



HEALTH

- CHILD POLICY
- CIVIL JUSTICE
- EDUCATION
- ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT
- HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE
- INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
- NATIONAL SECURITY
- POPULATION AND AGING
- PUBLIC SAFETY
- SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
- SUBSTANCE ABUSE
- TERRORISM AND HOMELAND SECURITY
- TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

This PDF document was made available from www.rand.org as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

[Jump down to document](#) ▼

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world.

Support RAND

[Browse Books & Publications](#)

[Make a charitable contribution](#)

For More Information

Visit RAND at www.rand.org

Explore [RAND Health](#)

View [document details](#)

Limited Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law as indicated in a notice appearing later in this work. This electronic representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents for commercial use.

This product is part of the RAND Corporation corporate publication series. Corporate publications describe or promote RAND divisions and programs, summarize research results, or announce upcoming events.

U.S. HEALTH CARE

Facts About Cost, Access, and Quality

DANA P. GOLDMAN ■ ELIZABETH A. McGLYNN

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world.

The Communications Institute is a nonprofit organization that enhances the ability of society to confront critical issues through the knowledge and application of objective, nonpartisan research and perspectives.

© Copyright 2005 RAND Corporation

RAND[®] is a registered trademark.

RAND Corporation
1776 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
phone: 310-451-7002; fax: 310-451-6915
<http://www.rand.org/>

The Communications Institute
55 South Grand Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91105
phone: 626-796-4747; fax: 626-609-2339
<http://www.communicationsinstitute.org>

U.S. HEALTH CARE

Facts About Cost, Access, and Quality

DANA P. GOLDMAN ■ ELIZABETH A. McGLYNN

PREFACE

The United States spends approximately 15 percent of its gross domestic product on health care, making health care the largest single sector of the U.S. economy. Despite these levels of expenditure, Americans are not healthier and do not live longer than citizens in many other nations (*World Health Report 2000—Health Systems: Improving Performance*, online at <http://w3.whosea.org/healthreport/main.htm>). Nearly 45 million Americans are uninsured—about 18 percent of Americans under 65. American adults receive just half of recommended health care services. And we find that quality of care does not vary much by socioeconomic factors: Quality is similar in cities with higher and lower rates of those without insurance, poverty, penetration of managed care, and supply of hospital beds and doctors.

Health policy experts at RAND Health, a division of the RAND Corporation, have assembled this chart book to provide a factual basis for addressing the nation's health care challenges. It is based on material prepared by RAND Health for a series of public meetings in California organized by the Communications Institute as part of its program of educational conferences for community leaders, policymakers, journalists, business executives, and government and labor officials. We wish to acknowledge the leadership of California State Assembly Members Joseph Nation, PhD (D-San Rafael), and Keith Richman, MD (R-Northridge), who provided the impetus for the California project.

The Communications Institute is a consortium of academic and research institutions and scholars dedicated to improving public policy decisionmaking based on objective, nonpartisan analysis. Information about the Communications Institute and its programs can be found on its web site at www.communicationsinstitute.com.

In compiling this chart book, the authors have drawn on the most recent data available and have used longitudinal data wherever possible to give a comprehensive view of the health care sector and how it has evolved. The book should be of interest to both state and national leaders as they pursue innovative and sustainable approaches to improving the health care system.

Much of the RAND work described in this book was conducted in the RAND Health Economics Research Program and in the Center for Research on Quality in Health Care. More information about this research can be found on the RAND Health web site at www.rand.org/health.

RAND has developed two clinically based systems for assessing quality of care. The Quality Assessment (QA) Tools—developed over the last decade with funding from the Health Care Financing Administration (now the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services), the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the California HealthCare Foundation, and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation—is a comprehensive system for assessing quality of care for children and adults. ACOVE™ (Assessing Care of Vulnerable Elders)—developed as part of RAND's strategic relationship with Pfizer—is a quality-of-care assessment system for the elderly who are at high risk of functional decline. These systems are the basis of RAND's quality assessment research reported in this chart book.

Health care is a critical public policy issue at every level of government. We hope that this book and the educational programs associated with it will help leaders in the public, private, and nonprofit sector make better decisions about the future of America's health care.

Michael D. Rich
Executive Vice President
The RAND Corporation

John E. Cox, Jr.
President
The Communications Institute

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Costs and Insurance	1
Health Care Spending as a Share of U.S. Economic Output Has Been Rising Steadily	3
Richer Countries Spend More on Health Care; the United States Is a Clear Outlier	4
The United States Is Not an Outlier with Respect to How Fast Health Care Costs Are Rising	5
We Spend More Than One-Half of Our Health Care Dollars on Hospital and Physician Services	6
The Elderly Spend Much More on Health Care, and the Services They Buy Are Different.	7
Age Is a Powerful Predictor of Health Care Use.	8
The Elderly Are a Rising Share of the U.S. Population	9
The Federal Share of Total Health Care Spending Has Been Rising Steadily	10
Medicare Is the Dominant Payer for the Elderly, Private Insurance for Those Under 65.	11
The Elderly Spend a Larger Share of Income on Health Care Services	12
The Share of Health Care Paid Out-of-Pocket Is Falling	13
Most of the Nonelderly Receive Their Health Care Coverage from Their Employer.	14
Large Firms Almost Always Offer Health Insurance; Smaller Firms Often Do Not.	15
Health Insurance for a Family of Four Cost \$9,950 in 2004; Workers Contributed About 27 Percent of the Total.	16
Health Insurance Premiums Are Rising Rapidly Nationwide	17
HMO Premiums Are Rising, but Profits Are Not	18
The Uninsured Population Is Rising Nationwide	19
Over One-Third of the Uninsured Nationwide Earn More Than 200 Percent of the Federal Poverty Level	20
Most of the Uninsured Live in Families with at Least One Worker	21
Young Adults Are Most Likely to Be Uninsured	22
The Price of a Day in the Hospital Rose Tenfold over the Past 40 Years	23
The Number of MRI Machines and MRI Procedures Has Increased	24
Employees Enrolled in HMOs Are Facing Higher Co-Payments for Physician Office Visits	25

Cost Sharing Has No Effect on Functioning or General Health	26
Prescription Drug Expenditures Have Been Rising at Double-Digit Rates	27
Prescription Drugs Are a Rising Share of Health Care Expenditures	28
Private Insurance Is the Predominant Payer for Prescription Drugs	29
The Share Paid Out-of-Pocket for Prescription Drugs Has Fallen.	30
The Share of Workers Facing Three-Tier Co-Payments for Prescription Drugs Has Increased.	31
Co-Payments Can Have a Large Effect on Service Use—including Prescription Drugs	32
Quality of Care	33
The Multiple Dimensions of Quality	35
Rates of Common Cardiac Procedures Vary Widely Nationwide (2001)	36
About One-Third of Common Surgical Procedures May Not Benefit Patients	37
Variation in Inappropriateness of Hospital Admission Is Not Related to Admission Rates	38
Overall, About One-Half of Recommended Care Is Received	39
Underuse Is a Greater Problem Than Overuse	40
There Is Substantial Room for Improvement Across All Types of Care.	41
Quality of Care for Heart and Lung Problems Varies Widely.	42
Significant Variation Exists in Management of Adults' General Medical Problems	43
Remarkably Little Variation Is Found Across Major Metropolitan Areas	44
Quality for Selected Chronic Conditions Varies by Community	45
What Are the Consequences of Poor Quality?	46
Care for Geriatric Conditions Is Poorer Than Care for General Medical Conditions	47
Quality of Preventive Care for the Elderly Is the Poorest	48
Quality of Care for the Elderly Varied by Condition	49
Vulnerable Elders Do Not Receive Recommended Care After a Fall	50
Medication Management for Vulnerable Elders Is Poor	51
The Multiple Dimensions of Quality	52
Problems with Patient Safety Occur in All Types of Hospitalizations.	53
Preventable Adverse Events Occur Most Often in Ordering and Administration of Drugs.	54

