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Webinar Logistics

• Audio is being streamed to device speakers (recommended)
• A phone line has also been set up. All lines will be muted:
  – Toll Call-in Number: 1-857-232-0156
  – Conference Code: 574875
• Use the Q&A Widget on your screen to ask a question or leave a comment
• Provide feedback using the survey widget
Learning Objectives

• Elaborate on the potential impact of payment reform on maternal and infant health outcomes
• Describe Value-Based Payment (VBP) approaches that states can implement to improve maternal and infant health outcomes and care quality indicators
• Provide state perspectives on the use of Medicaid VBP approaches in the maternal and infant health field
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Overview of Medicaid IAP and VBP Webinar Series

Katherine Griffith

Medicaid Innovation Accelerator Program
Medicaid IAP

- Commitment by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to build state capacity and support ongoing innovation in Medicaid through targeted technical support\(^1\)
- A program funded by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation (CMMI) that is led by and lives in the Center for Medicaid and Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Services (CMCS)
- Supports states’ Medicaid delivery system reform efforts:
  - The IAP goal is to increase the number of states moving toward delivery system reform across program priorities
- Not a grant program; provides targeted technical support

\(^1\) IAP refers to *technical support* as general support, program support, or technical assistance.
VBP Webinar Series

Medicaid VBP Approaches and Key Design Considerations

Medicaid VBP Approaches for Children’s Oral Health

Medicaid VBP Approaches for Substance Use Disorders

Medicaid VBP Approaches for Maternal and Infant Health
Importance of Payment Reform in Maternal and Infant Health

Crystal Tyler

*IBM Watson Health*
Poll Question

How would you describe your familiarity with VBP? (Select all that apply)

1. I am well-versed in VBP approaches.
2. I am aware of VBP approaches but don’t consider myself an expert.
3. I am new to the term VBP.
4. I participated in one of the previous three Medicaid IAP VBP webinars in October: *VBP Approaches and Key Design Considerations, VBP Approaches in Children’s Oral Health*, or *VBP Approaches in Substance Use Disorders*. 
Health Care Costs Associated with Adverse Birth Outcomes

- Adverse birth outcomes disproportionately affect Medicaid beneficiaries
- Preterm birth is a leading cause of infant morbidity and mortality
- Average health care utilization costs are higher for preterm births compared with uncomplicated deliveries
- Preterm birth accounts for half of all pregnancy-related costs
  - Costs are projected to top $32.3 billion in 2017

On Average, Medicaid Pays for Nearly Half of U.S. Births

Percentage of births financed by Medicaid

U.S. median: 49%

Medicaid VBP Approaches in Maternal and Infant Health

Mark Smith

IBM Watson Health
# Health Care Payment Learning and Action Network Alternative Payment Model Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY 1</th>
<th>CATEGORY 2</th>
<th>CATEGORY 3</th>
<th>CATEGORY 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEE FOR SERVICE – NO LINK TO QUALITY &amp; VALUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>FEE FOR SERVICE – LINK TO QUALITY &amp; VALUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>APMS BUILT ON FEE-FOR-SERVICE ARCHITECTURE</strong></td>
<td><strong>POPULATION – BASED PAYMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Payments for Infrastructure &amp; Operations (e.g., care coordination fees and payments for HIT investments)</td>
<td>Pay for Reporting (e.g., bonuses for reporting data or penalties for not reporting data)</td>
<td>APMs with Shared Savings and Downside Risk (e.g., episode-based payments for procedures and comprehensive payments with upside and downside risk)</td>
<td>Condition-Specific Population-Based Payment (e.g., per member per month payments, payments for specialty services, such as oncology or mental health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3N</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-for-Performance (e.g., bonuses for quality performance)</td>
<td>Risk Based Payments NOT Linked to Quality</td>
<td>4N</td>
<td>Comprehensive Population-Based Payment (e.g., global budgets or full/percent of premium payments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key VBP Foundational Design Elements

• Patient population of focus
• Services included in the VBP approach
• Financial performance measurement and benchmarking
• Quality performance measurement and alignment
• Attribution of patients
• Risk adjustment
• Data sharing
## Examples of VBP Models in Maternal and Infant Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>LAN Framework Category</th>
<th>VBP Model</th>
<th>Targeted Outcome or Delivery Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Nonpayment Policy</td>
<td>Early elective deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pay-for-Performance Success</td>
<td>Nurse-Family Partnership home visiting program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pay-for-Performance Success</td>
<td>17P injectable progesterone to prevent preterm births</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pay-for-Performance Success</td>
<td>Early elective deliveries, Breastfeeding, Low risk cesarean sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bundled Payment</td>
<td>Perinatal bundle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bundled Payment</td>
<td>Perinatal bundle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Population-Based Payment Models</td>
<td>Prenatal care initiation postpartum care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions or Comments?
State Perspectives:

