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Role of Hospitals in Improving Community Health

Drivers of change:

- A growing focus on social determinants of health.
- Health care reform.
- Expanding and refining the community obligations of tax-exempt hospitals.

Community Benefit

• **1956**: IRS rules that hospitals can meet the community benefit test if they furnish charity care.
• **1969**: IRS broadens community benefit definition to encompass hospital activities that benefit communities as a whole.
• **2009**: IRS introduces the Form 990 Schedule H Worksheet
### Part I - Financial Assistance and Certain Other Community Benefits at Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a Did the organization have a financial assistance policy during the tax year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b If “Yes,” was it written?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 If the organization had multiple hospital facilities, indicate which of the following best describes application of the financial assistance policy to its various hospital facilities during the tax year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Applied uniformly to all hospital facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Applied uniformly to most hospital facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Generally followed to individual hospital facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ancestry-based financial assistance eligibility criteria that applied to the largest number of the organization’s patients during the tax year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Did the organization use Federal Poverty Guidelines (FPG) as a factor in determining eligibility for providing care?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a If “Yes,” indicate which of the following was the FPG family income limit for eligibility for free care:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b If “Yes,” indicate which of the following was the FPG family income limit for eligibility for discounted care:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Did the organization use other financial factors in determining eligibility?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 a) If the organization prepared a community benefit report during the tax year, did the organization make it available to the public?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) If “Yes,” did the organization’s financial assistance expenses exceed the budgeted amount?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part III - Bad Debt, Medicare, & Collection Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A: Bad Debt Expense</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Did the organization report bad debt expense in accordance with Healthcare Financial Management Association Statement No. 157?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Enter the amount of the organization’s bad debt expense. Explain in Part VII the methodology used by the organization to estimate this amount.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Enter the estimated amount of the organization’s bad debt expense attributable to patients who are not patients of the organization’s financial assistance policy. Explain in Part VII the methodology used by the organization to estimate this amount and the rationale, if any, for including this portion of bad debt as community benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Include in Part VII the text of the footnote to the organization’s financial statements that describes bad debt expense or the page number on which this footnote is contained in the attached financial statements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part IV - Management Companies and Joint Ventures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9a Did the organization have a written lease collection policy during the tax year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b Did the organization’s collection policy that applied to the largest number of its patients during the tax year contain provisions on the collection practices to be followed for patients who are known to qualify for financial assistance? Describe in Part IV.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Numbers

• > 50% of all U.S. hospitals (> 2900) operate as nonprofit corporations.

• Between 2002 and 2011, national value of tax exemption estimated to nearly double, from $12.6 billion to 24.6 billion (federal and state income taxes, state and local property and sales taxes)

• IRS reported > $62 billion in community benefit spending in 2011
ACA Reforms to Tax-Exempt Policy

- EMTALA compliance
- Financial assistance policy
- Limits on charges
- Bar against unreasonable collection efforts
- Community Health Needs Assessment (CHNA) requirements including transparent, public-involved planning, transparency, and implementation strategy
- No change to pre-existing community benefit definition
What’s Missing?

Three key factors inform the conversation and collaboration:

• A clear link between health planning and community benefit investment
• Transparency in community benefit investment choices
• Incentives to spend on community-wide health improvement
Community Benefit Web Resource

• Prototype developed by GW for Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

• Full web resource scheduled to be available in 2017.
## Charity Care and Certain Other Community Benefits at Cost for Tax Year 2011: Number and Selected Financial Data by Type of Community Benefit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Community Benefit</th>
<th>Number of activities or programs</th>
<th>Number of persons served</th>
<th>Total community benefit expense</th>
<th>Direct offsetting revenue</th>
<th>Net community benefit expense</th>
<th>Percent of total expense*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Benefits†</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>553,999</td>
<td>82,710,801</td>
<td>$149,281,744</td>
<td>$86,927,818</td>
<td>$62,463,371</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total charity care and means-tested government programs‡</td>
<td>399,099</td>
<td>15,747,656</td>
<td>104,046,778</td>
<td>69,186,996</td>
<td>35,054,051</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity care at cost</td>
<td>25,575</td>
<td>3,159,408</td>
<td>17,415,426</td>
<td>2,500,841</td>
<td>15,011,379</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreimbursed Medicaid</td>
<td>372,742</td>
<td>11,758,070</td>
<td>82,406,170</td>
<td>63,769,821</td>
<td>18,736,792</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreimbursed costs— other means-tested government programs</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>830,178</td>
<td>4,225,182</td>
<td>2,916,334</td>
<td>1,305,880</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other benefitsv</td>
<td>154,900</td>
<td>66,963,145</td>
<td>45,234,966</td>
<td>7,740,822</td>
<td>27,409,320</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community health improvement services and community benefit operations</td>
<td>131,187</td>
<td>53,208,425</td>
<td>3,029,646</td>
<td>369,626</td>
<td>2,659,025</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professions education</td>
<td>9,804</td>
<td>1,465,110</td>
<td>13,621,372</td>
<td>4,389,163</td>
<td>9,232,250</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized health services</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>5,577,800</td>
<td>17,113,507</td>
<td>11,916,218</td>
<td>5,113,403</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>130,351</td>
<td>9,435,570</td>
<td>1,022,817</td>
<td>8,412,686</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and in-kind contributions to community groups</td>
<td>10,007</td>
<td>6,581,459</td>
<td>2,034,871</td>
<td>42,998</td>
<td>1,991,957</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Money amounts are in thousands of dollars. Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
New Research

CHNAs emphasis on importance of upstream spending on social risk factors:

• 72 percent of hospitals identified obesity;
• 68 percent identified mental health; and
• 62 percent identified diabetes

... as the top health challenges of their communities.
Current IRS Policy

• IRS separates community building (community-wide efforts) from community benefit spending while requiring separate justification for community-wide health improvement efforts.