Expected Mortality Rate Can Be Compared with the Rate Observed	55
Medicare Beneficiaries Report Least Problems with Receiving Timely Care	56
Medicare Beneficiaries Give Their Personal Physicians High Ratings for Communication.	57
Medicare Beneficiaries Rate Their Overall Health Care Higher	58
Women Are Less Likely to Get Effective Drug Therapies for Heart Attacks.	59
African Americans Are Less Likely to Have Access to Kidney Transplants.	60
Minority Patients Are Less Likely to Receive Adequate Cancer Pain Management.	61
African American Children Are Less Likely Than Whites to Be Diagnosed and Treated for ADHD	62
Use of Anesthesia Drugs Demonstrates One Type of System Inefficiency.	63
References	65


Costs and Insurance

Dana P. Goldman

Abby E. Alpert

Health Care Spending as a Share of U.S. Economic Output Has Been Rising Steadily


Source: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2004.



- National health care spending as a percentage of U.S. gross domestic product (GDP)—the total spending on goods and services in the United States—has been rising steadily over the past 40 years. In 1960, it accounted for slightly more than 5 percent of the total. By 2002, health care spending was about 15 percent of GDP
- Real health care spending (measured in 2002 dollars using the GDP deflator) rose from \$108 billion in 1960 to \$1.6 trillion in 2002, a 15-fold increase

Richer Countries Spend More on Health Care; the United States Is a Clear Outlier


Sources: OECD, 2002; Anderson et al., 2003.



- There is a close correspondence between GDP per capita and total health care spending per capita at any given point in time. The notable exception is the United States
- The United States is spending more on health care per capita than any other country, but its use of medical services—measured by, for example, hospital days and physician visits per capita—is below the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) median. This suggests that prices could be much higher in the United States than in other countries (Anderson et al., 2003)

The United States Is Not an Outlier with Respect to How Fast Health Care Costs Are Rising


Source: OECD, 2004.



- Eight of the countries shown on this graph had the highest health spending per capita in 2002 (U.S.\$ PPP)
- Between 1990 and 2002, growth in real health care spending per capita for these countries ranged from 9 percent in Italy to 57 percent in Norway

We Spend More Than One-Half of Our Health Care Dollars on Hospital and Physician Services


Source: California HealthCare Foundation, 2004a.



- In 2002, 53 cents of every health care dollar was spent on hospital and physician services
- Nursing home/home health care and prescription drugs each accounted for about 10 cents of each dollar spent

The Elderly Spend Much More on Health Care, and the Services They Buy Are Different


Source: Meara, White, and Cutler, 2004, Exhibit 4.



- People 65 and over spend much more on health care—about four times more than those under 65
- Both groups spend the majority of their health care dollars on hospital care and physician services: 64 percent for those under 65, 54 percent for those 65 and over
- The elderly spend a higher fraction of their health care dollar on nursing home care: Twenty-two percent versus 2 percent for people under 65

Age Is a Powerful Predictor of Health Care Use

Source: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2000.




- In general, costs rise approximately exponentially with age. This fact alone suggests that demographics, especially the baby boom generation, have, and will continue to have, profound effects on health care spending
- In 2000, average annual per-capita expenditures for personal health care for the U.S. population were \$2,255. But, as the table below shows, average per-capita expenditures for individuals 65–74 were two and a half times higher than for those 18–64. Expenditures for those over 85 were about three times higher

Age	Average Annual Per-Capita Expenditures
0 to 17	1,367
18 to 64	2,016
65 to 74	5,397
85 +	6,209

The Elderly Are a Rising Share of the U.S. Population


Source: Hobbs and Stoops, 2002.



- The elderly spend much more on health care. Thus, demographic trends pose a major challenge for cost containment
- In 1900, people 65 and older constituted slightly more than 4 percent of the U.S. total population of 76 million. By mid-century their share had doubled to more than 8 percent
- By 2000, those 65 and over accounted for more than 12 percent of the total U.S. population of 281 million
- Of particular significance for health care costs is the rapidly growing group of the oldest old—defined as 85 or older

The Federal Share of Total Health Care Spending Has Been Rising Steadily

Source: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2004.



- The federal share of total spending jumped sharply after the creation of Medicare and Medicaid, rising from about 10 percent in 1964 to nearly 25 percent after their enactment in 1965*
- Since then, the federal share has continued to rise. In 2002, the federal government paid 32 of every 100 dollars spent on health care
- Health care spending from private sources has fallen since 1960, from about 75 percent at the beginning of the period to about 55 percent in 2002
- Over the same period, state and local contributions have remained basically unchanged at about 12 percent of total health care spending


* People 65 and over who are eligible for Social Security are automatically enrolled, without a premium, in Medicare Part A, which covers hospital costs. They can pay a monthly premium to enroll in Medicare Part B, which covers outpatient care. Generally Medicare does not pay for long-term care. It does cover some disabled individuals under 65.

A Medicare drug benefit (Medicare Part D) begins January 2006; until then, there is an interim Medicare-endorsed drug discount card and transitional assistance program.

Medicaid provides care for the indigent. It is a jointly funded federal-state program. The federal government sets certain requirements for all Medicaid programs, but the states have some latitude in implementing the program. In California, the Medicaid program is called Medi-Cal. In June of 2003, Medi-Cal covered 6.4 million low-income children, adults, blind, disabled, and elderly individuals in California (California HealthCare Foundation, 2004b).

Medicare Is the Dominant Payer for the Elderly, Private Insurance for Those Under 65


Source: Olin and Machlin, 2003.



- We can expect the federal government to continue to play a predominant role in the financing of health care, since Medicare pays for 56 percent of the elderly's health care bills and the nation's elderly population is growing as a share of the total population
- Together, Medicaid and Medicare account for more than 60 percent of health care expenditures for those 65 and over. Private insurance accounts for only 14 percent
- For those under 65, the payment pattern is nearly a mirror image. Private insurance accounts for 54 percent of the total, while Medicaid and Medicare constitute only 16 percent

The Elderly Spend a Larger Share of Income on Health Care Services


Source: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2003.



- The elderly use a larger proportion of their income on health care services—more than double the proportion used by those under 65
- Possible reasons are that the elderly are in frailer health and use more services such as prescription drugs and long-term care, which are not covered by insurance

The Share of Health Care Paid Out-of-Pocket Is Falling


Source: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2004.



- Out-of-pocket expenditures (the share of health care spending that consumers must pay out of their own pockets) as a share of all personal health care spending fell over three decades until the mid-1990s, and they are now steady at about 15 percent
- Real out-of-pocket health care spending, excluding insurance premiums, was about \$744 per person, per year in 2002, up from \$280 in 1960

Most of the Nonelderly Receive Their Health Care Coverage from Their Employer


Source: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, 2003a.



