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The Essential Role of Primary Care

- Fee-for-service payment systems have typically under-resourced primary care
- Effective primary care is essential to achieving the triple aim
- Around the country, state policy-makers have tackled the issue of how to foster adoption of patient-centered primary care models
- Especially important for vulnerable populations with high rates of chronic disease and with limited access to health resources
States That Have Public and Private Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH) Initiatives That Use NCQA Recognition

Public (7)
Private (13)
Both – Including Multi-Payer (17)

Source: NCQA March 2014
MMPP Overview

- Maryland law (2010) required the MHCC to develop a three-year pilot Multi-Payor Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) Program to improve the health and satisfaction of patients and slow the growth of health care costs while supporting the satisfaction and financial viability of primary care providers and enabled:
  
  - Exemption for a cost-based incentive payment tied to PCMH; and
  - Authority for carriers to establish single carrier PCMH programs with an incentive-based reward structure (shared savings) and data sharing

- The pilot evaluation period ended June 30, 2014; however, the program continues through 2015, and with Medicaid until June 30, 2016
Participating Practices

- 52 practices from across Maryland that vary in size and ownership; includes two Federally Qualified Health Centers
- Specialties include pediatric, family practice, internal medicine, and geriatric practices
- 339 practitioners, mostly physicians and some certified registered nurse practitioners
- 100,000 attributed commercial patients
- 56,000 Medicaid patients
- For 15 of 52 practices in 2014, Medicaid enrollees were at least 20 percent of their patient mix
Key Program Components

- Innovative payment reforms to support primary care;
- Multiple payor participation;
- State government convening role;
- Standards for PCMH identification;
- New staffing models for team-based primary care;
- Technical assistance to practice sites;
- Common measurement of performance; and
- Collaborative learning
IMPAQ International conducted an evaluation of the MMPP pilot

- The IMPAQ team includes researchers from IMPAQ International, the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Healthcare Resolution Services, and the University of Maryland School of Pharmacy

IMPAQ developed five issue briefs:

- Health care disparities;
- Health care quality, utilization and costs;
- Patient experience and satisfaction;
- Practice transformation; and
- Provider satisfaction
Health Care Racial Disparities In Quality 2010 Versus 2013

Racial disparity was measured using the patient race for Medicaid enrollees: non-white or white. All measures presented have a significant disparity (p< 0.1) in the baseline year. This graph displays changes in disparities from the baseline (2010) period to the third year (2013) of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disparity rate ratio</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.4</td>
<td>Little or no disparity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-1.9</td>
<td>A disparity exists and should be monitored and may require intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.4</td>
<td>The disparity requires intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-2.9</td>
<td>Major interventions are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3.0</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health Care Racial Disparities In Utilization 2010 Versus 2013

Racial disparity was measured using the patient race for Medicaid enrollees: non-white or white. All measures presented have a significant disparity (p< 0.1) in the baseline year. This graph displays changes in disparities from the baseline (2010) period to the third year (2013) of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients with asthma, CHF, or diabetes with one or more condition-related ED visits</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients with asthma with one or more asthma-related ED visits</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients with asthma, CHF, or diabetes with one or more condition-related inpatient stays</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients with asthma with one or more asthma-related inpatient stays</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disparity Rate Ratio Interpretation

- **1.0-1.4**: Little or no disparity
- **1.5-1.9**: A disparity exists and should be monitored and may require intervention
- **2.0-2.4**: The disparity requires intervention
- **2.5-2.9**: Major interventions are needed
- **≥3.0**: Urgent interventions are needed
Health Care Payor Disparities In Quality 2010 Versus 2013

Disparity was measured comparing Medicaid to Commercial patients. All measures presented have a significant finding ($p<0.1$) in the baseline year. This graph displays changes in disparities from the baseline (2010) period to the third year (2013) of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disparity Rate Ratio</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.4</td>
<td>Little or no disparity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-1.9</td>
<td>A disparity exists and should be monitored and may require intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.4</td>
<td>The disparity requires intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-2.9</td>
<td>Major interventions are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\geq$3.0</td>
<td>Urgent interventions are needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Young persons (0–40) with asthma with one or more asthma-related hospital admissions within the year: 2010 - 12.0, 2013 - 35.8
- Pediatric diabetics (0–17 years old) with one or more HbA1c tests within the year: 2010 - 1.5, 2013 - 1.0
- Women (40–64 years old) with one or more breast cancer screenings within the year: 2010 - 1.8, 2013 - 1.7
- Two well-child visit(s) for first 15 months, to attributed practice: 2010 - 1.7, 2013 - 1.4
**Health Care Payor Disparities In Utilization 2010 Versus 2013**

