”
  – Support personalized care planning, care management, shared decision-making

• **Utilize team-based care model**
  – Designed roles for care management, care coordination
  – Multi-disciplinary identification of a team organized around the patient

• **Incorporate physical-behavioral health integration**

• **Focus on care coordination**
Comprehensive Care Management Illustrated

1. Identify Eligible Population
2. Ascertaining Care Management Needs and Levels
3. Assign to Appropriate Care Management Team
4. Individualized Care Plan
5. Care Management Contacts
6. Reassessment

**Level 1 Well Controlled**
- Low touch monitoring, coordination
- High client activation, self-management

**Level 2 Some Control, At Risk**
- In-person monitoring
- Increased complexity, greater need for health promotion, referrals, supports

**Level 3 Little if Any Control, High Risk**
- Frequent, high intensity supports, greatest complexity, hands-on care management

**Data Sources not an all-inclusive list**
- Assessment findings
- Claims data
- Inpatient primary care, behavioral health treatment records
- Medication data
- Screening results
- Patient/family interviews

**Risk Factors not an all-inclusive list**
- Age
- Gender
- Presence of specific chronic illnesses and levels of control
  - Asthma
  - Diabetes
  - Respiratory disease
  - Cardiac disease
  - Sickle cell disease
  - Seizure
  - Neurological disease
- Developmental disability
- Serious mental illness
- Substance use disorder
- Utilization
  - # ER visits over period
  - # ER visits for a specific chronic illness/condition
  - # hospitalizations over period
  - # hospitalizations for a specific chronic illness/condition
- Payer/financial class
- Family income
- Homelessness
- Other social or environmental

**The Assessment**
- Standardized instruments
- Motivational interviewing
- History and Physical

**Complete Comprehensive Health Assessment**

**Enter Program**

**Known Illnesses (Focus: chronic)**
- Program/Service Utilization Opportunities for Prevention

**Outreach to Client**

**Assessment Instruments**

**Care Coordination**
- Individual and family supports

**Care Transition Management**
- Health Promotion

**Referral to/Engagement with community-based resources**
BCN Care Management Programs: Multi-level Profiling and Interventions Required

• Limits of only relying on initial targeting of BCN population based on costs/ED/Hospitalization
  – Case in point: Denver Health analysis of clinic-enrolled high risk population found selective enrollment of some patient profiles and not others (i.e., screening out young, homeless, alcoholic adults because they were not yet medically complex). (Johnson)

• Critical importance of provider level data analysis to design care pathways based on patient profiles
  – Case in point: Australian analysis of the sequence of primary care utilization before and after hospitalization illustrates importance of not just relying on primary care visits as interventions, but also considering the intensity and reorganization of services needed to address emerging risk (Comino).

• Fidelity to care planning processes i.e., prevalence and sequence of steps in care management progress, significantly impacts outcomes
  – Case in point: Reaching and getting patients to a primary care visit within 1 week of hospitalization is the biggest opportunity to prevent 30-day readmissions. However, just establishing care doesn’t make a difference; active review of the care plan did (Everhart).
Care Management for BCN Populations: A Provider Perspective

Art Jones, MD
On the Ground Considerations for What Constitutes Primary Care Management

Community Areas Experience High Hardship

Hardship Index
(Range: 1 to 98)

Hardship Index Quartile
- Q1 (Lowest Hardship)
- Q2
- Q3
- Q4 (Highest Hardship)

Local Realities: Safety Net Delivery System and Provider Affiliations

Medical Home Network Partnerships Driving Transformation

**MHN ACO Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MHN ACO Members</th>
<th>ACO % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Members</td>
<td>ACO % of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>24,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHP</td>
<td>55,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>1,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MHN ACO Providers**

- 9 FQHCs
- 3 Hospital Systems
- 86 Medical Homes
- 375 PCPs
- 150 Care Managers
- 1,200 Specialists
- 5 Hospitals
Centralized vs. Practice Level Care Management

At risk entity:
- Cook County Hospitals and Health System (CCHHS)
  CountyCare

HMO/TPA: “standing in the shoes”
- TPA

Care Management and Coordination:
- MHN ACO
  - Practices working within a shared MHN ACO care model to improve quality and utilization
- Cook County Health System
  - Practices working within a centralized care model to improve quality and utilization
Provider Level CM Implementation Challenges

