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One Care: Implementation Council Meeting

Executive Office of Health & Human Services

MassHealth Demonstration to Integrate Care for Dual Eligibles

April 15, 2016, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Health Policy Commission

50 Milk St., 8th Floor, Public Meeting Room  
Boston, MA
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One Care Passive Round 6 Outreach Schedule

* One Care Presentation and Q& A Events
  + Suffolk County
* Friday, April 1, 2016 from 1 PM – 3 PM event at Codman Square Library in Dorchester had 6 attendees\*
  + Worcester County
* Wednesday, March 30, 2016 from 12 PM – 2 PM event at Fitchburg Public Library in Fitchburg had 7 attendees\*
* One Care Drop-in Events
  + Suffolk County
* Tuesday, April 5, 2016 from 9am – 12pm at Boston Health Care for the Homeless Program in Boston had 20 attendees\*
* Wednesday, April 13, 2016 from 2-5pm at Whittier St. Health Center in Roxbury had 13 attendees\*
  + Worcester County
* Friday, March 25, 2016 from 10am – 1pm at Jacob Edwards Library in Southbridge had 6 attendees\*
* Thursday, April 7, 2016 from 3-6pm at Edward M Kennedy Community Health Center in Worcester had 8 attendees\*

\* Attendees refers to interested consumers and/or providers
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Event Promotion

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event Promotion | Approximate # Contacted |
| Posted flyers in/around event host sites | Posted at 6 sites |
| Contacted/shared flyers with neighboring and community-based organizations | Shared with 30 organizations |
| Contacted and shared flyers with some provider organizations in Tufts’ provider network who had members included in passive enrollment | Contacted 17 provider organizations |
| Distributed flyer to Shared Learning listserv of One Care plan and provider stakeholders | Distributed to 3,835 providers & stakeholders |
| Distributed One Care information and flyers at statewide Brain Injury Association of Massachusetts (BIA-MA) conference | Conference had about 850 participants |
| Distributed flyers through Implementation Council member networks | Distributed through 20 different Council Member networks |
| One Care Ombudsman posted event information to Facebook page | Post received about 95 clicks |
| MassHealth tweeted about events on MassHealth twitter account; events were retweeted by EOHHS, Mass.gov, Commonwealth Care Alliance, Tufts, some Community Health Centers, and other community twitter feeds | MassHealth has about 615 followers; EOHHS has about 4,765 followers; and mass.gov has about 71,400 followers |
| Distributed through MassHealth Training Forum (MTF) and Assisters listservs | The MTF listserv has 5,586 subscribers; the Assisters list serv has about 2,017 (both including some internal staff as well). |
| Distributed through One Care stakeholders list-serv | The list-serve includes about 350 stakeholders |
| Event information distributed to SHINE and MassHealth Customer Service Center (CSC) staff | N/A |
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Quick Debrief on Passive Round 6 Outreach Strategies

* MassHealth hosted events in areas where concentrations of members included in passive enrollment live (as we did last time).
* We adjusted our outreach approach to include two different types of events:
* Drop-in events - MassHealth and the plans staffed tables at key providers and local community locations for 3 hour blocks, during which any interested members could stop by to ask questions.
* One Care Presentation and Q & A events- similar format as used in December 2015, with presentations from each plan, and representatives from MassHealth, SHINE, and the OCO, as well as One Care members.
* Each event included free snacks and giveaways.
* MassHealth sent flyers about the events to passively enrolled members in both the 60 and 30-day notice packets, and sent one additional mailing with just the event flyers.
* MassHealth/UMMS worked with our stakeholder partners to significantly increase our event promotion activities (see previous slide).
* Lessons learned:
* Holding drop-in events at locations with known, high numbers of potentially eligible members, and working with experienced partners such as Boston Health Care for the Homeless, seems to be a more promising practice to reach potentially eligible members than the targeted presentation and Q and A events.
* We hope to have a more in-depth discussion with the Council on strategies to better engage members in informed decision making during the passive process after this current round is completed.
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Definitions and Grievance Intake Process

* Grievance Definition: *Complaint surrounding any services provided by the health plan*
* A graphic depicts the current grievance reporting process and includes the following information:
  + A Member or Authorized rep has the ability to enter grievance
  + The following are avenues to enter a grievance:
    - Enter by contacting CMS directly
    - Enter by contacting MassHealth Directly
    - Enter by contacting Ombudsman
    - Enter by contacting the plan
  + If CMS or MassHealth are contacted directly, then the grievance is processed by CMS or MassHealth staff who enter grievance into Complaint Tracking Module (CTM). Depending on issue type:
    - Grievance is either handled by MassHealth staff OR
    - Grievance is relayed to the plans for processing
    - Plan will enter information into their operating system and resolve issue
  + If the Ombudsman is contacted directly, the grievance is processed by the Ombudsman who will contact the plan.
    - The plan enters grievance into operating system – if not already in the Complaint Tracking Module (CTM)
    - Plan will enter information into their operating system and resolve issue
  + If the Plan is contacted directly, the grievance is processed by the plan which will enter information into their operating system, and resolve issue.
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Grievance Categories

* Members may submit grievances to the One Care Ombudsman, MassHealth or CMS.
* Grievances are recorded electronically and grouped in the categories below.