- The predominant source of health insurance for the nonelderly is their employer
- Employers offer insurance through the workplace because of the tax advantages of doing so, the increase in worker productivity that results from improved health, or because a health benefit allows them to recruit and retain high-quality workers. Employers also offer a convenient way to pool risks—that is, spread health care costs across both healthy and sick employees

Large Firms Almost Always Offer Health Insurance; Smaller Firms Often Do Not


Source: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust, 2004b.



- In 2004, nearly two-thirds of U.S. firms offered health insurance to their employees. The size of the firm is a major factor in whether the employer offers insurance
- About 24 percent of workers were employed in firms with fewer than 50 employees in 2004. These firms are least likely to offer health benefits
- Almost all firms with 50 or more workers offer health insurance to their employees

Health Insurance for a Family of Four Cost \$9,950 in 2004; Workers Contributed About 27 Percent of the Total


Sources: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust, 2004a and 2004b.



- In 2004, health insurance for single workers cost \$3,695, up 9 percent from the previous year. Workers contributed 15 percent of the total cost, about the same as in 2003
- Insurance for a family of four also increased, rising from \$9,068 in 2003 to \$9,950 in 2004, an increase of 10 percent
- Workers' contribution for family insurance increased 10 percent between 2003 and 2004. In 2004, they paid about 27 percent of the total premium

Health Insurance Premiums Are Rising Rapidly Nationwide


Source: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust, 2003a.



- Since 1988, the annual nationwide increase in private health insurance has fluctuated quite a bit but has averaged about 11 percent
- The growth rate peaked at 18 percent in 1989, then slid quickly over the next several years. In part, this may reflect competitive trends: Health maintenance organizations (HMOs) gained a larger share of the health insurance market and implemented a variety of strategies for promoting cost control, including gatekeepers and prior approval for certain procedures. HMOs also used their market power to negotiate lower prices from hospitals, physicians, and other service providers

HMO Premiums Are Rising, but Profits Are Not


Source: Baumgarten, 2004.



- One possible reason for increased health insurance premiums could be that insurers are making more money. However, for example, HMO premiums in California suggest that this is not the case. California HMOs cover about 50 percent of the market (The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, 2004)
- HMO premiums have been rising quite sharply, from \$112 per month, per person in 1997 to \$166 in 2002, an increase of nearly 50 percent
- However, HMOs are also providing more services. As a result, their gross profitability has remained basically flat since 1997 at 10–12 percent. For example, in 1997, 88 cents of every premium dollar went toward medical expenses, while the remaining 12 cents went toward profits and administrative expenses. In 2002, the comparable numbers are 89 cents versus 11 cents

The Uninsured Population Is Rising Nationwide


Source: California HealthCare Foundation, 2004c.



- The percentage of the nonelderly—defined as those under age 65—who are uninsured has risen nationwide since 1987 from about 13 percent to 18 percent in 2003—about 45 million Americans

Over One-Third of the Uninsured Nationwide Earn More Than 200 Percent of the Federal Poverty Level


Source: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, 2000, 2002, 2003a, and 2003b.



- Many people believe that the uninsured are poor, unemployed, and elderly. The next three charts demonstrate that this image is not completely accurate
- Nationwide, over one-third of the nonelderly uninsured earn more than 200 percent of the federal poverty level—\$14,348 for a family of three in 2002

Most of the Uninsured Live in Families with at Least One Worker


Source: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, 2003a.



- In 2002, 70 percent of the uninsured lived in a family with at least one full-time worker
- Fewer than 20 percent lived in families where no one works

Young Adults Are Most Likely to Be Uninsured


Source: Institute of Medicine, 2004.



- The young and the near elderly—those under 18 and those 55–64—are least likely to be uninsured
- Medicaid provides coverage for many children
- Individuals ages 55–64 have lower labor force participation rates than other working age groups, but they are also more likely to purchase health insurance directly from an insurance company (Fronstin, 2004)

The Price of a Day in the Hospital Rose Tenfold over the Past 40 Years


Source: American Hospital Association, 1983 and 2004.



- The cost trend for a day in the hospital illustrates the steady increase in the price of health care services in the United States over the past four decades
- In 1965, the real cost per hospital day was about \$128. In 2002, the cost had risen to \$1,289—a tenfold increase. Much of this increase reflects that we are delivering more technologically advanced care in the hospital

The Number of MRI Machines and MRI Procedures Has Increased


Source: Baker and Atlas, 2004; Canadian Institute for Health Information, 2003.



- One source of rising health care costs is the use of more expensive technology. The increasing use of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) technology illustrates this trend. MRIs are used in a variety of diagnostic applications
- In the early 1990s, MRI machines were still relatively scarce. There was less than one MRI site for every 100,000 persons in the United States. By the end of the decade, the number of sites for every 100,000 persons had increased by about 130 percent
- The number of MRI procedures increased proportionately. In 1993, there were about 2,900 procedures per 100,000 persons. Six years later, the rate increased by more than 50 percent to 4,600 procedures

Employees Enrolled in HMOs Are Facing Higher Co-Payments for Physician Office Visits


Source: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust, 2003a, Exhibit 7.7.



- In 2003, almost all covered employees enrolled in HMOs were required to make co-payments for physician office visits with preferred health care providers (physicians approved by the HMO). The amount of co-payment has been increasing
- In 1996, 87 percent of employees had co-payments of \$10 or less
- By 2003, average co-payments had increased, and only 41 percent of employees faced that level of cost sharing
- A flat \$10 co-payment was once the most common type—61 percent of workers had such a payment in 1998. In 2003, only about one-third of workers had a \$10 co-payment
- The shifting of costs from insurers to patients is also reflected in the trend for deductibles—the amount that patients must pay out of their own pockets before insurance benefits begin. In 2003, the average deductible for preferred provider services in preferred provider organization plans was \$275, up from \$175 in 2000

Cost Sharing Has No Effect on Functioning or General Health

Source: Newhouse and the Insurance Experiment Group, 1993.




- For people with insurance, does cost sharing affect health? The RAND Health Insurance Experiment,* a large multiyear study, examined how different levels of cost sharing—ranging from none to 95 percent—affected both use of health care and health care outcomes
- Cost sharing consistently reduced spending. Patients didn't find lower prices for treatment; they sought treatment less often
- Those who had free care spent an average of 50 percent more per person per year than those with the highest level of cost sharing (\$1,019 versus \$700). Even mild cost sharing—25 percent—reduced average per-person spending from \$1,019 to \$826
- Cost sharing had few adverse health effects. There were no significant differences between those with free care and those with cost sharing on any general health measures, such as people's ability to function in their usual daily roles, physical functioning (e.g., self-care and mobility), mental health, or general health
- However, people with certain conditions might do better with less cost sharing. At the end of the study, those with free care had better blood pressure control, corrected vision, and oral health. With the advent of more-effective medications, these results raise the question about how cost sharing for prescription drugs affects outcomes

* The RAND Health Insurance Experiment, a 15-year (1971–1986) multimillion-dollar effort, was funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (now the Department of Health and Human Services).

Prescription Drug Expenditures Have Been Rising at Double-Digit Rates

Source: Berndt, 2001.