• Imbedding the care manager as part of the care team
• Create a common, structured approach to care management with tools, processes, staffing and sharing of care plans
• Create a model with a positive return on investment
• Improve on current risk stratification methodology by adding addressable barriers to treatment plan adherence to the usual claims-based diagnosis, utilization and cost factors
• Inform care management staff with real time information placed in historical context
• Follow task completion, lead and lag metrics aimed at improved utilization and cost across the full continuum of care
Implications for Working with Payer/Accountable Care Organization Context

• Payers depend on effective care management to handle financial risk; don’t expect delegation without assuming some of the latter
• Delegate care management responsibilities based on strengths and competencies
• Meet NCQA and any state specific care management delegation requirements
• Agree to clear deliverables, metrics and targets
• Negotiate a value-based payment that recognizes upfront investment but is ultimately supported by savings from improved management of the full continuum of care
• Pursue multi-payer contracts with aligned expectations
MHN Model of Care: 
*Driving Care Transformation via Risk-Focused Patient Management*

- Identify and Stratify
- Engage and Connect Moderate and High Risk
- Plan and Support
- Follow Up and Reassess Risk
- Transition to Low-Risk Reevaluation in Response to Triggers

- Health Risk Assessment (HRA)
- Comprehensive Risk Assessment (CRA)
- Medication Reconciliation
- Care Plan
- Reassessment
Medical Home Network Care Management Tool - Health Risk Assessment

Topics Covered:
- Responses stratify patients into 3 risk categories
- 20 questions take 5-7 minutes to complete
- Adult & Pediatric HRA
- Addresses:
  - Hospitalization/Emergency Department usage
  - Barriers to care (transportation, $$ for meds)
  - Health risk factors: BMI, smoking, alcohol/drugs
  - Social Determinates of health: Housing/food/clothing
  - Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL HOME NETWORK ACO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: __________________ PCP Name __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN ID (Medical Card #): __________ DOB: ______ AGE____ Clinic PT.ID:________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Name: __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address: __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address: __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Zip Code: __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Phone: __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phone: __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: __________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What language do you prefer to speak? ☐ English ☐ Spanish ☐ Other________
2. How do you prefer to be contacted? ☐ home phone ☐ cell phone ☐ e-mail ☐ text ☐ mail ☐ in person

Access to Medical Care & Transportation
3. When did you last see your Primary Care Provider (PCP)?
   Within last: ☐ 3 months ☐ 6 months ☐ 9 months ☐ Year Over a year
4. Do you need help making appointments with your PCP or other doctors? ☐ Yes ☐ No
5. Does lack of transportation keep you from making it to your appointments or getting your medication? ☐ Yes ☐ No
6. Do you have difficulty paying for your medications? ☐ Yes ☐ No

General Health & Healthcare History
7. Considering your age, how would you rate your overall health? ☐ Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor
8. What is your current height? _____ What is your current weight? _____
9. Has a doctor or other health care provider ever told you that you have any of the following conditions? If yes, have you been hospitalized in the past 12 months because of the condition?
   - Heart Disease □ Congestive Heart Failure □ Heart Attack □ Hospitalization
Medical Home Network Model of Care

Addressing Rising Risk by Identifying Barriers to Patient Compliance

- Super Utilizers
  - Inefficient Utilizers, with significant psychosocial risk factors
- High risk, chronic illness with psychosocial barriers to adherence to care plans
- Low risk chronic illness

Focusing exclusively on Super Utilizers doesn’t prevent them in the first place.
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High ER utilization is defined as members who self-reported having 3 or more ER visits in the last 6 months, while low ER utilization is defined as members who denied having ER utilization at this level.

High IP utilization is defined as members who self-reported either (a) having 1 or more hospitalizations for ambulatory-sensitive chronic conditions (e.g. heart failure, asthma, diabetes) OR (b) self-reported having 2 or more hospitalizations in past 12 months for any other condition. Low IP utilization is defined as members who denied having IP utilization at this level.
# Medicaid Expansion Population

**PROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS FINDINGS**

1. MHN’s risk stratification algorithm accurately correlates with subsequent cost of care.
2. Presence of addressable risk factors even in the absence of historical high inpatient or emergency room utilization increases subsequent hospital utilization and total cost of care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRA Risk Profile</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>ER Visits /1000</th>
<th>Inpatient Admits /1000</th>
<th>Medical &amp; RX Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low by Utilization without any Addressable Risk Factors</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low by Addressable Risk Factors</td>
<td>4,181</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium by Addressable Risk Factors</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium by Utilization +/- Addressable Risk factors</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>↑↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High by Addressable Risk Factors</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High by Utilization +/- Addressable Risk Factors</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>↑↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,762</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MHN: Driving Effective Care Management

