INTEGRATION, THEMES 2 AND 3
The Present and Future of Integrated Long-Term and Medical care

This session will address the integration of Themes 2 and 3, including innovations in the organization, financing, and delivery to support integration of medical care and long-term services and supports (LTSS) across the range of settings in which persons with AD/ADRD and their caregivers live and receive care.
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Dually eligible beneficiaries

The dually eligible population
- Higher incidence of chronic conditions, disability:
  - 41% have at least one mental health dx
  - 41% eligible for Medicare due to disability (vs. 8% for non-dual Medicare beneficiaries)
- About half use long term services and supports
- 19% have Alzheimer’s or related dementia

How it works
- Dually eligible beneficiaries navigate two separate programs:
  - Medicare for the coverage of most preventive, primary, and acute health care services and drugs
  - Medicaid for the coverage of long-term care supports and services, certain behavioral health services, and for help with Medicare premiums and cost-sharing
- Where benefits overlap, Medicare is primary payer

12 million individuals are simultaneously enrolled in Medicare and Medicaid
CMS’ Better Care for Dual Eligible Individuals Strategic Initiative

Initiative Goal: Improve quality, reduce costs, and improve the customer experience for people dually eligible for the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Modernizing the Medicare Savings Programs (MSPs)
- CMS–state data exchange
- Payment policy
- Reducing burden in eligibility processes

Promoting integrated care to achieve better outcomes
- Strengthening Medicare Advantage and Medicaid alignment
- Modernizing requirements for the Programs of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly
- Inviting states to partner to test approaches in serving dually eligible individuals
Overview of the Financial Alignment Initiative

- A longstanding barrier to coordinating care for the dually eligible population is the financial misalignment between Medicare and Medicaid. That is, investments or disinvestments in one program may result in savings or costs to the other program.
  - Individuals with Alzheimer’s and related dementias among populations that may feel that financial misalignment most acutely.
- CMS is testing models to integrate the service delivery and financing of both Medicare and Medicaid through federal-state demonstrations to better serve the population.
- Our goal is to increase access to quality, seamlessly integrated services for the dually eligible population.
FAI demonstration models

**Capitated Model**
- Three-way contracts among states, CMS, and health plans (Medicare-Medicaid Plans) to provide comprehensive, coordinated care in a more cost-effective way

**Managed Fee-for-Service (FFS) Model**
- Agreements between states and CMS under which states would be eligible to benefit from savings resulting from initiatives to reduce costs in both Medicaid and Medicare

**Informed by MN Senior Health Options (MSHO) experience**
- 65+ program aligning home and community-based services (HCBS) with Medicare D-SNPs
- MSHO enrollees had lower hospital and ED use, greater use of primary care, and more likely to use HCBS but no more likely to use long-term NF admission¹


Note: CMS and NY operate two separate capitated demonstrations, both in the New York City area.
Capitated model opportunities

• Integrating Medicare and Medicaid into one health plan product to align financial incentives

• Building in additional requirements into program design, health plan contracts with CMS/State
  • Dementia care specialists on care coordination staff (California, Rhode Island)
  • Process requirements for health risk assessments, care plans
  • Training for care coordination staff

• Reinforcement from CMS-State oversight teams to health plans

• Payment methodology includes ~3% withhold plans can earn based on performance on key metrics

• Benefit flexibility

• California-specific: Dementia Cal MediConnect Project
  • Administration on Aging grant to CA Dept of Aging, Alzheimer’s Greater Los Angeles
  • Trained health plan care managers, specialized training for dementia care specialists
  • Developed toolkits and training materials for care coordination staff
Promising practices

• Find and assess enrollees with dementia
  • Use of validated screening tool
  • Leverage claims data
  • Protocols and business processes built into plan systems

• Identify, screen, support care partner(s) as integral part of care team
  • Enrollee sets care goals, person-centered care plan
  • Integrate identification of care partner into plan systems
  • Screen, assess care partner needs
  • Train providers to support care partners, including better connections to LTSS

• Family-centered transitions of care
  • Care coordination protocols and communication tools and support