CATEGORY: BP: Dental

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with dental services / plan dental restrictions

EXAMPLE: Upset dental implant was not approved

CATEGORY: BP: Part C, Medicaid, Supplemental

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with dental services / plan dental restrictions

EXAMPLE: Upset PCA services not approved

CATEGORY: BP: Part D

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with the plans covered prescription drugs

EXAMPLE: Upset brand name drugs not approved

CATEGORY: Enrollment

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with the enrollment broker

EXAMPLE: Self-selected and placed in wrong plan

CATEGORY: MassHealth

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with MassHealth

EXAMPLE: Incorrectly dis-enrolled from One Care

CATEGORY: Medicare

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with services provided by Medicare

EXAMPLE: Received incorrect information from Medicare

CATEGORY: Network/Access

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction surrounding provider access/ availability

EXAMPLE: Preferred provider not in network

CATEGORY: Other

DESCRIPTION: Any grievance that does not fit into one of the pre-existing categories

EXAMPLE: No example

CATEGORY: Plan Management

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with the plan oversight

EXAMPLE: Care Coordinator is unresponsive

CATEGORY: Plan Marketing Materials

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with marketing materials received from the plan

EXAMPLE: Too many materials sent

CATEGORY: Provider

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with a provider

EXAMPLE: Rude office manager at specialist’s office

CATEGORY: Quality of Care

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with the quality of care received

EXAMPLE: Provided incorrect medication

CATEGORY: Transportation

DESCRIPTION: Dissatisfaction with transportation services provided

EXAMPLE: Transportation no-shows/late arrivals
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Plotted point line graph labeled “April 2015 - December 2015 Percentage of Plan Membership with Grievances”

Graph plots points showing the relative percent of plan members for CCA and Tufts that filed grievances from April 2015 to December 2015 CCA’s plotted point line is in blue and Tuft’s line is in yellow. The blue line representing CCA begins at 2.21% dips slightly through June 2015, then rises slowly to 3.04% in October 2015, and then falls more sharply through December 2015 to 1.77%. The yellow line representing Tufts begins at .81% in April and then jumps up and down each month through October 2015 at 3.04%, when it gradually slopes down through December 2015 and ends at 1.77%.

The data from the plotted line chart is included below:

April 2015

For CCA 227 grievances were filed, totaling 2.21% of membership

For Tufts 15 grievances were filed, totaling 0.81% of membership

May 2015

For CCA 206 grievances were filed, totaling 1.99% of membership

For Tufts 9 grievances were filed, totaling 0.49% of membership

June 2015

For CCA 170 grievances were filed, totaling 1.63% of membership

For Tufts 29 grievances were filed, totaling 1.61% of membership

July 2015

For CCA 224 grievances were filed, totaling 2.13% of membership

For Tufts 18 grievances were filed, totaling 1.02% of membership

August 2015

For CCA 266 grievances were filed, totaling 2.49% of membership

For Tufts 41 grievances were filed, totaling 2.34% of membership

September 2015

For CCA 281 grievances were filed, totaling 2.64% of membership

For Tufts 26 grievances were filed, totaling 1.42% of membership

October 2015

For CCA 322 grievances were filed, totaling 3.04% of membership

For Tufts 37 grievances were filed, totaling 1.79% of membership

November 2015

For CCA 262 grievances were filed, totaling 2.54% of membership

For Tufts 32 grievances were filed, totaling 1.56% of membership

December 2015

For CCA 181 grievances were filed, totaling 1.77% of membership

For Tufts 9 grievances were filed, totaling 0.49% of membership
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Graph titled “April 2015 – December 2015 Grievances Percentage Amount of Total Grievances by Category”

A bar graph shows the percent of grievances in each grievance category for CCA, whose bars are in blue, and Tufts, whose bars are in yellow. There is a red line at 15% of grievances labeled “examine categories exceeding 15% threshold.” The data points for grievances categories that exceed the 15% threshold are highlighted on the chart and include the categories of Transportation for CCA (81%) and Tufts (50%) and Network for Tufts (16%).