Judge effective care management by its ability to lower patient risk

**Medical Complexity**
- High Risk Criteria
  - Frequent ED Use
  - Avoidable Hospitalization
  - Chronic PQI (ambulatory sensitive hospitalization)
  - Gaps in Care
- Low Risk

**Behavioral Health Complexity**
- High Risk Criteria
  - Hospitalization or ED Use for SMI or SA
  - High PHQ9
  - Untreated SA
- Low Risk

**Social Complexity**
- High Risk Criteria
  - Barriers to therapeutic compliance
- Low Risk

PQI = Prevention Quality Indicators
PHQ9 = Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (Depression Module)
Texture Health

Brings structure to Care Management Processes

Analytics of Multi-Source Data Guides Care Management Tasking Continuously

Screening Health Risk Assessment

Patient Care Plan

High-level responses drive more detailed assessments (e.g., PHQ-2 to PHQ-9)

Integrates care plan tasks across patient care team (e.g., BH and PCP)

Integrated solution:
- Collects ADT, Claims and CM related Data
- Risk Stratifies & Re-stratifies Patients
- Prioritizes Care Team Tasks
- Drives Workflows
- Enables Communication Across the Delivery System

Comprehensive Risk Assessment

Creates goals informed by assessment results
# Medical Home Network Clinical Integration Dashboard

## MHN ACO - Current Members - Current Risk Level

Counts current member current risk level only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ON PATH - goal achieved for reporting period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFF PATH - goal not met, but at or within 20% of goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELOW - performance is 20% or more below goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weekly Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What we are measuring.....</th>
<th>Completion Counts</th>
<th>ACO Average</th>
<th>Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA Count</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>12/01/16-12/15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA Count</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12/01/16-12/15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Plan Count</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12/01/16-12/15/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Care Management Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What we are measuring.....</th>
<th>MHN ACO</th>
<th>Data Period Reported (Over Time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Member Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Count Over Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Over Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Initial HRA Completion Rate | All Products Combined | 66,669 | 54,288 | 81.4% | 70% | 7/1/14-12/22/16 |
| Timely Completion (New members as of 10/1/16) | 660 | 376 | 57.0% | 70% | 10/1/16-11/30/16 |
| All Products Combined | 5,336 | 3,481 | 65.2% |         |                     |
| High Intensity | 2,140 | 1,484 | 69.3% | 75% | 7/1/14-12/22/16 |
| Medium Intensity | 3,196 | 1,997 | 62.5% | 50% | 7/1/14-12/22/16 |
| Initial CRA Completion Rate | All Products Combined | 1,045 | 749 | 71.7% | 75% | 7/1/14-12/22/16 |
| ACA Members | | | | | | |
| High Intensity | 1,243 | 816 | 65.6% | 50% | 7/1/14-12/22/16 |
# Addressing Social Determinants of Health as part of Comprehensive Care Management

## A Community Centered Health Home Approach in North Lawndale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Resources</th>
<th>Health and Well-being Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The role of local churches</td>
<td>• Job training and employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community health center</td>
<td>• Peer counselling and centering programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Development Organization</td>
<td>• Gyms and fitness center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legal assistance</td>
<td>• Nutrition classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing rehab and affordable new housing</td>
<td>• Healthy food options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• After-school and summer programs for youth</td>
<td>• Police relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Escaping street violence lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Medical Home Network Medicaid Results

Impact on Cost, Outcomes & Engagement

**Patient Engagement - ACO**

MHN’s engagement efforts reach over 2½ times as many patients as other IL Medicaid providers/plans.

