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Overview—what is the issue?

• Difference in reimbursement rates between hospital-owned practices (most specifically, the Academic Medical Center) and independent practices for same medical services.

• Legislature’s concern:
  • Lower relative reimbursements for independents → financial strain → loss of independent practices?
  • Increased consolidation and growth of hospital-owned practices → greater out-of-pocket costs for consumers and greater health care costs for the state?
A Deeper Dive into the Reimbursement Differential, Health Care Consolidation and Clinician Landscape

• Literature review to understand national trends in provider consolidation

• Data analysis on reimbursement differential in Vermont

• Stakeholder work group meetings to address reimbursement differential

• VT Clinician landscape study (Survey and focus groups)

• Public Board Meetings
1. Both nationally and in Vermont, more providers are choosing employment in hospitals and health systems rather than practicing independently. This has led to greater consolidation in health care.

2. Multiple factors explain the trend toward more hospital-based employment including growing costs and challenges of running a business, ACA incentives to integrate, and provider preferences for consistent schedules and salaries. Commercial reimbursement is not a primary reason for providers to choose employment in hospitals. Salaries are not likely to be higher in hospital-based settings.

3. Fee-for-service rate differentials exist between hospital-based practices and independent settings for professional services. In Vermont, the largest differential exists between the academic medical center and other providers.

4. Adjusting fee-for-service rates through regulation is complex and will have impacts on consumer premiums and out-of-pocket costs, hospital budgets, as well as access and quality of care.
National Trends in Consolidation

The health care system nationally is transforming

FROM:
Diverse network of independent hospitals, clinics, physician practices

TO:
More concentrated system with one or more academic medical centers in full or partial control of surrounding community hospitals, physician practices and post-acute care facilities

Market concentration in U.S. has increased 40% since mid-1980s
  - horizontal (hospitals buying hospitals)
  - vertical (hospitals buying physician practices)

“Only 33% of physicians identify as independent practice owners or partners, down from 48.5% in 2012.”

~ 2016 Survey of America’s Physicians: Practice Patterns and Perspectives; Physicians Foundation
State Trends in Consolidation

VT’s health care system is transforming as well

- According to market research firm SK&A, VT trends mimic national trends:
  - In 2011 47% of VT providers were independent while 53% were hospital-employed (recall, nationally, it was about 49% independent in 2012)
  - In 2017 31% of VT providers are independent while 69% are hospital-employed (recall, nationally it was about 33% independent in 2016)

- In VT, most of the transition occurred among specialists
  - Between 2011 and 2017, the proportion of specialists who practice independently fell from 44% to 23%
  - Between 2011 and 2017, the proportion of primary care providers who practice independently fell from 54% to 46%
Key Points

1. Both nationally and in Vermont, more providers are choosing employment in hospitals and health systems rather than practicing independently. This has led to greater consolidation in health care.

2. Multiple factors explain the trend toward more hospital-based employment including growing costs and challenges of running a business, ACA incentives to integrate, and provider preferences for consistent schedules and salaries. *Commercial reimbursement is not a primary reason for providers to choose employment in hospitals. Salaries are not likely to be higher in hospital-based settings.*

3. Fee-for-service rate differentials exist between hospital-based practices and independent settings for professional services. In Vermont, the largest differential exists between the academic medical center and other providers.

4. Adjusting fee-for-service rates through regulation is complex and will have impacts on consumer premiums and out-of-pocket costs, hospital budgets, as well as access and quality of care.
Literature Review:
Factors driving national consolidation

- Literature describes several main reasons physicians are seeking employment or affiliation with hospitals and health systems (note: commercial pay disparities is not one of them)

  - High costs associated with EMR implementation
  - Increasing measurement and reporting requirements
  - Challenges and risks of running a complex business
  - Income security
  - ACA and ACO incentives to integrate health care systems
  - Lifestyle preferences (e.g., consistent schedules, less call)
VT Clinician Landscape Survey

**When:**

Fielded an electronic survey (SurveyMonkey) between 8/10/2017 – 8/22/2017

**Completed Responses:**

- 404 clinicians
- 91 clinicians (23%) practicing independently
- 313 clinicians (77%) are employed by AMC, community hospital, FQHC/rural health clinic

**How:**

We requested distribution of survey link via:

- Vermont Medical Society
- Hospital Systems
- Bi-State Primary Care
- VT HealthFirst

**Demographics:**

- Primary care (30%)
- Pediatrics (9%)
- Specialty (61%)
- HSA: all represented
Satisfying Factors: Independent Clinicians

