Summary of the ReThink Health Dynamics Model

ReThinking Health Systems

More and more people are rethinking what it takes to achieve profoundly better results in health systems across the U.S. Such ambitious ventures, however, are hard to plan, unwieldy to manage, and slow to spread. ReThink Health and its allies are learning what it takes to spark and sustain system-wide improvements in different settings. We usually focus on three connected spheres of innovation:

- **Stewardship** which sets the conditions for diverse stakeholders to work effectively across boundaries as they steer their common health system to fulfill shared aspirations over time;
- **Organizing** which engages people around shared values to build power for concerted action; and
- **Dynamics** which equips leaders to see the system in which they work, play out plausible scenarios, weigh trade-offs, and learn where the leverage lies to alter future trajectories.

This document summarizes progress in creating the ReThink Health Dynamics simulation model.

Guiding Questions

- How are local health systems structured?
- How and when do they change (or resist change)?
- Where is the greatest leverage to enhance performance?
- What trade-offs may be involved?
- What if non-experts could test scenarios for themselves?

These are among the main questions that guide our work with colleagues in different contexts.

Supporting Multi-Stakeholder Planning

Thinking through the complexities of the health system is fraught with difficulties. As a result, new initiatives tend to be short-sighted, fragmented, and unable to alter long-term trends. Formal modeling brings greater foresight,
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1 Financial Sponsors: this work is sponsored by generous investments from the Fannie E. Rippel Foundation and the California Health Care Foundation, along with key organizational allies and scores collaborators across the country. Opportunities are expanding for wider use and further development; therefore we seek like-minded partners to pool resources and make the most of this promising resource for the field.
evidence, and creativity to groups who are working to establish a healthier, more equitable, and more sustainable health system.

The primary purpose of the ReThink Health model is to support multi-stakeholder planning and strategy design, not to forecast specific outcomes. Planners may use this tool to examine uncertainties and explore opportunities for change—as well as the stakes of inaction. Simulating scenarios also encourages greater alignment and action as innovators see and feel what their efforts could accomplish.

Diverse teams are now using this tool across the country, and several have gathered local data to tailor it for their own region. Some of the most active users are in:

**Local Configurations**
- Pueblo, Colorado
- Whatcom, Washington
- Alameda, California
- Manchester, New Hampshire
- Contra Costa, California
- Morristown, New Jersey
- Atlanta, Georgia

**Additional Users**
- Minneapolis, Minnesota
- Upper Valley, New Hampshire & Vermont
- Albany, New York
- St. Louis, Missouri

**Representing Local Health Systems**

The ReThink Health model is a realistic, yet simplified, representation of a local health system. With a distinctive place-based and wide-angle view, it tracks changes in population health, health care delivery, health equity, workforce productivity, and health care costs under a variety of conditions—all within a single, testable framework tied to many sources of empirical data and open to sensitivity analysis. This diagram shows the general boundary and major sectors in the model.
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Population tracked separately in 10 segments by age, insurance, and income
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Selecting a Geographical Focus

When representing a local health system, an immediate challenge is to find an appropriate geographical focus. After reviewing data and considering where policy insights might be most influential, users typically select a set of zip codes, a county, a Health Service Area, or a Hospital Referral Region. We have also developed a version based on national data that have been scaled to represent a mid-sized American city of about 300,000 people (as opposed to 300 million), which we call Anytown, USA.

Situating Decisions in Context

The model captures some of the most important physical processes that drive future trajectories across the health system (i.e., demographic, epidemiological, economic, operational, etc.) as well as key behavioral decisions of particular actors. In the model, as in real life, people may change their decisions as conditions change around them. A summary of behavioral logic in the model lists specific features that make it closely resemble real-world patterns of cause and effect.

Tracking Health System Dynamics

Through both cognitive and experiential learning, the model shows how well-crafted strategies can significantly improve health system performance. Behind the scenes lies an explicit mathematical model, with a transparent causal structure and several hundred interacting elements. It tracks changing levels of risk or vulnerability stemming from unhealthy behaviors, crime, and environmental hazards, as well as poverty and lack of insurance. Together, those drivers affect health status over time, including physical illness (mild and severe), mental illness (controlled and uncontrolled) as well as acute episodes (urgent and non-urgent), and deaths.

Health status and illness prevalence, in turn, determine both the demand and cost for health care in different locations (i.e., routine and acute office visits, outpatient procedures and tests, hospital emergency room and inpatient stays, as well as post-acute/extended care in skilled nursing facilities, at home, and in hospice). The volume and nature of care delivered also feed back to affect health status, for example, by slowing the progression of chronic illness from mild to severe forms.