- Louisiana
- Arkansas
Louisiana’s Pay-for-Performance Strategy: A State Perspective of Progesterone Initiation for Prevention of Preterm Birth

Pooja K. Mehta

Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center
Louisiana Department of Health
Toward VBP for Population Health

Health of a Population

Experience of Care

Per Capita Cost

The **Triple Aim**
Toward VBP for Population Health

• Shift toward VBP during the following:
  – Medicaid expansion
  – Managed care organization (MCO) contract extension
  – Commitment to broader payment and system transformation

• Quality strategy included shared targets for population health improvement

• Approach aligns financial incentives for plans and providers

• Current 2% withhold of monthly capitation rate from incentive to contract compliance during CY15 to CY17 transition to “earn back” for MCO performance on quality measures and advance VBP during CY18 to CY19
Evolving Approach to Value Based Payment Contracting

1% Withhold for Quality and Health Outcome Improvement

- Monetary penalty for failure to meet CY17 quality measure targets ($250,000)
- Target defined for quality measures in CY 18
- Replace “money measure” penalty with full earnback of withhold for attainment of stretch goal targets and partial earnback for material improvement over baseline

1% Withhold for Increase in VBP Model Use

- Adds withhold earnback for development and submission of strategic plan to increase VBP use over time
  - Including baseline measure of APM use in CY17
- Adds withhold earnback for meeting implementation milestones of strategic plan in CYs18 and 19
  - Including increased VBP use over CY17 baseline

Louisiana Department of Health retains any unearned withhold amounts
Selection of Measures for Quality Strategy

• Nine incentive measures in current contract
• Revised quality strategy in extension with broad input from external stakeholders
  – Regional town hall meetings throughout state
  – Medicaid Quality Committee/Subcommittee meetings
  – Industry-specific meetings with Louisiana Primary Care Association, Louisiana Hospital Association, Louisiana State Medical Society, Medicine Louisiana, and American Academy of Pediatrics
  – Louisiana Department of Health website public comment
Selection of Measures for Quality Strategy

- New contract: 17 incentivized measures, including initiation of injectable progesterone (17-P) for recurrent preterm birth prevention
- Why 17-P?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive-Based Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#01 (PTB) $$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why 17-hydroxyprogesterone (17-P)?

- More than half of infant mortality occurs in babies born at <32 weeks
- LA ranks among the worst in the nation for preterm birth outcomes and infant mortality
- Pronounced geographic and racial disparities
- 17-P: one of few evidence-based interventions for preterm birth prevention
  - 33% reduction in those with a prior spontaneous preterm birth (weekly admin 16–36w)

Data source: Louisiana Vital Records, courtesy Lyn Kieltyka
# Stakeholder Engagement

## 2011: Coverage of compounded progesterone

- Louisiana Medicaid Birth Outcomes Initiative

## 2014: Coverage of Makena

- LAMMICO (CME)
- March of Dimes
- Louisiana Hospital Association
- Region 7,8 hospitals
- High Risk Pregnancy Registry (vital records & statewide Medicaid)
- Alere/Optum

## 2015: Incentivized measure

- LA ACOG
- 2017 Provider survey – March of Dimes
- LA Perinatal Commission
- MCO Prematurity Performance Improvement Projects

## 2018: Target set

- Medicaid Quality Committee
- Perinatal Quality Collaborative
- CityMatCH community engagement pilot
VBP Core Components: Selection of a Target Population

• Women currently pregnant with a prior spontaneous preterm birth
  – Singleton birth less than 37 weeks gestation
  – Twin birth less than 32 weeks gestation
  – Birth at least 23 weeks gestation
  – Maternal age from 11 to 50 years
VBP Core Components: Selection of a Target Population

- Vital record information on gestational age and plurality matched with all women and children ever enrolled in Medicaid via agreement between Medicaid and Office of Public Health
- Registry provided to Medicaid fiscal intermediary who parses list according to plan enrollment and distributes sub-registry to managed care organizations
- Providers give a “Notice of Pregnancy” with screening assessment to plans that use claims and Registry to determine eligibility for progesterone prophylaxis
VBP Core Components: Financial Benchmarking

