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Patients First: Action Plan for Health Care

Sets the stage for the next 3 years of transformation

- On February 2, the Minister announced *Patients First*, the next phase of Ontario's plan for changing and improving Ontario's health system.
- It exemplifies the commitment to put people and patients at the centre of the system by focusing on putting patients' needs first.
- This plan focuses on four key objectives and four policy pillars:

| Policy Pillar: | Improve System Integration, Accessibility | Modernize Home and Community Care | Increase the Health and Wellness of Ontarians | Ensure Sustainability and Quality |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Government Promise</strong></th>
<th>Open, transparent, accountable, effectively managed government that provides value for tax dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Health Promise** | **Patients First**  
• *a caring, integrated experience for patients*  
• *faster access to quality health services*  
• *for all Ontarians at every life stage* |

| **Access:** | Improve access – providing faster access to the right care |
| **Connect:** | Connect services – delivering better coordinated and integrated care in the community, closer to home |
| **Inform:** | Supporting people and patients – providing the education, information and transparency they need to make the right decisions about their health |
| **Protect:** | Protect our universal public health care system – making evidence based decisions on value and quality, to sustain the system for generations to come |
The Journey So Far

**The problem was clear**

- Health outcomes were not what they should be
- The fiscal environment required us to get better value from our investments
- System was fragmented, operated and funded in silos
- Lack of accountability and transparency
- Patients were confused – about where to go
- If unchecked, changing demographics would result in higher costs to the system

**A plan was set in motion**

- Ontario’s Action Plan for Health Care (Jan. 2012) is the foundation for transformation
  
  "Make Ontario the healthiest place in North America to grow up and grow old"
- Access, quality, and value drive improvements – focus on right care, right time, right place
- Two years in, progress has been made:
  - 99 of 105 recommendations from the Drummond Report are fully or in progress towards implementation

**Key elements are in place**

- A quality regime is in place (ECFA) – needs to expand beyond acute sector & become more transparent to consumers
- Integrated coordinated care is showing early results – intensifying Health Links as clinical networks is essential
- A focus on patient engagement is taking hold – need to empower people and discuss rights & responsibilities
- Funding reform has just begun – bold approaches to procurement and entitlements needed
Funding in the Past

Health Service Providers received 75-90% of their funding in lump sums (global budgets)
- Few opportunities to change funding to meet the demands of the populations being served
- Little incentive to improve performance or quality
Health System Funding Reform

Evidence-based funding approach based on:

- Best available evidence and best practices
- Number of patients or residents cared for
- Types of services delivered
- Needs of the populations served

- 637 Long-Term Care (LTC) Homes
- 87 Hospital Corporations
- 14 Community Care Access Centers (CCACs)
Hospital Snapshot

• As of Dec 2014, there are 155 hospitals in Ontario
  – 88 HSFR Hospitals
  – 57 Small & “Other” Hospitals
  – 6 Private Hospitals
  – 4 Specialty Psychiatric Hospitals

• The 88 HSFR Hospitals receive a portion of their base funding through HSFR
  – The HSFR hospitals have been divided into facility types of Teaching, Large Community, Chronic/Rehab and Specialty Children’s in order to capture service delivery provided by the facilities as accurately as possible

• Small & Other Hospitals are excluded from HSFR due to their vulnerability to fluctuations in funding
  – These hospitals are implementing best practices from QBP clinical care pathways

• Specialty Psychiatric Hospitals are excluded due to data-related limitations
CCAC Snapshot

• All 14 Community Care Access Centers (CCACs) are included in HSFR
• CCACs have approximately 30% of their base funding allocated by HBAM and QBPs
• There are three QBPs in CCAC sector:
  – Primary Unilateral Hip Replacement
  – Primary Unilateral Hip Replacement
  – Bilateral Hip or Knee Replacement
# Health System Funding Reform (HSFR)

## Goals and Objectives

- **Reflect needs** of the community
- **Equitable allocation** of health care dollars
- Better **quality care** and **improved outcomes**
- **Moderate** spending growth to sustainable levels
- Adopt/ learn from **approaches** used in other jurisdictions
- Phased in over time at a **managed pace**

## Hospitals and Community Care Access Centres

**Health Based Allocation Model (HBAM)**
- Evidence, health-based funding formula
- Enables government to **equitably allocate available funding** for health services
- Estimates future expense based on past service levels and efficiency, as well as population and health information

