

Celebrating the Promise of Parity and the Path Forward

October 09, 2018 | | By **Constance M. Garner**

This October 3rd marked the 10-year anniversary of the passage of the Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act (MHPAEA). Thinking back to 2008, there had already been several failed attempts to pass a more substantive parity bill. New rounds of negotiations began and were difficult. Substance use disorders (SUD) were still considered a step-child to mental health and labeled a human failing rather than a treatable disease with disabling consequences. If these conditions were not recognized and addressed, it would become a national crisis. However, value change is hard to legislate.

MHPAEA was intended to be more than insurance reform, it was intended to be civil rights legislation that brought mental health (and, for the first time SUD) to a level playing field with physical health. It was a long road to passage because it required a change in health care philosophy and value related to mental health and SUD— not just a change in coverage and payment protocols.

Now, 10 years later, the question is whether the law has changed the playing field to ensure greater access to care and more equitable financial parameters. Close to 100 million people now have parity protections and lives have been saved. Through enforcement of the law more restrictive financial requirements have been removed for patients, additional coverage has been added to insurance plans for mental health/SUD, and overly stringent precertification requirements have been eliminated.

Although the passage of this legislation created a pathway for change, there are still challenges to address. Discrimination related to SUD remains a challenge, as evidenced by the exclusion of ADA protections for those with SUD. Advocates continue to call for more transparency, established certifications, expanded provider network capacity, and more guidance on non-quantitative treatment limitations. The ongoing silos in which mental health/SUD and physical health conditions are treated as separate benefits with their own eligibility, fee schedules for services, credentialing, and poor provider network adequacy continue as areas to be addressed.

A couple of examples in which mental health/SUD services are treated differently: Providers have not been eligible for incentive payments to move to electronic medical records; payers have struggled in designing alternative payment models and value based payments for providers that move beyond simple process measures; payment restriction on same-day care are problematic in integrated settings where a person may be seen by both a mental health professional and a non-psychiatric physician; and physicians (non-psychiatrists) providing services in a specialty clinic creates credentialing and payment challenges.

New bipartisan legislation enacted to address the opioid crisis will be an important step to improving access to and the quality of substance use treatment, particularly in the Medicaid and Medicare programs --- but doesn't address the health system transformation that is needed to promote sustainable recovery. That is the challenge we face.

Hopefully our path forward will continue address these issues of implementation, so we approach the day when those living with mental health and substance use disorders will be seen as having a condition or disease that deserves prevention strategies, supports and treatment services, and civil rights protections similar to all other medical conditions.

Authors

Connie Garner