

Medicare Managed Care Data Deemed Good Start

BY JOYCE FRIEDEN

Associate Editor, Practice Trends

WASHINGTON — Knowing which Medicare managed care plans provide high-quality care is a good idea, but Medicare beneficiaries will need more information to figure out which providers to see within a particular plan, Glenn M. Hackbarth, J.D., said at a meeting of the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission.

In Boston, for instance, “If you’re a

Medicare beneficiary trying to get good health care, knowing that Harvard Pilgrim Health Care is ranked number one doesn’t tell you at all where to go *within* the Harvard Pilgrim network to get really outstanding care,” said Mr. Hackbarth, a Bend, Ore., health care consultant who is chairman of MedPAC. “That’s something that needs to be understood about plan rankings.”

The commission staff ranked about 150 Medicare Advantage plans, which are

managed care plans offered to Medicare beneficiaries. Senior analyst Niall Brennan presented their work.

To assess the plans, staff members looked at plan scores on nine different measures within the Health Plan Employer Data and Information Set (HEDIS) database. The researchers looked only at HMO plans; PPO and fee-for-service programs within Medicare Advantage were excluded because they weren’t required to report on all HEDIS measures.

Measures included breast cancer screening, β -blocker treatment after a heart attack, antidepressant medication management, hypertension management, osteoporosis management, cholesterol management, follow-up after mental illness, and colorectal cancer screening. One additional measure, diabetes care, counted double in the scoring, Mr. Brennan said.

Scores were calculated based on how well each plan did compared with other plans—for instance, a plan that scored above the 90th percentile on a particular measure received 1 point, while a plan that scored between the 75th and 90th percentile received a 0.88. Ten points constituted a perfect score.

Mr. Brennan noted that the total scores of the plans the staff evaluated ranged from 1.2 to 9.8.

If the HEDIS score ‘looks like a good measure for implementing a pay-for-performance program, I’d like to step back and say that it isn’t.’

And different measures had very different levels of result. For example, “giving β -blockers after a heart attack is a well established quality measure, and plans tend to score very highly on it,” he said. “Other measures [such

as osteoporosis management] are a little lower and more widely dispersed.”

In general, bigger plans seemed to perform better, with plans that had more than 50,000 enrollees having an average HEDIS score of 7.5 compared with an average of 5.7 for plans with fewer than 10,000 enrollees. Not-for-profit plans had slightly higher scores than did for-profit plans. And while there was not a lot of geographic variation, Boston area plans did score “significantly higher” in terms of quality, Mr. Brennan said.

Scores also appeared to remain stable over time: 74% of the plans in the lowest quartile in 2003 remained in the lowest quartile in 2004. “The results of our analysis are quite interesting, and highlight the need for a pay-for-performance program in Medicare Advantage, and the feasibility of using HEDIS data for differentiating among Medicare Advantage plans,” he said.

MedPAC commissioners, however, were not sure how useful the scores would be, especially if the quality data were supposed to be used as the basis for a pay-for-performance plan. “If this looks like a good measure for implementing a pay-for-performance program, I’d like to step back and say that it isn’t,” said Commission Vice-Chair Robert D. Reischauer, Ph.D., president of the Urban Institute.

Mr. Hackbarth noted that beneficiaries needed to look at more than just managed care plans. For plan data to be really useful, “beneficiaries ought to be able to compare plan offerings and choices to the ambient level of quality of fee-for-service Medicare in that same community,” he said. “We’re moving in the right direction, but there are a host of questions about how you do these things.” ■

Skin & Allergy News®

JOINTLY SPONSORED BY
 **CME**
 CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION

Managing Actinic Keratoses: A Review of Recent Advances

Register for this archived webcast at
www.managingactinickeratoses.com

There is no fee required to attend this activity

Today’s View of Actinic Keratosis: A Snapshot

James M. Spencer, MD, MS, Chairman
 Professor of Clinical Dermatology
 Mount Sinai School of Medicine
 New York

Scientific Basis of Skin Cancer

Mark H. Goldgeier, MD, FAAD, FABIM, FACP
 Clinical Assistant Professor of Medicine
 University of Rochester Medical Center
 Rochester, N.Y.

When and Why Should Actinic Keratoses Be Treated?

Arielle N.B. Kauvar, MD
 Director
 New York Laser & Skin Care
 Clinical Associate Professor of Dermatology
 NYU School of Medicine
 New York, N.Y.
 Co-Director of Procedural Dermatology
 SUNY Downstate
 Brooklyn, N.Y.

Management of Actinic Keratoses: Current Options and Patient Selection

Daniel M. Siegel, MD, MS
 Clinical Professor of Dermatology
 SUNY Downstate
 Brooklyn, N.Y.

Imiquimod in AKs: A Study of Cosmetic Outcomes

Albert M. Kligman, MD, PhD
 Professor of Dermatology
 Department of Dermatology
 University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine
 Philadelphia

Slide Clinic and Commentary:

A Series of Case Studies Presented by:
Mark H. Goldgeier, MD, FAAD, FABIM, FACP
James M. Spencer, MD, MS
Daniel M. Siegel, MD, MS

Intended Audience

This activity has been developed for dermatologists and other health care professionals involved in the diagnosis and treatment of actinic keratoses.

Educational Objectives

By reading and studying this supplement, participants should be able to:

- Discuss the epidemiology of actinic keratoses (AKs), the geographic differences in incidence, and the prevalence of these lesions in individuals with various Fitzpatrick skin types.
- Explain what is currently known about the etiopathogenesis and carcinogenic potential of AKs.
- Describe the clinical presentation of AKs and the characteristic features that distinguish AKs from seborrheic keratoses, invasive squamous cell carcinoma, and other lesions.
- Discuss the rationale for treating AKs.
- List and describe the options now available for treating AKs, and discuss patient selection issues.

AMA Physician’s Recognition Award

This activity has been planned and implemented in accordance with the Essential Areas and Policies of the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) through the joint sponsorship of the Elsevier Office of Continuing Medical Education (EOCME) and SKIN & ALLERGY NEWS. The EOCME is accredited by the ACCME to provide continuing medical education for physicians.

CME Credit Statement

The EOCME designates this educational activity for a maximum of 2 AMA/PRA category 1 credits toward the American Medical Association (AMA) Physician’s Recognition Award (PRA). Each physician should claim only those hours of credit that he/she actually spent in the educational activity.

Faculty Disclosure

It is the policy of the EOCME that all faculty must disclose relevant financial relationships with any commercial interest. Full faculty disclosure is made available on www.managingactinickeratoses.com.

Commercial Support

This activity is supported by an educational grant from

3M Pharmaceuticals