Chart has a note which states “*Data includes only grievances Q2 2015-Q4 2015. Grievance data collected prior to this period was not assigned to categories”*

Transportation

CCA 81% of grievances

Tufts 50% of grievances

Quality of care

CCA 3.51% of grievances

Tufts 2.16% of grievances

Provider

CCA 4.39% of grievances

Tufts 3.45% of grievances

Plan Marketing Materials

CCA 0% of grievances

Tufts 0.43% of grievances

Plan Management

CCA 8.27% of grievances

Tufts 9.48% of grievances

Other

CCA 0.79% of grievances

Tufts 10.78% of grievances

Network

CCA 0.65% of grievances

Tufts 15.95% of grievances, the chart rounds this value to 16% of grievances

Medicare

CCA 0% of grievances

Tufts 0% of grievances

MassHealth

CCA 0.05% of grievances

Tufts 0% of grievances

Enrollment

CCA 0% of grievances

Tufts 0.43% of grievances

BP: Part D

CCA 0.28% of grievances

Tufts 2.59% of grievances

BP: Part C, Medicaid, and Supplemental

CCA 0.23% of grievances

Tufts 1.72% of grievances

BP: Dental

CCA 0.56% of grievances

Tufts 2.59% of grievances
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Plotted point line graph labeled “April 2015 – December 2015 Percentage of Plan Membership with Transportation Grievances”

Graph plots points showing the relative percent of plan members for CCA and Tufts that filed transportation grievances from April 2015 to December 2015 CCA’s plotted point line is in blue and Tuft’s line is in yellow. The line representing CCA begins in April 2015 at 1.79% and dips slightly to 1.32% in June 2015, rises gradually to 2.48% in October 2015 and then dips to 1.59% in December 2015. The line representing Tufts begins at .59% in April 15, dips to .22% in May 2015, then rises and then remains relatively stagnant between June 2015 at .67% and December 2015 at .68%,

Chart describing each plotted point on the graph

April 2015

For CCA 184 grievances were filed, totaling 1.79% of membership

For Tufts 11 grievances were filed, totaling 0.59% of membership

May 2015

For CCA 159 grievances were filed, totaling 1.54% of membership

For Tufts 5 grievances were filed, totaling 0.22% of membership

June 2015

For CCA 138 grievances were filed, totaling 1.32% of membership

For Tufts 12 grievances were filed, totaling 0.67% of membership

July 2015

For CCA 173 grievances were filed, totaling 1.64% of membership

For Tufts 10 grievances were filed, totaling 0.57% of membership

August 2015

For CCA 209 grievances were filed, totaling 1.96% of membership

For Tufts 17 grievances were filed, totaling 0.97% of membership

September 2015

For CCA 227 grievances were filed, totaling 2.13% of membership

For Tufts 15 grievances were filed, totaling 0.82% of membership

October 2015

For CCA 263 grievances were filed, totaling 2.48% of membership

For Tufts 19 grievances were filed, totaling 0.92% of membership

November 2015

For CCA 223 grievances were filed, totaling 2.16% of membership

For Tufts 15 grievances were filed, totaling 0.73% of membership

December 2015

For CCA 162 grievances were filed, totaling 1.59% of membership

For Tufts 14 grievances were filed, totaling 0.68% of membership
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Plotted point line graph labeled “April 2015 – December 2015 Percentage of Plan Membership with Network Grievances”

Graph plots points showing the relative percent of plan members for CCA and Tufts that filed network grievances from April 2015 to December 2015 CCA’s plotted point line is in blue and Tuft’s line is in yellow. The line representing CCA is stays low and flat with grievances fluctuating between 0 and 5. The line representing Tufts is also low and flat with a slight increase in August 2015 to 5 and in October 2015 to 11, the number grievances lowered slightly in November and December to 9 and 7 resprectively.