Finally, the model considers financial incentives from different payment schemes (such as fee-for-service vs. per capita) along with the program cost for each simulated initiative. If those interventions do save health care costs (relative to benchmarks for each population segment), then users may choose to capture and reinvest those savings in an effort to sustain the initiatives over time.
Offering a Menu of Intervention Options

The model represents several dozen distinct initiatives. Each may be simulated individually or in combinations to study the likely consequences over time on many metrics of health, care, cost, productivity, equity, spending, savings, and return-on-investment. Additional design options let planners sequence initiatives and/or direct certain efforts only to certain sub-groups, as a way of concentrating limited resources among those with the most to gain.

Distinguishing Population Subgroups

The model divides the population into 10 sub-groups, each with a relatively distinct profile of health status and health care utilization. These groupings correspond closely to particular insurance categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Subgroup</th>
<th>Principal Insurance Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth (ages 0-17)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged, Insured</td>
<td>Commercial coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged, Uninsured</td>
<td>Mostly self-paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged, Insured</td>
<td>Medicaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged, Uninsured</td>
<td>Mostly uncompensated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Age (ages 18-64)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged, Insured</td>
<td>Commercial coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged, Uninsured</td>
<td>Mostly self-paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged, Insured</td>
<td>Medicaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged, Uninsured</td>
<td>Mostly uncompensated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior (ages 65+)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged</td>
<td>Medicare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Dual Medicare + Medicaid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integrating Data Into a Single—Testable—Framework**

Each local configuration draws together data from dozens of disparate sources to create a broad and balanced profile of the health and health care system in a particular region. The main data elements in each model address:

- **Population composition**, divided by 10 subgroups according to age, insurance status, and income, and projections for aging and overall growth through 2040;
- **Population health status**, including the prevalence of physical and mental illness (by subgroup);
- **Health risks**, including high risk behaviors, environmental hazards, and high crime (by subgroup);
- **Provider resources**, including office-based primary care providers (general and FQHC), specialists, and acute care hospital beds;
- **Health care utilization**, including PCP visits and available slots for the indigent, ER visits urgent and non-urgent, inpatient stays and readmissions and discharge destinations, and people in nursing facilities or using home health care;
- **Health care costs**, including nearly every category in the “personal healthcare expenditures” portion of the National Health Expenditures tracking system.
Wherever possible we use local data contrasted against national averages. If local data are unavailable or inadequate, we then develop small area estimates based on regional, state, or national sources. Some of the main databases that inform this model include:

- U.S. Census 2010 (American Community Survey)
- CDC’s Behavioral Risk Surveillance System (BRFSS)
- National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS)
- National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NHAMCS)
- National Survey of Children’s Health (NSCH)
- National Nursing Home Survey (NNHS)
- National Home Health Care Survey (NHHCS)
- National Health Expenditure Accounts
- National Health Interview Survey (NHIS)
- National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)
- Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS)
- National Vital Statistics Reports from the CDC
- Kaiser Family Foundation State Health Facts
- National Hospital Discharge Survey (NHDS)
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality-Health Care Utilization Project (AHRQ-HCUP)
- Health Resources and Services Administration – Area Resource Files (ARF)
- Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care

Many parameters are also consistent with previously published analytic tools such as:

- CDC HealthBound policy model, selected by AcademyHealth as Public Health Systems Research Article of the Year for 2012; and

- CDC-NIH Prevention Impacts Simulation Model (PRISM), selected by the System Dynamics Society as Best Application of System Dynamics Modeling for 2011.

**Initial Insights**

Despite its uncertainties and limitations, users have discovered many valuable insights when using this tool. For example, local leaders have been consistently able to anticipate common pitfalls or “failure modes” that threaten to disappoint or derail regional change ventures. Some of the main failure modes stem from:

- Unsustainable program financing (i.e., attempting too much without adequate funding);
- Exacerbating bottlenecks (i.e., especially those affecting primary care);
• Supply push responses from providers that undercut health care cost savings (i.e., increasing the intensity of care per episode to compensate for drops in utilization and income);

• Comparing alternative strategies using only a short time horizon (i.e., biasing conclusions about the relative cost-effectiveness of different interventions); and

• Improving health, care, or cost while perpetuating or exacerbating inequities (i.e., failing to alter the structural conditions that drive health inequity).