## Quality-Based Procedures (QBPs)

- Clusters of patients with clinically related diagnoses / treatments with an evidence-based framework as providing opportunity for:
  - Align incentives to facilitate adoption of best clinical practices
  - Appropriately reducing variation in costs and practices across the province to improve outcomes

## Long-Term Care Homes

**Case Mix Index (CMI)**
- Evidence-based funding approach that uses resident profiles
- Reflects resident needs by considering factors such as diagnosis and functional capacity
- Enables the government to **equitably allocate available funding** for resident services
HBAM adjusted results are used to calculate each hospital's expected share of the HBAM funding envelope ($5.15B).
Key Things to Remember about HBAM

• HBAM is a ‘pie-sharing’ model where the pie is the sum of all expected expenses in the province

• Approximately 37% of total hospital base funding ($5.15B) is then distributed based each HSP’s percentage of the pie

• An HSP’s share of the pie is impacted by:
  1. An HSP’s own expected results, including year-over-year changes in expected results; and
  2. The expected results of all other HSPs within each of the HBAM care types

An HSP’s change in HBAM expected results does not have a 1:1 correlation with their change in funding
Key Features of the HSFR CCAC Model

• Similar to the hospital model, the main driver in determining the funding change is the comparison between the share of the HBAM expected expense and the share of the base funding.

• Key differences between the hospital and CCAC HBAM model:
  – In the CCAC HBAM model, the derivation of expected expenses is based on the service intensity provided to long-stay clients only.
  – The CCAC module also has a portion of the funding (approximately 11%) which is protected from being re-distributed across the CCACs; in order to maintain funding stability for targeted programs.
The “Quality” in Quality-Based Procedures

- Develop indicators to evaluate/monitor actual practice and support on-going quality improvement
- Broaden scope of QBPs to strengthen the continuity of care
- Best practices informed by clinical consensus and best available evidence
- Engage in clinical process improvement / re-design and adopt best practices
- Best practices pricing to strengthen linkage between quality and funding
**QIPs: Lever for Quality Improvement**

A Quality Improvement Plan is a formal, documented set of commitments that a health care organization makes to its patients/clients/residents, staff, and community to improve quality through focused targets and actions.

| Throughout System | • Collectively address system-wide priorities  
|                   | • Entrenching quality improvement culture as a system-wide standard |
| Across Sectors    | • Vehicle to harmonize quality improvement efforts across sectors  
|                   | • Tool for initiating partnerships |
| Within Organization | • Formal commitment to improve quality  
|                   | • Vehicle to engage organizations from board to bed-side  
|                   | • Overseen by a Quality Committee and approved by the Board |
Funding Mitigation

- Mitigation was provided to phase in implementation of HSFR at a managed pace
- Facilities were provided one-time funding to ensure their year over year changes were maintained within an set mitigation corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3: 2014-15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2%, No ceiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HBAM only, no mitigation on QBPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1% to +3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Applied to Overall HSFR Envelope)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Year 2: 2013-14**                       |
| Hospitals and CCACs                      |
| -1%, + 3%                                |
| (Joint HBAM + QBP)                       |

| **Year 1: 2012-13**                       |
| Hospitals and CCACs                      |
| -2%, + 2% (HBAM) ± 15% (QBPs)            |

- As we move forward to year 4, facilities have been provided with signals that we are moving to an unmitigated environment
HSFR Lessons Learned

Highlights: Lessons Learned

- HBAM was introduced to achieve the goals of funding following the patient and a more equitable allocation of available dollars. HBAM is a rich source of information about patient flow, services provided and cost efficiency.

- Early stakeholders involvement in the design of model was important for buy-in and ensuring model credibility.

- Implementation showed that there could be a trade-off between striving for an equitable allocation and making your funding model too complex. For example:
  - Ontario has a number of adjustments to try to achieve equity, but there might be a concern that this adds to complexity because of the interconnection of the adjustments.

- Experience showed that having a technical working group can assist in policy determination and provide face validity, but we needed to ensure a provincial perspective (i.e., test for special interests).

- There is a growing need to develop a coordinated data strategy to, among other things, improve data quality, timeliness, and availability and ensure providers have adopted a data quality culture.