- Prescription drugs are an increasingly important component of modern health care treatment. Drug spending has been rising at double-digit rates since the mid-1980s. However, the composition of that growth has shifted
- From 1987 to 1993, about one-half of the annual increase in prescription drug spending was due to higher prices. However, over the past ten years, about 80 percent of the increase is due to higher drug use per capita

Prescription Drugs Are a Rising Share of Health Care Expenditures


Source: California HealthCare Foundation, 2004a.

Category	Spending distribution			Growth ('02 versus '01)	
	1982	2001	2002	Billions	Percentage
National Health Expenditures	100%	100%	100%	\$132	9%
Hospital care	42%	31%	31%	\$ 42	9%
Physician and clinical services	19%	22%	22%	\$ 24	8%
Dental/other professional	8%	10%	10%	\$ 13	9%
Nursing home/home health care	8%	9%	9%	\$ 6	5%
Prescription drugs	5%	10%	10%	\$ 22	15%
Administration	5%	6%	7%	\$ 15	16%
Other	13%	10%	10%	\$ 10	7%

- Over the last two decades, spending on hospital care has fallen as a percentage of total health care expenditures but spending on prescription drugs is an increasing share
- Between 1982 and 2002, hospital care dropped from 42 percent of total expenditures to 31 percent. Recent increases in hospital costs of \$42 billion suggest some of the cost-cutting gains during the 1980s and 1990s will not continue
- Over the same period, expenditures on prescription drugs as a share of total expenditures doubled, rising from 5 percent to 10 percent. Total expenditures on prescription drugs grew by \$22 billion between 2001 and 2002, a 15 percent increase

Private Insurance Is the Predominant Payer for Prescription Drugs


Source: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2004.



- Private insurance picks up the largest share of the cost for prescription drugs and physician services—about one-half in each case
- About two-thirds of health care provided in hospitals and nursing homes is paid for by public sources, which is not surprising since Medicare and Medicaid are the predominant payers for the elderly

The Share Paid Out-of-Pocket for Prescription Drugs Has Fallen


Source: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2004.



- Private insurers now cover about one-half of all spending for prescription drugs. That reflects a major change over the past four decades
- In 1960, the out-of-pocket share of drug expenditures was close to 100 percent, while the private share was essentially zero
- As firms began to add prescription drugs to benefit packages for their employees, the out-of-pocket share of drug expenditures fell
- Public funding for drugs has also risen steadily since 1960

The Share of Workers Facing Three-Tier Co-Payments for Prescription Drugs Has Increased


Source: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust, 2003a, Exhibit 9.1.



- Although private insurers are paying for an increasing share of overall prescription drug spending, they are shifting a larger share of the costs to patients
- Three-tier pharmacy benefits are now the most prevalent. Under this arrangement, an employee faces one level of co-payment for generic drugs, a higher co-payment for “preferred drugs” (for example, brand-name drugs with no generic substitutes), and an even higher co-payment for nonpreferred drugs (for example, brand-name drugs that have generic substitutes)
- Two-tier arrangements, in which employees have lower co-payments for generic drugs, and payment that does not vary by drug type have both declined
- The size of co-payments has been increasing. Between 2000 and 2003, the average co-payment for preferred drugs in tiered arrangements rose from \$13 to \$19. The average co-payment for nonpreferred drugs rose from \$17 to \$29

Co-Payments Can Have a Large Effect on Service Use— Including Prescription Drugs

Source: Goldman et al., 2004.



- Doubling patients' co-payments for drugs can reduce their use of the most common classes of medications by 25 to 45 percent
- The patients most sensitive to price changes are those who are taking medications but are not receiving regular care for their conditions
- Even the chronically ill who are receiving routine care cut their drug use between 8 percent and 23 percent when their co-payments are doubled

Quality of Care

Elizabeth A. McGlynn

The Multiple Dimensions of Quality


Source: Institute of Medicine, 2001.

<u>Elements of quality care</u>		<u>Type of quality problem</u>
People get the care they need	} Effectiveness	Underuse
People need the care they get		Overuse
Provided safely		Error
Timely		Delays
Patient centered		Unresponsive
Delivered equitably		Disparities
Delivered efficiently		Waste

- The Institute of Medicine (IOM) has defined quality of care as a multidimensional concept
- People should get the *care they need*; when they don't, we call it underuse. This problem occurs when health care interventions that are known to improve people's health are not provided to those who could benefit
- People should *need the care* they receive; when they don't, we call it overuse. This problem occurs when people receive health care interventions that are not expected to improve their health or may even be harmful
- Taken together, these two elements characterize care that is effective
- Care should be provided *safely*. When it isn't, we refer to the problem as medical error
- Care should be provided in a *timely manner*, which means that patients do not experience unreasonable or unacceptable delays
- Care should be *patient centered*. When it isn't, patients experience the health care system as unresponsive to their needs and preferences
- Care should be delivered *equitably*. When it isn't, we observe differences in who receives appropriate or effective care that are not related to health needs. These differences are called disparities
- Care should be delivered *efficiently*. When it isn't, we find that the health care system is wasting resources
- We will explore each dimension of the IOM's definition. Because this definition represents a relatively new way of thinking about quality of care, there is more research available on effectiveness, and that is where we begin our discussion

Rates of Common Cardiac Procedures Vary Widely Nationwide (2001)

Source: *The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care*, 2004.




- Work first published in the early 1970s identified substantial variation in the rates at which different surgical and diagnostic procedures were used and patients were admitted to hospitals
- This variation is not related to the health care needs of the population
- For example, three common cardiac procedures have different rates of use in hospital referral regions* across the country
 - Coronary angiography rates range from 7.5 per 1,000 Medicare beneficiaries in Hawaii to 35.5 in Alabama
 - Percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty rates range from 3.4 per 1,000 Medicare beneficiaries in Hawaii to 15.8 per 1,000 in Louisiana
 - Coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgery rates range from 2.6 per 1,000 Medicare beneficiaries in Hawaii to 8.3 per 1,000 in Kentucky
- Identification of substantial variation in rates of service delivery led to research on the underlying causes.

* Hospital referral regions represent regional health care markets for tertiary medical care.

About One-Third of Common Surgical Procedures May Not Benefit Patients


Sources: Bernstein et al., 1993; Winslow et al., 1988; Chassin et al., 1987; Hilborne et al., 1993; Tobacman et al., 1996.



- Several RAND studies conducted in the 1980s and early 1990s investigated whether patients who received common surgical procedures would be expected to have experienced significant health benefits from them
- On average, about one-third of procedures were provided for reasons that were not supported by clinical research and may have been harmful to patients
- The proportion of procedures performed for inappropriate (overuse) or equivocal (potential overuse) reasons ranged in these studies from 9 percent (cataract surgery) to 44 percent (coronary artery bypass graft [CABG] surgery)
- We have no current information on the appropriateness with which common surgical or diagnostic procedures are used

Variation in Inappropriateness of Hospital Admission Is Not Related to Admission Rates


Source: Siu et al., 1986.



- Multiple studies have failed to find a relationship between the rates at which a health care service is used and the proportion of services that are provided for clinically acceptable reasons
- For example, findings from RAND's Health Insurance Experiment illustrated here show that the proportion of hospitalizations judged to be for inappropriate reasons ranged from 10–35 percent. The study sites are ordered from the communities with the lowest rates of hospital admission (left) to the highest rates (right). There is no relationship between admission rates in these communities and the proportion of inappropriate admissions

Overall, About One-Half of Recommended Care Is Received


Source: McGlynn et al., 2003.