**MHN ACO:**
79% COMPLETE

Period: July 1, 2014 – May 19, 2015

**Total Cost of Care - ACO**

**Contract Year 1**

$17.7m SAVINGS

+12.1% variance from target

**Contract Year 2 Q1**

$6.6m SAVINGS

+18% variance from target

**ACA Utilization - ACO**

**Inpatient Days/1000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 Acute Days/1000</th>
<th>Year 2 Acute Days/1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Network</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 1 Jul14–Jun15
10% BETTER OUTCOME

**ACA Utilization - ACO**

**ED Visits/1000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 ED Visits/1000</th>
<th>Year 2 ED Visits/1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Network</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 1 Jul14–Jun15
18% BETTER OUTCOME

**IAP**

Medicaid Innovation Accelerator Program
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Care Management for BCN Populations: Insights from Michigan

Tom Curtis
Michigan Agenda

• Michigan Medicaid Managed Care Contract
  – Physical/Behavioral Health Integration
  – Patient Centered Medical Home
  – Population Health Management

• Michigan State Innovation Model (SIM) Project
  – Structured community collaboration between health care partners across sectors
  – Address social determinants, population health management priorities
  – Model for care coordination
Care Management Policy Levers: Michigan’s Medicaid Managed Care Contract

- Physical/Behavioral Health Integration via collaboration between Medical Services and Behavioral Health Administrations
  - Shared care management processes/protocols
    - Risk stratification
    - Care management standards
    - Document/track shared care plan
  - Shared care management metrics
    - Jointly develop and implement performance improvement projects
      - Shared metrics
      - Shared incentives
Physical/Behavioral Health Integration

• Medicaid managed care performance bonus
  – Implementation of Joint Care Management Processes
    • Managed care plans and Pre-paid Inpatient Hospital Plans (PIHPs) will demonstrate that joint care plans exist for members with appropriate severity/risk that have been identified as receiving services from both entities
    • Provide documentation of joint monthly care management meetings
  – Follow-up after hospitalization for Mental Illness within 30 days
    • MDHHS will define specifications for minimum standard and eligible population
    • Measurement period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017
    • Performance rate will be Medicaid health plan/PIHP combined
Care Management Policy Levers: Michigan’s Medicaid Managed Care Contract

- Patient-Centered Medical Home
  - Report and expand model
  - Accept accreditations as designated by MDHHS
  - Participation in MDHHS-defined policies
    - Eligible provider types
    - Payment parameters
    - Care coordination measures
    - Care coordinator types
Patient Centered Medical Home

- Compliance review requirements to report number and percentage of enrollees receiving care from PCMH designated practices
  - Designation agnostic
  - State Innovation Model (SIM) defined PCMH program requirements in partnership with Managed care plans
- Contract requirement to coordinate health plan care management activities with care managers embedded in primary care practices
Community Integration Policy Levers: Michigan’s Medicaid Managed Care Contract

• Population Health Management
  – Incorporate social determinants of health into interventions (Community Health Workers)
  – Begin developing partnerships with community-based organizations
  – Participate in State Innovation Model (SIM) Pilot efforts
    • Local, collaborative infrastructure
    • Clinical-community linkage partnerships
    • Data collection and decision-making
Community Integration:
Medicaid Managed Care Performance Bonus

• Population Health Management
  – Submit and annually update multi-year plan to meet all Population Health Management contractual requirements
    • Incorporate social determinants of health data into analysis and intervention design
    • Address health disparities through services beyond telephonic and mail-based care management
  – Pursue community-based approaches to care coordination, health promotion, and disease management where applicable

• Community Health Workers (CHWs)
  – Contract defines CHWs, responsibilities, and education/training requirements
  – Contract defines minimum CHW ratio 1 FTE per 20,000 managed care enrollees

• Community Collaboration Project
  – Report participation in MDHHS-approved community-led project to improve population health in each service area
  – Describe activities, timelines, and updates relative to new initiatives
Community Integration: State Innovation Model (SIM) efforts

- Pilot local, multi-sector collaborative infrastructure to support Medicaid managed care plans in coordination to address social and behavioral health determinants
  - Governance to include providers, physician/hospital organizations, Medicaid managed care plans, and behavioral health entities
  - Requirement to implement clinical-community linkage partnerships to impact social/behavioral determinants of community-defined ED utilization issue
Community Integration: State Innovation Model (SIM) efforts (con’t)

• Leveraging Michigan Pathways to Better Health (MPBH) Demonstration
  – CMMI Health Care Innovation Award (HCIA) project led by the Michigan Public Health Institute (MPHI) and Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS)

• Piloted Pathways Community Hub model
  – Coordinated community care and leveraged data to inform collaborative decision making
  – Community Health Workers employed by designated Pathways organization
  – Used quality assurance/data collection tools called Pathways to address other determinants of health outcomes