• IRS does not require hospitals to report CHNA-linked CB spending or describe how CB spending responds to CHNA priorities.
IRS Policy Opportunities

• Broaden the definition of community benefit to clearly include community health improvement activities that encompass community-wide efforts, now classified as separate community building activities.

• Revise Schedule H reporting to include hospital reporting on the Relationship between CHNAs, implementation strategies, and CB spending.

• Advance best practices in community-wide health improvement through government-wide advisory committee that identifies evidence-based upstream spending initiatives that hold promise to improve community health.
Suggested Reforms

1. Eliminate regulatory obstacles to “upstream” spending
2. Clearer link between CHNAs and community benefit spending
3. Transparency
Presentation Overview

- Promoting community involvement in the Community Health Needs Assessment (CHNA) process
- Using regulatory tools to incentivize a focus on social and economic determinants of health
- Encouraging hospital transparency and accountability
- Repeal and Replace: Implications for states
Regional and community partnerships can increase the effectiveness of the CHNA process

- Multi-facility collaborations and collaborations between hospitals and public health agencies are not only permitted but *encouraged* by the 2014 IRS final rules.

- Collaborations help align hospital community benefits with public health planning and avoid duplication of effort.

- Potential partners: hospitals, physician groups, state and local public health and social services agencies, community stakeholders, health plans, private funders.
States can encourage or require community involvement in the CHNA process

- **Massachusetts**: Attorney General’s guidelines encourage hospitals to seek input from community groups representative of the populations served.

- **Maryland**: Requires hospitals to consider CHNAs developed by state/local health departments and encourages consultation with community groups.

- **Texas**: Requires hospitals to consider input from local health departments, public health districts, and community stakeholders.

- **Utah**: Mandates annual consultation with county health officials by hospitals and nursing homes as part of the CHNA process.
Some successful regional and community collaborations

- Integrating Community Health Improvement and Population Health: Children’s National Health System, Washington, DC
- Mayor’s Healthy City Initiative: Baton Rouge, LA
- From Volume to Value: Carroll Hospital, MD
- Soccer for Success: Trinity Health
Some successful regional and community collaborations continued

- Enos Park Access to Care Collaborative: Springfield, IL
- Communities that Care Coalition: Franklin County, MA
- Allies for Substance Abuse Prevention of Anderson County: Anderson County, TN
Some states use regulatory tools to encourage investment in social and economic determinants of health

- **New York**: Implementation strategies must focus on at least two of five state Prevention Agenda priorities

- **California**: Statute gives examples of community benefit activities that address social and economic factors that shape health

- **Maryland**: Statute requires hospital implementation strategies to describe efforts to track and reduce health disparities
State reporting forms can include a focus on social and economic determinants of health

- New Hampshire: The state’s community benefit reporting form requires hospitals to indicate socioeconomic “needs” being addressed, such as poverty, unemployment, educational attainment, high school completion, vandalism/crime, homelessness, air quality, and water quality
State reporting requirements can encourage transparency and accountability

31 states require hospitals to report on community benefits
Examples of state reporting requirements that encourage transparency and accountability

- **California** hospitals must complete a narrative section on community benefit activities.
- **Vermont** requires community benefit reports to be posted on both the hospital’s website and the state’s website.
- **New York** and **Washington** require hospitals to post implementation strategies on their websites.
- **Indiana** and **Maryland** hospitals must report on the effectiveness of community benefit initiatives.
- **New Hampshire** and **Rhode Island** require hospitals to report activities that they anticipate undertaking in the near future.
- **Maryland**, **Indiana**, and **Texas** can impose civil penalties on hospitals for overdue community benefit reports.
How can states be more proactive in promoting targeted and collaborative hospital community benefits?

- Now that the CHNA process mandated by the Affordable Care Act (ACA) is established, states should focus on:
  - More regional, multi-stakeholder collaboration
  - Greater transparency
  - Implementation processes and challenges
  - Evaluation to assess whether desired outcomes are being achieved
  - More comprehensive reporting by hospitals that goes beyond Schedule H and can be used to monitor progress with state health reform initiatives
Repeal and Replace: Where does this leave states?

- Repeal of §9007 of the ACA would:
  - Eliminate the requirement for hospitals to conduct CHNAs every 3 years (as well as to adopt CHNA implementation strategies and conduct evaluations)
  - Do away with reforms related to financial assistance policies, limitations on charges to patients who are eligible for financial assistance, and billing and collections practices

- States need to act now to develop their own legislative and regulatory “replace” strategies in the event Congress does not see this as a priority
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Contact Information

Cynthia Woodcock
Executive Director
410.455.6274
cwoodcock@hilltop.umbc.edu

Blair Inniss
Policy Analyst
410.455.1441
binniss@hilltop.umbc.edu

The Hilltop Institute
University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC)
www.hilltopinstitute.org
Please type your questions into the chat box.
Thank you!

Your opinion is important to us. After the webinar ends, you will be redirected to a web page containing a short survey. Your answers to the survey will help us as we plan future NASHP webinars.