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Utilization in Context (Macro Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LTC</th>
<th>Acute care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$118,540,437,264</td>
<td>$145,542,016,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing homes</td>
<td>$43.8 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home health/personal care</td>
<td>$61.9 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rx drugs</td>
<td>$8.4 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Hospital</td>
<td>$56.9 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Medicaid spending for one drug, Abilify, in 2015 was $2B for 2 million prescriptions and 66 million doses.

Significant changes in recent years

Trends in Medicaid Total Spending for the Top 5 Drugs in 2015
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Objectives

• Describe the types of policy questions that can be answered using Medicaid claims and encounter data
  1. Descriptive
  2. Predictive
  3. Evaluative

• Describe the key challenges inherent in using Medicaid claims and encounter data for research

• Introduce analytic tools that have been created to help overcome challenges
Descriptive Uses (1)

• Snapshot-in-time reporting
  – Example: quality monitoring to support value-based purchasing
  – Why Medicaid claims data?
    • Facilitates standardized measurement
    • Sample sizes large enough to cover small, but high priority populations

• Related tools
  – Adult and Child Core Set
  – In development – new measures on vulnerable Medicaid beneficiaries, along with technical specifications
    • Dual-eligible, MLTSS, Innovation Accelerator Program populations
Descriptive Uses (2)

• Assessing beneficiary-level trajectories over time
  – Example: monitoring population health outcomes among priority subpopulations
    • Prescription drug adherence
    • Continuity of care after SUD detoxification
  – Why Medicaid claims data?
    • Consistent time series availability

• Related tools
  – Guide to using MAX data
  – Overview and guide to working with Medicaid claims data for questions about prescription drug use
Predictive Uses (1)

- Example application #1: Risk adjustment for rate setting and performance scoring of quality measures

- Why Medicaid claims data?
  - Standardized measurement
  - Consistent time series availability
  - Widespread availability

- Related tools
  - Technical specifications for condition groupers
    - Chronic Conditions Warehouse (CCW)
    - Chronic Illness and Disability Payment System (CDPS)
  - Standardized risk-adjustment algorithm for both dual eligible and non-dual eligible beneficiaries
  - Comprehensive guide for Medicaid-specific risk adjustment implementation
Predictive Uses (2)

• Example application #2: Developing risk scores to support population health initiatives (e.g., targeted case management)

• Why Medicaid claims data?
  – Standardized measurement
  – Widespread availability
  – Sample sizes large enough to cover small, high-priority populations of interest

• Related tools
  – How-to guide for state Medicaid purchasers
  – Instructive use cases for Medicaid beneficiaries with complex care needs and high costs
Evaluative Uses

• **Application: Evaluating the impacts of a policy change**
  – Can speak to current policy debates
    • *Delivery system redesign*: Implementing a risk-tiered case management intervention reduced inpatient hospital costs among target beneficiaries in Washington State
    • *The use of beneficiary financial incentives*: Using beneficiary financial incentives increased well-child visit compliance in Idaho

– **Why Medicaid claims data?**
  • Standardized measurement
  • Sample sizes large enough to cover small, high-priority populations of interest
  • Consistent time series availability; rigorous evaluation designs are inherently longitudinal
Limitation (1): Missing Data

• Sample coverage
  – Populations experiencing insurance churn
  – Managed care (MCO) data
  – Behavioral health organization (BHO) data
  – Dual eligible beneficiaries

• Limited clinical outcome measures

• Provider and MCO fields

• Related tools
  – Usability assessments for MAX MCO and BHO data
  – Technical assistance guides on linking Medicare and Medicaid data for dual eligible beneficiaries
  – Illustrative use cases of patient attribution in Medicaid Accountable Care Organizations (ACO)
Limitation (2): Making Comparisons

- A.k.a. answering the “compared to what?” question
- Finding external benchmarks for quality reporting applications
- Related tools
  - Publicly available data tools
    - SHADAC’s State Health Compare
    - Dartmouth Atlas
    - Core Set chart packs
- Making causal conclusions for impact analyses
  - Related tool
    - Evidence grading for impact analyses
    - In development: Regression-to-the-mean benchmarks for Medicaid beneficiaries with complex care needs and high costs
Limitation (3): Data Linkage