• Integrate community-based organizations in plan network
Challenges

• Promising practices don’t always translate into thorough implementation at health plan, even with contractual requirements
• Identification of at-risk beneficiaries
• Need models of true partnership between health plans and CBOs
• Identification and assessment of PLWD did not always result in referrals to CBOs or other supports
• Supports for care partners didn’t fully materialize
• Navigating authorized representative and power of attorney
• Care coordination staff turnover
• Skill development opportunities and capacity in health plans
• Market complexity (California, New York)
• Transitions in care and flexibility to adjust to life course of the disease
• Cost-effectiveness
Build the business case: translate to audience

- **Translate to the (growing) audience of states and health plans** implementing integrated care, investing in Medicare supplemental benefits, and growth:
  - State and local data on prevalence, costs
  - Demonstrate tools, data health plans can mine
  - Investments in LTSS can lead to reductions in ED/hospitalizations
  - Value in investing and integration in plan operations of evidence-based care coordination models for persons with dementia and integration
  - Supporting the care partner
  - Ongoing workforce and training
  - Value of CBOs

- **Growth in Medicare Advantage (MA)**
  - HCC codes for dementia (effective 1/1/2020)
  - Opportunities around flexibility in supplemental benefits
  - Growth in state interest to pull levers in state contracts with MA Dual Eligible Special Needs Plans
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• FAI State-specific evaluation reports are posted at: [https://www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-and-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-Office/FinancialAlignmentInitiative/Evaluations](https://www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-and-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-Office/FinancialAlignmentInitiative/Evaluations)
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My Approach Today...

• Will start by considering a critical feature of successful care delivery models and pose a few questions to consider in the context of considering integrated models for PLWD

• Then try to apply that construct to finding signals from the literature on successful approaches to integrating LTSS and medical care for PLWD

• All in service of identifying research gaps and opportunities in this space

• Will intentionally not talk about existing dementia-specific models of care – others will have presented them
Critical Feature of Successful Care Delivery Models: They Line Up 3 Things

- Targeted Population
- Care Model
- Outcome
Population-based Dementia Care Model

**Risk Stratification**

1st Tier (1%) 50 patients
- Many behavioral problems, severe functional impairment, minimal resources, comorbidities
- Frequent ED and hospital admissions

2nd Tier (2-5%) 199 patients
- Frequent behavioral problems, functional impairment, minimal resources, comorbidities
- Multiple ED and hospital admissions

3rd Tier (6-20% 746) patients
- May have behavioral problems and/or severe functional impairment, comorbidities

4th Tier (21-60%) 1990 patients
- Mild dementia
- Getting routine health care

5th Tier (61-100%) 1990 patients
- Mild dementia
- Getting routine health care

**Dementia Plan of Care**

1st Tier (1%) 50 patients
- Intensive individualized care, small-panel primary care, ACP, Palliative Care, UCLA ADC program, hospital strategies

2nd & 3rd Tier (2-20%) 945 patients
- UCLA ADC program, ACP, Neurology, Psychiatry consultations as needed

4th & 5th Tier (21-100%) 3,980 patients
- Caregiver education, referral and monitoring and usual care


Should severity play a prescriptive role?

Courtesy of David Reuben, MD
Which LTSS Services and for Whom? What is Need? (Nice to Have versus Must Have)

- Personal care services
- Case management
- Round-the-clock services
- Day services
- Home-based services: aide, personal care, companion, homemaker, chore
- Mental health and behavioral services, e.g. assessment, community tx, behavioral support
- Health services, e.g. medication management, health assessment, skilled therapies
- Financial management
- Nutrition support
- Transportation
- Caregiver support, e.g. respite, counseling
- And other services, etc

- Important Associated Issues
  - Assuring quality of services
  - Variability of services
  - State issues
  - How to dose LTSS?
  - How to mix LTSS?
  - Do services synergize? – positively or negatively?

What Does it Mean to Integrate LTSS and Medical Care? What are we Integrating with What?

- What is being integrated?
  - Payment, services, providers?
- What does play look like?
  - Parallel play aware?
  - Parallel play unaware?
- Are playing together...
  - A little, a lot?
  - In synch or getting in each other’s way
  - Who is the integrator?
- Integration may not guarantee results
- Integration may be needed, it may not - (may depend on the outcome)
What Sort of Medical Care Are We Integrating With and in What Setting?