- In the only national study conducted on quality of care, RAND found that American adults were receiving about one-half of recommended medical services—that is, services shown in the scientific literature to be effective in specific circumstances and agreed upon by medical experts
- This study used RAND’s Quality Assessment (QA) Tools system, a comprehensive method for assessing quality that includes 439 measures of effectiveness for 30 acute and chronic health problems of adults as well as the leading preventive health care interventions

Underuse Is a Greater Problem Than Overuse


Source: McGlynn et al., 2003.



- RAND's national study found that failure to deliver needed services (underuse) occurred more often than delivering services that were not needed or harmful (overuse)
- Patients failed to receive needed services 46 percent of the time
- Patients received services they did not need 11 percent of the time. This rate of overuse is consistent with previous findings about the rates of use for surgical procedures that were clearly inappropriate but may underrepresent the total rates of overuse in the population

There Is Substantial Room for Improvement Across All Types of Care


Source: McGlynn et al., 2003.



- RAND’s national study found deficits in quality of care across all types of care—chronic, preventive, and acute
- Recommended care for managing chronic conditions (e.g., diabetes and hypertension) was provided 56 percent of the time
- Preventive care (e.g., flu shots, mammograms and smoking cessation counseling) met quality standards 55 percent of the time
- Recommended care for acute health problems (e.g., pneumonia and urinary tract infections) was provided 54 percent of the time

Quality of Care for Heart and Lung Problems Varies Widely


Source: McGlynn et al., 2003.



- RAND found wide variation in the proportion of recommended care provided for some specific conditions
- For example, recommended care for heart and lung problems ranged from 25 percent for atrial fibrillation (irregular heart rate) to 68 percent for coronary artery disease

Significant Variation Exists in Management of Adults' General Medical Problems


Source: McGlynn et al., 2003.



- RAND found wide variability in the quality of care provided to patients with other common medical problems ranging from 11 percent for alcohol dependence to 79 percent for cataracts
- The poor quality of care delivered to persons with diabetes is especially troubling because it is associated with significantly increased risk of death and disability
- The performance rates for both depression and alcohol dependence were limited to persons who had one of these diagnoses noted in their medical chart. We know from other work (and this is supported in RAND's national study) that many people with these problems are not identified or diagnosed—so the quality deficit is actually much greater in these two areas

Remarkably Little Variation Is Found Across Major Metropolitan Areas


Source: Kerr et al., 2004.



- RAND’s national study also examined the quality of care provided in 12 major metropolitan areas (described in Kerr et al., 2004). RAND found remarkably little variation in the percentage of recommended care that people received in these areas
- Overall, the proportion of residents receiving recommended services ranged from 51 percent in Orange County, California, and Little Rock to 59 percent in Seattle
- The proportion of residents receiving needed preventive services ranged from 50 percent in Newark to 61 percent in Seattle
- The proportion of residents receiving needed acute care services ranged from 48 percent in Miami to 59 percent in Cleveland
- The proportion of residents receiving needed care for chronic health problems ranged from 52 percent in Orange County to 58 percent in Cleveland and Syracuse

Quality for Selected Chronic Conditions Varies by Community

Source: Kerr et al., 2004.



- The 12 metropolitan areas in the study had similar overall rates of recommended care for chronic conditions. However, there were some differences across communities
- Care for diabetes ranged from 39 percent in Little Rock to 59 percent in Miami
- Care for depression ranged from 47 percent in Newark to 63 percent in Seattle
- Care for hypertension ranged from 54 percent in Little Rock to 69 percent in Cleveland
- Care for cardiac problems ranged from 52 percent in Indianapolis and Orange County to 70 percent in Syracuse
- Care for pulmonary problems ranged from 45 percent in Orange County to 64 percent in Miami
- No community was consistently best or worst in the provision of recommended services


What Are the Consequences of Poor Quality?

Condition	What we found	Estimated preventable complications/deaths (annual)
Diabetes	Blood sugar not measured for 40%; 24% uncontrolled	2,500 blind; 29,000 kidney failure
Hypertension	Blood pressure uncontrolled in 58%	68,000 deaths
Heart attack	39–55% did not receive needed medications	37,000 deaths
Pneumonia	36% no vaccine	10,000 deaths
Colon cancer	62% not screened	9,600 deaths

- The deficits in care documented in RAND’s national study pose serious threats to the health of the American public and translate into thousands of preventable complications and deaths each year
- People with diabetes received only 45 percent of the care they needed. Blood sugar was not measured in the two years of the study in 40 percent of patients with diabetes. One-quarter of those with their blood sugar measured demonstrated poor control, which can lead to kidney failure, blindness, and amputation of limbs
- Patients with hypertension received less than 65 percent of recommended care. Uncontrolled blood pressure is associated with increased risk for heart disease and stroke and has been estimated to cause 68,000 preventable deaths annually (Woolf, 1999)
- People with coronary artery disease received 68 percent of recommended care, but just 45 percent of heart attack patients received beta blockers and 61 percent got aspirin. This gap has been estimated to cause 37,000 preventable deaths annually (Woolf, 1999)
- Fewer than two-thirds of elderly Americans were vaccinated against pneumonia. Nearly 10,000 deaths from pneumonia could be prevented annually through proper vaccinations (Woolf, 1999)
- Just 38 percent of adults over age 50 were screened for colorectal cancer. Routine tests and appropriate follow-up could prevent 9,600 deaths a year (Woolf, 1999)

Care for Geriatric Conditions Is Poorer Than Care for General Medical Conditions


Source: Wenger et al., 2003.



- RAND's national assessment of quality described the epidemiology for the country. Other RAND quality assessment efforts using the ACOVE™ (Assessing Care of Vulnerable Elders) quality measurement system have focused on individuals 65 or over who are at increased risk for functional decline or death
- The study findings for this subset of the population were the same as for the national study: Overall, vulnerable elders received about one-half of recommended care, as measured by the percentage of time that providers met standards for quality care
- Adherence to standards of care was even poorer for geriatric conditions. For example, RAND found that recommended care was provided 31 percent of the time for geriatric conditions such as dementia, urinary incontinence, and falls, which affect primarily the elderly. This finding is particularly troublesome given that early attention to geriatric conditions such as falls and gait disorders may avoid functional decline and even death

Quality of Preventive Care for the Elderly Is the Poorest


Source: Wenger et al., 2003.



- The percentage of quality standards met varies for different types of care
- Standards were met least often for preventive care—43 percent of the time. Standards met for diagnosis were only slightly higher at 46 percent
- Standards were met most often for treatment (80 percent)
- This difference might be explained by the nature of the U.S. health care system, which reimburses providers for time spent performing procedures and prescribing medications, but not for time spent taking thorough histories or providing preventive counseling
- Researchers also found that providers administered proper care to patients with conditions that needed immediate treatment (acute conditions) far more frequently than to those with chronic health problems—83 percent of the time versus 51 percent

Quality of Care for the Elderly Varies by Condition


Source: Wenger et al., 2003.



- As was the case in the national assessment, quality of care for the elderly varied widely by condition
- Quality standards were met in treatment for stroke 82 percent of the time. In contrast, standards were met in end-of-life care only 9 percent of the time

Vulnerable Elders Do Not Receive Recommended Care After a Fall


Source: Rubenstein et al., 2004.



