

A Collaborative Strategy

for Better Care,

Healthier People,

and Affordable Costs:

***Recommendations to
King County Executive Ron Sims***

**King County
Health Advisory Task Force**

June 14, 2004

Health Advisory Task Force Membership

Co-Chairs

Alvin J. Thompson, M.D., MACP, Internist

Edward Wagner, MD., MPH, Director
MacColl Institute
Group Health Cooperative

Richard K. Onizuka, PhD, Director
Policy, Data and Legislative Relations
Washington State Health Care Authority

Charles Royer, National Program Director
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Urban
Health Initiative

Task Force Members

Larry Chapman, MPH, Chairman
Summex

Michael Cochran, Benefits Manager
Washington Mutual

Richard Feldman, Executive Director
Worker Center – King County Labor Council

David Fleming, Director
Global Health Initiatives
Gates Foundation

Sally Fox, Director
Employee Health Services
City of Seattle

Thomas Fritz, Chief Executive Officer
Inland Northwest Health Services

Annette King, Director
Benefits & Savings
Starbucks Coffee Company

Daniel Lessler, MD, Associate Professor
University of Washington

Jodi Palmer Long, Associate General Counsel
Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center

David Saperstein, MD
University of Washington

Andy Stergachis, PhD, RPh, Professor
Epidemiology, Pharmacy
University of Washington

Mike Stuart, MD, President
Delfini Group, LLC
Clinical Assistant Professor
University of Washington

Jay Tihinen, Assistant Vice President
Benefits
Costco

Debbie Ward, RN, PhD, Associate Professor
University of Washington

Cindy Watts, PhD, Professor
Health Services
University of Washington

Ana White, Senior Benefits Manager
Microsoft Corporation

Staff to the Task Force

Judith Clegg, President
Clegg and Associates

Robert Cowan, Director
Finance and Business Operations Division
King County Department of Executive Services

Elaine Kraft, Communications Director
King County Executive Office

David Lawson, Manager
Executive Audit Services
King County Office of Management and Budget

James Lopez, Senior Fellow
King County Executive Office

Kathleen Oglesby, Labor Liaison
King County Executive Office

Kerry Schaefer, Manager
Benefits and Compensation, Human Resources Division
King County Department of Executive Services

Paul Tanaka, County Administrative Officer
King County Department of Executive Services

Deb Thalasis, Senior Policy Analyst
King County Office of Management and Budget

Dorothy Teeter, Chief of Health Operations
Public Health - Seattle & King County

Caroline Whalen, Deputy County Administrative Officer
King County Department of Executive Services

Table of Contents



Executive Summary	i
Section I. The Business Case for Quality	1
Section II. Findings: Our Health System Today	6
Section III. Findings: What Works.....	14
Section IV. Recommendations.....	22

Executive Summary

The Purpose of the Task Force

In December 2003, King County Executive Ron Sims convened a broad-based leadership group, *The King County Health Advisory Task Force*, to develop an integrated strategy to address the systemic problems facing the health care system in the Puget Sound region. In particular, the County Executive requested that the Task Force focus on three inter-related issues:

- The increases in health care costs for both patients (employees and their families) and purchasers (employers who buy coverage through benefits plans)
- The quality of care provided by health professionals
- The importance of improving the health of the community


The Task Force Membership

The Task Force included a number of self-insured employers (employers who manage the insurance risks of their employees internally as opposed to through health insurance plans), experts in the health care arena, including physicians, a nurse practitioner, legal, labor and economic experts, and a pharmacist. The Task Force was chaired by two local experts who have numerous years of experience in improving the health care system, Alvin J. Thompson, M. D. and Edward Wagner, M.D.

In addition to relying on its own expertise, the Task Force invited outside experts to assist in its deliberations, including Sally Trude, Ph.D., Senior Health Researcher, Center for Health System, Dr. Arnie Milstein, Medical Director of the Pacific Business Group on Health, and David Lansky, Ph.D., President of the Foundation for Accountability (FACCT).

The Health System Today

The current system of health care financing and delivery can best be depicted by a series of disconnected strategies (Graphic 1) all working concurrently but without a system steward, or neutral leader, to coordinate them and ensure that they are achieving the optimal mix of cost, quality, and health outcomes.



Graphic 1: What Our System Looks Like Now

This lack of systemic leadership and absence of agreement on what the system is intended to accomplish has resulted in an unsustainable approach to health care in the Puget Sound region.

The Key Outcomes

The Task Force began its work by creating a critical foundation - agreement on a set of intended outcomes for the region's health care system:

- A. Increase the likelihood and predictability that King County employees and other health care beneficiaries in the Puget Sound Region will receive high quality, patient-centered health care services
- B. Mitigate increases in personal costs/financial responsibility for health care benefits for King County employees by implementing strategies to effectively reduce the increase in total health care expenditures
- C. Increase the involvement of King County employees and other health care beneficiaries in the Puget Sound region in managing their own health and ability to act as partners with providers in making evidence-based health care decisions.
- D. Develop a system in which health plans, providers, purchasers and employees use shared health information and technology to continuously improve health outcomes and decrease medical errors.