• Financial benchmarking
  – MCOs report their Quality Performance Measures to the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA)
  – Measures validated by External Quality Review Organization Current Contract
  – Based on an MCO’s Performance Measure outcomes, a maximum $250,000 per measure is withheld from payment if specified performance measures fall below DHH’s established benchmarks for improvement
VBP Core Components: Evaluation Data

- Data sharing between Office of Public Health and Medicaid to identify target population
- Primary data from MCOs shared in plan Performance Improvement Project submit performance measures to NCQA (validated by External Quality Review Organization)
- Global evaluation data from Medicaid fee-for-service claims
Initiation of Injectable 17-P: 2013-2016

Injection between 16-21 weeks gestational age

Statewide Medicaid 17-P Initiation Rate (MCOs + FFS)
Courtesy ULM Data analytics team

Injection between 16-21 weeks gestational age

Measure adjusted: Between 16-21 weeks gestational age

Statewide Medicaid 17-P Initiation Rate (MCOs + FFS)

Courtesy ULM Data analytics team
Insurance and Pricing Barriers

- High rates of uninsurance in Louisiana
- Prohibitive pricing: Makena costs $1440 per injection; 17p costs $15 per injection*
- Variable insurance coverage of Makena and 17-P
- Prior authorization requirements
- Variable gestational age limits for coverage
- Variable coverage of the drug as medical benefit vs. pharmacy benefit

Supply Chain Barriers

- 17P must be ordered through a compounding pharmacy
- Makena is only available through certain specialty pharmacies
- Many providers choose not to stock Makena due to its high price

Adherence Barriers

- Difficulty adhering to weekly injections
- Transportation to a physician’s office for administration
- Fear of injections
- Copays under private insurance for weekly visits
- Lack of providers in rural areas
- Provider practice organization and behavior

Other Barriers

- LA Medicaid covers both Makena and 17-P, at no cost to Medicaid patients
- Elimination of prior authorization requirements for Makena/17-P in LA Medicaid MCOs
- LA Medicaid MCOs offer coverage of the drug as both a pharmacy and medical benefit

Creation of the 17-P Louisiana Ordering and Billing Summary distributed by MCOs, ACOG

LA Medicaid MCOs cover home administration of injectable progesterone
Next Steps

• Increase/improve communication with providers, patients, and MCOs for more effective barrier analysis and improvement cycles
• Align and synergize redundant efforts on improvement
• Understand best practices from other states and practices
• Continue shift from monitoring to incentivizing measures and pay for performance – opportunity in new MCO RFP in 2 years
• Move from process evaluation of progesterone initiation to outcome evaluation of preterm birth and low birthweight rates
• Engagement with Perinatal Quality Collaborative for provider and practice transformation
Thank You!

• Acknowledgements
  – Jen Steele
  – Larry Humble, Eddie Myers
  – Piia Hanson

• Reference articles
Arkansas: VBP for Maternal and Infant Health Care

William Golden MD MACP
Arkansas Division of Medical Services
Arkansas Health Care System

• 100% Primary Care Case Management (PCCM)
  – No managed care
• Patients choose or are assigned to a primary care provider
• Prior to Affordable Care Act expansions, Medicaid paid for 65% of pregnancies
• Medicaid covers 65% of pediatric care costs
Impetus to Change Health Care Delivery Model

• Desire to explore new incentives to shape health care delivery
  – Reward outcomes, effectiveness, and quality

• Health care systems contend with service demand amid limited resources
  – Taxes vs. premiums vs. co-pays vs. access limitations

• Need for greater financial stewardship
  – Includes providers, payers, patients, and policymakers
Arkansas VBP Approaches

  - Includes early elective deliveries, breastfeeding, low-risk cesarean sections, timely submission of newborn screens

- Episodes of care (2012 – present)
  - Includes all medical services with a pregnancy-related diagnosis code
  - Triggered by a live birth on a facility claim
  - Episode begins 40 weeks prior to delivery and ends 60 days after delivery

