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Rethinking health care
Out of crisis, opportunity?

Three crises
- Population health
- Affordability, access, quality
- Professional integrity

What we’ve learned over the past 10 years
- Marked variations in spending – and in growth – across regions
Per-capita Medicare Spending
Trends: 1992 to 2005

Note: US GDP per capita growth 92-05: 2.02%

Annual growth rate

Miami 4.61
Salem, OR 2.03
Per-capita Medicare Spending Trends: 1992 to 2005

Note: US GDP per capita growth 92-05: 2.02%

Annual growth rate

- Miami 4.61%
- E. Long Island 4.58%
- Boston 3.13%
- San Francisco 2.52%
- Salem, OR 2.03%
## Per-capita Medicare Spending
### Trends: 1992 to 2006 -- Wisconsin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital Referral Region</th>
<th>1992 Level</th>
<th>2006 Level</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wausau</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>8,127</td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neenah</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>6,790</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>7,578</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>3,802</td>
<td>6,603</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>3,699</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>6,416</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse</td>
<td>3,414</td>
<td>5,812</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>8,304</td>
<td>3,193</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rethinking health care
Out of crisis, opportunity?

Three crises
- Population health
- Affordability, access, quality
- Professional integrity

What we’ve learned over the past 10 years
- Marked variations in spending – and in growth – across regions
- Simple answers are “wrong”: technology is available everywhere, even fee-for-service payment can’t fully explain it.
- Where is the money going? Supply-sensitive services
What do high spending regions get?
Use Rates in High vs Low

**Effective Care: technical quality**
- Reperfusion in 12 hours (Heart attack)
- Aspirin at admission (Heart attack)
- Mammogram, Women 65-69
- Pap Smear, Women 65+
- Pneumococcal Immunization (ever)

**Preference Sensitive Care: elective surgery**
- Total Hip Replacement
- Total Knee Replacement
- Back Surgery
- CABG following heart attack

**Supply sensitive services: often avoidable care**
- Total Inpatient Days
- Inpatient Days in ICU or CCU
- Evaluation and Management (visits)
- Imaging
- Diagnostic Tests
Rethinking health care
Out of crisis, opportunity?

Three crises
- Population health
- Affordability, access, quality
- Professional integrity

What we’ve learned over the past 10 years
- Marked variations in spending – and in growth – across regions
- Simple answers are “wrong”: technology is available everywhere, even fee-for-service payment can’t fully explain it.
- Where is the money going? Supply-sensitive care
- More supply-sensitive care isn’t better.
What do high spending regions get?  
The paradox of plenty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources – and Content of Care</th>
<th>Health Outcomes</th>
<th>Patient-Perceived Quality</th>
<th>Physician’s Perceptions</th>
<th>Trends Over Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% more beds and MDs; 65% more specialists</td>
<td>Slightly higher mortality</td>
<td>Worse access to primary care</td>
<td>Worse communication among physicians</td>
<td>Greater growth in per capita resource use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse technical quality</td>
<td>No better function</td>
<td>Lower overall rating of medical care</td>
<td>Greater difficulty ensuring continuity</td>
<td>Lower gains in survival following AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more elective surgery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower satisfaction with hospital care</td>
<td>Greater perception of scarcity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More hospital stays, visits, tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower satisfaction with career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If all U.S. regions could adopt practice patterns of most conservative fifth of US, Medicare spending would decline by 30%
Rethinking health care

Out of crisis, opportunity?

Three crises

- Population health
- Affordability, access, quality
- Professional integrity

What we’ve learned over the past 10 years

- Marked variations in spending – and in growth – across regions
- Simple answers are “wrong”: technology is available everywhere, even fee-for-service payment can’t fully explain it.
- Where is the money going? Supply-sensitive services
- More of this kind of care isn’t better.

What’s going on?
What’s going on?

*The challenge of “gray area” decision-making*

Evidence is an important – but limited – influence on clinical practice

Physicians practice in settings where capacity and local social norms exert powerful influence

- Current payment system ensures existing capacity fully utilized
- Income pressures (price cutting) motivate: purchase of new technology; recruitment of new specialists; referral of more complicated patients
- Acceptable professional behavior varies
  - (Specialist referral in S. California or NYC)
  - (Ownership of CT/MRI in N. Carolina or Idaho)

Differences in practice are invisible to providers
Just the gray areas?

capitalize on imaging opportunities in urology

The introduction of MultiSlice Computed Tomography (MSCT) has changed the way urologists diagnose their patients. Today, CT has become the gold standard for many diagnostic examinations in urology.

New Siemens Medical Solutions is making this fascinating imaging technology available to private practices like yours. Adding computed tomography can not only improve patient convenience — by combining diagnosis and care in one location — but it can also significantly improve the overall bottom line of your practice. Furthermore, in today’s competitive marketplace, adding this service can help distinguish and grow your practice successfully.