- Innovative applications of linked data analyses answering important policy questions
  - Descriptive: Maternity Core Set quality measures
  - Predictive: Santa Clara County Triage Tool for targeting case management for homeless population
  - Evaluation: a medical home for women with high-risk pregnancies that was piloted in Wisconsin and supported by linked vital statistics and Medicaid data

- But linking data across systems can be (very!) hard
  - Related tools
    - Instructive use cases from state Medicaid agencies
    - Technical assistance brief on linking Medicaid data with vital statistics data
Summary and Conclusions

• Medicaid claims and encounter data systems
  – Are powerful tools to answer critical policy questions
  – Serve as key data sources for emerging value-based purchasing initiatives across Medicaid programs
  – Require appreciable investment to use for research purposes

• Lots of good, free resources designed to help end-users navigate challenges

• Excited for the future
  – Especially on the missing data front
    • Transformed Medicaid Statistical Information System (T-MSIS)
    • Linkages across data systems both within and outside of health care sector
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Structure of Behavioral Health services before April 1, 2016

- Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS)
  - Regional mental health carve-out plans for SMI/SED population (RSNs)
  - County-administered outpatient SUD treatment system (including methadone)
  - State agency administers IP/residential SUD treatment system

- Health Care Authority (HCA - Washington’s single state Medicaid agency)
  - Outpatient mental health benefit for persons not meeting SMI/SED criteria
  - All mental health medications, regardless of prescriber
  - Other medication assisted treatment (mainly buprenorphine for OUD)

Structure of Behavioral Health services beginning April 1, 2016

- Phased transition to statewide FIMC plans under HCA oversight by 2020
  - Currently operating in 2 of 39 counties

- DSHS delivery systems administered by integrated regional BHO plans in regions not yet transitioned to FIMC
Measurement Approach

• Behavioral health integration changes how the state delivers Medicaid physical and behavioral health services through health plans, or county or state government agencies that performed health-plan functions such as:
  – Building and maintaining a provider network
  – Authorizing services
  – Managing utilization

• Evaluation approach uses tools commonly used to assess relative health plan performance:
  – HEDIS®
  – State-developed HEDIS®-like measures designed to fill measurement gaps in areas that are of particular importance to Medicaid clients with behavioral health needs

• Regression-adjusted difference-of-difference evaluation design
Testable Hypotheses

• Relative to the experience in regions operating with separate BHOs and MCOs, does delivering care through integrated FIMC plans:
  – Improve *access* to needed services?
  – Increase beneficiary *engagement* in behavioral health treatment?
  – Improve *quality* and *coordination* of physical and behavioral health care?
  – Reduce potentially avoidable *utilization* of emergency department (ED), medical and psychiatric inpatient, and crisis services?
  – Improve beneficiary level of functioning and quality of life, as indicated by *social outcomes* such as:
    ▶ Improved labor market outcomes,
    ▶ Increased housing stability, and
    ▶ Reduced criminal justice involvement?
  – Reduce *disparities* in access, quality, health service utilization, and social outcomes between Medicaid beneficiaries with serious mental illness and/or SUD, relative to other Medicaid beneficiaries?
Focus on Baseline Disparities
Medical Service Utilization

**Emergency Department Visits**
Per 1,000 MM • Adults Age 18-64
Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 71.7
- Serious Mental Illness: 145.1
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 196.7

**Inpatient Admissions**
Per 1,000 MM • Adults Age 18-64
Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 10.8
- Serious Mental Illness: 25.0
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 35.5

Access to Care

**Mental Health Service Penetration**
Adults Age 18-64 • State Defined Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 42.9%
- Serious Mental Illness: 51.3%
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 71.5%

**Substance Use Disorder Service Penetration**
Adults Age 18-64 • State Defined Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 26.6%
- Co-Occurring SMI/SUD: 27.3%
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 25.6%

**Access to Preventive/Ambulatory Care**
Adults Age 18-64 • HEDIS®-AAP Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 77.5%
- Serious Mental Illness: 96.0%
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 90.3%

