January 25, 2024

State Medicaid Agency Contracts

Interviews with key stakeholders

Drew Gerber



Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission



www.macpac.gov



Overview

- Background
- Conducting interviews
- Key themes
 - Contracting considerations
 - SMAC authority
 - Data and reporting
 - Monitoring and oversight
 - Performance improvement and enforcement
- Next steps

Background

Medicare Advantage Dual Eligible Special Needs Plans (D-SNPs)

- Medicare Advantage D-SNPs are a type of special needs plan designed to provide targeted care to dually eligible beneficiaries
- D-SNPs are different from other Medicare Advantage or special needs plans because they are required to contract with state Medicaid agencies
- Levels of Medicaid-Medicare integration in a D-SNP vary

- In 2021, 54 percent of dually eligible beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare managed care were enrolled in a D-SNP
 - The majority are in coordination-only D-SNPs, which typically provide minimal levels of integration



- Minimum requirements for coordination of Medicaid benefits were established for D-SNPs by the Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 (MIPPA, P.L. 110-275)
 - Additional requirements, including those defining higher integration plans, were included in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115-123)
- States can go beyond these requirements to require greater integration or better tailor how D-SNPs serve their population
- The federal government has established minimum requirements, such as information sharing regarding care transitions

Conducting Interviews



Methodology

- Case study states
 - California
 - District of Columbia
 - Idaho
 - Minnesota
 - New Jersey
- Interviewees
 - Federal officials at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS)
 - State Medicaid officials
 - Health plan representatives

Key Themes

Contracting Considerations

- CMS requires a SMAC for D-SNPs to operate, but states are not required to contract with every plan
- States consider whether contracting with a D-SNP would strengthen Medicaid and Medicare alignment
 - All case study states require exclusively aligned enrollment
- States also said they prioritize limiting disruptions for beneficiaries in regard to plan enrollment
- Input from health plans

- State staff meet regularly with D-SNPs to solicit feedback on planned changes to SMAC requirements
- Health plan representatives noted that SMAC approval timelines can be difficult to reconcile with Medicare deadlines



SMAC Authority

- CMS officials said states are free to include any requirements as long as they do not conflict with federal law
- However, state officials were mixed on their perceptions of the level of flexibility
- States also said certain factors imposed operational limits on what they could feasibly require in their SMAC
 - Staff capacity
 - Lack of Medicare knowledge



- All case study states require data and reports related to:
 - appeals and grievances,
 - provider networks,
 - care coordination, and
 - enrollment and disenrollment.
- States noted that strong relationships with the D-SNPs allowed them to request other data not required in the SMAC
- Health plan representatives noted challenges in meeting data reporting requirements due to delays in guidance from states, as well as the potential for administrative burden from state-specific operational requirements and unaligned enrollment

Data and Reporting, continued

- States and CMS said that care coordination data were useful in assessing program health and plan performance
 - Includes information related to health risk assessments, individualized care plan completion rates, care transitions, and discharge planning
- CMS requires D-SNPs to submit a variety of data and reports for purposes of Medicare oversight
 - Such data may be useful to states in evaluating D-SNP performance and for care coordination, but states must require these data in their SMAC to receive it
- Several states require Medicare Advantage encounter data
 - State capacity to use these data is limited, but officials expressed interest in building capacity to do so

Monitoring and Oversight

- CMS oversees compliance with Medicare requirements while states primarily oversee delivery of Medicaid services, particularly long-term services and supports
- States use data and reports to monitor and oversee D-SNPs. However, due to limited staff capacity, reports are frequently checked only for timeliness, completion, and accuracy.
- Staff capacity limits what data can be used for oversight and states are reluctant to include additional requirements without sufficient capacity to oversee them
 - Small core teams lead oversight efforts with support from other teams across departments and agencies
- Data on appeals and grievances and care coordination are commonly used to identify problems with plan performance

Performance Improvement and Enforcement

- States described a number of enforcement mechanisms available to ensure plan compliance with SMAC requirements
- Penalties

- Corrective action plans
- Fines and monetary damages
- Public data dashboards of plan performance
- Few states include financial incentives for D-SNPs in their SMACs
 - Officials cited a lack of resources and clear quality benchmarks
- CMS said that enforcement tools should be included in the SMAC in order to be most effective



Next Steps

- Items for discussion:
 - What are the considerations for states in terms of monitoring and enforcing their SMAC authority? What burden do additional requirements place on states?
 - How should states build upon care coordination requirements included in the D-SNP Model of Care?
 - Do Medicare Advantage encounter data provide enough value to states given limited state capacity?
- Depending on Commissioner interest, we will return in March with policy options

January 25, 2024

State Medicaid Agency Contracts

Interviews with key stakeholders

Drew Gerber



Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission



www.macpac.gov