



The Role of Primary Care in Network Development Efforts

Subtitle: How do you know when you're losing too much money???

EMORY
HEALTHCARE

Hunter.
Results, driven.

Agenda:

- **The Client**
- **The Context**
- **The Business Problem**
- **The Process**
- **Outcomes**
- **Lessons Learned**
- **Next Steps**

The Client

- Emory Healthcare's Physician Enterprise
- The Emory Clinic: 1,200 physician-faculty with 45 Primary Care Physicians in 6 locations
- Emory Specialty Associates: 200 physicians with 100 Primary Care Providers (PCP)
- Emory's physician enterprise operates from one management and shared services chassis

The Context

- Inelastic demand for Primary Care access
- Growing population and an aging population
- Declining number of fulltime PCP's
- Minimal health system competency in Primary Care operations/systems/finances
- Minimal health system competency in population management
- Health system needs to cut \$300 Million in costs/funding/losses over three years
- Health system documents need to add 15 Primary Care sites and 40 + providers over next 18 months

The Business Problem

- Many of Emory's Primary Care providers and locations are the product of a 2-3 year buying spree
- Competitor's outreach is outpacing Emory's
- Four Points of the Compass v. Geographic Market niches demands best in class execution
- Strategy tightrope: Grow, while improving financial results and deliver a care model that floats on its own bottom

The Business Problem

- Wide range of financial results variation: Coding practices, productivity, cost structure, information systems competencies, compensation practices
- Wide range of operational workflow variation at the local level
- Wide range of local site physician leadership competencies
- “Come as you are” philosophy/promises not matched with financial accountability
- Governance and leadership are focused on achieving Primary Care/Population Management/Care Model Transformation

The Process

Get Ready:

- “We have no choice”
 - “We’re out of time”
 - “We need help setting priorities and targeting our efforts”
-
- Data shows random variation, site to site and provider to provider:
 - Clinical Documentation
 - Productivity/Throughput/Scheduling
 - Practice Models
 - Staffing/Costs levels
 - Compensation Models
 - Multiple clinical information systems and work flows

The Process

Get Set:

- Ambitious budget established: burned the ships behind us
 - Hard wired goals into incentive compensation
 - Sought outside help (Financial/Operational AND Compensation Experts)
-
- Set oversight/steering process in place
 - Turned consultants loose with the data and the people closest to the work
 - Gave providers notice that compensation plan would be reset on December 1, 2013

The Outcomes



Analysis Components:

- ✓ Total RVU
 - ✓ Practice & Malpractice RVUs
- ✓ Physician Work RVU
- ✓ 2013 Conversion Factor (CF) - \$34.0230
- ✓ GPCI adjustments
- ✓ Modifiers
- ✓ Place of Service
- ✓ MGMA Chart of Accounts



Key RBRVS Uses

- **Revenue cycle yield (in conjunction with cash and PMI)**
 - Cash yield as a % of Medicare
 - How does that compare to expected reimbursement?
- **NOTE: Also Useful For Payer and Service Mix Shifts**
(highly-sensitive indicator)
- **Non-provider staffing levels**
 - Staffing to work output, not “nose count”
 - Extra staff for extra output
- **Provider productivity**
 - Productivity (specialty-and license-specific)
 - ☐ Median (ALWAYS under water – no exceptions)
 - ☐ Midpoint between median and 75%tile (baseline)
 - ☐ 75%tile (preferred)
- **Provider compensation**
 - Comp per wRVU (median works pretty well)
 - Recent ortho example

Provider RVU Benchmarking:

- **Non-provider staffing**

- Divide total wRVUs earned by median benchmark
- “Virtual” clinical FTE (VCFTE)
- Multiply VCFTE by median staffing benchmark per FTE (with a 75%tile cap x self-reported CFTE)
- Staffing budget based on actual work output
- NOTE: must include all staffing (allocated central support)

Revenue Cycle Uses:

- **Cash Yield As A % of Medicare**

- Total Cash/tRVUs = a group's/site's cash conversion factor
- Divide this factor by \$34.0230 = cash yield as a % of M/C

- **Payer Mix Index**

- Payer Mix:

- ☐ BCBS 25% (170% of M/C) = $1.7 \times .25$
- ☐ Aetna 25% (180% of M/C) = $1.8 \times .25$
- ☐ Medicare 35% (100% of M/C) = $1.0 \times .35$
- ☐ Medicaid 15% (60% of M/C) = $.6 \times .15$
- ☐ Payer Mix Index = $(.425) + (.45) + (.35) + (.09) = 1.315$
- ☐ ACME Medical Group's cash CF = 1.25
- ☐ Actual yield is 5% below expected given PMI
- ☐ On \$100M in net revenue, might show a \$5M gap
- ☐ Current example (surgery outlier)