NEW: Quick Start Package
To get you started quickly, we will prepare your personal “CT Quick Start Package” (details can be found in the QuickStart Kit). In addition, we will customize your personal information package with these features:

Product Brochures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Procedures Per Day</th>
<th>Days Per Month</th>
<th>Average CPT</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>FMVL Cost</th>
<th>ROI* Per Month</th>
<th>ROI for 5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$7,950</td>
<td>$7,950</td>
<td>Break Even</td>
<td>Break Even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$7,950</td>
<td>$14,050</td>
<td>$843,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$7,950</td>
<td>$36,050</td>
<td>$2,163,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample computation — Basic SOMATOM Spirit configuration, based on a 5-year Fair Market Value Lease (FMVL). Prices will vary with additional options. Please consult your Siemens Account Executive for details.

*Return on Investment.

Siemens makes it easy

Sit back and relax. We help you step by step.

Siemens has a dedicated team of experts to help you step-by-step. Your team includes:

Business Development Manager: Your local Siemens Sales Representative will be your personal contact partner. He or she will listen to your plans and advise you on the right products and solutions. In addition, he or she will introduce the right specialist at the right time and prepare the appropriate system quote.

Project Manager: Your local Project Manager is responsible for assessing your site and supporting the installation process.

Financial Analyst: Your Financial Analyst will prepare a business pro forma and calculate income, expenses, and profitability. He or she will also show you Siemens financing solutions that meet your financial and administrative needs.
“These marketing ploys are wildly successful across the entire country. Patients are viewed as the ball in a pinball machine, popped back and forth, ringing up profits, until finally they escape past the paddles and can no longer render income. I believe that the fingers controlling those paddles often use those "gray areas of judgment" as an excuse to shoot the patient back to the triple-score bumpers.

Geoffrey G. Smith, MD, Casper Medical Imaging, PC
May 24, 2007 (email)
An aside
What’s going on with access to care?

Access to care: what we know
- Access to hospitals and specialists WORSE in higher spending regions
- Massachusetts reports “crisis” in availability of physicians

What’s the likely explanation?
- Primary care physicians: must keep schedule full to break even; more efficient to see “easy” patients: result – close to new patients; refer to specialists; send sick patients to ER.
- Specialists: increased referrals from primary care MDs and from other specialists

Worrisome anecdotes:
- Some physicians report that at least half of their visits are unnecessary
- S. Florida endocrinologist describes breakdown of primary care
Moving forward

*Address the underlying causes of rising costs, poor quality*
*Shift focus from “health care” to “health”*

**Underlying cause**

Failure to recognize key role of local system (capacity, local social norms) as a driver of cost and quality

Assumption that more is better
Equating less care with rationing

Payment system that rewards more care, increased capacity, high margin treatments, entrepreneurial behavior

**Key principles**

**Organizational accountability:** Foster the development of local systems accountable for the overall cost and quality of care

**Measurement:** (1) Comparative effectiveness (2) comprehensive performance measures

**Payment reform:** foster accountability for capacity – and behavior: capitation or global shared savings
Organizational Accountability
Foster Accountable Care Organizations (Systems)

**Essential attributes of an Accountable Care Organization**
- Provides (or can effectively manage) continuum of care as a real or virtually integrated local delivery system
- Sufficient size to support comprehensive performance measurement

**Potential Accountable Care Organizations**
- Integrated delivery systems
  - (Mayo Clinic, Intermountain Health Care)
- Physician-Hospital Organizations / Practice Networks
  - (Middlesex Health System, Academic medical centers)
- Regional Collaboratives
  - (Rochester, NY; Indianapolis, IN)

**Would entail little disruption of practice**
- All physicians practice within easily defined “Physician-Hospital Networks”, which provide 70% or more of the care to their patients.

Fisher et al. Creating Accountable Care Organizations, Health Affairs 26(1) 2007:w44-w57.
Performance measurement more tractable at ACO level

- Can include all physicians who contribute to care within frame of measurement immediately – with adequate sample sizes
- More practical (5000 entities, vs 500,000)

Allows shift to meaningful measures

- Health outcomes, patient experience, care coordination, costs
- Important structural measures:
  - Traditional – electronic health records, CPOE
  - New dimensions: transparency on incentives, conflicts of interest

Establishes locus of accountability and organizational support

*No other logical candidate for decisions on capacity*

- ACOs could finance electronic health records, provide decision support, feedback, quality improvement
Organizational Accountability
Support for quality improvement, non-punitive professional feedback

Massachusetts General Hospital
Impact of Individualized Feedback and Education.

