Moving Beyond Quality: Strategic Responses of Nursing Homes to Nursing Home Compare

R. Tamara Konetzka, University of Chicago

Co-author: Daifeng He, College of William and Mary

September 2012 Funding: NIA, R21 AG040498



Public Reporting of Health Care Quality

- Capitalizing on market forces to change the incentive structure that health care providers face is intuitively more efficient than regulating or mandating quality.
- The ACA relies heavily on market-based reforms such as public reporting and value-based purchasing to maintain and encourage quality while holding down costs.

Motivation for Public Reporting

 Market failure in health care – asymmetric information – leads to less than optimal quality.
 – Difficult for consumers to judge quality

Little incentive for providers to compete on quality

Public reporting is intended to improve quality.

- Giving consumers information needed to shop on quality
- Giving providers incentive to compete on quality

Nursing Home Compare

- Launched November 12, 2002
- 6 states launched as pilot in April 2002
 CO, FL, MD, OH, RI, WA
- Publicly release quality information: <u>http://www.medicare.gov/NHCompare</u>
- All Medicare- and Medicaid-certified NHs
 - 17,000 nursing homes
 - Reporting for NFs with >20-30 qualifying assessments
- 10 quality measures: 4 post-acute, 6 chronic care
- Staffing, inspections

Find Criteria > Home Select

Nursing Home Search (Step 2 of 2)

There is 1 nursing home available within Zip Code 22202.

- . Select one or more Nursing Homes and click "Next Step" at the bottom of the page.
- . Click on the "Select All" button to view all of the Nursing Homes in this area.

Name:	Participation	Certified Beds	Type of Ownership	Located in a Hospital?	Continuing Care Retirement Community?	Resident & Family Councils
Select All Date of Last Change of Ownership:	Initial Date of Certification					
	Medicaid Participation					
POTOMAC CENTER	Yes	240	For profit - Corporation	No	No	Resident
1785 HAYES STREET	10/23/1978					
(703) 920-5700	Yes					
	Address: Phone Number: Date of Last Change of Ownership: POTOMAC CENTER GENESIS ELDERCA 1785 HAYES STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22202	Address: Phone Number: Date of Last Change of Ownership: POTOMAC CENTER GENESIS ELDERCA 1785 HAYES STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22202 (703) 920-5700	Name: Address: Phone Number: Date of Last Change of Ownership:Initial Date of CertificationCertified BedsMedicaid ParticipationMedicaid ParticipationCertified BedsPOTOMAC CENTER GENESIS ELDERCA 1785 HAYES STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22202 (703) 920-5700Yes 10/23/1978240	Name: Address: Phone Number: Date of Last Change of Ownership:Initial Date of Certification Medicaid ParticipationCertified BedsPOTOMAC CENTER GENESIS ELDERCA 1785 HAYES STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22202 (703) 920-5700Yes 10/23/1978240For profit - Corporation	Name: Address: Phone Number: Date of Last Change of Ownership:Initial Date of 	Name: Address: Phone Number: Date of Last Change of Ownership:Initial Date of CertificationCertified BedsHospital?Retirement Community?Medicaid ParticipationMedicaid ParticipationMedicaid ParticipationPortomac center 10/23/1978Yes 240For profit - CorporationNoNo

Overview	About Homes	Quality	Inspections	Staffing	Resource	ces
Search Results for the selected nursing homes within Zip Code 22202 Nursing Home Summary Information in the Nursing Home database should be interpreted carefully and used in conjunction with other sources, as well as a visit to the nursing home. We suggest you use our Nursing Home Checklist to help evaluate the nursing homes you visit, or contact your long-term care ombudsman or State Survey Agency before making a decision. The phone number for the long-term care ombudsman or State Survey Agency in your area can be found in the Helpful Contacts section of this website.						
About the N	ursing Home	Qualit Measu	ity <u>He</u> ures <u>Defic</u>	ciencies	lursing Staff Hours per tesident per Day	CNA Hours per Resident per Day
POTOMAC CENTER GENE 1785 HAYES STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22202 (703) 920-5700 Mapping/Directions View all information a		Information of the 19 o measure availab	quality Defic es is 5 Fire	Health iciencies e Safety iciencies	1 hour 28 minutes Total Number	2 hours 3 minutes of Residents:



Percent of Short-Stay Residents Who Had Moderate to Severe Pain



Existing evidence on Nursing Home Compare

- Quality: small, inconsistent improvements
 - Iong-stay residents (Mukamel, Weimer et al. 2008)
 - post-acute residents (Werner, Konetzka et al. 2009)
- Some evidence of financial gain by high-scoring facilities (Park et al., 2010)
- Market share: little effect
 - Among long-stay residents, no discernible effect on market share (Grabowski and Town 2011)
 - Among post-acute residents, statistically significant but small effect of quality ratings for pain control on market share (Werner and colleagues 2012)

Provider Response to Public Reporting: Multiple Responses Possible

Providers may increase quality

Providers may change price

- Before quality reporting, price and quality may be only loosely correlated
- After public reporting, high-quality firms may increase price and low-quality firms may decrease price

Demand for high-quality providers may be rationed if capacity is constrained (e.g., health, education).