The Importance of an Integrated Strategy

During the course of its discussions the Task Force recognized that achieving these four outcomes requires the integration of financial, insurance, and health care delivery strategies on a regional basis. It also concluded that the current health care system is not structured to allow for systemic and sustainable change in cost, quality, and health improvements. For example, although the health care literature has documented that managing diabetes to attain better health and cost outcomes may require electronic registries, group visits, nutrition advice, and telephonic support by provider teams, it is not common for provider reimbursement schemes or benefit designs to include financial incentives and payment contracts that reward or support this approach.

In order to achieve this type of systemic and long lasting improvement, the Task Force realized that a coordinated set of changes must be supported by the four key partner communities in the health

system: practitioner, purchaser, patient, and health plan. Each group plays a critical role in an integrated approach to health care:

- The purchasers require clinical advice from the practitioners about how best to structure benefits to achieve better health at lower costs.
- The health plans need to bridge the needs of purchasers, patients, and providers in supporting the systems for change.
- The providers need to understand from patients how best to deliver convenient and high quality care.
- The patients need to understand how to best seek and receive care that is most likely to improve their health at the most optimal costs.

The Task Force's Recommendations: An Integrated and Collaborative Approach

In carefully examining how to bring about this type of system change, the Task Force concluded that there is currently no organizing mechanism for ensuring that these four groups work together effectively to improve health in the region. To fill this void, the Task Force is recommending the creation of a regional partnership to provide the leadership necessary to implement an integrated set of system improvement strategies. Such a partnership will serve as the central reference point and leadership body for the health care players that are dedicated to improving health and health care in the Puget Sound region.

In order to bring about changes in the health system, the Task Force recommends that this partnership build on what is known to be effective as the basis for making improvements to the delivery and financing mechanisms at play in the Puget Sound region. Key elements of what is effective that will be integrated into the partnership's strategic approach include:

1. Chronic disease management to improve health, quality and cost outcomes. Local examples of success are included in this report.
2. Scientific evidence to guide providers and patients to attain better health.
3. Data driven clinical quality feedback to improve provider performance.

4. Quality and payment strategies to effectively reinforce each other.
5. Alignment of health care benefit design with high quality clinical delivery models.
6. Opportunities for practitioners to learn together with similar avenues for patients.
7. Evidence based formularies and the systems to support them to reduce costs.
8. Decreasing practice variation to improves quality and decreases costs.
9. Preventive care to improve health and save money in the long run.
10. Employer and purchasers involvement to ensure that the dollars spent in health care are used wisely on best practices.
11. Quality measurement and reporting to support practice improvement and allow patients to seek appropriate care.


The Starting Point

The Task Force recommends that the Partnership support building the necessary components to achieve optimal outcomes for the health system in the Puget Sound region. It recommends that this work be organized around five areas of health care delivery:

- Chronic disease services
- Acute and episodic care
- Prevention services
- Safety practices
- Service quality.


The Partnership will ensure the integration of evidence-based clinical decision support, with evidence-based patient education and self-management tools, and will provide the infrastructure to support provider-based learning collaboratives for quality improvement. It will also build a system to analyze and report on quality and cost outcomes in the region. This data will be used as a

resource for all partners to continually create aligned health and financial strategies for the population of Puget Sound. The following graphic depicts the Partnership's activities:



Graphic 2: The Collaborative Process

By conducting this type of integrated, collaborative approach, the Partnership will move the health system to an aligned approach that is able to achieve affordable costs, better care, and healthier patients. Graphic 3 shows what this aligning of interests looks like:



Graphic 3: Aligning Interests

Aligning Interests to Achieve Change

The Task Force considered the difficulties in moving towards its vision of a high quality, affordable health care system. There are always market dynamics that can serve to obstruct such a vision. However, in numerous dialogues with all parts of the health care system, there is a uniform sentiment that there must be major change.

The current system is unsustainable. Each community of participants must play a significant role. If even one element of the health care system does not participate, it is impossible to achieve optimal outcomes for the region. Patients are increasingly interested in the care they receive and how to positively affect their health. Providers want to do what is best clinically for their patients and are requesting financial payment to support it. Purchasers are engaged and willing to try something

new. Health plans have experience and ideas about how to positively effect change. Public health and other governmental and policy-making entities are actively creating strategies to support healthy lifestyles.

The Task Force believes that enough is known in the fields of science, finance and actuarial risk, public health, technology, quality measurement, health-seeking behavior, health care delivery, and quality improvement to activate a partnership for better care, healthier people and affordable costs. By providing the needed leadership, the Partnership can use this knowledge to bring about a new system.

The Puget Sound region is home to world class innovation and expertise in the fields of technology, health care, and science. There is nothing standing in the way of improving the health and the health care for the residents of Puget Sound. The partners are ready; the Task Force recommends immediate formation of the Partnership to provide the leadership necessary to move the region forward.

Section I. The Business Case for Quality

In December 2003, King County Executive Ron Sims convened a broad-based leadership group, *The King County Health Advisory Task Force*, to develop an integrated strategy to address the systemic problems facing our health care system. In particular, the County Executive expressed his intention that the Task Force address three inter-related issues:

- Increasing health care costs facing employers and employees
- Questions about the quality of care
- Concerns about the community's health.

As the cornerstone of the Task Force's efforts, the County Executive invited a number of other large, self-insured employers to join the County in bringing about significant changes in the region's health system: Microsoft, Washington Mutual, Costco, Starbucks, the City of Seattle, and the State of Washington became critical members of the Task Force. In addition, the membership included experts in the health arena: physicians, industry executives, a nurse practitioner, a pharmacist, an economist and a labor representative.

To ensure that the Task Force had the leadership necessary to accomplish this effort, Mr. Sims appointed Alvin J. Thompson, M.D. and Edward Wagner, M.D. as co-chairs. Both of the co-chairs brought many years of experience to the Task Force's charge.

Mr. Sims encouraged the group to develop a portfolio of strategies that includes both short-term and long-term approaches. He expressed concern that the current escalating costs and stagnating of quality in health care require that the Task Force develop some strategies that can deliver short-term results i.e., progress within one to two years.

I refuse to sit back and allow the county and its employees to be victims of these seemingly uncontrollable cost increases. Further, I refuse to accept there are only two choices: reducing benefits to our employees and their families, or paying crippling annual increases. Tweaking the edges of the problem will no longer work.

- Ron Sims

"Creating a road map for health-care reform" Seattle Times: Friday, November 14, 2003.

Increasing Costs Brought Us to the Table

The purchasers of care who joined the Task Force - as well as other employers locally and nationally - are facing an urgent need to effectively contain the rise in employee health care costs. For example, if the current rate of cost increases experienced by King County government continues at approximately 15% per year, the County will incur an increase in premium spending from \$124 million per year in 2003 to \$249 million per year in 2008. This staggering rate of increase and the underlying factors contributing to the County's trend are the same issues threatening to overwhelm employers locally, regionally, and nationally.

Nationally, health spending accounts for over 15 percent of the nation's economy.¹ Projections put health spending at 17.7 percent of gross domestic product by 2012.² Projecting today's trends forward, hospital care and prescription drugs will account for much of this overall increase both locally and nationally.³

Much of the cost increases relates to care for chronic conditions (which patients and providers can work together to manage) and catastrophic events (which are unpredictable and therefore not amenable to management).⁴ The experience of health plans which cover King County employees, and which are typical of other large employers, reflect the following distribution of costs:


- 10% of the total work force have chronic and catastrophic conditions; these individuals accounted for 70% of the claims dollars in 2002.
- 64% of the members (including employees and their family members) had claims of less than \$1,000 and represented only 7% of the claims dollars.

Graphic 1 below demonstrates the potential costs savings to employers when they bring about systemic improvements and manage four key components that impact health care costs: the plan; the financials; health behaviors; and health systems.

We've said publicly that we are not going to turn our back on our people, but the hard facts are that we are on a collision course with time. And there has to be a significant level of reform. There has to be, I think, some partnership between government, business and the consumer in which we're going to see a change, a significant change so that companies like Starbucks can continue to provide this opportunity.

*- Howard Shultz,
Chief Executive
Officer of Starbucks*

Determining the potential savings



Figures from Watson Wyatt Worldwide

Improving Quality of Care is the Path to Containing Costs

Numerous studies have shown that significant “waste” in the American health care system results from inadequate quality of care including excessive services and redundancy, under-treatment of risk factors and predictable conditions, and inappropriate treatment. The Dartmouth Center for Evaluative Clinical Science states that 20 to 30 per cent of health care spending in the United States is spent on procedures, visits, drugs, hospitalizations, and treatments that do not improve quality or extend life.⁵ The Institute of Medicine in Washington, D.C., estimates that health care costs could be reduced by 25 percent if inappropriate care were eliminated.⁶

In support of these findings, data from the National Committee for Quality Assurance’s (NCQA) show that regardless of what health condition a person has, or whether care is provided by a public or private plan, the quality performance of our health care system varies widely.⁷ This inconsistency takes a significant financial toll, costing the nation more than \$1 billion dollars in avoidable hospital bills each year.⁸ In addition, the associated nearly 41 million missed worked days result in an estimated loss of \$11.5 billion in revenue for American businesses.⁹

The President’s Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the

Health Care Industry,¹⁰ the Institute of Medicine (IOM),¹¹ and/or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, have drawn attention to the fact that health care is too often inappropriately delivered, is of poor quality, and is unsafe. The IOM report, *To Err is Human*, published in 2000, stated that approximately 98,000 preventable deaths occur each year because of medical errors.¹² A 2003 New England Journal of Medicine report based on the Community Quality Index Study found that the study patients were receiving only about 55% of recommended care across various conditions and treatments.¹³ That study concluded that “the gap between what we know works and what is actually done is substantial enough to warrant attention”.¹⁴

Other studies on using evidence-based guidelines give an indication of the actual costs when providers do not follow these guidelines. A report published by the American Medical Association on April 21, 2004 reports that greater adherence to evidence-based guidelines for the management of hypertension could save \$1.2 billion nationally each year.¹⁵

There is Room for Improvement in Cost and Quality Performance

Even in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, many people do not understand or believe that there is a quality problem. Many think that the care delivered by their doctors, or in their community, is better than the care delivered in the nation as a whole. Most perceive their care to be individualized to their needs or requests. However, a recent Harris interactive survey found that only one-third of Americans age 50 or over agreed that the chronically ill receive adequate care.¹⁶

Recent research conducted by RAND Health entitled the Community Quality Index (CQI) Study confirms this public perception of chronic diseases.¹⁷ Published in May 2004, the CQI provides a comprehensive examination of how effectively health care is delivered in Seattle and eleven other metropolitan areas. For example, the study documented the following findings specifically for Seattle:

- People with diabetes received just 54 per cent of the recommended care.
- Individuals requiring cardiac care received 60 per cent the recommended

We hope this study stimulates a dialog among patients, doctors, employers, hospitals, and insurers in these 12 communities...about the best local solutions to these serious deficits.

- Elizabeth A. McGlynn, PhD, Associate Director of RAND Health and co-author of study

care.

The conditions selected for the CQI study represent 52 percent of all ambulatory care utilization and 46 percent of hospital utilization. There is a strong correlation between the conditions selected for this study and those the Task Force is recommending for emphasis in its strategy. The deficits in care documented for these conditions in the CQI Study present serious concerns relating to health outcomes and translate into thousands of preventable complications and deaths per year as shown in the table below:

Condition	What RAND Found	Potentially Preventable Complications or Deaths (US annual)
Diabetes	Average blood sugar not measured for 24%	2,600 blind; 29,000 kidney failure
Hypertension*	Less than 65% received indicated care	68,000 deaths
Heart attacks*	39-55% did not receive needed medications	37,000 deaths
Pneumonia*	36% of elderly received no vaccine	10,000 deaths
Colorectal cancer*	62% not screened	9,600 deaths

*Source: Woolf SH, "The Need for Perspective in Evidence-Based Medicine," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 282, 1999, pp. 2358-2365.

A Commitment to Action

Following its discussions on the impacts of rising health care costs and the national research indicating opportunities to improve care as an approach to containing these costs, the Task Force members agreed to take a quality improvement approach to the problem. With this framework in mind, the group turned its attention to gaining a more complete understanding of dynamics driving the health system in the Puget Sound region.

Section II. Findings: Our Health System Today

One of the Task Force's most important actions was to take a critical look at how the health system in our region functions now. By carefully examining the system's current strengths and weaknesses, the group was able to identify the most important areas to focus on for improvement. For example, the following scenario could happen in our system today:

Scenario A (now):

A mother seeks help for her child's worsening asthma from her provider (physician, nurse practitioner, etc.). Unfortunately, the provider is not equipped with up to date guidelines to guide the use of medications, assessment instruments to determine severity, or patient education tools to teach the parent and child how to effectively manage the asthma. As a result the child has not received medication to prevent further attacks, and the family remains ill-prepared. Several days later the child has a serious asthma attack; the mom calls in sick to work in order to take her child to the emergency room for treatment. Following treatment at the emergency room, the mother returns home with her child. The mother still does not know how to effectively manage her child's asthma; she has missed a day of work; she has incurred emergency room costs (paid in part by her self-insured employer and in part by herself); and her child is still at risk.

The Task Force's intent is to change this scenario to the one below:

Scenario B (following system improvements):

A mother seeks help for her child's asthma from her provider (physician, nurse practitioner, etc.). Her provider has access to state of the art evidence-based decision support guidelines and assessment instruments and patient education tools for reference and use in treating the asthma and for teaching the mom and the child how to manage the asthma. Several days later the

child is taking appropriate controlled medications, is monitoring his/her condition and is able to avoid a serious asthmatic attack. The mom and the child know what to do – they have the tools the provider gave them and put them to use immediately. The child is able to go to school; the mother goes to work; there is no trip to the emergency room; there are no unnecessary costs incurred.

The Constituencies that Comprise Our System

To better understand the factors underlying Scenario A and B, the Task Force looked closely at the constituencies that make up our system:

Health Professionals (Providers):

A wide range of clinicians deliver the health services in our system today. Physicians, nurse practitioners, nurses, pharmacists, public health staff all play a role in working directly with patients to improve their health. These clinicians provide a full continuum of health care services, including prevention, primary care, specialty care, and hospital care. Pharmacists play a critical role in working with providers and patients to ensure the safe and effective use of medications.

Consumers (Patients):

A diverse array of people comprise the population that receives care in our health system. Some segments of this population receive health care benefits through their employers. Other groups obtain their care through government-sponsored programs such as Medicaid and Medicare, and sadly many have no health insurance. And broadly speaking, all patients are community members for whom public health initiatives are created to control disease, help people with addictions such as tobacco and alcohol, and improve healthy lifestyles through exercise and diet.

Purchasers:

Employers are the source of health coverage for many people through the health benefits they provide. The government is the purchaser for others via



programs such as Medicaid and Medicare. Purchasers of care can play a critical role in ensuring that the care they are purchasing is effective in improving their beneficiaries' health and that it is affordable. Many large employers operate on a self-insured basis, i.e. managing the risk for their workforce themselves, and contracting with third party administrators to process the claims for their employees.

Health Plans:

Health insurance plans are the fourth component of our health system. While some large employers (including governments) do not use insurance plans to manage their risk, most medium and smaller employers provide their employees with health coverage through health plans, e.g., Aetna, Community Health Plan of Washington, Group Health Cooperative, Molina, Premera, and Regence.

After looking at the evidence and these constituencies, the Task Force considered the following fact and questions: *We have a healthcare system that does not provide quality care at an affordable cost. Why is there no **system steward**, a neutral entity that is providing integrated leadership for the system; Who is integrating the cost and quality strategies for each of the key players in the health arena, and Who is pulling together the different components to achieve the best value (cost/quality)?* The Task Force realized that without a system steward, it is impossible to create a health system that successfully balances the needs of all of its constituencies and achieves a healthier population at an affordable cost.

The current system of health care financing and delivery can best be depicted by a series of disconnected strategies (Graphic 2) all working concurrently but without a system steward to coordinate them and ensure that they are achieving the optimal mix of cost, quality, and health outcomes.



↑ Costs ↓ Quality ↓ Health

Graphic 2: What Our System Looks Like Now

The Impact of Market Forces

Given that a considerable body of knowledge is available to support the provision of quality care and improve people's health at an affordable cost, why hasn't the health system in the Puget Sound region made more progress in that direction? To answer this question, the Task Force examined some of the economic and structural dynamics that have discouraged the development of a common regional infrastructure to support the achievement of top quality outcomes, better health, and decreased costs.

In a 2004 article Len Nichols, Paul Ginsberg, et al conducted an analysis of whether market-based reforms by themselves will produce the urgently needed improvements in the efficiency and quality of the nation's health care system.¹⁸ They outline *four* key areas where market forces may work against accomplishing significant improvements in health systems.¹⁹

1. Provider Market Power

Large groups of providers can refuse to contract with specific health plans unless the providers are able to influence key terms of the agreement. In these situations, for example, providers might use this power to negotiate rates of reimbursement or to ensure their placement in preferred provider networks. In addition, providers may use consumer preference to force purchasers to include them in their network based on consumer demand rather than cost and quality performance.

2. Large Provider System Inefficiencies

Efficient provider systems are difficult to create in the current environment. The consumer demand for large provider networks has made it difficult for provider groups to focus on defined patient populations for whom they are uniquely responsible. There are still some examples of effective provider groups that are willing and able to bear risk, thereby allowing them to invest in the tools and infrastructure

necessary to provide high quality and cost effective care.

3. Employer Attempts to Control Costs

Employers are encountering difficulties in pushing the system towards efficiency and quality. The preference for broad networks by large heterogeneous workforces has led employers to offer similar plans through different carriers. Employers may respond to recent large premium increases by either passing more of the premium costs to employees or "buying down" the actuarial value of their benefit packages. A frequent way of doing this is to increase patients' cost sharing at the point of service. Employers do not have confidence in this approach, and are beginning to seek other solutions.

4. Competition Among Plans

Health plan competition is not working effectively. Distinct provider networks that compete on cost and quality are not a significant market force in the Puget Sound region. Health plan dynamics have devolved to competing on things such as administrative efficiencies, customer service related to claims payment, and increasing market share to better negotiate discounted reimbursement rates.

Other Systemic Problems

Systems as complex as health care are not able to easily organize themselves into highly functioning, cost effective entities. Nichols, Ginsberg et al point out that market forces alone do not provide sufficient control to create a high functioning health care system; in fact they contribute currently to the problems of mediocre quality and runaway cost inflation.²⁰ They also note that regardless of the market dynamics in effect, there are policy and strategy approaches that high quality systems must incorporate to achieve cost and quality gains.²¹ These include:

- state of the art evidence-based medicine;
- data for comparing quality among providers so that consumers,

providers, health plans, and purchasers can make informed choices about how to design insurance programs, purchase or seek care, and whether to seek particular services in specific patients' cases;

- investment in health information infrastructure, at the provider level and at the more aggregate population levels, to track both care being provided *and* to assess it for quality and cost outcomes;
- governmental facilitation of research and collaboration among providers and quality accreditation bodies; and
- community-based conversations with all parties discussing how to take the next steps in addressing quality and cost concerns.²²

In examining the current health system in our region, it is clear that there are a number of key infrastructure elements that are missing. In order to correct the current imbalances in the market, we must create the following infrastructure elements:

1. A *forum and delivery mechanism* through which it is possible to develop, disseminate, and continuously update a set of uniform evidence-based guidelines and decisions, support tools for professional and patients.
2. A *trusted central repository* of evidence-based patient education and self-management tools that enable patients to effectively manage their health care decisions and health behaviors.
3. A *common measurement system* for routinely collecting, analyzing, and reporting on results of quality and cost improvement. To be effective, this system requires both data exchange technology, data base management, and expertise in clinical measurement, analysis, and reporting of performance.
4. A *region-wide support system* for supporting collaboratives or other learning initiatives to support practice systems change and provider improvement. There are discrete local examples where this approach has been effective:

COAP (Clinical Outcomes Assessment Project) and the Diabetes Collaborative funded by the Institute for Healthcare Improvement are both success stories in this region.

5. An *organized forum* where the impacts of various benefit designs and provider payment methodologies are studied and placed in alignment with cost, quality, and health improvement goals.
6. A *regional leadership forum* where purchasers, plans, patients, and providers can work collaboratively to design and implement the strategies that will improve the health system.

The Importance of not “Reinventing the Wheel”

During the course of its deliberations the Task Force learned a great deal about the *local initiatives* originating among purchasers and providers. In addition, the group invited experts from other parts of the country to share their results and ideas. As a result of these discussions, the group has also learned a great deal about *innovative and successful health system improvement efforts*, both here and in other parts of the country. The Task Force recommends that we learn from these examples and incorporate their insights into our efforts.

Section III. Findings: What Works

Creating a health system that improves health, provides high quality care, and is affordable is not an easy goal to accomplish. A number of communities throughout the United States have tried to bring about major, systemic improvements in the health systems. A few have succeeded; many more have failed.

A wide range of current studies describes state-of-the-art approaches to improving quality as a key driver for achieving gains in health status at an affordable cost:

1. Chronic Disease Management Offers Successful Models

There are proven models for managing chronic disease that both improve health and drive down costs.

For example, the Task Force received information from *four local groups* of practicing physicians which described their experience and their actual and projected cost for quality gains from implementing planned, proactive systems of care for and managing diabetes.

- The *Northwest Physician Network* has a team of instructors teaching primary care practitioners how to move from an acute, episodic model of caring for chronic disease to an active management model, and in two years time has reduced HbA1C averages for its diabetic population from 7.4 to 6.9.
- *The Everett Clinic* reports scoring above the 90th percentile nationally on three diabetes test rates (HbA1C, LDL and Microalbumin) since the inception of its diabetes program. In addition, The Everett Clinic has quality improvement teams working on asthma, hypertension and congestive heart failure.
- In a letter to the Task Force, *The Polyclinic* also indicated two-year

returns on improved quality performance of its diabetic patients, with a 30% increase in patients with HbA1C < 7%, and a 25% increase in patients with LDL cholesterol < 100.

- *Group Health Cooperative* provided information that documented several dimensions of improved performance in diabetes care over a six year timeframe. The percent of diabetics with documented foot exams increased by 70% over a six year period. The percent of patients obtaining a retinal eye exam has increased 35%. As of February 2004, the percent of patients with HbA1C less than 8.0 is 67%.

The cost savings from such approaches are reported to exceed the investments made in building these planned systems of care. Northwest Physicians report that they use the cost savings to invest in new quality improvement efforts. The Polyclinic estimates that with a fully implemented diabetes care system, their 2000 diabetic patients (or their payers) could save as much as \$600,000 annually. Group Health's experience indicates an 11% cost savings over a two year period, resulting from 26% fewer inpatient days, 30% fewer unnecessary visits to physicians, and an 11% increase in needed pharmaceuticals.

These provider organizations uniformly state that aligning health benefit design and physician payment methods with proven methods of delivering chronic disease care are *key* to the ongoing success of managing chronic diseases.

These models of planned care require the use of current evidence about what constitutes effective treatment; measurement systems for providers and patients to use to monitor and improve both the care provided and the self-management plans; and information systems (patient registries) for providers to keep track of the care provided for various clinical subpopulations.

2. Scientific Evidence to Guide Care is in the Hands of Providers and Patients

There is wide variation in the availability of sound scientific data for treatment of various clinical conditions. Depending on the clinical area, such scientific evidence exists for 20% to 82% of medical interventions.²³

The challenge now is to make sure that physicians have up-to-date evidence-based information at hand when they are treating or advising their patients. The May 2004 RAND study demonstrated that fewer than 65% of those with hypertension received the indicated care, resulting in 68,000 potentially unnecessary deaths and a great deal of unnecessary care.²⁴ If both patients and physicians had access to the needed information and it was integrated into practice, this cost and quality gap could be more easily closed.

3. Feedback Improves Provider Performance

Providers are more likely to improve the quality of their care if they have credible information available that describes how they are managing key conditions. For example, quality improvement reports that indicate that only a fraction of his/her hypertensive patients are being treated according to indicated guidelines can help the practice focus on improving that percentage and sustaining a higher level of performance.

4. Quality and Payment Should Go Together

The implementation of payment and reimbursement systems that reward high quality reinforces the notion that misuse, under-use or overuse of health care resources leads to poor quality. David Cutler, a health economist at Harvard, points out that medicine is the only industry in the United States where high quality is reimbursed at no higher rate than low quality.²⁵ The current method of payment pays for what is done, not for what is accomplished.

5. Providers Learn Best Together

Providers prefer to learn and improve in collaborative environments where they can share knowledge and expertise. There is a growing national push to improve the care of chronic diseases, for example, through the use of organized regional learning and improvement collaboratives. Providers embrace the idea of improving care for their patients, and will support systems of financing and delivery that keep this as the aim. In a recent meeting with key medical leaders in the Puget Sound region, physicians noted that collaboratives are a good training ground for care improvement and encouraged the development of a more robust infrastructure and financing mechanism to support them.

6. Aligning Benefits and Needs is Essential

Improved quality and lower costs can result when we align health benefits design with health care needs. The Wall Street Journal (May 10, 2004) featured Pitney-Bowes's use of a counter-intuitive approach to pharmacy co-pays as a means of improving quality and lowering costs. Instead of raising the co-pay costs for drugs to treat asthma and diabetes, the company lowered them. Previously, the patient's share of these drugs was as high as 50%. Under Pitney-Bowes new approach, the patient was responsible for only 10%. Because these patients could then afford to purchase these needed drugs, they were able to manage their chronic disease more effectively and avoid the need for higher expense care. As a result, the overall annual cost of care for the median asthma patient fell 15% and the cost for the median diabetes patient fell 12%.²⁶ (See Appendix A for a more in-depth discussion of these issues.)

7. Evidence-based Formularies Reduce Costs

The implementation of pharmacy systems that support the use of less costly yet equally effective drugs bring costs down. The transition to these evidence-based formularies requires a strong education and support system for both providers and patients as they learn to use them in ways that support high quality care.

8. Decreasing Practice Variation Improves Quality and Decreases Costs

There is currently unnecessary and unexplained variation in treatment regimens for conditions such as low back pain. It is possible to decrease this practice variation by analyzing the clinical decision-making practices of physicians. John Wennberg at the Center for Evaluative Clinical Sciences, Dartmouth points out that rates of underlying illness do not account for differences in spending among regions.²⁷ The Center found about 41% of practice variation is driven by the supply of physicians and hospitals rather than by the demand for the care they provide.²⁸ Wennberg has found that improved health does not result from more money being spent, and that, in fact, excessive care can cause harm.²⁹

9. Investments in Quality Improvement Pay Off

The National Committee for Quality Assurance 2003 Report notes that there *are* health plans performing at high quality levels.³⁰ This provides evidence that investments in clinical guidelines, measurement reporting and analysis, quality improvement infrastructure, and ongoing monitoring assist providers in achieving and maintaining high levels of performance.

10. The Web is an Information Source for Patients

Consumers are increasingly relying on web-based information for help in making informed health care decisions. They are looking for accessible, easy to understand information and decision support about their health, their health care decisions, and about the quality of the providers they can access.³¹ The web offers the opportunity to make up-to-date, accurate information available at a reasonable cost.

11. Preventive Care Improves Health and Saves Money

Preventive care has a critical role to play in improving the community's health and keeping health care costs under control. The May 2004 RAND study noted that 36% of seniors did not receive their flu vaccine. This

resulted in 10,000 deaths (and numerous more unnecessary visits to the doctor for flu symptoms and treatment.). A 2002 study on the impact of the flu in the workplace, published in the Annals of Internal Medicine, estimated that the annual spate of influenza cost employers nearly \$400 per employee in lost work and medical expenses, costs that could be easily avoided by inoculation.

12. Employers Have a Critical Role to Play

There are currently evidence-based approaches to implementing employer-based prevention and chronic disease management programs. These efforts offer employers the opportunity to focus on what they can do to prevent misuse, under-use, or overuse of care by providing employees and family members with proven approaches to play a greater role in their own health and reduce their utilization of health care services (See Appendix B for a thorough presentation of employer-sponsored prevention and chronic disease management examples.).

13. Patients Have a Critical Role to Play

All of the systems we create must ultimately influence patients to play an active role in managing their own health, selecting quality, cost-effective health care and complying with best-practice treatments regimens. In the final analysis it is the patient who is making the choice to seek and receive care. The following is a checklist from the Foundation for Accountability (FACCT) on achieving patient-centered systems:

FACCT Strategies for Achieving a Person-centered Health Care System

1. We require our plans to have consumer representation on their Board of Directors and all advisory, strategic and quality management committees.
2. We require our plans and providers to disclose quality performance information, and we provide our employees with

comparative quality information.

3. We encourage our plans and provider systems to collaborate with other health plans and provider systems within our community to adopt common data standards and create interoperable clinical information systems so they can exchange appropriate data with each other.
4. We encourage our plans and provider systems to reward providers that adopt Computer Physician Order Entry and Electronic Medical Record systems.
5. We encourage our plans and provider systems to provide patients with access to online medical information.
6. We encourage plans and provider systems to use incentives in their provider contracts for superior quality and safety performance.
7. We participate in pay-for-performance programs to reward our health plans for superior quality and safety performance.
8. We work with our employees to help them understand the costs of their care options and make responsible decisions.
9. We sponsor in-house dialogues for employees on universal coverage, options for benefit designs and the trade-offs facing society.
10. We encourage our employees to seek care from providers that offer new patient-centered services, including same-day appointments, e-mail consultations, electronic medical records and chronic care management.
11. We educate our employees about evidence-based medicine and emerging standards for safety and quality, and encourage them to seek care from providers who follow these standards. We offer health risk assessment and chronic disease monitoring tools to our

employees on our health Web pages.

12. We are working with public schools in communities where we're located to train youth to become smarter health care users and citizens.
13. We provide visibility and recognition to higher quality and safer hospitals and doctors.
14. Our government relations staff monitors state and federal legislation affecting health care safety and quality, and advocates for public policy that ensures better information is available to the public and greater consumer involvement in policy formation.

Section IV. Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Align Quality and Cost

The Task Force has found that essentially all the local players in the health care system (patients, providers, purchasers, and plans) are unhappy and searching for solutions. Today's sense of frustration is in sharp contrast to the 1980's when providers were defending the system in the face of escalating costs. Currently, major concerns relating to safety, quality, clinical variation, and cost are broadly shared and there is a strong interest in working collaboratively to make systemic improvements.

This motivation to work together stems from a variety of dynamics at play throughout the Puget Sound region. For example, we have a good model to align health improvement, quality improvement, cost sharing, and cost containment strategies. To support this alignment, database, data exchange, and data sharing technologies have matured and can be scaled to address regional solutions. Clinical quality and cost measures are available to create meaningful performance profiles and to direct and support improvement efforts.