Disparity was measured comparing Medicaid to Commercial patients. All measures presented have a significant disparity ($p<0.1$) in the baseline year. This graph displays changes in disparities from the baseline (2010) period to the third year (2013) of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disparity Rate Ratio</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.4</td>
<td>Little or no disparity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-1.9</td>
<td>A disparity exists and should be monitored and may require intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.4</td>
<td>The disparity requires intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-2.9</td>
<td>Major interventions are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\geq$3.0</td>
<td>Urgent interventions are needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- One or more ED visit: 2010 = 2.3, 2013 = 2.4
- Asthma, CHF, or diabetes with one or more condition-related ED visits: 2010 = 4.7, 2013 = 3.0
- Asthma with one or more asthma-related ED visits: 2010 = 2.8, 2013 = 2.0
- Diabetes with one or more diabetes-related ED visits: 2010 = 10.0, 2013 = 6.3
- Asthma, CHF, or diabetes with one or more condition-related inpatient stays: 2010 = 2.6, 2013 = 2.0
- Asthma with one or more asthma-related inpatient stays: 2010 = 2.2, 2013 = 1.5
- Inpatient stays with readmissions within 30 days (count): 2010 = 1.9, 2013 = 1.6
- Mean nursing home days among patients with nursing home stays: 2010 = 2.0, 2013 = 1.5
**Adjusted Difference-In-Difference Estimates For Selected Quality Measures (vs. 2010)**

*Results are based on the difference-in-difference coefficients, and are adjusted for practice location (proximity to large/small metropolitan area), practice type (solo vs. other), practice use of electronic medical records, proportion of white practitioners in the practice and patient case-mix. The DID approach compares the change in the non-MMPP group to the change in the MMPP group.*
Adjusted Difference-In-Difference Estimates For Selected Utilization Measures (vs. 2010)

Results are based on the difference-in-difference coefficients, and are adjusted for practice location (proximity to large/small metropolitan area), practice type (solo vs. other), practice use of electronic medical records, proportion of white practitioners in the practice and patient case-mix. The DID approach compares the change in the non-MMPP group to the change in the MMPP group.
Adjusted Difference-In-Difference Estimates For Selected Cost Measures (vs. 2010)

Results are based on the difference-in-difference coefficients, and are adjusted for practice location (proximity to large/small metropolitan area), practice type (solo vs. other), practice use of electronic medical records, proportion of white practitioners in the practice and patient case-mix. The DID approach compares the change in the non-MMPP group to the change in the MMPP group.
Patient Experience & Satisfaction Survey Responses Indicating Excellent Performance - Adult

For the items and scales from the CAHPS Survey, this report displays the “top box” score, referring to the percentage responding in the most positive response categories, indicating excellent performance.
Patient Experience & Satisfaction Survey
Responses Indicating Excellent Performance – Respondents for Children

For the items and scales from the CAHPS Survey, this report displays the “top box” score, referring to the percentage responding in the most positive response categories, indicating excellent performance.
Provider Survey Results, 2014

• Greater inclusion and extended roles for medical assistants in MMPP practices compared to non-participating practices

• Greater use of health educators

• Higher satisfaction with their job than “Other PCMH”

• Higher satisfaction with patient care than “Other PCMH”

• Positive perceptions of several team-functioning measures
Provider Survey Results, 2014

- Greater inclusion and extended roles for medical assistants
- Greater use of health educators
- High satisfaction with their job
- High satisfaction with patient care
- Everyone on your team is motivated to have the team succeed

*P values from ordinal logistic regression models that adjust for age (continuous), gender (male/female), race (Caucasian/other), profession in years (<20, >=20), practice type (solo, single specialty, multi-specialty, other), EMR system (no, all electronic, partially electronic), and clustering (robust standard error).
Wrap Up – The Evaluation

• IMPAQ concluded that the program led to improved health care, which may result in improved health outcomes

• Breadth of improvements ranged from breadth of positive findings from high job satisfaction, and satisfaction with the care provided to their patients, to improving relationships between patients and providers

• One of the greatest improvements reported by IMPAQ was in reducing health care disparities; continuing to reduce health care disparities will:
  - Improve health outcomes for the Medicaid population;
  - Reduce expenditures related to medical care and indirect costs; and
  - Align Maryland’s health care system with the national Healthy People Initiative
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