Source: GMCB Provider Landscape Survey, 2017

- Stronger patient relationships/ability to spend time with patients: 77%
- Opportunity to run own business/Autonomy over how practice is managed: 74%
- Flexibility and choice over my work schedule: 53%
- Autonomy in medical decision-making: 44%
- Direct responsibility for practice costs: 11%
- Opportunity to make my own technology decisions: 11%
- Opportunity to work with colleagues: 10%
- Direct oversight of billing, paperwork and other administrative responsibilities: 4%
- Level of my income: 4%
- Certainty of my income: 1%
- Managing my own professional liability: 1%

91 respondents
**Frustrating Factors: Independent Clinicians**

- **Billing, paperwork and other regulatory and administrative burden**: 68%
- **Uncertainty of my income**: 49%
- **Burden of running own business**: 46%
- **Technology burdens and/or lack of access to the latest technology**: 30%
- **Level of my income**: 22%
- **Direct responsibility for practice costs**: 21%
- **Hours are longer or less flexible than I would like**: 21%
- **Limited opportunities to work with colleagues**: 9%
- **Responsible for my own professional liability**: 7%

*Source: GMCB Provider Landscape Survey, 2017*
Satisfying Factors: Employed Clinicians

- Not having to run own business: 63%
- Not directly responsible for high practice costs: 56%
- Opportunities to work with colleagues: 46%
- Certainty of my income: 45%
- Less regulatory paperwork, billing and other administrative burden: 27%
- Stronger patient relationships/ability to spend time with patients: 14%
- Access to better and/or the latest technology: 13%
- Flexibility and choice over my work schedule: 12%
- Level of my income: 9%
- Autonomy in medical decision-making: 4%

Source: GMCB Provider Landscape Survey, 2017
Frustrating Factors: Employed Clinicians

Source: GMCB Provider Landscape Survey, 2017

- Less control over practice management: 71%
- Compliance, paperwork, billing and other administrative burden: 57%
- Lack of control over work schedule: 37%
- Level of my income: 36%
- Not having opportunity to run own business: 19%
- Patient relationships not as strong as I would like/ Lack of time with patients: 18%
- Lack of autonomy in medical decision-making: 12%
- Lack of access to better and/or the latest technology: 11%
- Uncertainty of my income: 8%
- Fewer opportunities to work with colleagues: 6%

313 respondents
Greatest Threats: Independent Clinicians

- Regulatory and other administrative burdens: 44%
- Health care reform payment models: 34%
- Medicaid reimbursement: 33%
- Commercial reimbursement: 31%
- Challenges/Costs associated with running an independent practice: 16%
- Medicare reimbursement: 10%
- Electronic Health Records (EHR): 8%

Source: GMCB Provider Landscape Survey, 2017
Greatest Threats: Employed Clinicians

- Regulatory and other administrative burdens: 60%
- Health care reform payment models: 37%
- Medicaid reimbursement: 28%
- Electronic Health Records (EHR): 21%
- Medicare reimbursement: 13%
- Commercial reimbursement: 4%
- Ability to access latest technology: 4%

Source: GMCB Provider Landscape Survey, 2017
Which best describes your professional morale and your feelings about your current employment?

- Very positive/optimistic: 23% independent, 20% employed
- Somewhat positive/optimistic: Independent, 42% employed, 47%
- Somewhat negative/pessimistic: 24% independent, 27% employed
- Very negative/pessimistic: 11% independent, 7% employed

Source: GMCB Provider Landscape Survey, 2017
Next Three Years

Independent Clinicians

- Continue practicing as I am: 66%
- Retire: 15%
- Cut back on hours or work part-time: 15%
- Merge with another independent practice and/or expand staffing: 4%

74 respondents

Employed Clinicians

- Continue practicing as I am: 69%
- Cut back on hours or work part-time: 14%
- Retire: 12%
- Seek a non-clinical job within health care: 3%
- Switch to cash/concierge practice: 1%
- Switch to independent practice: 1%

284 respondents

Source: GMCB Provider Landscape Survey, 2017
Takeaways from VT clinician survey

• Independent clinicians like the autonomy and flexibility that running their own practice provides while employed clinicians like not having to deal with the burdens and high costs of running their own practice.

• Both independent and employed clinicians are frustrated by the administrative burdens.

• Independent clinicians identify the uncertainty of their income as a frustration whereas employed clinicians identify the level of their income as a frustration.

• Whether independent or employed, the greatest threats to practicing in Vermont are seen to be regulatory/administrative burden, health care reform payment models and Medicaid reimbursement.

• Even with these frustrations, most clinicians plan to continue practicing in the coming years as they are today.
2017 Medscape Physician Compensation Report

Who Earns More: Employed or Self-employed Physicians?