- Mitigation was necessary in the early years of implementation especially since hospitals had 0% increase. However, as mitigation is being lifted concerns may be raised about the inability of some providers to completely adjust to unmitigated environment.
HBAM-Hospitals: Includes Acute Inpatient, Day Surgery, Emergency, Outpatient, Rehabilitation, Complex Continuing Care (CCC) and Mental Health

PCOP: Post Construction Operating Plan
New Structure for HSFR Governance

Leadership Council
Associations, Agencies, Academia

Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care
System Integration Committee

Hospitals Advisory Committee
[MOHLTC, LHIN, OHA]
Hospitals Sub-groups to be formed
Priorities
• Ensuring transparency in decision-making
• Oversee the HSFR evaluation and action plans associated with the results
• Build the quality overlay into our funding models
• Oversee the implementation of key HBAM enhancements
• Guide future decisions regarding QBPs and integrated care models

Community Advisory Committee
Community Sub-groups to be formed
Priorities
• HBAM enhancement in the Home Care module for short stay and palliative populations
• Integration of Long-Term Care funding with HSFR in terms of funding stability and flexibility

Data Strategy Advisory Committee
Data Strategy Sub-groups to be formed
Priorities
• Development of a data roadmap
• Oversee data collection and reporting including CCO and CCN registries, CIHI databases and Ontario Case Costing
• Design approach for data readiness related to HSFR
Avenues of Evaluation

HSFR feedback opportunities*

- QBP Process Day
- CCAC Home and Community Care Session
- HSFR Dialogue
- LHIN Engagement Sessions
- OHA-Led HSFR Survey

HSFR Workplan

- Informs the next 9 months of HSFR implementation
- Considers feedback received from HSFR evaluations
- Follows the policy direction of HSFR moving forward (e.g., legislative/regulatory, policy barriers)

*Sector engagement and evaluation activities undertaken in conjunction with ministry partners (HSFPB & QBPB) and HQO
## Where We Still Need to Go

Maximizing our levers to drive health system improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHERE WE’VE BEEN</th>
<th>WHERE WE CAN STRENGTHEN...</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector specific</td>
<td>Integrated approaches</td>
<td>Bundled payments / Episodes of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care not coordinated</td>
<td>Coordinated care with health system partners</td>
<td>Health Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration within organizations</td>
<td>Integration across health sectors</td>
<td>Right care, right place, right time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental volume-based approach</td>
<td>System wide capacity planning</td>
<td>Evidenced-based care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying structural barriers</td>
<td>Enabling re-design with patients at centre</td>
<td>Re-designed models of care / funding systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silo’d levers</td>
<td>Mutually reinforcing levers</td>
<td>QIPs / QBPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease specific</td>
<td>Patient-based</td>
<td>New models of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate, distinct quality focus</td>
<td>Quality embedded in programs and funding</td>
<td>Leveraging HQO role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value = Quality / Cost</td>
<td>+ Appropriateness</td>
<td>Addressing variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care organized around the provider</td>
<td>Care organized around the patient</td>
<td>Patient experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Where We’ve Been**

1. Sector specific
2. Primary Care not coordinated
3. Integration within organizations
4. Incremental volume-based approach
5. Identifying structural barriers
6. Silo’d levers
7. Disease specific
8. Separate, distinct quality focus
9. Value = Quality / Cost
10. Care organized around the provider

**Where We Can Strengthen...**

1. Integrated approaches
2. Coordinated care with health system partners
3. Integration across health sectors
4. System wide capacity planning
5. Enabling re-design with patients at centre
6. Mutually reinforcing levers
7. Patient-based
8. Quality embedded in programs and funding
9. + Appropriateness
10. Care organized around the patient
Integrated Funding Models

*Intent is to achieve quality outcomes for patients and efficiency in health care spending by focusing on providing the right care, at the right time, in the right place and at the right price*

Through an integrated funding model, or bundled payment approach, a single payment is provided to multiple providers for all services related to an episode of care.

- The ministry has:
  - Engaged sector partners to seek innovative approaches to integrating funding across more than one phase of care;
  - Released an expression of interest process for partners to propose innovative models for evaluations; and
  - Created a team to develop an evaluation of these models to identify success factors for, and potential barriers to, implementation of integrated funding models across the system.