“ACME” Medical Group

Site	Total FTE	wRVUs	\$ if Provider Productivity ≥ Midpoint	Revenue Cycle Opportunity	Payer Mix Index	Yield as a % of M/C	E&M Coding Opportunity	Coding Opportunity (valued at each site's % of M/C)	Comp Opportunity at 50%tile per wRVU
Jones Clinic	21.20	155,696	\$131,738	\$692,242	170.89%	163.99%	\$286,120	\$469,210	\$33,123
East Clinic	11.00	59,868	\$76,525	\$276,172	144.43%	139.32%	\$156,827	\$218,494	\$0
Blue Clinic	20.80	96,469	\$422,368	\$251,225	151.29%	144.38%	\$214,448	\$309,610	\$183,912
Middle Clinic	9.30	27,856	\$715,909	\$444,990	178.40%	171.98%	\$176,807	\$304,065	\$279,449
Smith Clinic	7.40	30,472	\$299,439	\$16,899	147.98%	147.12%	\$43,464	\$63,947	\$182,978
	69.70	370,360	\$1,645,978	\$1,681,527			\$877,667	\$1,365,326	\$679,461

“ACME” Medical Group

Site	wRVUs	Virtual CFTE @ Median	Total Support Staff FTE	Total Target Support Staff FTE	Staffing Opportunity	\$ Opportunity Related to Staff FTE	"All In" Opportunity w/productivity @ Median	Opportunity per FTE
Jones Clinic	155,696	24.78	108.29	98.56	9.73	\$486,472	\$1,812,785	\$85,509
East Clinic	59,868	10.00	40.18	39.03	1.15	\$57,638	\$628,830	\$57,166
Blue Clinic	96,469	19.33	83.25	72.21	11.03	\$551,672	\$1,718,786	\$82,634
Middle Clinic	27,856	6.45	27.12	22.31	4.82	\$240,804	\$1,985,216	\$213,464 *
Smith Clinic	30,472	7.31	27.38	24.34	3.03	\$151,679	\$714,941	\$96,614
	370,360	67.87	286.22	256.45	29.77	\$1,488,264	\$6,860,558	\$98,430

Academic Medical Center Variation:

SECTION/DEPT		TOTAL PAYROLL COMP	Division Benefit Factor	Total Comp & Benefits	State	GME	Grant	Contract	UPL	Other	Default Clinical Comp	Self-Rptd CLINICAL FTE	Default Clinical FTE	MGMA Acad Midpoint wRVU OPP at Default CFTE
CV Surgery	1.00	\$326,415		\$368,988	\$53,190			\$27,455	\$22,065		\$266,278	0.70	0.72	1,689
CV Surgery	1.00	\$1,027,877		\$1,161,938	\$256,969	\$23,015		\$250,000	\$15,368		\$616,586	0.70	0.53	
CV Surgery	1.00	\$665,000		\$751,733	\$53,190		\$26,035	\$13,998	\$16,917		\$641,592	0.70	0.85	6,549
CV Surgery	1.00	\$330,560		\$373,673	\$53,190		\$11,484	\$0	\$12,419		\$296,580	0.70	0.79	4,654
CV Surgery	1.00	\$678,629		\$767,139	\$135,726	\$11,508		\$230,126	\$8,452		\$381,327	0.50	0.50	
CV Surgery	5.00	\$3,028,481	13.04%	\$3,423,470	\$552,265	\$34,523	\$37,519	\$521,579	\$75,221	\$0	\$2,202,363	3.30	3.40	12,892
CV Surg-PEDS	1.00	\$418,626		\$474,713	\$53,190			\$0	\$51,237		\$370,286	0.85	0.78	1,589
CV Surg-PEDS	1.00	\$418,626	13.40%	\$474,713	\$53,190	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$51,237	\$0	\$370,286	0.85	0.78	1,589
CV-THORACIC	1.00	\$247,204		\$279,446	\$53,190	\$9,206		\$68,504	\$23,310		\$125,235	0.85	0.45	
CV-THORACIC	1.00	\$451,807		\$510,734	\$59,838	\$11,508		\$23,200	\$15,583		\$400,605	0.85	0.78	3,304
CV-THORACIC	2.00	\$699,011	13.04%	\$790,179	\$113,028	\$20,714	\$0	\$91,704	\$38,894	\$0	\$525,840	1.70	1.23	3,304
CARDIO-EP	1.00	\$336,593		\$404,088	\$53,190	\$9,206		\$91,483	\$12,293		\$237,916	0.60	0.59	2,215
CARDIO-EP	1.00	\$261,647		\$314,114	\$59,838	\$9,206		\$12,898	\$19,788		\$212,383	0.80	0.68	2,711
CARDIO-EP	1.00	\$299,750		\$359,857	\$59,838	\$155,506		\$31,048	\$37,959		\$75,506	0.60	0.21	
CARDIO-EP	3.00	\$897,990	20.05%	\$1,078,059	\$172,866	\$173,918	\$0	\$135,429	\$70,040	\$0	\$525,805	2.00	1.47	4,926
CARDIO-INT/INV	1.00	\$382,150		\$424,189	\$53,189	\$9,206	\$0	\$20,735	\$64,242		\$276,817	0.85	0.65	
CARDIO-INT/INV	1.00	\$461,300		\$512,046	\$59,838	\$188,005	\$0	\$53,721	\$88,030		\$122,452	0.60	0.24	
CARDIO-INT/INV	2.00	\$843,450	11.00%	\$936,236	\$113,027	\$197,211	\$0	\$74,456	\$152,273	\$0	\$399,269	1.45	0.89	0
CARDIO-NON-INV	1.00	\$206,818		\$243,947	\$39,892	\$9,206		\$5,300	\$26,084	\$2,000	\$161,466	0.85	0.66	1,283
CARDIO-NON-INV	1.00	\$124,500		\$146,851	\$39,892	\$6,905		\$7,583	\$31,598		\$60,873	0.85	0.41	930
CARDIO-NON-INV	0.25	\$118,515		\$139,792				\$0	\$73,750		\$66,042	0.25	0.47	425
CARDIO-NON-INV	0.50	\$170,193		\$200,747	\$132,974	\$11,508		\$19,123	\$12,586		\$24,556	0.40	0.12	
CARDIO-NON-INV	0.60	\$195,553		\$230,660		\$6,905		\$398	\$4,606		\$218,751	0.60	0.95	3,375
CARDIO-NON-INV	1.00	\$282,479		\$333,191	\$59,838	\$11,508		\$125,794	\$53,454		\$82,598	0.60	0.25	
CARDIO-NON-INV	1.00	\$232,815		\$274,611	\$59,838	\$9,206		\$82,728	\$78,196		\$44,644	0.85	0.16	
CARDIO-NON-INV	5.35	\$1,330,873	17.95%	\$1,569,800	\$332,434	\$55,238	\$0	\$240,926	\$280,272	\$2,000	\$658,930	4.40	3.03	6,013
VASCULAR	1.00	\$440,465		\$516,362	\$53,189	\$9,206		\$6,546	\$50,258	\$12,892	\$384,271	0.85	0.74	
VASCULAR	1.00	\$323,250		\$378,950	\$53,189	\$9,206		\$7,306	\$104,767		\$204,482	0.85	0.54	
VASCULAR	1.00	\$459,570		\$538,759	\$53,189	\$9,206		\$24,757	\$67,057		\$384,550	0.85	0.71	658
VASCULAR	1.00	\$371,647		\$435,686	\$59,838	\$83,133	\$2,854	\$55,816	\$74,134		\$159,912	0.55	0.37	
VASCULAR	4.00	\$1,594,932	17.23%	\$1,869,757	\$219,405	\$110,751	\$2,854	\$94,425	\$296,215	\$12,892	\$1,133,215	3.10	2.36	658
CV Sciences	22.35	\$8,813,363		\$10,142,214	\$1,556,215	\$592,355	\$40,373	\$1,158,519	\$964,152	\$14,892	\$5,815,709	16.80	8.99	29,381

Analysis Conclusions:

- If you can demonstrate that you've:
 - *Maximized productivity per provider (according to national benchmarks by specialty/provider type)*
 - *Set compensation at national benchmark levels per work output*
 - *Optimized staffing per provider (based on actual output and compared to national benchmarks)*
 - *Optimized documentation (as demonstrated through bell curve analysis)*
 - *Minimized operating costs (as benchmarked)*
 - *Optimized revenue cycle yield based given expected payment*
 - *Side benefit: established a tool that gives real-time indication of payer and service mix shifts*
- Then you can demonstrate that any remaining subsidies within the physician enterprise are the cost of doing business in your particular market.

The Lessons Learned

- Draw attention at every level
 - Don't under-invest in structure: before, during, after
 - Project Plan/Timelines extend far past the engagement
 - Don't under-estimate communication loops
-
- Assume beneficial intent: Everyone wants to be on a winning team
 - Invest in noise-canceling head phones: Emory has an organizational tendency to try to boil the ocean
 - Set the targets, measure the results and publish the progress

The Next Steps

- Weekly conference calls around focused areas
- Weekly executive meetings with work group leaders
- Grab the Provider's schedules
- Compensation consultant completes work in mid-October

Questions?

EMORY
HEALTHCARE

Hunter.

Results, driven.