- The standards of care used by RAND represent the basics of good medical care rather than focusing on only new or high-technology services. For example, standards of care for falls require that a physician examine a vulnerable elder who has fallen to determine the reason for the fall and to identify problems that may be treatable so the patient will be less likely to fall again
- But RAND found that elderly patients who had fallen were getting only a fraction of the care they should have received. For example, only 6 percent of patients were evaluated for blood pressure standing and lying, 7 percent had a gait and balance examination, and about one-quarter had a vision or neurological examination
- Such exams are necessary to identify patients who are weak and need physical therapy or patients with conditions such as Parkinson's disease who need specific medication

Medication Management for Vulnerable Elders Is Poor

Source: Higashi et al., 2004.



- Despite concerns about inappropriate use of medication, RAND has found that among the vulnerable elderly, the greatest problems with medication management are failure to prescribe needed medications and failure to monitor patients' response to (or side effects from) the medications that are prescribed
- This underscores the importance of comprehensive evaluations of quality problems—so that priorities can be set across the broad range of quality issues

The Multiple Dimensions of Quality


Source: Institute of Medicine, 2001.

<u>Elements of quality care</u>	<u>Type of quality problem</u>
People get the care they need	Underuse
People need the care they get	Overuse
Provided safely	Error
Timely	Delays
Patient centered	Unresponsive
Delivered equitably	Disparities
Delivered efficiently	Waste

- We have been focusing on the effectiveness of care. We now turn our attention to the other five dimensions of quality defined by the Institute of Medicine: safety, timeliness, patient centeredness, equity, and efficiency

Problems with Patient Safety Occur in All Types of Hospitalizations


Source: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2004.



- The Institute of Medicine focused national attention on quality problems related to medical errors in its recent report *To Err Is Human* (Kohn, Corrigan, and Donaldson, 2000)
- The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality has found that 1.12 million problems with patient safety occurred in 1.07 million hospitalizations—about one per hospitalization
- The problems were distributed relatively equally across the three major types of hospitalizations:
 - 34 percent in surgical admissions
 - 31 percent in obstetrics admissions
 - 35 percent in medical admissions
- Other studies have found that 45–48 percent of adverse events are attributable to surgical admissions (Leape et al., 1991; Thomas et al., 2000)
- About 17 percent of adverse events in surgery were the result of negligence (Leape et al., 1991; Thomas et al., 2000)

Preventable Adverse Events Occur Most Often in Ordering and Administration of Drugs


Source: Bates et al., 1995.



- A study of the sources of preventable adverse drug events found that 56 percent occurred at the time a medication was ordered and 34 percent when the drug was administered
- Errors were more likely to be intercepted by computerized systems if they occurred earlier in the process (48 percent of ordering errors were preventable compared to 0 percent of administration errors)

Expected Mortality Rate Can Be Compared with the Rate Observed


Source: California CABG Mortality Reporting Program, 2003.



- Public reporting of quality data is one way to make the public more aware of, and concerned about, quality issues and to give providers an incentive to provide quality care. For example, the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development and the Pacific Business Group on Health established a voluntary statewide reporting program to collect and publicly report mortality data from California hospitals for coronary artery bypass graft (CABG)
- This chart compares the expected mortality rate for CABG—that is, the number of patients one would expect to die following surgery, given the severity of their illness—and the actual mortality rate for hospitals in the Greater Los Angeles Area in calendar year 1999 that participated in the program
- None of these hospitals had a significant difference between the expected mortality rate and the actual rate—in either direction. That is, the hospitals did not perform either better or worse than one would expect, given the kind of patients they treat

Medicare Beneficiaries Report Least Problems with Receiving Timely Care


Source: *The National CAHPS® Benchmarking Database, 2002–2003.*



- Quality care is also timely and patient centered. A standardized national survey known as CAHPS® (originally, Consumer Assessment of Health Plans) gathers annual data about aspects of consumer experiences with obtaining medical care, including these two dimensions
- CAHPS data show that Medicare beneficiaries were significantly more likely than individuals covered by Medicaid or private insurance to report that they always got the care they needed (appointments, treatments, and seeing a doctor when scheduled) in a timely manner

Medicare Beneficiaries Give Their Personal Physicians High Ratings for Communication


Source: *The National CAHPS® Benchmarking Database, 2002–2003.*



- One dimension of patient-centered care that CAHPS measures is a physician's ability to communicate with his or her patients. Patients rated how often (*never or sometimes, usually, or always*) physicians communicated well
- Medicare beneficiaries were more likely than other patient groups to give their physicians high marks on communication

Medicare Beneficiaries Rate Their Overall Health Care Higher


Source: *The National CAHPS® Benchmarking Database, 2002–2003.*



- The CAHPS survey asks patients to rate their overall care, on a ten-point scale, where zero is the worst possible and ten is best possible
- Medicare beneficiaries were more likely than other groups to rate their overall care as a 9 or 10

Women Are Less Likely to Get Effective Drug Therapies for Heart Attacks


Source: Gan et al., 2000.



- Many studies have identified disparities in care between men and women and between different ethnic or socioeconomic groups
- For example, data from 1994–1995 show disparities in care between men and women who have had heart attacks
- Female Medicare patients hospitalized for heart attacks were less likely than men to receive drug therapies known to be effective in improving survival
- They were also less likely to receive time-sensitive therapies on a timely basis

African Americans Are Less Likely to Have Access to Kidney Transplants


Source: Ayanian et al., 1999; Epstein et al., 2000.



- Almost all end-stage renal disease (ESRD) patients have Medicare coverage, which should minimize disparities in financial access to care
- But among ESRD patients age 18–54 who started kidney dialysis, African Americans were less likely than white patients to be referred for evaluation or to receive a kidney transplant
- African Americans were also less likely to be placed on a waiting list for a transplant
- There were no differences between men and women in access to kidney transplants

Minority Patients Are Less Likely to Receive Adequate Cancer Pain Management


Sources: Bernabei et al., 1998; Cleeland et al., 1994.



- Two studies in the last decade found that many cancer patients did not receive adequate medication for their pain
- Among elderly nursing home residents who reported being in daily pain, 34 percent of African Americans and 25 percent of white residents did not receive any pain medication (Bernabei et al., 1998)
- Among cancer patients visiting 54 outpatient clinics, 59 percent of minority patients and 38 percent of white patients had inadequate pain management (Cleeland et al., 1994)
- The overall level of inadequate pain management among cancer patients is troubling; the greater inadequacy among minorities is even more disturbing

African American Children Are Less Likely Than Whites to Be Diagnosed and Treated for ADHD


Source: Bussing et al., 2003.



- In 1998, most elementary school children with symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) were recognized by their parents as having behavior problems
- White children were more likely than African American children to have been professionally evaluated and subsequently diagnosed and treated for ADHD
- Boys were also more likely than girls to be diagnosed and treated

Use of Anesthesia Drugs Demonstrates One Type of System Inefficiency

Source: Gillerman and Browning, 2000.



