Value to Health Plan Members of a Comprehensive **Patient Navigation and Customer Support System**

Emily Hague, MS,* Timothy T. Brown, PhD,* & Alicia Neumann, PhD†

*University of California, Berkeley

†University of California, San Francisco

RESEARCH QUESTION

What is the value to consumers of a comprehensive patient navigation and customer support system, which has been demonstrated to improve health plan value and increase member satisfaction?1

POPULATION STUDIED

· Survey was sent to >35k benefit-enrolled employees of a single large organization; responses were received from 2,045 employees:



- Employee-only enrollees (EE only) Employee +1 enrollees (EE + 1)
- Employee + family enrollees (EE + family)
- · 50 years old on average
- · 59% identified as female
- Majority white (39%) or Asian/Pacific Islander (31%)
- · 77% reported holding at least a four-year degree
- . 41% reported annual household income ≥\$150k

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

The navigation and support feature was ranked third most important of seven attributes surveyed, following paycheck premiums and deductibles. Patterns were consistent across all three employee segments.

Willingness to pay (WTP) for the "moderate" (vs. "low") level of this feature ranged from \$59.80 (EE only) to \$185.03 (EE + family) per month. WTP for the highest level (vs. "moderate") ranged from an additional \$30.55 (EE only) to \$100.54 (EE +1) per month.

Model certainty ranged from 0.653 to 0.680, indicating that estimated values were about two-thirds of the way between what would be expected by chance (0) and a perfect fit (1.0).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was funded by Catalyst for Payment Reform and the Peterson Center on Healthcare.

We conducted a choice-based conjoint (CBC) experiment to mimic the available health plan options and "real-world" health plan selection process of a large employer, following guidance from the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research.2

CBC Definitions

Attribute: A hypothetical set of factors used by a respondent (e.g., employee) to choose a health plan

Level: A hypothetical set of values that each attribute can take in the research

Choice: A set of options from which a respondent is asked to choose, comprised of randomly-ordered attributes with randomlyselected levels (see example at far right)

Willingness to pay: The value, measured in dollars, that respondents place on a level. calculated from the choices they make

Experimental Design

- · Attributes were identified by the employer's leadership as those most relevant to health plan selection for their employee population
 - · Cost attributes included paycheck premiums, in-network deductibles, and retail pharmacy costs
 - · Plan design attributes included specialist self-referral, non-emergency coverage for out-of-network care, one login for digital access to care and claims, the comprehensive patient navigation and customer support system
- · Respondents were shown 15 choice sets, each

with three hypothetical health plan options from which they were asked to select the plan they would prefer, assuming that any attributes not shown were the same for each plan (see example at top right)

Estimation

- WTP was estimated using Hierarchical Bayes respondent, averaged for estimation)
- · All attributes were modeled as part-worth utilities with the exception of paycheck premiums (modeled as linear)

STUDY DESIGN

Attribute	First Level	Second Level	Third Level	Fourth Level	l
In-network deductible*	None	• \$250 (EE only) • \$500 (EE +1) • \$750 (EE + tamily)	N/A	N/A	
Out-of-network coverage	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	l
Specialist self- referral	Yes (you decide for yourself if you want to see a specialist)	No (primary care authoriz-ation required to see a specialist)	N/A	N/A	l
Paycheck contribution (premium)*	- \$0 (EE only) - \$0 (EE +1) - \$160 (EE +	• \$25 (EE only) • \$40 (EE +1) • \$200 (EE +	• \$30 (EE only) • \$60 (EE +1) • \$300 (EE +	\$200 [EE only] \$400 [EE +1] \$700 [EE +	
Retail pharmacy cost (varies by drug tier)	Low (\$5 or \$15 per prescription)	Moderate (\$10, 25, or \$50 per prescription)	N/A	N/A	١
One login for digital access to care & claims	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	l
Health plan advocacy support	Low No proactive outreach No live advocacy support No digital health tools	Moderate Proactive outreach to close care gaps Live advocacy support (e.g. outreach, patient activation, transitions of care) No digital health tools	High Proactive outreach to close care gaps Live advocacy support (e.g. outreach, patient activation, transitions of care) Digital health tools to facilitate patient advocacy	N/A	

- analysis in Sawtooth Software to model preferences for each respondent (10k preliminary iterations for convergence and 10k draws per

ase review the features of the three hypothetical health plans shown and select the health plan you would prefer. Assume that any features that are not explicitly shown, such as health plan quality or member satisfaction ratings, are the same for each. If these were your only ontions, which would you choose? Health Plan A Health Plan B Health Plan C Out-of-network coverage yourself if you want to see a specialist) Paycheck contribution \$200 \$30 Retail pharmacy cost Low (\$5 or \$15 per (varies by drug tier)

Sample Choice Posed to Respondents (EE only)

One login for digital access

Health plan advocac

Yes

Select Select

CONCLUSIONS

Health plan consumers view the comprehensive patient navigation and customer support system as a benefit for which they are willing to pay.

This is meaningful because the feature also increases health plan quality and member satisfaction and generates savings through more appropriate utilization. Health plans should consider investing in a comprehensive patient navigation and customer support system as a "win-win" feature to improve value.

CONTACT

emily.hague@berkeley.edu timothy.brown@berkeley.edu alicia.neumann@ucsf.edu

REFERENCES

- 1. Brown TT, Hague E, Neumann A, Rodriguez HP, Shortell SM (in review), "Impact of a Selective Narrow Network with Comprehensive Patient Navigation on Risk Scores
- Expenditures, and Enrollee Expenences:
 Bridges JPF, Hauber AB, Marshall D, et al. Conjoint Analysis Applications in Health—a Checklist: A Report of the ISPOR Good Research Practices for Conjoint Analysis Applications in Health—a Checklist: A Report of the ISPOR Good Research Practices for Conjoint Analysis Task Force, Value in Health. 2011;14(4):602-413. doi:10.1016/j.jnal.2010.11.013