Models for a Rural Healthcare Future
(Doing More, Better, for Less)

RWHC Eye On Health

“Why are rural providers excellent swimmers? They get lots of practice being thrown out with the bath water.”

Tim Size
RWHC Executive Director

NRHA Policy Institute
February 1st, 2011
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*RWHC: Rural Wisconsin Health Cooperative
RWHC by the Numbers

- Founded 1979.
- Non-profit coop owned by 34 rural hospitals (who have net rev \( \approx \$3/4B; \approx 2K \) hospital & LTC beds).
- \( \approx \$7M \) RWHC budget (\( \approx 75\% \) member sales/dues; 20\% other sales, 5\% grants).
- 7 PPS & 27 CAH; 20 freestanding; 14 system affiliated.
Four RWHC Hospital Network Models

- RWHC Advocacy/Shared Services
- RWHC Network Health Plan Contacting
- RWHC ITN Shared EHR
- RWHC PHO Medicare Contracting

More info at www.RWHC.com
Ongoing Myths Lead to Poor Models

- Rural residents don’t want to get care locally.
- Rural folks are naturally healthy, need less.
- Rural health care costs are less than urban care.
- AND Rural health care is inordinately expensive.
- Rural quality is lower; urban is better.
- Rural hospitals are just band-aide stations.
- Rural hospitals are poorly managed/governed.
Tension Between Power of Place & Capital

• All providers are more incented to collaborate; so distinction fading: “independent” (power of place) and “system” (power of capital).
• Tele-health offer more choices in where and how rural gains assistance for local care.
• Population health imperative advantages those with strong local connections.
• Shift to primary care will ultimately reduce the disproportionate power of specialty centers.

See “Collaboration Equals Independence” in Jan 2012 issue of H&HN.
About Competencies More Than New “Models”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Future State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost:</strong></td>
<td>Reduction Viewed as Discrete Projects</td>
<td>Continuous Process Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality:</strong></td>
<td>Public Relations/Liability Issue</td>
<td>Drives Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physicians:</strong></td>
<td>Drive Volume</td>
<td>Drive Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration:</strong></td>
<td>Limited Amount Required for Financial Success</td>
<td>Clinical and Finance Staff Must Work Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Risk:</strong></td>
<td>Revolves Around Cost Position</td>
<td>Revolves Around Utilization of Services Across Continuum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Healthcare Financial Management Association
ACO’s Urban Model Can Be Adapted

• There aren’t enough beneficiaries & providers in most rural communities to support even one ACO, let alone competing ACOs.

• Many rural communities are located in areas that will have the potential for overlapping ACOs with multiple urban based networks.

• CMS’s ACO model should be adapted for local providers to offer their services to multiple ACOs and choice to their community.
“DRG” Spelled “Bundled” is Still Urban?

We need rural relevant incentives to:

• Work in context of a “cost-based” safety net
• Facilitate collaboration among provider types to facilitate Care Transitions.
• Standardize patient information and access to data across the continuum
• Identify/address gaps in post-acute care services
Rural CAH/PPS Valued Based Purchasing

- Resolve to use readily available metrics/data.
- Adopt those rural best practices that are shown to be successful in CMS’ upcoming “Value-Based Purchasing Demonstrations” & “Payment Bundling National Pilot Project.”
- Rural need to be proactive with state and third-party payers to identify meaningful quality data sources for use in P4P metrics.
Just a Few More Examples of Rural Models

- EHR Networks (RWHC)
- Health Plan Contracting Networks (RWHC)
- Immunization Consortiums (SWIC)
- GME Collaboratives (WRTTC)
- Rural Telestroke Networks (Illinois)
- Advanced Directive Campaigns (La Crosse, WI)
- Upcoming participation in CMS’s “Partnership for Patients” (incl. emphasis Care Transitions)
- Community Collaboratives (New RWJ Prize)
Collaboration Can Bring GME to Rural

Wisconsin Rural Training Track Collaborative

UWSMPH and/or other potential sponsoring institutions.

Dotted lines = “1-2” configurations = 1st year urban, 2nd year rural
$25,000 “Roadmaps to Health” Prizes

• RWJ Foundation & UW Population Health Institute will give up to six awards
• To honor successful efforts; inspire, stimulate local coalitions to improve community health
• Applicant: any town, city, county, region or tribe
• Demonstrate health improvement through partnerships & progress measured.
• Applications available in March, 2012.

www.countyhealthrankings.org/roadmaps
Rural Advocacy Relevant to All Models

1. Federal **Healthcare Reform** that recognizes rural realities.
2. Fair **Medicare & Medicaid** payments to rural providers.
3. **Federal & State regulations** that recognize rural realities.
4. Solve growing **shortage of rural physicians and providers**.
5. Bring a rural voice into the **quality improvement** movement.
6. Bring a rural voice to **EHR & HIT development**.
7. Bring rural voice to **regional provider networks & payers**.
8. Continue push for workplace and community **wellness**.
9. Strong link between **economic development** and rural health.
10. **Retain property tax exemption** for nonprofit providers.
The Rural Hometown Advantage

If we meet community need, we are hard to beat.

1. Rural hospitals/providers have the advantage of being able to make change more quickly.

2. There is a depth of passion and dedication that can’t be overstated when neighbors are quite literally caring for each other.
We Still Have a Long Way to Go

RWHC Eye On Health

“I like it, but ‘Thou Shall Not Fail To Cooperate When Resources Are Scarce’ makes eleven.”