Chart describing each plotted point on the graph

April 2015

For CCA 0 grievances were filed, totaling 0% of membership

For Tufts 0 grievances were filed, totaling 0% of membership

May 2015

For CCA 2 grievances were filed, totaling 0.02% of membership

For Tufts 1 grievances were filed, totaling 0.05% of membership

June 2015

For CCA 2 grievances were filed, totaling 0.02% of membership

For Tufts 0 grievances were filed, totaling 0% of membership

July 2015

For CCA 1 grievances were filed, totaling 0.01% of membership

For Tufts 0 grievances were filed, totaling 0% of membership

August 2015

For CCA 5 grievances were filed, totaling 0.05% of membership

For Tufts 5 grievances were filed, totaling 0.29% of membership

September 2015

For CCA 0 grievances were filed, totaling 0% of membership

For Tufts 4 grievances were filed, totaling 0.22% of membership

October 2015

For CCA 3 grievances were filed, totaling 0.03% of membership

For Tufts 11 grievances were filed, totaling 0.53% of membership

November 2015

For CCA 0 grievances were filed, totaling 0% of membership

For Tufts 9 grievances were filed, totaling 0.44% of membership

December 2015

For CCA 1 grievances were filed, totaling 0.01% of membership

For Tufts 7 grievances were filed, totaling 0.34% of membership
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MassHealth Grievance Oversight Process

* Currently plans report grievances directly to MassHealth on a monthly basis.
* These Grievance Reports are circulated to a variety of One Care staff including:
  + MassHealth Leadership
  + MassHealth Contract Management
  + MassHealth Quality Staff
  + CMS Counterparts
  + Staff review reports and identify any areas of concern, or questions they may have to further discuss with the plans.
* Areas of concern/questions are then sent to the plans and discussed during the bi-weekly contract management meetings.
* During bi-weekly contract management meetings, plans provide responses on the previously identified grievances concerns/ questions.
* Additionally grievance data is aggregated by quality staff and shared with the plans, allowing plans to
  + Proactively identify areas of concerns, and
  + Implement strategies to improve plan operations and member satisfaction

Plan responses illustrating past, previous, and current strategies are shown on the following
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CCA’S Response to Transportation Grievance Data

Background/Context

* 81% of CCA’s grievances are transportation related
* Transportation utilization consistently increasing – April 2016 average is over 20,000 rides per month.
* Grievances decreasing each month despite steady increases in utilization.
* Complaints consistently remain less than 1% of trip volume.
* The decrease in complaints is attributed to numerous efforts and interventions (see right).
* Top 3 issues are:
  + Vendor/driver lateness
  + Vendor/driver no-shows
  + Customer service, including clerical errors

INTERVENTIONS

Lateness

* Implemented a one hour pick-up window for Boston and Greater Boston
* Observed immediate improvement in member satisfaction
* Reinforced communications policy for vendors to notify CCA when they are late so CCA can call the member and provider offices as appropriate

No-shows and Lateness

* Reduce volume of rides to no-show and late vendors
* Work with vendor to address issues impacting lateness, no-shows, customer service
* Annual vendor meetings and regular communication to vendors via fax and email blasts

Other

* Staff trainings to address data entry errors that result in member complaints at CCA and transportation broker
* Staff is held accountable for errors made

Improvements to Existing Operations

* Implementation of skills-based routing prompts within Transportation toll-free line
* Ongoing efforts with member education
* CCA and broker leadership met in December 2015 to agree upon ongoing improvement strategies

Innovations

* Implementation of portal for CCA staff: directly schedule in broker’s portal
* Improving interactive voice response solutions - Members to confirm rides
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Tufts’ Response to Network and Transportation Grievance Data

TRANSPORTATION

* Less than 1% of all rides result in a grievance.
* In general, members complain that:
  + their ride was late for the scheduled pick up;
  + did not show; or
  + in some cases, members grieved that the transport showed up too early.
* Staff review all transportation grievances with contracted vendors to resolve the specific grievance, and identify opportunities for improvement.
* In 2015, Tufts Health Plan enhanced the oversight function for transportation vendors, added multiple companies to the network, and ended a relationship with a vendor.
* Despite increasing membership enrollment and utilization, Tufts Health Plan improved performance of its transportation network according to grievance trends.
* Tufts Health Plan continues to monitor transportation-related grievances and will implement additional changes as necessary in the future.

NETWORK

* Network-related grievances were filed by 0.5% of members during the reporting period.
* Majority of network grievances received following FTC exit from One Care
* Most often, members grieve that their PCP or specialist is not in network.
* Customer service and care management staff work individually with these members to identify in-network providers to satisfy their needs.
* Tufts Health Plan's provider network meets or exceeds proximity access requirements for facilities and providers.
* In Fall 2015, Tufts Health Plan passed CMS's new network adequacy requirements for Medicare-Medicaid Plans.
* Membership and utilization patterns are consistently monitored against network adequacy requirements; if gaps are identified, Tufts Health Plan pursues contracts with relevant providers as expeditiously as possible.
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Questions?
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Visit us at: [www.mass.gov/masshealth/onecare](http://www.mass.gov/masshealth/onecare)

Email us at: [OneCare@state.ma.us](mailto:OneCare@state.ma.us)