Mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine are models of health care delivery that use emergency medical services (EMS) personnel to fill gaps in local health care infrastructure. Community paramedics may perform in an expanded role and require additional training in the management of chronic disease, communication skills, and cultural sensitivity, whereas other models use all levels of EMS personnel without additional training. Currently, there are few studies of the efficacy, safety, and cost-effectiveness of mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine programs. Observations from existing program data suggest that these systems may prevent congestive heart failure readmissions, reduce EMS frequent-user transports, and reduce emergency department visits. Additional studies are needed to support the clinical and economic benefit of mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine. [Ann Emerg Med. 2016;67:361-366.]
of Emergency Medicine, the New Mexico Department of Health, and the rural town of Red River. The consortium created a pilot program featuring expanded EMS services to fill health care gaps in a town whose closest hospital was 60 minutes away. The program was funded with $394,000 in federal grant money and backed by legislation passed by the state senate. The program featured 78 approved protocols and a 980-hour training program administered by the University of New Mexico EMS academy. Provider scope of practice was expanded to cover chronic disease surveillance, community health education, and prevention. Providers were also authorized to administer medications, including oral antibiotics, and perform simple procedures such as suturing. Although the program generated considerable initial publicity, interest in it eventually waned, with only 1 of the original 16 expanded-EMS providers remaining in practice in 1997. The program voluntarily ceased operations in 2000.

Despite the failure of the Red River program, federal and state agencies issued statements supporting the integration of EMS with community health-focused initiatives, particularly in rural areas. In 1996, the US Department of Transportation EMS Agenda for the Future called for integrating EMS into the community and providing services typically associated with primary care, including preventive care, community health interventions, and outpatient management of chronic illness. This was followed by a 2004 US Department of Health and Human Services guide for service chiefs calling for community paramedics to apply specifically to rural populations, and a 2010 Joint Committee on Rural Emergency Care strategic plan calling for community paramedics to receive training in general primary and preventive care. More broadly, a 2012 consensus conference of the National Association of State EMS Officials formally defined community paramedicine as “an emerging healthcare delivery model that increases access to basic services through the use of specially trained emergency medical service...providers in an expanded role.”

The concept of mobile integrated health care practice was also introduced in 2012 as a proposed expansion of community paramedicine into multiple nonrural settings. The strategy included community paramedics as one of its many components, along with primary care offices, hospices, Visiting Nurse Association services, social services, and other home health care providers. The model also called specifically for community paramedics to play a larger role in reducing the need for patient transport and hospital readmissions.

In 2014 at the National Association of EMS Physicians annual meeting, a consensus panel unified mobile integrated health care practice and community paramedicine under the term “mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine.” In addition, the term “community paramedic” was updated to “community paramedicine provider” to reflect the fact that not all providers were paramedics.

**OUTCOMES OF MOBILE INTEGRATED HEALTH CARE AND COMMUNITY PARAMEDICINE PROJECTS**

There have been few data published on the safety, cost-effectiveness, and feasibility of mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine programs. Outcomes data will likely result from existing and pilot programs, many of which have specifically integrated evaluation components. Most data on mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine clinical outcomes and cost-effectiveness originate from the MedStar Mobile Health Program in Dallas and Fort Worth, TX. MedStar’s efforts focus on 2 areas: community health practice and the congestive heart failure Readmission Prevention Program. Patients enrolled in the community health practice receive a series of home visits provided by MedStar community paramedicine providers for education in the management of chronic medical conditions, as well as reinforcement of existing primary and specialty care network resources. If patients require 911 response, a community health practice practitioner is also dispatched to the call to ascertain whether transport to an emergency department (ED) can be safely deferred. From January 2010 to February 2015, 146 patients avoided 1,893 transports to the ED because of 911 calls, resulting in a Medicare charge avoidance of $21,627 and payment avoidance of $5,536 per participant.

Conducted in a fashion similar to that of the community health practice program, the CHF readmission prevention program targets CHF patients in concert with local cardiologists. Compared with the national 2013 median risk-standardized readmission rate of 23%, the rate for MedStar was 16.3% for the enrolled participants, a Medicare charge avoidance of $30,343 and payment avoidance of $7,620 per participant from October 2013 to February 2015. Participants also reported an overall patient satisfaction score of 4.9 out of 5.