- Patient-centered medical homes (2014 – present)
  - Includes pediatric medical homes
Providers Who Meet Quality Standards and Have Average Costs Below the Commendable Threshold Share in Savings
## Practice Support Payment Tracking Activity Provides a Framework for Transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Completion of activity and timing of reporting</th>
<th>Commit to PCMH Month 0-3</th>
<th>Start your journey Month 6</th>
<th>Evolve your processes Month 12</th>
<th>Continue to innovate Month 16-18</th>
<th>Month 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Identify office lead(s) for both care coordination and practice transformation&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Assess operations of practice and opportunities to improve (internal to PCMH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Develop strategy to implement care coordination and practice transformation improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Identify top 10% of high-priority patients (including behavioral health clients)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Identify and address medical neighborhood barriers to coordinated care (including behavioral health professionals and facilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Provide 24/7 access to care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Document approach to expanding access to same-day appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Complete a short survey related to patients’ ability to receive timely care, appointments, and information from specialists (including behavioral health specialists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Document approach to contacting patients who have not received preventive care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Document investment in health care technology or tools that support practice transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Join SHARE to get inpatient discharge information from hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Incorporate e-prescribing into practice workflows&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Integrate electronic health records into practice workflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - At enrollment; 2 - Three months after the start of each performance period; 3 - At 18 months
Stakeholder Engagement

Governor’s Office: establish vision, recruit payers

Department of Human Services: host meetings, develop VBP Framework

Legislature: approve regulations

Contractors: conduct outreach activities, data management

Private Insurers: develop internal programs

Clinical Leaders: acceptance of need for change

Professional Societies: cautious support and engagement

Creation of Learning Systems – Data/Feedback/Revisions
Data Capacity

• Arkansas Medicaid has a robust data warehouse
• Claims data drives program development
  – Document practice variations
  – National and homegrown measures
• P4P program requires hospital abstraction
  – Vendor validates self-reported data
• Episodes of care and patient-centered medical homes
  – Claims data, Internet portal, quarterly reports, custom Microsoft® Excel reports
Arkansas Progress to Date

- Engine has processed 2.0 billion claims
- 4.8 million episodes (before exclusions)
- 39,000 episode of care reports
  - 18,600 episode of care level payment or performance reports
  - 4,000 episode of care level reconciliation reports
  - 2,450 distinct principal accountable provider
- 4,000 patient centered medical home reports
Arkansas Outcome Data
Lessons Learned

• Big data
  – Analytics are essential – but a demanding garden
  – Real time data vs. claims data
  – Systems data vs. patient journey
  – Missing data, moving patients, metrics

• When do you get “there”?
  – Concept, outreach, implementation, reconciliation
  – Until payments are finalized, you’re in transit

• National payers/self-insured partnerships
Challenges and Mitigation Strategies

- Medicaid and per diem reimbursement
  - Economic ceiling for episodes
- Electronic health record limitations
  - Key rate limiting step in 2017
- Practice style snapshots
  - Value to provider
  - Value to patient-centered medical homes
Special Considerations When Implementing a VBP Approach

• Accountability for patient journey
  – Niche populations and the social determinants of health

• Future metrics = stewardship
  – Total cost of care, outcome, patient satisfaction
  – Role of the medical neighborhood

• Financial incentives + timely and valid data
Key Presentation Takeaways

- State Medicaid agencies are implementing VBP approaches to address maternal and infant health outcomes

- Lessons learned include the following:
  - Get buy-in first (from providers, managed care organizations, etc.)
  - Share best practices wherever possible
  - Remove unnecessary barriers
  - Establish coverage options for maternal and infant health services
  - Reimburse services for different provider types
  - Ensure that measurement tools are timely and accurate
  - Link provider performance to additional payments and withholds
  - Start small and build up to scale
  - Sustain political attention
  - Take accountability for the patient journey

- VBP stands to improve quality of care/patient experience, improve access, and reduce costs in maternal and infant health
Questions or Comments?
VBP Resource List

• Resource list includes general information and additional case studies on VBP and maternal and infant health
  – VBP overview
  – Bundled payment
  – Nonpayment policy
  – Pay for performance
  – Shared savings models
  – Population-based models

• Resource list and slide deck will be sent out to participants after the presentation.
We hope you take the opportunity to review materials from the following Medicaid IAP VBP webinars, which will provide more information about Medicaid VBP approaches:

- **Medicaid VBP Approaches and Key Design Considerations**
  - Materials available here

- **Medicaid VBP Approaches for Children’s Oral Health and Medicaid Value-Based Payment Approaches for Maternal and Infant Health**
  - Materials available here soon

- **Medicaid VBP Approaches for Substance Use Disorders**
  - Materials available here soon.
Thank You for Joining Today’s Webinar!

Please take a moment to complete a short feedback survey.