



MEDICAID Fact Sheet

Unwinding the Medicaid Continuous Coverage Provision: Risks to People with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency


Introduction

The federal COVID-19 Public Health Emergency (PHE) implemented changes that enabled people to stay on Medicaid. Most significantly, in 2020, Congress enacted the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (FFCRA), which required states to keep people continuously enrolled in Medicaid through the end of the month in which the PHE ended in exchange for increased federal funding.¹ At the end of last year, Congress passed another law setting the end date for continuous coverage as March 31, 2023.² States have a fourteen month unwinding period from that date during which they must complete renewals for all enrollees and disenroll those who no longer qualify for Medicaid.³

Over ninety million individuals will face a Medicaid eligibility redetermination during the unwinding of the continuous coverage provision. Experts estimate more than 8 million people will lose Medicaid coverage as a result.⁴ The unwinding process is expected to cause significant stress on state eligibility and enrollment systems. Although these systems are always under obligations to not discriminate, states will need to comprehensively assess their processes and systems, especially any changes implemented for unwinding, to protect against discrimination against people with disabilities and people with limited English proficiency (LEP).

State Medicaid agencies are subject to compliance with nondiscrimination requirements outlined in Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.⁵ These civil rights requirements prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability and “national origin,” which has been interpreted by the Supreme Court to include the language one speaks and thus limited English proficient individuals.⁶

From previous examples of state eligibility and enrollment systems under stress, such as with the implementation of the ACA, nondiscrimination requirements can fall by the wayside. During the ACA implementation, people with disabilities and with LEP struggled through administrative barriers and often were



denied or lost coverage because they could not navigate the troubled systems, especially when they did not receive information. To avoid these problems during the unwinding, states will need to prepare their systems, policies, and procedures; train staff, especially frontline and Call Center staff; properly notify beneficiaries; and set up systems of compliance.

Nondiscrimination in the provision of Medicaid benefits means that protected classes of people receive some degree of positive effort and a more comprehensive approach to ensuring access to benefits.⁷ States must not only ensure that there is language access, accessible formats, interpreters, etc., but that their methods of administration do not discriminate.⁸


The unwinding of the continuous coverage period has a high risk of discriminatory impact on certain populations which are often the same ones facing significant harm from coverage loss. Predictions about coverage loss during the unwinding indicate that of the 8.2 million who will lose coverage, 6.8 million will be disenrolled despite being eligible. States should be making efforts to ensure their administrative processes and policies do not create barriers for people with disabilities and LEP. This brief offers a series of questions (although not an exhaustive list) that states should consider as they develop their unwinding plans. Stakeholders may initiate conversations with their state Medicaid agencies to help ensure that nondiscrimination requirements are met and effective plans are in place to ensure that people with disabilities and people with limited English proficiency are not left even further behind during the unwinding.

The unwinding of the continuous coverage period has a high risk of discriminatory impact on certain populations which are often the same ones facing significant harm from coverage loss. Predictions about coverage loss during the unwinding indicate that of the 8.2 million who will lose coverage, 6.8 million will be disenrolled despite being eligible.⁹ States should be making efforts to ensure their administrative processes and policies do not create barriers for people with disabilities and LEP. This brief offers a series of questions (although not an exhaustive list) that states should consider as they develop their unwinding plans. Stakeholders may initiate conversations with their state Medicaid agencies to help ensure that nondiscrimination requirements are met and effective plans are in place to ensure that people with disabilities and people with limited English proficiency are not left even further behind during the unwinding.¹⁰

Preventing Discrimination against People with Disabilities

States have obligations to not discriminate against people with disabilities in the operation of the Medicaid program, including how the state provides reasonable accommodations and how policies, procedures, and other methods of administration impact people with disabilities. When thinking about how a state can meet the needs of people with disabilities, it is important to think beyond the commonly cited accommodations such as alternative format, e.g., braille, for those with visual impairments, but also to consider whether call centers or other front line staff are trained to provide accommodations to individuals with traumatic brain injury or other cognitive disabilities that may require a front line staffer to speak more slowly, repeat information, and send follow up in writing. Many of the questions about the state's preparations should include specific details to ensure equal access for people with disabilities. Disability access questions include:

Identification of People with Disabilities. How is the state identifying those who need accommodations, including those that have a prior or current need for alternative format notices, in-person assistance or other accommodations? What are they doing to follow up where needed? For example, does the state have a system so that people who have requested alternative format or accommodations in the past will get



those accommodations again? How is the state identifying need in the population and doing outreach to offer accommodations or at least ensure that people know they can get assistance?

In Person Assistance. Is the state prepared to provide in-person assistance? Will that in-person assistance be accessible, including appropriate training, time allowed per appointment, in physically accessible locations, or accessible virtually as may be appropriate? How will states advertise or otherwise make sure beneficiaries are aware of in-person assistance? Any targeted outreach to ensure beneficiaries who need the assistance to access Medicaid benefits know about it and how to access it?

Training. What training are call centers workers or other front-line staff receiving to recognize requests for accommodations? People are unlikely to specifically say “I need an accommodation” so how are call center workers trained to listen for requests for accommodations or otherwise facilitate access? Do the call centers have appropriate training on video relay calls, helping callers who have disabilities that are hard of hearing or may have cognitive disabilities? What is the state’s plan to ensure access to people with disabilities when the call center may have long wait times? People with disabilities may have someone helping make the call for only a limited period of time and may not have that person available to wait for hours to get through a long wait time. Is there capacity for the call center to make appointments for callers with disabilities?

Automations. How will automations impact people with disabilities—are they accessible? Are they harder for people with disabilities to manage/use? For example, if the state is using QR codes for documents and that document has to be attached to submitted documents, that may be difficult for people with limited dexterity to meet. Or whether the QR codes are read properly by screen readers such that a person using a device would know what it is and how to attach it. Are apps or other online sites accessible? Do automations require facility with technology that may be inaccessible for people with intellectual or cognitive disabilities?


Monitoring. How will the state monitor:

- If people are losing eligibility who should not (e.g., many people with disabilities have eligibility situations that are unlikely to change like Disabled Adult Child)?
- Whether disability-based or associated categories are disparately impacted by procedural denials?
- Whether accommodations are being provided?

Complaints. What complaint system is available for people to raise problems? How are people aware of the complaint system? Are there clear processes with timelines and appeal rights? What policies and procedures will the state follow so that people understand the processes and decision-making criteria?

Preventing Discrimination against People with Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

Approximately 16 percent of Medicaid households include a person who is LEP.¹¹ In some states, over 20 percent of Medicaid households include LEP individuals, including California, Florida, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York and Texas.¹² An individual is considered limited English proficient if the individual’s primary language for communication is not English and the person has a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English. A limited English proficient individual may be competent in English for certain types of



communication (e.g., speaking or understanding), but still be limited English proficient for other purposes (e.g., reading or writing).¹³

Medicaid agencies have specific requirements to provide language access. Although the services to be provided may be slightly different, many of the questions about the state's preparations are similar to the questions regarding equal access for people with disabilities. Language access questions include:

Identification of People with Limited English Proficiency. How is the state identifying those who need language services, including those that have a prior or current need for translated notices, in-person assistance by qualified bilingual staff or with qualified interpreters, or other language services? What are they doing to follow up where needed? How is the state identifying need and capacity for language services based on known information about the Medicaid population, prevalence of language needs in that population within the state, and what services the state needs to have available to meet the expected need?

Training. What training are call centers workers or other front-line staff receiving to recognize the need for language services?

Assessments of Language Access. How has the accessibility of processes and procedures to provide language services been assessed? What about the accessibility of outreach?¹⁴

- Are materials being produced in non-English languages and/or translated?
- Are interpreters available at outreach events?
- Is outreach being conducted to ethnic media and CBOs serving LEP individuals?

Automations. How will automations impact people with limited English proficiency—do they provide language access? Are they harder for people with LEP to manage/use?

Monitoring. How will the state monitor:

- If people are losing eligibility who should not (e.g., many people with LEP may not respond to English notices).
- Whether language services are being provided.

Complaints. What complaint system is available for people to raise problems? How are people aware of the complaint system? Are there clear processes with timelines and appeal rights? What policies and procedures will the state follow so that people understand the processes and decision-making criteria?

Call Centers. How do LEP individuals get through a state's call center (or chat feature if it uses one) if it uses integrated voice prompts (IVP) only in English (and possibly Spanish)? That is, how does an LEP person get to an actual call center representative if the LEP person cannot understand what numbers to press and just holding on the line will not ultimately connect to a representative?

In Person Assistance. What in-person assistance will be available for LEP individuals and how will language services be provided? How does a person request and access such assistance?



Conclusion

Medicaid agencies will be focused on ensuring that no one who is eligible for Medicaid loses their coverage during the unwinding period. As we approach a time of intense stressors on eligibility and enrollment systems, states must not only plan to ensure access, but have plans to recognize and then address access issues affecting these populations. Assuming new policies, processes, and technology will work for people with disabilities and with LEP fails to take the necessary steps to ensure access. Not all populations will be affected similarly by changes or by problems. States have obligations to prepare adequately for access; monitor for adverse impacts on people with disabilities and with LEP; and make both proactive and reactive changes to ensure these populations are able to access their Medicaid benefits.

This document was developed by **Sarah Somers J.D.**, Managing Attorney, Network for Public Health Law – Southeastern Region Office, **Elizabeth Edwards J.D.**, Senior Attorney, National Health Law Program and **Mara Youdelman, J.D.**, National Health Law Program.

The Network for Public Health Law provides information and technical assistance on issues related to public health. The legal information and assistance provided in this document does not constitute legal advice or legal representation. For legal advice, please consult specific legal counsel.

Date Published: May, 2023

Supporter:



Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

References

¹ Pub. L. No. 116-127 (March 18, 2020), <https://www.congress.gov/116/plaws/publ127/PLAW-116publ127.pdf>.

² Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2023, Pub. L. No. 117-328.

³ Ctrs. for Medicare & Medicaid Servs., Dear State Health Official (SHO# 23-002) at 3, Jan. 27, 2023.

⁴ APSE, *Unwinding the Medicaid Continuous Enrollment Provision: Projected Enrollment Effects and Policy Approaches* 6-7 (Aug. 19, 2022), <https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/60f0ac74ee06eb578d30b0f39ac94323/aspe-end-mcaid-continuous-coverage.pdf>. See also Jennifer Tolbert & Meghana Ammula, Kaiser Family Foundation, 10 Things to Know About the Unwinding of the Medicaid Continuous Enrollment Provision, Feb. 22, 2023, <https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/10-things-to-know-about-the-unwinding-of-the-medicaid-continuous-enrollment-provision/> (estimating between 5.3 million and 14.2 million will lose coverage).

⁵ 42 U.S.C. § 18116; 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 29 U.S.C. § 794a; 42 U.S.C. § 2000d.


⁶ See *Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

⁷ *Henrietta D. v. Bloomberg*, 331 F.3d 261, 275-76 (2d Cir. 2003) citing *L.C. ex rel. Zimring v. Olmstead*, 527 U.S. 581, 598 (1999).

⁸ See, e.g., 28 C.F.R. §§ 35.130(b)(3); 41.51(b)(3); 80 C.F.R. §§ 80.3(b)(2), 80.4(b)(2).

⁹ APSE, *Unwinding the Medicaid Continuous Enrollment Provision: Projected Enrollment Effects and Policy Approaches* 6-7.

¹⁰ CMS has issued a slide deck on this issue that may be helpful with advocacy to states. CMS, *Accessibility Requirements in Medicaid and CHIP* (Feb. 2023), <https://www.medicaid.gov/resources-for-states/downloads/accessibility-unwinding-slides.pdf>.



¹¹ Sweta Haldar, Samantha Artiga, Robin Rudowitz, Anthony Damico, Unwinding of the PHE: Maintaining Medicaid for People with Limited English Proficiency, Kaiser Family Found. (Mar. 3, 2022), <https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/unwinding-of-the-phe-maintaining-medicaid-for-people-with-limited-english-proficiency/>.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ HHS Office for Civil Rights, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking: Nondiscrimination in Health Programs and Activities*, 87 Fed. Reg. 47824 (Aug 4, 2022), <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2022-08-04/pdf/2022-16217.pdf>.

¹⁴ See, e.g., CMS, *Strategies States and the U.S. Territories Can Adopt to Maintain Coverage of Eligible Individuals as They Return to Normal Operations* 8-9 (Nov. 2021), <https://www.medicaid.gov/state-resource-center/downloads/strategies-for-covrg-of-indiv.pdf>.