Smaller North American urban and rural mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine programs have also provided outcomes data. A rural Nova Scotia program on Long and Brier Islands reduced ED visits by 23% in 2002 and 2003. In Raleigh, NC, a program attempted to divert patients who were determined not to need ED level of care to the facility best suited to their specific health or social needs. The program triaged more than 300 patients to alternate treatment facilities such as
mental health crisis stabilization units and community alcohol treatment centers. Each successfully triaged patient represented 14 bed-hours returned to the ED, although 20% to 25% required subsequent transport to the hospital.

Future patient outcome and cost data from newer state- and government-supported programs have the potential to greatly add to or detract from continued support for the establishment and funding of similar programs. The Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority, based in Washoe County, NV, was the recipient of a 2013 Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Innovations grant for $9.6 million to start community health programs focusing on alternative transport, in-home care by paramedics, and a permanent nurse help line for telephone evaluations, with the goal of saving $10.5 million during a 3-year period. From December 2012 to June 2014, the program’s preliminary results include an estimated 1,795 ED visits, 354 ambulance transports, and 28 hospital readmissions avoided, with $7.9 million in charge avoidance and $2.8 million in Medicare payments avoided.

The California state government Emergency Medical Services Authority has also begun a community paramedicine pilot program involving 12 sites across the state, beginning with paramedic training in 2015 and expected to undergo independent evaluation in 2017. Finally, a community paramedicine pilot program, which began in January 2014, was established to combat pediatric asthma readmissions in Indianapolis, IN. However, there are currently no published data on the program’s effectiveness.

In an effort to facilitate and standardize their appraisal, the Health Resources and Services Administration published an evaluation tool for mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine programs. The 2012 document is a self-assessment tool intended for use by not only program leadership but also key stakeholders in the community, including public health, hospitals, EMS, primary care, regulatory agencies, and any other health and social services groups affected by a mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine program. Programs are scored according to 3 major benchmark areas: continuing assessment and analysis of local community health needs, as well as establishment of a system to collect and process such data and ensure dissemination of that information to stakeholders; appropriate policy development, including prioritization of program resources, obtaining of proper legislative and regulatory authority for a program’s operation, and continued quality assurance; and assurance to constituents of ongoing fulfillment of service obligations through dedicated medical oversight, ongoing cost-effectiveness, and maintenance of a competent, safe, and legally compliant workforce. The tool’s intent is to allow a mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine program to prioritize activities, reinforce weaknesses, and benchmark itself over time. It is not intended to be used to compare different individual programs because they would likely serve different needs.

TRAINING FOR MOBILE INTEGRATED HEALTH CARE AND COMMUNITY PARAMEDICINE PROVIDERS

Mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine represents an expansion in the standard scope of practice for community paramedicine providers compared with personnel who perform only treatment centered on acute transport. Depending on the specific needs of the population being served and existing resources available in the community, some programs provide significant additional training for community paramedicine providers and thereby expand their scope of practice, whereas others do not. Expanded psychomotor, diagnostic, and triage skills, in addition to knowledge of cultural sensitivity, chronic disease pathophysiology, and facility with community resources, can be important parts of a community paramedicine provider’s skill set. To meet this need, the Community Healthcare and Emergency Cooperative, based out of the North Central EMS Institute in St. Cloud, MN, has developed a community paramedicine educational curriculum. Undergraduate-level educational institutions may obtain the curriculum free and customize it for institution-specific community paramedicine training programs.

Hennepin Technical College in Brooklyn Park, MN, has offered a community paramedicine curriculum since 2008. This program has been adopted as an initial training option by mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine programs in several states. Individuals taking the course must be certified at the Emergency Medical Technician-Paramedic level and have 2 years of full-time work experience or the equivalent amount of experience gained through part-time employment. The curriculum includes 72 in-person and 72 online hours of classroom time, along with 196 hours of clinical training. Salient components of the course include

1. the boundaries and role of community paramedicine provider practice in the overall health care system;
2. skills required to inventory and evaluate extant community health services, map out community demographics, and assess the effect of socioeconomic factors on potential clients’ health;
3. instruction on conducting expanded histories and physical examinations and accurately document
findings, as well as the importance of organized and secure recordkeeping; and
4. the medical management of pertinent chronic diseases, the process of identifying and making appropriate referrals to medical and social services, and approaches to providing clinical advice and care.

