Medicaid Transformation Provider Experience Survey 2022

2022 Results Overview for Survey Participants

- **What is the Medicaid Transformation Provider Experience Survey?**
  Administered among organizations providing primary care and/or Ob/Gyn services to Medicaid patients in North Carolina, this survey is part of a larger multi-year evaluation effort of NC’s Medicaid transformation.
  The survey provides a snapshot of organizational experiences, contracting, and satisfaction with Prepaid Health Plans (PHPs) in the transition to Medicaid managed care. Survey findings will serve as a leading indicator for quality improvement for PHPs. This report details a general overview of findings at the end of the first year of managed care.

- **How did you develop the survey?**
  This year’s survey built on the initial instrument developed in consultation with clinicians, health system/practice leaders, and stakeholders from NC Department of Health Human Services in the fall of 2020. This year’s survey was finalized in February 2022. We sampled and fielded the survey at the organizational level, given that most interactions with PHPs occur at the organizational (rather than individual clinician) level.

### Survey Domains

- **Practice characteristics**
- **Contacting/negotiating with PHPs**
- **Experience with clinical and administrative factors**
- **Overall perceived effects of PHPs on care delivery**
- **Behavioral Health and Tailored Plans**

- **How did you field the survey?**
  We used IQVIA OneKey data to identify 1,243 unique organizations providing primary care and Ob/Gyn services in North Carolina, using Medicaid provider data to confirm the sample.
  Survey responses were collected between April and July 2022 from these identified organizations. Through our recruitment process using phone calls, mailings, and emails, we determined that approximately 63% of the organizations in our sample were eligible to receive the survey.

- **Who responded to the survey?**
  The table to the right summarizes overall characteristics of 394 respondent organizations. Our final response rate was 50%.
  Our sample includes a diverse set of organizations, from solo practice physicians to large integrated delivery systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership (self-reported)</th>
<th>Total (n = 394)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Systems</td>
<td>14 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Practices/Medical Groups</td>
<td>380 (96%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (1 – 2 physicians)</td>
<td>261 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (3 – 9 physicians)</td>
<td>96 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (10+ physicians)</td>
<td>37 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services (inclusive)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary care</td>
<td>385 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenatal/Postnatal care</td>
<td>42 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient obstetrics care</td>
<td>23 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contracting with PHPs

Rates of contracting with one of the five PHPs among surveyed provider organizations ranged from **73.3% to 94.5%**. Among medical groups and independent practices, the mean number of plans surveyed organizations contracted with was **4.3**.

Respondents had very **similar dispositions toward each PHP**; mean overall ratings for the five PHPs (on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being “poor” and 4 being “excellent”) ranged from **2.56 to 2.69**.

Overall perceived effects of PHPs on care delivery

While most organizational respondents felt ambivalent about the effects of PHPs on care delivery, about a third of respondents felt the PHPs would worsen or strongly worsen overall **provider experience** and **overall financial health** of medical groups/practices.

Experience with clinical and administrative factors

We asked provider organizations about their experiences with each PHP on thirteen different factors, split into clinical and administrative domains.

**Clinical factors** included items like access to specialists, behavioral health prescribers, and formulary, while examples of **administrative factors** included timeliness of claims processing, timeliness to answer questions and/or resolve problems, and adequacy of reimbursement.

**Plans performed similarly** to each other across clinical and administrative domains. **Compared with the Legacy NC Medicaid program**, PHPs performed worse on **administrative domains**. The lowest rated domain for PHPs was access to behavioral health providers. Interestingly, PHPs performed better than the Legacy NC Medicaid program in access to behavioral health providers.
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**Behavioral health and tailored plans**

In this survey, we asked provider organizations about their approach to integration of care with behavioral health providers and their plans regarding the upcoming tailored plans. 24% of provider organizations reported that they have embedded or co-located behavioral health professionals in primary care offices. For those organizations without embedded or co-located behavioral health, the most common reasons were not enough space, unable to sustain a position with current reimbursement, not enough demand from patients, and administrative processes are burdensome. 44% reported that they did not have access to a psychiatrist to support the Collaborative Care Model.

Regarding plans to contract with Behavioral Health and Intellectual/Developmental Disability Tailored Plans, 30% said yes. **51% were not aware of tailored plans**. These responses suggest that primary care and Ob/Gyn practices are currently not focused on tailored plans and may not understand any potential care delivery changes and resources that may become available for these populations.

To learn more about our survey results or our multi-year Medicaid transformation evaluation Contact us at medicaideval@unc.edu