All of these phenomena, and more, can be traced to the dynamically complex structure of a local health system. In addition, when equipped with model-based scenarios, planners are better able to address other shortcomings that may plague multi-stakeholder endeavors such as lack of a common vocabulary, inability to interpret performance metrics, the absence of a strategic perspective, disorganization, and dysfunctional teamwork.

**Building Confidence Through Scientific Critique**

Adhering to standard modeling practice, we use multiple approaches to critique the scientific integrity of this tool. Although the model is new and remains a work-in-progress, it builds on many prior analyses now extended to a local level. It remains open to evolve with user input and new research. Questions guiding our iterative development focus on:

• **Policy Scope & Metrics:** How useful are the intervention inputs as well as the health and economic outputs? This involves a close consideration of the stakeholder perspectives, population sub-groups, health states, and causal structures represented in the model.

• **Dynamic Behavior:** How well does the model capture real-world dynamics, particularly in its responses to intervention scenarios over time?

• **Credibility for Strategy Planning:** How credible are the conclusions that users may draw from this tool, particularly regarding the relative direction, timing, and magnitude of intervention effects?

We are continually testing and refining the model to make certain that its historical outputs are accurate, its future outputs are plausible and internally consistent, and its boundary is wide enough to encompass the most significant drivers of change over time.

The first formal scientific review, chaired by Dr. Elliott Fisher, was held at the Dartmouth Center for Health Care Delivery Science just weeks after the model was first calibrated in 2011. Reviewers included a mix of health scholars, economists, engineers, policy analysts, organizational researchers, philanthropists, game designers, and more. Several subsequent reviews were conducted and we have received strong support from colleagues through scores of demonstrations and presentations. Detailed documentation and peer-reviewed manuscripts are now being written based on the recently released version #2 of the model.
Finally, we place great value on the reactions from local collaborators. Their close examination of this tool has helped to assure that it adequately represents current circumstances and is robust for thinking about plausible futures.

**Recommended Uses**

Individuals are welcome to use the model alone; however it is best used with a trained facilitator. Group workshops encourage stakeholders to interact with each other and with the model as they explore where the health system is headed and their own roles as change agents within it.

**Interactive, Role-Play Gaming**

Game-based learning offers yet another way to explore how the health system works from the perspective of its many players. We are therefore working with leading game designers at Dartmouth’s Tiltfactor Laboratory and the Dartmouth Center for Healthcare Delivery Science to design an active, role-play game anchored in insights from the ReThink Health simulation model. Several prototype versions of the RePlay Health Games have been tested with diverse colleagues in which they experience empathy, understanding, and ultimately optimism about what they can accomplish together. Serious games like these offer an engaging way to spark interest and involvement among many stakeholders. We plan to design workshops where participants immerse themselves in the RePlay Health Game as a prelude to simulating formal scenarios using the ReThink Health model.

**Invited Presentations**

Many invited presentations and workshops feature the model in diverse venues. Examples include:

- Dartmouth Center for Health Care Delivery Science (September 2011)
- Institute for Healthcare Improvement (March 2012)
- Mayo Clinic (May 2012)
- MIT Sloan School of Management (June 2012)
- AcademyHealth (July 2012)
- International System Dynamics Society (July 2012)
- Northwest Health Foundation (September 2012)
- Commonwealth Fund (September 2012)
- Rockefeller Foundation (September 2012)
- Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement (October 2012)
- Atlanta Regional Collaborative for Health Improvement (November 2012)
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (November 2012)
- American Academy of Health Behavior (March 2013)
Selected References

The following references report illustrative scenarios from a previous version of the model. In addition, three manuscripts are in development for peer-review, based on version #2.


Developers

A talented group of practitioners and system scientists leads this work. **Team members** include:

**Coordinators**  
Bobby Milstein, PhD, MPH  
Laura Landy, MBA  
Leigh Scherrer, BA

**Science Advisors**  
Elliott Fisher, MD, MPH  
John Sterman, PhD  
Others...

**Modelers**  
Jack Homer, PhD  
Gary Hirsch, SM  
Christina Ingersoll, MBA  
Justin Trogdon, PhD

**Evaluators**  
Karen Minyard, PhD, MSN  
Richard Turner, MBA, MHA  
Tina Smith, MPH

**Trainers**  
Rebecca Niles, MBA  
Kristina Wile, MBA

**Game Designers**  
Mary Flanagan, PhD  
Max Seidman, BA

For More Information

To ask questions or to discuss possible alliances, please contact Bobby Milstein by email at [bmilstein@rippelfoundation.org](mailto:bmilstein@rippelfoundation.org); or by phone at 404.664.5293.