Type and Setting Likely Matters a Lot!

- Ambulatory primary care?
- Home-based primary care? (USMM)
- Home-based palliative care?
- Hospital care?
- Skilled home health care?
- Nursing home?
- Assisted living?
- Within an integrated health system or the wild west?
- CVS and Walgreens?
Successful Approaches to Accomplish What? What Outcome Are We Designing For?

- Health service utilization – hospital, ED, home health, drugs, etc
- Total costs of care
- Out of pocket costs of care
- Nursing home admission / long term care costs
- Medication costs
- Time at home (not in hospital, not in nursing home)

- Patient care experience
- Patient quality of life
- Caregiver quality of life
- Respite care costs
- Time to institutionalization
- Mortality
- Other non-traditional outcomes
  - Occupancy rate – Assisted Living
Examples and Additional Issues to Keep in Mind
Integration to Little Effect & What Happens When Alignment Less than Perfect? The Example of Guided Care

**Targeted Population**
- Ambulatory Patients with High HCC Scores

**Care Model**
- **Embedded RN**
- Home visit, CGA
- Care planning w PCP, Pt, CG
- Monitoring
- Care coordination
- Transitional care
- CDSM
- CG support
- Access to community-based services

**Outcomes**
- Functional health (SF-36)
- Quality of Care
- Utilization

Integration to Substantial Effect: Home-Based Primary Care Integrated with Home and Community-Based Services (for PLWD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dementia Prevalence</th>
<th>Long-Term Institutionalization</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated HBPC and LTSS (N=721)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAH Qualified with HBPC Not Integrated with LTSS</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- HBPC addresses medical and social issues but needs LTSS to prevent long-term institutionalization
- Drivers:
  - 24/7 access – Peace of mind
  - Single source of medical care
  - Interrupted glidepaths
  - Addressing SDOH because access to the home puts SDOH front and center

Valluru. Integrated home and community-based services improve community survival among IAH Medicare beneficiaries without increasing costs JAGS 2019; 67:1495
Drivers of High-Cost Status Among Dual-Eligible Medicare and Medicaid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Persistent High-Cost</th>
<th>Transient High-Cost</th>
<th>Non-High-Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Comorbidities

- 7-10: 26% 32% 24%
- >10: 24% 46% 8%

Chronic conditions %

- Cognitive impairment/Intellectual Disability: 60% 19% 8%
- Emphysema: 15% 31% 14%
- Chronic Heart Failure: 24% 45% 16%

- Little spending in persistent high cost related to preventable hospitalizations – **most related to LTC**
- When HCBS services made available at program level, it has been hard to restrict them to persons who would otherwise go to a nursing home
- Models that effectively target HCBS for dual-eligible people who would otherwise be admitted to NH have potential to decrease spending for high cost patients

Value-Based Care and Quality Measures: Enabler or Barrier?

• Current quality measure sets for Medicare value-based care programs may create incentives for inappropriate care for certain PLWD and cause harm
  • HEDIS, MIPS, ACO measures, GPRO

• Need measures appropriate for sites of care and for vulnerable populations
Conclusions

• The design of successful approaches to integrating medical care and social supports requires some discipline in defining the target population, the care model and what success looks like – not an easy task

• Sometimes success may require integration, sometime it may not

• If integration is needed, must carefully select the types of medical and LTSS and modes of integration

• Sometimes success may require an approach that focuses only on PLWD but most of the time it may be better to partner

• Optimizing approaches to quality measurement and performance reporting at the federal level could help move these efforts forward
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Research Gaps and Opportunities
Research Gap and Opportunity 1

In the context of integrated/coordinated long-term services and supports (LTSS) and medical care for persons with dementia, determine what services are appropriate for integration/coordination, in what manner, for whom, toward what end, and with what payer arrangements.
Examine whether models of integrated/coordinated LTSS and medical care are best designed as carve out (separate) models or as add-in models integrated within the full health system; if separate models, clarify the (sub)populations of persons with dementia to whom they apply.
Develop, evaluate, and optimize approaches to quality measurement in the context of value-based care initiatives, so as to encourage and support optimal care delivery models and approaches for persons with dementia.
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