Inver Hills Community College, in Inver Grove Heights, MN, started a similar program in 2013. The Inver Hills program requires 100 hours of online theory-based coursework and 200 hours of clinical training.33

Nearly all formalized mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine training programs require substantial investment of time and money. Costs range from $2,200 to $2,500, not including living expenses and transportation, and thus present a potential barrier to entry for individuals hoping to receive expanded training, as well as programs attempting to establish themselves in local communities. However, these costs may also serve as a mechanism by which programs without appropriate financial, regulatory, and community stakeholder backing are prevented from potentially operating and causing harm.

MOBILE INTEGRATED HEALTH CARE AND COMMUNITY PARAMEDICINE PROGRAM DESIGN

Nearly 2 decades of experience with both successful and failed mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine initiatives have allowed experts to form consensus about requirements for successful program implementation, even in the absence of validated national benchmarks or norms.29 Most experts suggest the following:
1. Successful mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine program implementation requires a comprehensive assessment of local health care needs before program planning and implementation. Not every community has the same health care system gaps or priorities. Directors should invest time visiting and planning alongside services such as VNA and other home health care providers, and must receive buy-in from local primary care providers, community clinics, EMS agencies, and hospitals. 2. There are often regulatory and administrative barriers such as state or local legislation mandating EMS transport for all patient encounters. Directors should involve and gain cooperation from state and local health departments, elected officials, and firefighters’ or health care workers’ unions. 3. Potential sources of income and reimbursement must be addressed early, especially because the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and a majority of commercial insurance plans currently reimburse EMS providers only for transporting patients. Programs must also address how they will continue operations, training, and quality assurance when initial funding or public interest and support eventually diminish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Liabilities of MIH/CP as a Health Care Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program implementation can be laborious and carry a significant risk of failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some EMS providers may see MIH/CP implementation as undue strain on staffing and payroll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few published objective data on efficacy, cost-effectiveness, and safety of MIH/CP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No standardized reimbursement for CP providers on a federal level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure. Summary of potential benefits and liabilities of mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine as a health care model. MIH, Mobile integrated health care; CP, community paramedicine.
Historically, extant programs have been open and enthusiastic about providing personal education on this level for all ranges of program involvement. Structured development guidelines are available from numerous EMS-focused resources such as the Community Healthcare and Emergency Cooperative and International Roundtable on Community Paramedicine, which has held annual meetings since 2005. Health care device and delivery companies such as Zoll have also started to offer mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine training and skills seminars directed at leadership and establishment of programs.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Although the definition and scope of mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine has been markedly refined since the publication of the National Consensus Conference on Community Paramedicine in 2013, the main hurdle to the progression of mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine as a recognized health care discipline is the lack of safety, efficacy, and long-term outcomes data. Community paramedicine providers will have to demonstrate to government and private payers, as well as the rest of the medical community, that they are a safe and effective means of filling local health care gaps. Furthermore, they will have to justify financial reimbursement for these duties. Such arguments have been and likely will always need to be supplemented by evidence of patient benefit. Improved data reporting such as through the National EMS Information System and through state health information exchanges will be essential for regional assessment of these programs.

Funding for mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine programs thus far has been achieved mainly from grants from federal and state governments, as well as by ambulance services themselves. However, Medicare and most private insurers still do not provide reimbursement for EMS services performed without transport. Without fundamental changes to the Medicare reimbursement model, mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine programs may not be able to sustain operations on a wide scale. Two proposals that have been extensively explored are

1. to decouple EMS payment for treatment from that for transport; and
2. to institute a population-based payment system, like bundled payments already in existence, or shared savings models similar to an accountable care organization.

Although mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine does not represent a significant change in the existing EMS scope of practice, EMS personnel function in these roles likely requires additional training in the care of subacute patients and those with semichronic disease, application of public health principles, and cultural competency. Training is also required for providers in programs providing primary care and screening functions. To further mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine acceptance by other medical professionals, stakeholders should highlight and distinguish the education and training of such providers from traditional EMS training. Efforts to implement mobile integrated healthcare and community paramedicine are most likely to reap benefits when implemented after intensive preparation to minimize the impact of liabilities inherent in such programs (Figure).

In summary, mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine is a concept that seems new but has actually been practiced for many years. Although EMS providers have served in an expanded role to fill local health care gaps nationwide, only recently have there been attempts to formally study the safety and cost-effectiveness of this model of care delivery and its place in the overall health care system. Initial data from established programs seem to support the use of mobile integrated health care and community paramedicine to reduce EMS and ED use while maintaining patient satisfaction. More study will be needed to explore the potential benefits, structure, and outcomes of such programs.
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