- Employed:
  - Specialties: $287K
  - Primary Care: $214K
- Self-employed:
  - Specialties: $368K
  - Primary Care: $223K

1. Both nationally and in Vermont, more providers are choosing employment in hospitals and health systems rather than practicing independently. This has led to greater consolidation in health care.

2. Multiple factors explain the trend toward more hospital-based employment including growing costs and challenges of running a business, ACA incentives to integrate, and provider preferences for consistent schedules and salaries. Commercial reimbursement is not a primary reason for providers to choose employment in hospitals. Salaries are not likely to be higher in hospital-based settings.

3. Fee-for-service rate differentials exist between hospital-based practices and independent settings for professional services. In Vermont, the largest differential exists between the academic medical center and other providers.

4. Adjusting fee-for-service rates through regulation is complex and will have impacts on consumer premiums and out-of-pocket costs, hospital budgets, as well as access and quality of care.
## Average allowed amount per primary care service*, Vermont Blueprint practices, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMERCIAL payers</th>
<th>Blueprint practices</th>
<th>Avg. allowed amount</th>
<th>Services per patient</th>
<th>Allowed PMPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FQHC/RHC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$95.66</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>$17.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Medical Center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$167.58</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>$27.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$99.72</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>$21.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Hospital</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$103.31</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>$19.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Blueprint practice roster and VHCURES claims data, CY2015

*Primary care services as defined by primary care work group in 2015.
1. Both nationally and in Vermont, more providers are choosing employment in hospitals and health systems rather than practicing independently. This has led to greater consolidation in health care.

2. Multiple factors explain the trend toward more hospital-based employment including growing costs and challenges of running a business, ACA incentives to integrate, and provider preferences for consistent schedules and salaries. Commercial reimbursement is not a primary reason for providers to choose employment in hospitals. Salaries are not likely to be higher in hospital-based settings.

3. Fee-for-service rate differentials exist between hospital-based practices and independent settings for professional services. In Vermont, the largest differential exists between the academic medical center and other providers.

4. Adjusting fee-for-service rates piece-meal through regulation is complex and will have impacts on consumer premiums and out-of-pocket costs, hospital budgets, as well as access and quality of care.
Achieving Site Neutral, Fair Reimbursement for Medical Services: Long Run Solution

- Vermont is moving away from fee-for-service payments toward system-wide value-based payment reform

- One Care ACO model offers prospective, population-based payments, calculated using the historical expenditures of attributed members from all participating payers.

- Reduces emphasis on fees for individual services (and the disparities therein)

- Capitation/global budgeting gives flexibility to redirect pool of dollars to better support preventive, primary care and improve health care outcomes.
Regulatory Actions: Short Run

• **Hospital Budgets**: FY2018 budget order directed UVMMC to reallocate an $11.3 million proposed reduction in professional fees to site neutral services (~300 E/M codes in both primary and specialty care) in order to close the gap.

  • As a result, UVMMC “estimated the gap in reimbursement levels is reduced to approximately 10%.”

  • BCBS confirmed that the Board’s adjustment reduced the reimbursement differential by 34% for key E/M services and that consumers “will no longer be surprised by dramatically different reimbursement for the same fundamental healthcare practices”.
Regulatory Actions: Short Run

• **Rate Review**: In 2018 QHP filings, the Board ordered reductions in the medical trend with the intention that the reduction would come from negotiating rates downward to promote parity in reimbursements and reflect actual cost of care rather than site of service. Specific language used:

“We reasonably expect that insurers will vigorously negotiate rates with the hospitals, including those that are outside our borders, in a way that promotes parity in reimbursements between academic medical centers, community hospitals and independent providers. Provider reimbursements should reflect actual costs of care rather than site of service.”
Regulatory Actions: Short Run

• **ACO budget**: GMCB gave conditional approval contingent upon the following:
  
  • OneCare must submit a payment differential report that describes its Comprehensive Payment Reform Pilot’s payment methodology and analyzes how the capitated payments for primary care services under its program compare to the payments hospitals make to primary care providers that are not participating in the pilot.
  
  • The report must also address how the Comprehensive Payment Reform pilot reduces administrative burden for primary care providers.
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• Provider reimbursement report materials are available on the GMCB website:
  • http://gmcboard.vermont.gov/publications/legislative-reports/provider-reimbursement-reports

• April 27, 2017 Board meeting materials:
  • UVMHN Presentation - Act 54 and Act 143: "Fair and Equitable Payments" and Site Neutrality
  • GMCB Act 143 Update