

Costs Associated with Implementation of Two Models of Diabetes Shared Medical Appointments

Jeanette A. Waxmonsky, PhD^{1,2} Dennis Gurfinkel, MPH¹ Natalie Ritchie, PhD^{3,4,5} Jayna DeRoeck CDE,³ Bethany M. Kwan, PhD MSPH,^{1,2} & Mark Gritz, PhD ^{1,6}

University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus

(1) Adult & Child Consortium for Health Outcomes Research & Delivery Science (ACCORDS), (2) Department of Family Medicine, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO, (3) Center for Health Systems Research, Office of Research, Denver Health and Hospital Authority, Denver, CO; (4) Department of Psychiatry, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO (6) Division for Healthcare Research & Policy, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

- Shared medical appointments (SMAs) for patients with diabetes are an evidence-based and potentially efficient approach to provide self-management education and support in a group setting.
- The Invested in Diabetes study tests two approaches to implementing SMAs (standardized vs. patient-driven).¹
- Objective: For sustainability planning, we evaluated personnel time and cost, and other costs for starting and delivering diabetes SMAs in primary care.

POPULATION STUDIED

Population and Study:

- 21 of 24 primary care practices in Colorado and Kansas City randomized to one of two models for implementing diabetes SMAs. 3 practices stopped participation prior to data collection.
- Both models included six two-hour sessions using the Targeted Training in Illness Management curriculum for groups of approximately 5-15 patients with diabetes.
- Standardized approach is delivered by a health educator with accompanying provider visits.
- Patient-driven approach further incorporates behavioral health providers, peer mentors (volunteer position), and patient-led topic prioritization, in response to prior feedback from patient stakeholders.

SMA IMPLEMENTATION

Description of Cohorts and Roles:

- Initial cohorts at each practice took between 2 and 12 months to plan (6.25 month average)
- Cohorts reported were weekly (6 weeks), bi-weekly (3 months), and monthly (6 months)
- Roles required to deliver SMAs were filled by various staff (see Table 1), and include paid and volunteer positions.
- All practices attended an onboarding training. Patientdriven practices also had a peer mentor training.

STUDY DESIGN

Cost data collection and evaluation:

- Practices were surveyed around cost using Time-Driven Activity Based Costing² methodology at two time points to collect costs for the initial start-up period (prior to first cohort), and the SMA implementation for the first completed cohort (after the last SMA for cohort).
- Surveys asked staff hours devoted to activity groups during the two periods for each team member involved.
- Surveys asked for other costs associated with SMAs at each time, including staff training, non-recurrent start-up expenses, materials, and overhead.
- Staff hours are converted to costs using US Bureau of Labor Statistics mean salaries for each staff position/role. Salaries for volunteer roles were not calculated, but time is reported.
- To account for trainer time for trainings conducted by study staff, 5 hours of staff time was added to all practices for staff training. 5 additional hours were added to patient-driven practices for peer mentor trainings. This did not vary by how many staff or peer mentors were trained.
- Costs are broken down by start-up and implementation costs, and reported by SMA implementation model (standardized vs. patient-driven).

Start-up

Table 1: SMA Roles within Practices

SMA Role	Who fills the role				
Health Educator	 Certified Diabetes Educator, Registered Dietician Program manager or coordinator (including DSME coordinator) Lifestyle coach, health coach, other community health worker Registered Nurse, nurse practitioner, licensed practical nurse Case manager 				
SMA Coordinator	 Medical assistant, licensed practical nurse, registered nurse Certified diabetes educator Program coordinator 				
Prescribing Provider	Physician (MD, DO)Other provider (NP, PA)Pharmacist				
Behavioral Health Provider	Health psychologist (PhD)Social worker (LCSW, LSW)Other BHP				
Roles associated with indirect support	 Data analyst, IT professional, biostatistician Office/clinic/practice manager Administrative support staff, receptionist Outreach coordinator, site coordinator, recruiter Medical assistant, medical interpreter, patient navigator Pharmacist Registered dietician, certified diabetes educator Chief medical officer, executive director 				
	SMA Coordinator Prescribing Provider Behavioral Health Provider Roles associated with indirect				

Implementation

	Personnel Time, hours Avg (Min, Max)	Personnel Cost, \$ Avg (Min, Max)	Other Cost, \$ Avg (Min, Max)	Personnel Time, hours Avg (Min, Max)	Personnel Cost, \$ Avg (Min, Max)	\$
Standardized SMAs	79.6 (21, 162)	\$3,420 (\$848, \$8,700)	\$957 (\$0, \$6,736)	53.4 (34.5, 100.5)	\$1,948 (\$1,085, \$3,397)	\$137
Patient-driven	131.1	\$4,660	\$1,717	83.4	\$2,430	\$177
SMAs	(58, 213.9)	(\$1,229, \$9,877)	(\$0, \$7,629)	(49, 132)	(\$699, \$5,015)	(\$0, \$802)
All practices	102.5	\$3,971	\$1,295	67.7	\$2,177	\$156
	(16, 140)	(\$848, \$9,877)	(\$0, \$7,629)	(34.5, 132)	(\$699, \$5,015)	(\$0, \$802)

Cost Results:

Table 2: Cost

- Reported costs of delivering diabetes SMAs varied considerably among practices, both in personnel time and other expenditures. Some practices did not report any additional expenditures for the SMAs, while others reported material costs, travel, portions of facility cost etc.
- As expected, delivering a model with a larger team involved more hours during planning and implementation than an approach with fewer personnel, plus modest increases in other costs.
- Differences in roles involved changed cost per practice, and could affect reimbursement. Roles selected were due to a combination of staff availability and interest in SMAs, as well as scheduling decisions made at each practice.

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

- Practices seeking to implement diabetes SMAs should consider:
 - Diabetes SMAs may take considerable hours to set up and implement. Roles to involve may vary based on who is available at the practice, and desired reimbursement.
- What elements of SMAs are most important to the care of their patients, as well as providers and other stakeholders.
- The patient-driven approach studied resulted in costs that were close to double that of the standardized approach, and require practices to have integrated behavioral health.
- The staffing resources required relative to available funding and/or potential reimbursement for each model.
- Average per patient costs may be lowered if practices are able to deliver diabetes SMAs to relatively larger groups.
- Reimbursement options likely vary by factors such as setting, payer mix, and credentials of personnel involved in SMA delivery. While physician visit reimbursement is more lucrative, some sites chose to utilize other provider types or not have as many prescribing provider visits due to scheduling or not wanting patients to have to pay copays, resulting in lower reimbursement.
- Utilizing volunteers for the peer mentor role and not considering some costs (i.e., facility cost) to be attributable to SMAs may have reduced reported costs.

CONCLUSION

- The patient driven SMAs are more expensive and resource intensive to deliver than the standardized SMAs. That said, practices seeking to implement diabetes SMAs should consider what elements of SMAs are most important to their patients and the resources required relative to reimbursement for each model.
- Time-Driven Activity Based Costing (TDABC) is an important methodology for determining implementation cost and capacity utilization of resources at the practice level for pragmatic trials.
- Future analyses will examine whether patient-driven SMAs lead to better clinical and patient reported outcomes relative to standardized SMAs.

REFERENCES

1. Kwan BM et al. 2020 in *Trials*

2. Kaplan RS, Porter ME. 2011 in *Harvard Business Review*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Research reported in this poster was funded through a Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI) Award (IHS-1609-36322). The views, statements, and opinions presented in this work are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI), its Board of Governors or Methodology Committee.

Contact information

Contact:

Jeanette Waxmonsky, PhD at: jeanette.waxmonsky@cuanschutz.edu