Quality of Care

All Cause 30-day Hospital Readmission
Adults Age 18-64 • HEDIS-PCR
Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 15.9%
- Serious Mental Illness: 19.6%
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 20.4%

Psychiatric 30-day Hospital Readmission
Adults Age 18-64
Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 13.4%
- Serious Mental Illness: 12.8%
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 13.6%

Social Outcomes

Homeless
Narrowly Defined • Adults Age 18-64
Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 4.8%
- Serious Mental Illness: 7.1%
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 12.5%

Arrested
Any Crime • Adults Age 18-64
Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 6.5%
- Serious Mental Illness: 9.1%
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 18.9%

Employed
Part-time or Full-time • Adults Age 18-64
Statewide • CY 2015

- All Medicaid: 49.9%
- Serious Mental Illness: 33.4%
- Co-Occurring MI/SUD: 35.1%

Discussion

Extreme disparities in ED and inpatient utilization exist between persons with SMI and/or SUD, relative to the balance of the adult Medicaid population.

Disparities in homelessness and criminal justice involvement for persons with SMI and/or SUD mirror ED/IP utilization disparities.

Inpatient utilization rates better reflect disparities in inpatient risk than 30-day hospital readmission metrics.
The Promise T-MSIS Holds for Future Medicaid Utilization Research
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Roadmap

• Advances made by T-MSIS and their implications for research on utilization
  – New data files
  – New data elements
  – More timely, better quality
  – More efficient data storage and processing

• Examples of the kinds of research questions that would get fuller answers under T-MSIS

• A big assumption: that in time, the data will be available promptly and their quality will be high
  – Data availability, quality, and completeness still pose challenges, but with time, exploration, data use, technical assistance, and feedback, they will improve
Advances Made by T-MSIS
Managed Care Plan Information File

- A record for each managed care entity
  - Identified by state plan ID that is linkable to beneficiaries’ enrollment, capitation payments, and encounter records

Example Data Elements

- Profit status
- Service area
- Percentage of business in public programs
- Operating authority (e.g., 1115 waiver, 1932(a) state plan option)
- Reimbursement arrangement (e.g., risk-based, with or without incentives)
New Data Files (2)

• **Provider file**
  - A record for each provider serving Medicaid enrollees
    - Identified by a state-assigned identifier and linkable to claims and encounter records
    - Also captures National Provider Identification (NPI) if available
  - **Example Data Elements:**
    - Ownership and location
    - Group or association affiliation
    - Individual characteristics (e.g., sex, birthdate)
    - License/accreditation
    - Provider type and specialty
    - Whether accepting new patients
New Data Files (3)

• Third-party liability file
  – A record for each Medicaid enrollee who has some form of third party entity other than Medicaid and Medicare liable for payment of some or all medical expenses
    • Identified by an MSIS ID that is linkable to eligibility and claims/encounter records
  – Example Data Elements
    • Insurance plan ID, group number and effective date
    • Policy owner/relationship
    • Plan type (e.g., HMO, Dental, Long-Term Care, TRICARE)
    • Coverage type (e.g., inpatient, mental health, home health)
    • Annual deductible amount
Examples of Other New or Improved Data Elements (1)

• Beneficiary characteristics
  – Citizenship/immigration status, language, marital status, veteran, Social Security Disability (SSDI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI)

• Waivers
  – Expanded information about special programs and waivers (e.g., Money Follows the Person) on Eligibility file (e.g. enrollment dates, waiver ID, waiver type)
  – Attaching waiver ID (e.g. 1115 waiver) to service encounter records

• Dual eligible beneficiaries
  – Amount paid by Medicare on the claim
  – Medicare reimbursement type (e.g. fee schedule, prospective payment system)
Examples of Other New or Improved Data Elements (2)

• Diagnosis
  – Diagnosis present on admission flag to help identify certain preventable conditions

• Provider
  – Admitting, billing, referring, servicing, and operating providers identified as reported on claims/encounter records to allow tracking of provider roles and market consolidation

• Payment
  – Medicaid paid amount for encounter claims
  – Fixed-payment indicator
    • For premiums or fixed fee states pay providers (e.g. Primary Care Case Management)

• Rx
  – Drug utilization code indicating the conflict, intervention, and outcome of a prescription presented for fulfillment
Timeliness and Data Quality

• Submitted monthly instead of quarterly

• Front-end data validation rules in areas such as completeness and data element relational tests
  – Automated inferential measures that feed into a data quality compliance database for tracking

• Medicaid and CHIP Managed Care Final Rule (CMS-2390-F)
  – Strengthens state/managed care plan requirements to comply with MSIS/T-MSIS reporting requirements on encounter data,
  – Gives the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) the explicit option to withhold federal financial participation (FFP) if the data submitted do not meet its criteria for accuracy, completeness, and timeliness
  – Guidance provided to states recently on CMS’s expectations for reporting complete and accurate encounter data in T-MSIS*

Data Storage and Processing Management

• Efficiency gain, faster turnaround with data processing
  – Relational instead of flat file
  – Data storage and processing in the Amazon cloud
  – Distributed processing

• New Business Intelligence (BI) tools anticipated
  – SAS Enterprise Business Intelligence (EBI), Microstrategy, Tableau, Python, Databricks
  – Support for user-friendly graphs and charts, mapping and geocoding, interactive dashboard components, machine learning, and more
Examples of Improved Utilization Analyses: Past vs. Future
Understand Medicaid Managed Care Better

**Past**

- Incomplete and inconsistent encounter data
  - Not all states report them; when they do, usability varies
  - Limited analysis for a growing majority of beneficiaries
- Little knowledge about how much services cost managed care organizations (MCOs)
- Little information about the managed care plans
- Medicaid moving to value-based purchasing, but much of the quality measure and other data analytics development is restricted to fee-for-service (FFS)

**Future**

- States and MCOs are required to submit complete and accurate encounter data on time
- States are required to submit MCOs’ actual payment to providers for services (MEDICAID-PAID-AMT)
- Rich plan-level information
- Much better analytic capacity at all levels (e.g., managed care enrollee, plan, state) for issues of access, cost/value for care, quality, and program integrity
Utilization Among Beneficiaries with Complex Needs and High Costs (BCN)

Past

- Cost-based BCN definitions are only applicable to FFS beneficiaries
- Most cross-sectional descriptive analyses of medical service utilization among Medicaid-only beneficiaries
- Little knowledge about other important factors that make this population’s needs “complex”: socioeconomic conditions, behavioral health, living arrangements, use of other social services

Future

- Managed care enrollees may finally be included
- More time points and enrollee characteristics to conduct longitudinal analysis and predictive modeling with finer granularity
- More data on location of beneficiaries, plans, and providers to accommodate geocoding (e.g., heat map of ED visits, provider network serving BCN)
- Possibly better linkage with census and other data to understand non-medical risk factors and service use among BCN
Final Thoughts (1)

- Using the data to answer real-world questions will help identify data limitations, demonstrate the utility of T-MSIS, and incentivize states to submit high quality data on time in the future.

- A practical question: CMS required all states to stop reporting MSIS and start reporting T-MSIS data for a reporting period no later than October 2015, but some states stopped reporting MSIS and started reporting T-MSIS earlier. How will researchers deal with the transition years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Submitted via MSIS</th>
<th>Submitted via T-MSIS</th>
<th>No data submitted yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50 states</td>
<td>1 state</td>
<td>0 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Thoughts (2)

• Research-friendly T-MSIS Analytic File (TAF)

• Related systems under Medicaid and CHIP Business Information Solution (MACBIS)

• Data linking can increase research capacity exponentially

• Standardized reporting from T-MSIS could potentially relieve burden on states; at the same time, improve timeliness, consistency, reliability, and transparency
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Questions?

Webinar audience can submit questions for our speakers now using the Q&A widget at the bottom of the webinar interface.

Please state whether your question is for a specific panelist.
Prior Moving Medicaid Data Forward Forums

- **Understanding T-MSIS, the Transformed Medicaid Statistical Information System**
  https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/events/moving-medicaid-data-forward-part-1

- **Medicaid Enrollment: Overview and Data Sources**
  https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/events/moving-medicaid-forward-part-2
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