Variation in proportion of visits with EKG ordered

Physician level (n = 117)
  Low: 0.0%
  High: 24.6%

Practice level (n = 10)
  Low: 1.0%
  High: 8.1%

Organizational Accountability
Support for quality improvement, non-punitive professional feedback

Practice Variation Report
High Cost Radiology PCP Ordering
October 01 2006 thru September 30 2007
(normalized for 1000 PT Panel) by Modality

Tests normalized for 1000 PT Panel

May 29, 2008 Presentation at Federal Trade Commission
Tom Lee, MD (Partners Healthcare System) (with permission)
**Payment reform**

*The critical element*

**Current payment system has two effects**
- Fosters unprofessional behavior in some
- Presents serious barrier to aligning care with our values

**Long-term: reward improved care and outcomes & lower costs**
- Capitation – or other means with population-based cost accountability
- Medical home, P4P, and bundled payments will NOT constrain overall cost growth. (But can help if *within* population-based cost accountability)

**Short term -- Shared savings models**
- Establish target growth rate
- Reward ACOs that achieve spending growth below target (if quality benchmarks met)
Shared-savings
What is current evidence?

**Physician Group Practice demonstration**

Shared savings payments if groups achieve target savings and meet quality goals

Within 2 years, most quality benchmarks achieved by all groups; almost all achieved some savings; almost half received shared savings payments in each year

**Dartmouth experience – a new conversation**

Growing internal support for primary care & “medical home”

System beginning to focus on improving “population health”

Interest in all-payer model – essential to fully reorient system

(Current incentives to increase volume in < 65)
Why would anyone want this?
Reforms must meet interests of key parties

Physicians and hospitals
- Offers alternative that allows realignment of work and values
- ACO model allows adaptation of private practice to integration
- Allows personal incomes to be preserved while total revenues fall
  (achieving savings for patients and payers)

  Better than the threatened alternative of draconian price cuts

Patients and consumers
- No lock-in required (but incentives to choose PCP would help)
- System-level measurement allows more rapid implementation
- Offers possibility of real savings (maybe more than capitation)

  Better access to care: if unnecessary “revenue-driven” visits eliminated,
  access to both specialists and primary care physicians should improve
  (preliminary evidence from medical home pilots highly relevant)
What about other reforms?
Comparison of current payment reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Primary Care “Home”</th>
<th>Episode Bundled Payments</th>
<th>Global Shared savings</th>
<th>Full Capitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens primary care directly or indirectly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters coordination among participating providers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (for some)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removes payment incentives to increase volume</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters accountability for total costs of care</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires providers to bear risk for excess costs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (within episode)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires “lock-in” of patients to specific providers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers
And what we might do

Without all-payer participation, savings may not occur
  Temptation may be to increase utilization (and maximize income) from any
  patients not participating in shared savings program
  Solution: support for state and local development of all-payer ACO –
  shared savings models

Proliferation of often conflicting reforms: quality measurement,
  P4P, medical home, e-health, etc
  Establish clear long term goals: integration, EHRs, systematic quality and
  outcome measures, global shared savings
  Align interim steps with long term goals
Moving forward

*Align interim steps with long-term goals*

**Support coordination & integration among physician groups**
- Provide list of MDs within network
- Report on network quality using admin data (eg AQA), and surveys (CAHPS)
- Align Medical Home pilots with integration models

**Performance measurement pathway to support quality improvement, shared savings and HIT**
- Interoperable EHR & registries
- Health outcome measures for conditions included in the registry (e.g. functional status)
- Cost-measures for specific conditions included in the registry

**Shared savings payments for qualifying ACOs**
- Shared savings payments to ACOs that meet quality benchmarks (progressively increasing performance standards, based on above)
Barriers
And what we might do

Without all-payer participation, savings may not occur
  Temptation may be to increase utilization (and maximize income) from any patients not participating in shared savings program
  Solution: support for state and local development of all-payer ACO – shared savings models

Proliferation of often conflicting reforms: quality measurement, P4P, medical home, e-health, etc
  Establish clear long term goals: integration, EHRs, systematic quality and outcome measures, global shared savings
  Align interim steps with long term goals

Focus short-term efforts on aggressive pilot testing and evaluation of new payment models
A riddle for would-be health care reformers:

Q: How is a kilowatt-hour of electricity like a day in the hospital?

A: Nobody wants either
California per-capita electricity use FLAT, while Gross State Product rose by 82%

Insights from the energy industry

Utility industry rewarded for producing energy.
- Result: only interested in building power plants.
- Reforms require new structure to reward “end-use efficiency”: light, heat, cold beer – at lowest cost.

Key principles of energy reforms
- Population-based accountability for end-use goals.
- Payment reform: (1) Decouple profits from volume (2) Shared savings
- Performance measurement
Insights from the energy industry – how applicable to health care?

Providers now rewarded for producing services.

- Result: focus on high margin services; volume growth.
- Reforms require new structure to reward “end-use efficiency”: health promotion, restoring health / function; quality of life – at lowest cost.

Key principles of health care delivery system reform

- Population-based accountability for end-use goals (*health*).
- Payment reform: (1) Decouple profits from volume (2) Shared savings
- Performance measurement

Imagine if health care costs were flat for the next 10 years