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Building the Scorecard

Access & Affordability (7 indicators)
Prevention & Treatment Quality (16)
Avoidable Hospital Use & Costs (10)
Healthy Lives (10)
Disparities (19 income-related)

Rank

Overall I Rank

### Ranking Highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018 Rank</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Affordability</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention &amp; Treatment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidable Use &amp; Cost</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Lives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We took a closer look at these four communities:

Stockton, California
Pueblo, Colorado
Akron, Ohio
Paducah, Kentucky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Health System Performance</th>
<th>Health System Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stockton</strong></td>
<td>Improved on 19 OF 33 indicators tracked over time — most among all regions</td>
<td>92 OF 306 regions in 2016 vs. 156 OF 306 regions in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pueblo</strong></td>
<td>Improved on 17 OF 32 indicators tracked over time — second-most among all regions</td>
<td>128 OF 306 regions in 2016 vs. 181 OF 306 regions in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paducah</strong></td>
<td>Improved on 17 OF 32 indicators tracked over time</td>
<td>225 OF 306 regions in 2016 vs. 279 OF 306 regions in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akron</strong></td>
<td>Improved on 19 OF 33 indicators tracked over time — most among all regions</td>
<td>137 OF 306 regions in 2016 vs. 224 OF 306 regions in 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State health system performance varies within regions

Note: Regions are U.S. Census regions. Regional shading is based on performance among states within the region only. See Scorecard Methods for additional detail.

**States that expanded Medicaid saw greater declines in the share of adults who went without care because of costs**

*Average percentage-point change, 2013 to 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Low-Income Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid expansion states, as of January 1, 2016</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonexpansion states, as of January 1, 2016</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Average percentage point change is defined as the rate of adults 18 and older who reported going without needed care because of costs in 2013 less the rate in 2016. Rates were calculated in expansion and non-expansion states by summing the number of individuals who did and did not forego needed care. For the purposes of this exhibit we count the District of Columbia as a Medicaid expansion state, and Louisiana, which expanded its Medicaid program after Jan. 1, 2016, as a non-expansion state. Colorado is included among Medicaid expansion states.


Income-related disparities in health care access differ across states

Alabama
- Uninsured adults: 27%
- Adults who skipped care because of cost: 33%

Colorado
- Uninsured adults: 19%
- Adults who skipped care because of cost: 21%


2018 Scorecard on State Health System Performance

A state-by-state report measuring access to care, quality of care, health outcomes, and health disparities across the United States

by David C. Radley, Douglas McCarthy, and Susan L. Hayes


State Health System Scorecard Methods

- Goal: to provide benchmarks and trends to inform national, state and local action to improve health care system performance
- Health System Focus: Builds on previous Scorecards
  - 43 indicators organized into 4 dimensions: Access/affordability; Prevention/treatment; Avoidable hospital use and costs; and Healthy lives
  - Disparity dimension assesses a subset of indicators by income within states
  - National data sources including administrative claims, national surveys, and vital statistics available for states
- 2- to 3-year trend data available for 37 indicators
  - Generally from 2013 to 2016, but varies by indicator
- Scoring:
  - Each indicator is ranked
  - Dimension rank is based on average of indicator ranks
  - Overall rank based on average of five dimension ranks
- Estimated gains are based on rates of performance in the top performing state