Research Questions

Do high-quality nursing homes raise prices for self-pay patients after public reporting?
Do high-quality nursing homes attract more profitable patients (Medicare) and, if capacity constrained, crowd out the less profitable ones (Medicaid)?

Conceptual Framework

- Nursing home markets are monopolistically competitive
 - Many buyers and sellers
 - Products differentiated by quality
 - Asymmetric information
- Before public reporting, demand is relatively inelastic wrt quality
- Public reporting increases the precision with which consumers observe sellers' quality (Dranove and Satterthwaite 1992)
 - Increased precision increases elasticity of demand wrt quality

Providers choose level of quality where marginal cost of providing quality = marginal benefit

- Marginal benefit likely to be higher for increase in Medicare residents
- If capacity-constrained, little benefit from improving quality --- increase price instead
 Sellers' equilibrium level of quality increases? Overall market share of highquality homes increases? Unclear.

Data (1999-2005)

Minimum Data Set

- All Medicare- and Medicaid-certified nursing homes
- Detailed clinical data used for care planning
- Source to calculate quality measures for Nursing Home Compare
- Used to calculate quality measures over study period, both pre and post.

OSCAR

- Facility-level covariates (e.g., beds, ownership, occupancy)
- Patient by-payer counts.

Pennsylvania and California state Nursing Home Surveys

Price for self-pay patients.

Summary Statistics

Variables	Mean (Standard Deviation)
Utilization and facilities characteristics	National Sample (quarterly data)
Medicaid county share	18.9(25.5)
Medicare county share	17.9 (26.1)
Total number of residents/patients	91.2 (60.3)
Medicaid census	60.6 (49.2)
Medicare census	10.3 (12.3)
Percent Medicaid	62.1 (24.5)
Percent Medicare	14.2 (19.4)
Government facility	0.06
Not-for-profit facility	0.28
For-profit facility	0.66
Number of beds	105.9 (66.5)
Self-Pay Price	State Sample (Annual Data)
Self pay price, semiprivate room (Penn)	276(183)
Self pay price, private room (Penn)	249(161)
Self pay price (California)	208(222)

Quality Measures

- Focus on clinical quality measures as reported in NHC
 - re-created for pre- and post-reporting periods
 - keep homes that report at least 6 measures
- For each measure, calculate z-score relative to other nursing homes in the county
- Calculate average z-score over all reported measures for each nursing home

Empirical Strategy: Facility-Fixed Effects Models

$Y_{j,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Q M_{j,t_{-1}} * Post_t + \beta_2 Q M_{j,t_{-1}} + \beta_3 \mathbf{X}_{j,t} + \lambda_t + \eta_j + \varepsilon_{j,t}$

- Y_{it}: outcome in NH j in year t (self-pay price, Medicare or Medicaid county share).
- $QM_{j,t}$: composite QMs for NH *j* in year *t*, lagged 1 quarter.
- \mathbf{X}_{it} : control variables: beds, ownership (gov't, non-for-profit, for-profit).
- $-\mathbf{T}_{it}$: set of time dummies
- $-\eta_i$: set of nursing home fixed effects

Price Results (Coefficient on QM*Post-NHC)

	California	Pennsylvania: Semi-private room	Pennsylvania: Private room
Pooled	-4.37*	-0.44	-1.94
	(2.258)	(1.742)	(2.094)
Non-Capacity-	2.05	4.51*	-0.02
Constrained	(2.533)	(2.584)	(3.066)
Capacity-	-8.68*	-4.53**	-1.72
Constrained	(4.935)	(2.110)	(2.657)

Utilization Results (Coefficient on QM*Post-NHC)

	Medicaid	Medicare	Total Market
	Market Share	Market Share	Share
Pooled	0.13**	-0.28**	0.18***
	(0.064)	(0.123)	(0.055)
Non-Capacity-	0.14*	-0.16	0.23***
Constrained	(0.082)	(0.158)	(0.070)
Capacity-	0.14	-0.54***	0.11
Constrained	(0.101)	(0.194)	(0.085)

Summary of Findings

High quality nursing homes were able to raise price after quality disclosure

Effect is stronger among capacity constrained NHs.

Overall, high quality NHs seem to gain Medicare market share and to decrease Medicaid market share.

- Effect is small.

Policy Implications

- Public reporting needs to be implemented and evaluated within the broader context of profitability incentives.
- Policymakers should expect heterogeneous response to public reporting.
- The overall welfare consequences of public reporting systems is ambiguous when multiple responses are considered.

Next Steps

- Robustness Checks / Sensitivity Analyses
 - Market definition
 - Combining quality measures
 - Use of staffing and deficiencies
 - Separating out Post-Acute v LTC quality
- New admissions vs census (data challenge)