• Local variation/choices determined targeted issues, business processes, and partnership roles/responsibilities
Community Integration: State Innovation Model (SIM) efforts (con’t)

• Support Medicaid managed care plan adoption of new contract requirements
  – Consider partnerships with community-based community health workers as augmentation of plan-based CHWs and care management services
  – Collect social determinant of health data for incorporation into health plan intervention design and implementation
  – Identification of community-based partners for coordination, health promotion, and disease prevention/management
  – Participation in broad community collaboration project
Perspectives from a BCN State: Oregon’s Experience and Commentary

Leslie Clement
Oregon’s Coordinated Care Model

Care Management Strategies

Patient Centered Primary Care Model (PCPCH)

Oregon’s Coordinated Care Model

- Best Practices to manage and coordinate care
- Paying for outcomes and health
- Transparency in price and quality
- Sustainable rate of growth
- Shared responsibility for health
- Measuring Performance

Better Health, Better Care, Lower Costs
State-based Levers to Encourage Effective Care Management Strategies

• **CCO Incentive Measures**
  – Annual assessment of CCO performance on 17 measures.
  – Quality pool paid to CCOs meeting performance goals.

• **EHR/HIE Development/Incentives**
  – EDIE (Emergency Dept. Information Exchange)
  – Clinical Metrics Registry

• **Public-Private initiatives**
  – Example: Multi-payer Primary Care Payment Reform Collaborative
    • Alignment on payment recommendations that promote care management
State-based Levers to Encourage Effective Care Management Strategies (Cont.)

- Patient-centered Primary Care Home (PCPCH) Program
- Certification program for Oregon’s “medical homes”
  - Increases in: team-based care, culture of continuous improvement, patient-centered lens
  - Organizational culture shifts => care coordination, shared decision-making, use of data, population-based strategies
Primary Care Supports the Triple Aim

• OHA’s PCPCH program:
  – ~$240M savings first three years
  – 4.2% reduction expenditures per person
  – 13:1 ROI

• National CMS Comprehensive Primary Care Initiative (CPCI)
  – 65 Oregon clinics saved $12.8 million in Medicare costs
  – All clinics met quality metric benchmarks, qualifying for shared savings payments totaling $1 million (2015)
CPC+: Advancing Care Delivery and Payment

Fee-for-Service Primary Care

- Focus on volume
- High-cost services
- In-person encounters
- Fragmented care
- Provider burnout
- Payer segregation
- Little attention to social determinants of health

Comprehensive Primary Care

- Focus on efficient, high quality care
- High-value utilization
- Population-based care delivery
- Engaged patients, caregivers, and families
- Multi-payer support
- Coordination across the medical neighborhood and community services

Practice Transformation

- Actionable milestones to deliver high quality, whole-person, patient-centered care
- Effective use of health information technology (HIT) and data analytics
- Practice learning networks

Payment Redesign

- Non-visit based care management fees
- Regional shared savings opportunity
Lessons Learned/Key Takeaways

• Set broad vision/goals at state level
• Allow for ownership/experimentation at local level
  – Foster local leadership (e.g., quality improvement training)
• Incorporate financial incentives
  – Incentive measures drive behavior change
• Seek payment alignment across the delivery system
  – Value-based payment alignment key
Questions?

Leslie M. Clement
Director of Health Policy & Analytics
Oregon Health Authority

Leslie.m.clement@state.or.us
Q & A: Discussion
Key Takeaways

• States play a pivotal role to set standards and drive the uptake of effective care management models for BCN populations
  – Various policy levers to advance health care transformation
  – Strategy alignment is key

• Fidelity to evidence-based care models can be balanced with care management programs that accommodate local, regional and statewide health care landscapes and diverse populations
  – Consider the characteristics of BCN sub-populations and provider/health system characteristics/capacity

• Information and data analytics supports are critical at both state and provider levels in order to develop and support effective care management for BCN subpopulations
  – State risk stratification/population health management for value based health care strategies
  – Provider risk stratification, registries and data driven care management
Closing Remarks

Karen LLanos
Closing Remarks

• National Dissemination Series continues:
  – February 27, 2017: Factoring Social Determinants into Strategies for BCNs
  – March 27, 2017: Employing Alternative Payment Strategies for BCNs
  – All sessions are scheduled for 2:00 p.m.-3:30 p.m. ET

• Please complete the post webinar evaluation