- One dimension of waste in the health care system is supplies that are ordered and not used, particularly when those supplies cannot be reused
- Use of six high-volume or high-cost anesthesia drugs was studied over a one-year period in one hospital. The authors compared the amount of medication ordered to the amount that was actually administered
- The total cost of unadministered drugs was \$165,667 or 26 percent of what was spent on all drugs in the anesthesia department
- The main reason for waste was disposal of syringes that were full or partially full
- We have no national estimates of the amount of health care spending that can be attributed to waste

References

Costs and Insurance

- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Center for Financing, Access, and Cost Trends, *Medical Expenditure Panel Survey*, 2000.
- American Hospital Association, *American Hospital Association Hospital Statistics*, Chicago, IL, 2004.
- American Hospital Association, *American Hospital Association Hospital Statistics*, Chicago, IL, 1983.
- Anderson, G, Reinhardt, U, et al., "It's the Prices, Stupid: Why the United States Is So Different from Other Countries," *Health Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 2003, pp. 89–105.
- Baker LC, and Atlas SW, "Relationship Between HMO Market Share and the Diffusion and Use of Advanced MRI Technologies," *Journal of the American College of Radiology*, Vol. 1, No. 7, 2004, pp. 478–487.
- Baumgarten, A, *California HealthCare Market Report 2004*, California HealthCare Foundation, Oakland, CA, April 2004.
- Berndt ER, "The U.S. Pharmaceutical Industry: Why Major Growth in Times of Cost Containment?" *Health Affairs*, Vol. 20, 2001, pp. 100–114.
- California HealthCare Foundation, *Health Care Costs 101*, Oakland, CA, May 2004a.
- California HealthCare Foundation, *Medi-Cal Facts and Figures: A Look at California's Medicaid Program*, Oakland, CA, January 2004b.
- California HealthCare Foundation, *Snapshot: California's Uninsured, 2003*, Oakland, CA, January 2004c.
- Canadian Institute for Health Information, *Medical Imaging in Canada*, 2003.
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, *The CMS Chart Series, An Overview of the U.S. Healthcare System: Two Decades of Change, 1980–2000*, Baltimore, MD, October 2, 2003. Online at <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/charts/healthcaresystem/> (as of August 18, 2004).
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, *Health Accounts*, "National Health Expenditures Aggregate, Per Capita, Percent Distribution, and Annual Percent Change by Source of Funds: Calendar Years 1960–02," "National Health Expenditures by Type of Service and Source of Funds: Calendar Years 1960–02," "National Health Expenditure (NHE) Amounts by Type of Expenditure and Source of Funds: Calendar Years 1965–2013," Baltimore, MD: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Office of the Actuary, 2004. Online at <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/statistics/nhe/#download> (as of August 24, 2004).
- Fronstin P, "Health Insurance Coverage of Individuals Ages 55–64, 1994–2002," Employee Benefit Research Institute (EBRI) *Notes*, Vol. 25, No. 3, March 2004, pp. 6–16.
- Goldman DP, Joyce GF, Escarce JJ, Pace JE, Solomon MD, Laouri M, Landsman PB, and Teutsch SM, "Pharmacy Benefits and the Use of Drugs by the Chronically Ill," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 291, No. 19, May 18, 2004, pp. 2344–2350.
- Hobbs F, and Stoops N, *Demographic Trends in the 20th Century*, Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, November 2002. Online at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/censr-4.pdf> (as of August 18, 2004).
- Institute of Medicine, *Insuring America's Health: Principles and Recommendations*, Fact Sheet 1 and 2, Washington, DC: National Academies Press, January 2004. Online at <http://www.iom.edu/report.asp?id=17632> (as of August 18, 2004).
- Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, *Health Insurance Coverage in America: 2002 Data Update*, Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, December 2003a. Online at <http://www.kff.org/uninsured/kcmuchartbookpkg.cfm> (as of August 18, 2004).
- Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, *Health Insurance Coverage in America: 2001 Data Update*, Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, January 2003b. Online at <http://www.kff.org/uninsured/kcmuchartbookpkg.cfm> (as of August 18, 2004).
- Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, *Health Insurance Coverage in America: 2000 Data Update*, Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, February 2002. Online at <http://www.kff.org/uninsured/kcmuchartbookpkg.cfm> (as of August 18, 2004).
- Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, *Health Insurance Coverage in America: 1999 Data Update*, Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, December 2000. Online at <http://www.kff.org/uninsured/kcmuchartbookpkg.cfm> (as of August 18, 2004).
- The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, *State Health Facts Online*, Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, August 2004. Online at www.statehealthfacts.org (as of August 18, 2004).

The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust, *California Employer Health Benefits Survey 2003*, Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, March 2004a.

The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust, *Employer Health Benefits Survey, 2004*, Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, August 2004b.

The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust, *Employer Health Benefits 2003 Annual Survey*, Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, September 2003a.

The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust, *The Health Insurance Act of 2003 (SB2): Updated Findings from the 2002 California Employer Health Benefits Survey, #3376*, Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, October 2003b. Online at <http://www.kff.org/statepolicy/california.cfm> (as of August 18, 2004).

Meara E, White C, and Cutler D, "Trends in Medical Spending by Age, 1963–2000," *Health Affairs*, Vol. 23, No. 4, July/August 2004, pp. 176–183.

Newhouse JP, and the Insurance Experiment Group, *Free for All? Lessons from the RAND Health Insurance Experiment*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *OECD Health Data 2002*, Paris: OECD, 2002.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *OECD Health Data 2004*, Paris: OECD, 2004.

Olin G, and Machlin S, *Health Care Expenses in the Community Population, 1999*, Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, MEPS Chartbook No. 11, AHRQ Pub. No. 03-0038, August 2003.

Quality of Care

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, web site, <http://www.ahrq.gov/>, 2004.

Ayanian JZ, Cleary PD, Weissman JS, and Epstein AM, "The Effect of Patients' Preferences on Racial Differences in Access to Renal Transplantation," *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 341, No. 22, November 25, 1999, pp. 1661–1669.

Bates DW, Cullen DJ, Laird N, Petersen LA, Small SD, Servi D, Laffel G, Sweitzer BJ, Shea BF, Hallisey R, Vliet MV, Nemeskal R, and Leape LL, "Incidence of Adverse Drug Events and Potential Adverse Drug Events. Implications for Prevention," ADE Prevention Safety Group, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 274, No. 1, July 5, 1995, pp. 29–34.

Bernabei R, Gambassi G, Lapane K, et al., "Management of Pain in Elderly Patients with Cancer," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 279, No. 22, June 17, 1998, pp. 1877–1882.

Bernstein SJ, McGlynn EA, Siu AL, Roth CP, Sherwood MJ, Keesey J, Kosecoff JB, Hicks NR, and Brook RH, "The Appropriateness of Hysterectomy: A Comparison of Care in Seven Health Plans," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 269, No. 18, May 12, 1993, pp. 2398–2402 (also available from RAND Corporation as RP-204, 1993).

Bussing et al., "Barriers to Detection, Help-Seeking and Service Use for Children with ADHD Symptoms," *Journal of Behavioral Health Services Research*, Vol. 30, 2003, pp. 176–189.

California CABG Mortality Reporting Program, *The California Report on Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery: 1999 Hospital Data*, Summary Report, Sacramento, CA, 2003. Online at <http://www.oshpd.cahwnet.gov/HQAD/HIRC/hospital/Outcomes/CABG/index.htm> (as of August 16, 2004).

Chassin MR, Kosecoff J, Solomon DH, and Brook RH, "How Coronary Angiography Is Used: Clinical Determinants of Appropriateness," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 258, No. 18, November 13, 1987, pp. 2543–2547 (also available from RAND Corporation as RP-152, 1987).

Cleeland, CED, Gonin R, Hatfield, AK, et al., "Pain and Its Treatment in Outpatients with Metastatic Cancer," *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 330, No. 9, March 3, 1994, pp. 592–596.

