Policy #	Policy Recommendations	Current State	Barriers	Required Change/ Recommended Action	Due Date	Status
	The workgroup recommends that MDHHS should develop a process for <u>evaluating model</u> concepts that do not require	History: During the 298 Facilitation Workgroup process, stakeholders had an opportunity to submit models for review and evaluation by the workgroup.	Barriers to pilot implementation are detailed	MDHHS is testing models through the pilot and demonstration projects as required by the legislature. The legislature has more	Leg Report - 11.1.2017	In Process
F 1.0	policy or statutory changes for implementation.	Current State: Financing models are being explored as part of the recommended FY18 Sec. 298 pilot(s) and will be evaluated against the current financing and service delivery structure/system.  1) The demonstration project will test integration with no financial integration through the MHP. Medicaid contracts will continue with their current payer structure through the Prepaid Inpatient Health Plan (PIHP) for specialty behavioral health services.  2) Pilot(s) are required to have an integrated funding model with a single contract (inclusive of specialty BH) for all Medicaid Health Plans (MHPs) in the pilot geographic area.  MDHHS Position: Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS)	in the 11.1.2017 report to the legislature.	narrowly defined the expectations for testing models; there are no additional evaluation resources to test additional models at this time.  2) Additionally, MDHHS encourages consideration of other integrated health care and financing models including co-location, shared staffing, etc. While ongoing reporting will not be required, MDHHS may survey the system to assess the current state of integration efforts.  Note: through prior evaluation, MDHHS has determined some proposed financing models are not feasible.	Pilots and Dem Proj. Launch July 1, 2018	
F 2.0	The workgroup recommends that MDHHS, informed by stakeholders, should conduct a more in-depth review of model proposals that were submitted to see if other model(s) might emerge.	will test financial integration models pursuant to Section 298 of Public Act 107 of 2017.  Pilot planning is inclusive of key stakeholder input. One financing model is included as a demonstration project for Kent County.  MDHHS Position: MDHHS will test financial integration models pursuant to				
· 3.0	For inclusion among models to be tested, the workgroup recommends the expansion and broadening of jointly funded, staffed and operated programs between MHPs and the local public behavioral health system for coordinating services to shared enrollees.	Section 298 of Public Act 107 of 2017.  The current service delivery system has examples of co-located and co-funded physical health/behavioral health strategies.  MDHHS currently requires all PIHPs and MHP to have coordination agreements.  MDHHS Position: MDHHS will test financial integration models pursuant to Section 298 of Public Act 107 of 2017.				
<sup>-</sup> 5.0	The workgroup recommends the use of models which improve the coordination of physical health and behavioral health services and supports through the local public behavioral health network for individuals with a mental illness, serious emotional disturbances, and substance use disorders. Within that population, the focus should be on individuals who are vulnerable and at risk for issues of increased morbidity and premature death as well as persons who are high utilizers of emergency services and hospitalization services.	Current project and parameters planning includes provider network adequacy and retention of the current specialty BH networks; 298 Boilerplate stipulates the CMHSP in the pilot geographic area is allowed "to be a provider of behavioral health supports and services."  MDHHS Position: MDHHS will test financial integration models pursuant to Section 298 of Public Act 107 of 2017.				
F 4.0	The workgroup recommends the development of <u>consistent</u> statewide contract provisions to encourage the integration of physical health, behavioral health and	Current PIHP contracts are permissive of shared staffing and co-location options for physical and behavioral health integration.  Additional stakeholder input may be needed to further define the desired improvement/outcome.  MDHHS Position: MDHHS supports development of contract provisions that encourage integration.	Billing for co-located services  Additional detail is on the planning worksheet	1) MDHHS staff will work with MHP, Community Mental Health service Program (CMHSP), and PIHP leadership to review contracts and determine if language can be strengthened and more objectively defined.  2) MDHHS will work with payer/providers to resolve billing concerns in co-located settings.	October 2018 amend FY19 or applicable for FY2020	In Process

4/10/2018

Financing Models										
Policy #	Policy Recommendations	Current State	Barriers	Required Change/ Recommended Action	<b>Due Date</b>	Status				
	The workgroup recommends the establishment of an	MDHHS Position: This policy recommendation is dependent on Legislative	Start-up funding through	The 298 Workgroup Final Report was referred to the legislature.	NA	Not Planned				
	Integration Innovation Venture Capital Fund, which would	funding. The 298 Facilitation Workgroup Report was provided to the Legislature.	grants, donations or	Action on this recommendation would require legislative						
	provide opportunities for Local/Regional Integration	Should the Michigan Legislature wish to appropriate resources for an Integration	legislative appropriations	appropriation, private or grant funding. No further action is						
F 6.0	Arrangements. The fund should be established and used to	Innovation Venture Capital Fund, MDHHS will provide requested support.		required by MDHHS at this time.						
	support, enhance or develop integration arrangements at the									
	provider level.									

4/10/2018