

Can Better Care Coordination Save Medicare?

The Alphabet Soup of Care Delivery Transformation
Alliance for Health Reform Briefing
September 10th, 2012

Randy Brown

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

Overview

- 1. What does the evidence tell us about likely care coordination effects in fee-for-service Medicare?**
- 2. What ACA provisions are likely to produce savings for Medicare?**
- 3. What can we do to enhance the likelihood of success?**
- 4. What are the major barriers to success?**

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

The Best Evidence on Effective Care Coordination

- **CBO review of 30+ programs (1/12) found little favorable evidence**
 - Telephonic-only disease management programs didn't work
 - More personal care coordination programs didn't save enough
 - Value-based purchasing yielded little or no savings

- **Other studies show some significant favorable effects—but only for high risk patients**
 - Transitional care (Naylor, Coleman)
 - Medicare Coordinated Care Demonstration—4 sites
 - Care Management Plus model (Dorr; OHSU)
 - Geriatric Resources for Assessment and Care of Elders (GRACE) model (Counsell)
 - Mass. General Hospital high cost program

What distinguishes successful interventions?

Care Coordinators:

1. Have frequent face-to-face contact with patients (~ 1/month)
2. Build strong rapport with patients' physicians through face-to-face contact at hospital or office
3. Use behavior-change techniques to help patients increase adherence to medications and self-care
4. Know when patients are hospitalized and provide support for transition home
5. Act as a communications hub among providers and between patient and providers
6. Have reliable information about patients' Rx and access to pharmacists or medical director

Proposed Models in the ACA

- **Models of care suggested in ACA that have promise of improved care coordination:**
 - Patient-centered medical homes for high risk patients
 - Advanced payment ACOs
 - Geriatric assessment and comprehensive care plans (GRACE)
 - Care coordination through HIT and telehealth (high risk patients)
 - Community-based health teams to improve self-management
 - Fully integrated care for dual eligibles
 - Home health providers who offer multidisciplinary care teams
 - Replication of successful programs from MCCD for high risk patients
- **But success will depend on *how implemented***
 - And evidence suggest net savings will be modest
- **Bundling models had better results, but create new silos**
- **Structure of managed care plans offers greater potential**

How Can We Increase Likelihood of Success?

Whether FFS, ACO, or managed care solutions are tried:

- **Require key features of successful past programs**
- **Focus effort on high risk patients**
- **Feed back information to programs and physicians**
- **Build in studies of operational issues**
- **Test replicability of proven core features in other settings**

Potential Barriers to Success

1. Excessive attention to rapid cycle learning

- Quick answers are often wrong answers
- Takes time to learn, train, adapt, build rapport
- So use intermediate outcomes and build in tests of program implementation issues (Mahoney)
- Don't sacrifice rigor of evidence for speed
- Building on prior successes should shorten time to improvement

2. Lack of political will

- Failure to withstand pressure from special interests will thwart attempt to save—fees/premiums have to be set low enough

3. Lack of information and incentives for providers

- Physicians need data on *quality and efficiency* (own and others)
- Payment to providers should be tied to both factors
- Resource use reporting should provide this