The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care, Hanover, NH: Center for the Evaluative Clinical Sciences at Dartmouth Medical School. Online at <http://www.dartmouthatlas.org/> (as of August 16, 2004).

Epstein AM, Ayanian JZ, Keogh JH, Noonan SJ, Armistead N, Cleary PD, Weissman JS, David-Kasdan JA, Carlson D, Fuller J, Marsh D, and Conti RM, "Racial Disparities in Access to Renal Transplantation," *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 343, No. 21, November 23, 2000, pp. 1537–1544.

Gan SC, Beaver SK, Houck PM, MacLehose RF, Lawson HW, and Chan L., "Treatment of Acute Myocardial Infarction and 30-Day Mortality Among Women and Men," *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 343, No. 1, July 6, 2000, pp. 8–15.

Gillerman RG, and Browning RA. "Drug Use Inefficiency: A Hidden Source of Wasted Health Care Dollars," *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, Vol. 91, No. 4, October 2000, pp. 921–924.

Higashi T, Shekelle PG, Solomon DH, Knight EL, Roth C, Chang JT, Kamberg CJ, MacLean CH, Young RT, Adams J, Reuben DB, Avorn J, and Wenger NS, "The Quality of Pharmacologic Care for Vulnerable Older Patients," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, Vol. 140, No. 8, May 4, 2004, pp. 714–720.

Hilborne LH, Leape LL, Bernstein SJ, Park RE, Fiske ME, Kamberg CJ, Roth CP, and Brook RH, "The Appropriateness of Use of Percutaneous Transluminal Coronary Angioplasty in New York State," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 269, No. 6, February 10, 1993, pp. 761–765 (also available from RAND Corporation as RP-186, 1993).

Institute of Medicine, Committee on Quality of Health Care in America, *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*, Washington DC: National Academies Press, 2001, p. 364.

Kerr EA, McGlynn EA, Adams J, Keesey J, and Asch SM, "Profiling the Quality of Care in Twelve Communities: Results from the CQI Study," *Health Affairs*, Vol. 23, No. 3, May/June 2004, pp. 247–256.

Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, and Donaldson MS, eds., *To Err Is Human: Building a Safer Health System*, Institute of Medicine, Committee on Quality of Health Care in America, Washington DC: National Academies Press, 2000.

Leape LL, Brennan TA, Laird N, Lawthers AG, Localio AR, Barnes BA, Hebert L, Newhouse JP, Weiler PC, and Hiatt H, "The Nature of Adverse Events in Hospitalized Patients. Results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study," *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 324, No. 6, February 7, 1991, pp. 377–384.

McGlynn EA, Asch SM, Adams J, Keesey J, Hicks J, DeCristofaro A, and Kerr EA, "The Quality of Health Care Delivered to Adults in the United States," *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 348, No. 26, June 26, 2003, pp. 2635–2645.

The National CAHPS® Benchmarking Database, 2002–2003. Online at http://ncbd.cahps.org/pdf/NCBD2003Chartbook_Vol1.pdf (as of August 16, 2004).

Rubenstein LZ, Solomon DH, Roth CP, Young RT, Shekelle PG, Chang JT, MacLean CH, Kamberg CJ, Saliba D, and Wenger NS, "Detection and Management of Falls and Instability in Vulnerable Elders by Community Physicians," *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, Vol. 52, No. 9, September 2004, pp. 1527–1531.

Siu AL, Sonnenberg FA, Manning WG, Goldberg GA, Bloomfield ES, Newhouse JP, and Brook RH, "Inappropriate Use of Hospitals in a Randomized Trial of Health Insurance Plans," *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 20, No. 315, 1986, pp.1259–1266.

Thomas EJ, Studdert DM, Burstin HR, Orav EJ, Zeena T, Williams EJ, Howard KM, Weilder PC, and Brennan TA, "Incidence and Types of Adverse Events and Negligent Care in Utah and Colorado," *Medical Care*, Vol. 38, No. 3, 2000, pp. 261–271.

Tobacman JK, Lee P, Zimmerman B, Kolder H, Hilborne L, and Brook RH, "Assessment of Appropriateness of Cataract Surgery in Ten Academic Medical Centers in 1990," *Ophthalmology*, Vol. 103, No. 2, 1996, pp. 207–215.

Wenger NS, Solomon DH, Roth CP, MacLean CH, Saliba D, Kamberg CJ, Rubenstein LZ, Young RT, Sloss EM, Louie R, Adams J, Chang JT, Venus PJ, Schnelle JF, and Shekelle PG, "The Quality of Medical Care Provided to Vulnerable Community-Dwelling Older Patients," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, Vol. 139, No. 9, November 4, 2003, pp. 740–747, E-748–E-759.

Winslow CM, Kosecoff JB, Chassin M, Kanouse DE, and Brook RH, "The Appropriateness of Performing Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 260, No. 4, July 1988, pp. 505–509.

Woolf SH, "The Need for Perspective in Evidence-Based Medicine," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 282, No. 24, December 22, 1999, pp. 2358–2365.

Chart Permissions

Costs and Insurance

Reprinted by permission of the California HealthCare Foundation, pp. 6, 28.

Reprinted by permission of The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, p. 15. The Kaiser Family Foundation, based in Menlo Park, California, is a nonprofit, independent national health care philanthropy and is not associated with Kaiser Permanente or Kaiser Industries.

Reprinted by permission of the National Academy of Sciences, courtesy of the National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., from *Insuring America's Health: Principles and Recommendations*, © 2004, p. 22.

Quality of Care

Reprinted by permission of *The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care*, courtesy of the Trustees of Dartmouth College, © 2004, p. 37.

RAND Health

RAND Health, a research division of the RAND Corporation, is the nation's most trusted source of objective health policy research. Its mission is to advance understanding of health and health behaviors and to examine how the organization and financing of care affect costs, quality, and access. The focus of its agenda is on policy research to promote a better health care system.

RAND Health's research staff of more than 180 experts includes physicians, economists, psychologists, mathematicians, organizational analysts, political scientists, psychometricians, medical sociologists, policy analysts, and statisticians. Many of the staff physicians hold joint appointments at the University of California, Los Angeles, Medical Center and/or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

RAND Health is directed by RAND Vice President Robert H. Brook, MD, ScD, FACP. Dr. Brook is also Director of the Robert Wood Johnson Clinical Scholars Program at UCLA and Professor of Medicine and Health Services at UCLA's Center for Health Sciences. He is an internationally known expert on health care quality assessment and assurance, development and use of health status measurement in health policy, efficiency and effectiveness of care, and geographic variation in the use of health care services.

The Communications Institute

The Communications Institute, based in Pasadena, California, was founded to enhance the ability of society to confront critical issues through the knowledge and application of objective, nonpartisan research and perspectives. The institute is a consortium of academic and research institutions and scholars with expertise in economics, science, engineering, and the law. It provides programs and resources for policymakers and journalists along with leaders in the private and independent sectors of society.

The institute is governed by a board with members from institutions such as the RAND Corporation, Harvard University, the California Institute of Technology, Dartmouth College, the University of Southern California, and the University of Rochester. The Communications Institute staff has three decades of international experience in program development on public policy and technology issues for thousands of policymakers, business executives, community leaders, and journalists.



OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS.
EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS.