**ATTACHMENT A**

**Preparing the Evaluation Design**

**Introduction**

Both state and federal governments need rigorous quantitative and qualitative evidence to inform policy decisions. To that end, for states that are testing new approaches and flexibilities in their Medicaid programs through section 1115 demonstrations, evaluations are crucial to understand and disseminate information about these policies. The evaluations of new initiatives seek to produce new knowledge and direction for programs and inform Medicaid policy for the future. While a narrative about what happened during a demonstration provides important information, the principal focus of the evaluation of a section 1115 demonstration should be obtaining and analyzing data. Evaluations should include findings about the process (e.g., whether the demonstration is being implemented as intended), outcomes (e.g., whether the demonstration is having the intended effects on the target population), and impacts of the demonstration (e.g., whether the outcomes observed in the targeted population differ from outcomes in similar populations not affected by the demonstration).

**Submission Timelines**

There is a specified timeline for the state’s submission of its draft Evaluation Design and subsequent evaluation reports. The graphic below depicts an example of this timeline for a 5-year demonstration. In addition, the state should be aware that section 1115 evaluation documents are public records. The state is required to publish the Evaluation Design to the state’s website within thirty (30) calendar days of CMS approval, as per 42 CFR 431.424(e). CMS will also publish a copy to the Medicaid.gov website.

**Expectations for Evaluation Designs**

CMS expects Evaluation Designs to be rigorous, incorporate baseline and comparison group assessments, as well as statistical significance testing. Technical assistance resources for constructing comparison groups and identifying causal inferences are available on Medicaid.gov: [https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/section-1115-demonstrations/1115-demonstration-monitoring-evaluation/1115-demonstration-state-monitoring-evaluation-resources/index.html](https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/section-1115-demo/evaluation-reports/evaluation-designs-and-reports/index.html). If the state needs technical assistance using this outline or developing the Evaluation Design, the state should contact its demonstration team.

All states with section 1115 demonstrations are required to conduct Interim and Summative Evaluation Reports, and the Evaluation Design is the roadmap for conducting these evaluations. The roadmap begins with the stated goals for the demonstration, followed by the measurable evaluation questions and quantifiable hypotheses, all to support a determination of the extent to which the demonstration has achieved its goals. When conducting analyses and developing the evaluation reports, every effort should be made to follow the approved methodology. However, the state may request, and CMS may agree to, changes in the methodology in appropriate circumstances.

The format for the Evaluation Design is as follows:

1. General Background Information;
2. Evaluation Questions and Hypotheses;
3. Methodology;
4. Methodological Limitations;
5. Attachments.
6. **General Background Information** – In this section, the state should include basic information about the demonstration, such as:
   1. The issue/s that the state is trying to address with its section 1115 demonstration and/or expenditure authorities, the potential magnitude of the issue/s, and why the state selected this course of action to address the issue/s (e.g., a narrative on why the state submitted an 1115 demonstration proposal).
   2. The name of the demonstration, approval date of the demonstration, and period of time covered by the evaluation.
   3. A description of the population groups impacted by the demonstration.
   4. A brief description of the demonstration and history of its implementation, and whether the draft Evaluation Design applies to an amendment, extension, renewal, or expansion of, the demonstration.
   5. For renewals, amendments, and major operational changes: a description of any changes to the demonstration during the approval period; the primary reason or reasons for the change; and how the Evaluation Design was altered or augmented to address these changes.
7. **Evaluation Questions and Hypotheses** – In this section, the state should:
   1. Identify the state’s hypotheses about the outcomes of the demonstration, and discuss how the evaluation questions align with the hypotheses and the goals of the demonstration.
   2. Address how the hypotheses and research questions promote the objectives of Titles XIX and/or XXI.
   3. Describe how the state’s demonstration goals are translated into quantifiable targets for improvement, so that the performance of the demonstration in achieving these targets can be measured.
   4. Include a Driver Diagram to visually aid readers in understanding the rationale behind the cause and effect of the variants behind the demonstration features and intended outcomes. A driver diagram, which includes information about the goals and features of the demonstration, is a particularly effective modeling tool when working to improve health and health care through specific interventions. A driver diagram depicts the relationship between the aim, the primary drivers that contribute directly to achieving the aim, and the secondary drivers that are necessary to achieve the primary drivers for the demonstration. For an example and more information on driver diagrams: <https://innovation.cms.gov/files/x/hciatwoaimsdrvrs.pdf>.
8. **Methodology –** In this section, the state is to describe in detail the proposed research methodology. The focus is on showing that the evaluation meets the prevailing standards of scientific and academic rigor, that the results are statistically valid and reliable, and that it builds upon other published research, using references where appropriate.

This section also provides evidence that the demonstration evaluation will use the best available data. The state should report on, control for, and make appropriate adjustments for the limitations of the data and their effects on results, and discuss the generalizability of results. This section should provide enough transparency to explain what will be measured and how, in sufficient detail so that another party could replicate the results. Table A below is an example of how the state might want to articulate the analytic methods for each research question and measure.

Specifically, this section establishes:

1. *Methodological Design –* Provide information on how the evaluation will be designed. For example, whether the evaluation will utilize pre/post data comparisons, pre-test or post-test only assessments. If qualitative analysis methods will be used, they must be described in detail.
2. *Target and Comparison Populations* – Describe the characteristics of the target and comparison populations, incorporating the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Include information about the level of analysis (beneficiary, provider, or program level), and if populations will be stratified into subgroups. Additionally, discuss the sampling methodology for the populations, as well as support that a statistically reliable sample size is available.
3. *Evaluation Period –* Describe the time periods for which data will be included.
4. *Evaluation Measures –* List all measures that will be calculated to evaluate the demonstration. The state also should include information about how it will define the numerators and denominators. Furthermore, the state should ensure the measures contain assessments of both process and outcomes to evaluate the effects of the demonstration during the period of approval. When selecting metrics, the state shall identify opportunities for improving quality of care and health outcomes, and controlling cost of care. The state also should incorporate benchmarking and comparisons to national and state standards, where appropriate.

The state also should include the measure stewards (i.e., the organization(s) responsible for the evaluation data elements/sets by “owning”, defining, validating, securing, and submitting for endorsement, etc.) Proposed health measures could include CMS’s Core Set of Health Care Quality Measures for Children in Medicaid and CHIP, Consumer Assessment of Health Care Providers and Systems (CAHPS), the Initial Core Set of Health Care Quality Measures for Medicaid-Eligible Adults and/or measures endorsed by National Quality Forum. Proposed performance metrics can be selected from nationally recognized metrics, for example from sets developed by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation or for meaningful use under Health Information Technology.

1. *Data Sources –* Explain from where the data will be obtained, describe any efforts to validate and clean the data, and discuss the quality and limitations of the data sources. If the state plans to collect primary data (i.e., data collected specifically for the evaluation), include the methods by which the data will be collected, the source of the proposed questions and responses, and the frequency and timing of data collection. Additionally, copies of any proposed surveys must be provided to CMS for approval before implementation.
2. *Analytic Methods –* This section includes the details of the selected quantitative and/or qualitative analysis measures that will adequately assess the effectiveness of the demonstration. This section should:
   1. Identify the specific statistical testing which will be undertaken for each measure (e.g., t-tests, chi-square, odds ratio, ANOVA, regression).
   2. Explain how the state will isolate the effects of the demonstration from other initiatives occurring in the state at the same time (e.g., through the use of comparison groups).
   3. Include a discussion of how propensity score matching and difference-in-differences designs may be used to adjust for differences in comparison populations over time, if applicable.
   4. Consider the application of sensitivity analyses, as appropriate.
3. *Other Additions* – The state may provide any other information pertinent to the Evaluation Design for the demonstration.
4. **Table A. Example Design Table for the Evaluation of the Demonstration**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Research Question | Outcome measures used to address the research question | Sample or population subgroups to be compared | Data Sources | Analytic Methods |
| **Hypothesis 1** | | | | |
| Research question 1a | -Measure 1  -Measure 2  -Measure 3 | -Sample e.g. All attributed Medicaid beneficiaries  -Beneficiaries with diabetes diagnosis | -Medicaid fee-for-service and encounter claims records | -Interrupted time series |
| Research question 1b | -Measure 1  -Measure 2  -Measure 3  -Measure 4 | -Sample, e.g., PPS patients who meet survey selection requirements (used services within the last 6 months) | -Patient survey | Descriptive statistics |
| **Hypothesis 2** | | | | |
| Research question 2a | -Measure 1  -Measure 2 | -Sample, e.g., PPS administrators | -Key informants | Qualitative analysis of interview material |

**D. Methodological Limitations** – This section provides more detailed information about the limitations of the evaluation.  This could include limitations about the design, the data sources or collection process, or analytic methods.  The state should also identify any efforts to minimize these limitations.  Additionally, this section should include any information about features of the demonstration that effectively present methodological constraints that the state would like CMS to take into consideration in its review.

CMS also recognizes that there may be certain instances where a state cannot meet the rigor of an evaluation as expected by CMS. In these instances, the state should document for CMS why it is not able to incorporate key components of a rigorous evaluation, including comparison groups and baseline data analyses. For example, if a demonstration is long-standing, it may be difficult for the state to include baseline data because any pre-test data points may not be relevant or comparable. Other examples of considerations include:

1. When the demonstration is:
   1. Non-complex, unchanged, or has previously been rigorously evaluated and found to be successful; or
   2. Could now be considered standard Medicaid policy (CMS published regulations or guidance).
2. When the demonstration is also considered successful without issues or concerns that would require more regular reporting, such as:
   1. Operating smoothly without administrative changes;
   2. No or minimal appeals and grievances;
   3. No state issues with CMS-64 reporting or budget neutrality; and
   4. No Corrective Action Plans for the demonstration.

**E. Attachments**

1. **Independent Evaluator.** This includes a discussion of the state’s process for obtaining an independent entity to conduct the evaluation, including a description of the qualifications that the selected entity must possess, and how the state will assure no conflict of interest. Explain how the state will assure that the Independent Evaluator will conduct a fair and impartial evaluation and prepare objective Evaluation Reports. The Evaluation Design should include a “No Conflict of Interest” statement signed by the independent evaluator.
2. **Evaluation Budget.** A budget for implementing the evaluation shall be provided with the draft Evaluation Design. It will include the total estimated costs, as well as a breakdown of estimated staff, administrative, and other costs for all aspects of the evaluation. Examples include, but are not limited to: the development of all survey and measurement instruments; quantitative and qualitative data collection; data cleaning and analyses; and reports generation. A justification of the costs may be required by CMS if the estimates provided do not appear to sufficiently cover the costs of the draft Evaluation Design, if CMS finds that the draft Evaluation Design is not sufficiently developed, or if the estimates appear to be excessive.
3. **Timeline and Major Milestones.** Describe the timeline for conducting the various evaluation activities, including dates for evaluation-related milestones, including those related to procurement of an outside contractor, if applicable, and deliverables. The final Evaluation Design shall incorporate milestones for the development and submission of the Interim and Summative Evaluation Reports. Pursuant to 42 CFR 431.424(c)(v), this timeline should also include the date by which the Final Summative Evaluation Report is due.