Furthermore, the clinical community is supportive of the ideal of evidence-based practice, seeks common guidelines and tools, and is interested in working on implementation. On the patient side, increasing public awareness of gaps in quality and interest in ensuring high quality and sustainable costs is evident. Employers and plans appear are ready to invest in innovative health care benefit contracting provisions and health improvement programs.

The Task Force members recognize that no one sector of the health care system can achieve cost and quality outcomes alone. We also realize that if one sector is not aligned in the methods and approaches for achieving better quality, more sustainable costs and improved health, it will not be possible to achieve our intended outcomes.

“Imagine a solo violinist, a solo cellist, a pianist, a clarinetist—all playing beautifully, but taking no notice of each other. Dissonant; noisy; unpleasant. This is the sound presented to patients and health plan members by health plans, physicians, and hospitals in most regions in our country. We would all benefit from a regional collaboration and alignment, from regional health care orchestras.”

*Gorden Mosser,
M.D., Executive
Director of the
Institute for Clinical
Systems
Improvement (ICSI)
in Minneapolis
Minn.*

The successful achievement of these impacts calls for the active participation of and collaboration among all health care sectors. Clinicians, hospitals, purchasers, employers, health plans, and patients who live and work in the Puget Sound region have a critical role to play in aligning the health care benefits, health plan products, clinical interventions, care delivery systems, consumer education services, and financial reimbursement systems necessary to make improvements in quality and contain costs. Graphic 3 depicts the Task Force’s concept of the process by which the health system’s constituencies will work together to achieve better care at an affordable cost.



Graphic 3: The Collaborative Process

The Vision

Endnotes

- ¹ Pear, R. “Health Spending Rises to Record 15% of Economy,” The New York Times, 9 Jan., 2004
- ² Id.
- ³ Id.
- ⁴ Halverson G, Isham G, “Epidemic of Care,” (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2003) ch.14
- ⁵ <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~cecs/>
- ⁶ Id.
- ⁷ National Committee for Quality Assurance, “The State of Health Care Quality 2003” (Washington, DC, NCQA, 2003), Executive Summary
- ⁸ Id.
- ⁹ Id.
- ¹⁰ President’s Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry. “Improving Quality in a Changing Health Care Industry, Chapter One: The State of Health Care Quality: How Good Is Care?” 18 July 1998, <http://www.hcqualitycommission.gov/final/chap01.html>
- ¹¹ Institute of Medicine, “Insuring America’s Health: Principles and Recommendations,” Jan 2004, <http://www.iom.edu/file.asp?id=17732>
- ¹² Committee on Quality of Health Care in America, Institute of Medicine, “To Err is Human,” (Washington DC, National Academy Press, 2000), p.1
- ¹³ McGlynn EA, Asch SM, Adams J, Keesey J, Hicks J, DeCristofaro A, Kerr EA. “The Quality of Health Care Delivered to Adults in the United States,” New England Journal of Medicine, 26 June 2003, pp. 2635-2645
- ¹⁴ Id.
- ¹⁵ Fischer M, Avorn J, “Economic Implications of Evidence-Based Prescribing for Hypertension,” The Journal of American Medical Association, 21 April 2004, p. 1850-1856
- ¹⁶ <http://www.harrisinteractive.com>
- ¹⁷ Rand Health Research Highlights, “The First National Report Card on Quality of Health Care in America,” May 2004, <http://www.rand.org/publications/RB/RB9053/RB9053.pdf>.
- ¹⁸ Nichols L, Ginsburg P, Berenson R, Christianson J, Hurley R, “Are Market Forces Strong Enough to Deliver Efficient Health Care Systems? Confidence is Waning,” Health Affairs, Mar/Apr 2004, pp. 8-21
- ¹⁹ Id.
- ²⁰ Id.
- ²¹ Id.

²² Id.

²³ See Rand Health Research Highlights

²⁴ Id.

²⁵ Brownlee, S “The Overtreated American,” The Atlantic Monthly, 1 Feb, 2003

²⁶ Kaisernetwork.org, Daily Reports, Daily Health Policy Report, “Health Care Marketplace | Wall Street Journal Examines Efforts by Companies to Lowwer Health Care Costs by Using Tiered Health Plans,” 10 May 2004, http://www.kaisernetwork.org/daily_reports/rep_index.cfm?hint=3&DR_ID=23625

²⁷ John E. Wennberg J, Fisher E, Skinner J, “Geography And The Debate Over Medicare Reform,” Health Affairs, 2003

²⁸ Id.

²⁹ Id.

³⁰ See National Committee for Quality Assurance (2003), Executive Summary

³¹ Taylor H, Leitman R, “eHealth’s Influence Continues to Grow as Usage of the Internet by Physicians and Patients Increases,” Health Care News, 17 April 2003

³² National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Center for Disease Control and Prevention, “The Importance of Physical Activity and Good Nutrition,” http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/aag/aag_dnpa.htm

³³ www.leapfrog.org

³⁴ Farley D, Haims M, Keyser D, Olmstead S, Curry S, Sorbero M, “Regional Health Quality Improvement Coalitions: Lessons Across the Life Cycle,” (Santa Monica, Rand Corporation, October 2003) p. 54

³⁵ Id. p. 56

³⁶ Id.

³⁷ Id. p.13

³⁸ Id. p.53