

Assessing Progress in End-of-Life and Serious Illness Care

National Academy of Medicine

May 23, 2016

Policies & Payment Systems

NOTES—BREAKOUT SESSION 1

Barriers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of outcome data (patient/family experience is the outcome, family/proxy survey in population-wide way); denominator problem • HC system rewards interventions • Move from system focused on services to efficiency may burden caregivers • Culture in health care sees medical and social services as disconnected (Health plans often can't pay for social services) • Because many patients often receive many interventions before palliative care and hospice services, inability to show cost savings of these services • How to connect learning over past few decades, including of hospice development, with outpatient and community based care models and other care models • Number of board certified physicians (ratio of physicians to patients who need this type of care) 	
Solutions/Opportunities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data/information, patient/family experience is the outcome, family/proxy survey in population-wide way • Find where system rewards value • Make sure to avoid unintended consequences of cost shifting to caregivers • Harness data in health care to help identify patients who need conversations about services including palliative care and hospice (go beyond provider as gatekeeper) • Tie payment to patient choices for care (MA) • Change system to require opt-out of palliative care • Interdisciplinary models, incentivizing interdisciplinary care • Expand or enhance definition of provider depending on care needed • Policy review 	
Other	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Person-centered language (does our policy reflect this?) 	
Top Priority Action Items (limit to 3-5)	
	Actor(s)
1	<p>Outcome measures: Build from surveys of family members/proxy; review surveys that have been done; implement population-wide/more broadly; Investment in quality measures (they require agreement on defining denominator)</p> <p>CMMI CMS Private companies (transparency of models) States Academic medical centers Associations</p>
2	<p>Test financial models that deliver high-quality care that pay for patient-centered outcomes and reward interdisciplinary care (properly designed incentives, measurements, adequate</p> <p>Private sector/Foundations Payers</p>

	transparency, appropriate accountability)	
3	Tie payment to people's choices; Get care inconsistent with patient wishes listed as medical error (need for definition of medical error from federal level)	CMS Payers Congress
4	Change system to make palliative care services the default (comanagement);	
5	Well-defined accountability system	CMS (COP) Accrediting bodies (NCQA) Foundations