Chart 1 shows how One Care plans are performing with respect to the Core 2.1 measure from the demonstration reporting requirements. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) requires Medicare-Medicaid Plans participating in all capitated model demonstrations under the Financial Alignment Initiative to regularly report core measures, including Core 2.1.

The Core 2.1 measure tracks how many One Care members have had a comprehensive assessment within 90 days of their enrollment effective date into a One Care plan. This measure is cumulative based on monthly data submissions from the One Care plans, and for the period covered in this report includes members who enrolled as of January 1, February 1, or March 1 of 2015. The measure excludes members who were unwilling to participate in an assessment or who did not respond to at least three attempts to contact them (“unable to locate”). The Core reporting requirements document, including the specifications for the Core 2.1 measure, are posted on the MMCO website: <http://www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-and-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-Office/FinancialAlignmentInitiative/InformationandGuidanceforPlans.html> This graph shows that 99% of members who enrolled in One Care during this time period, who the plan was able to locate, and who agreed to participate in an assessment, received a comprehensive assessment within 90 days of their first effective date of enrollment.

While it is not a measure required by CMS, Chart 2 shows how many members were assessed within 120 days. Chart 2 demonstrates that One Care plans have continued to conduct assessments for members between their 90th and 120th day of enrollment; while the percentage assessed remained consistent at 99%, the denominator increased compared to Chart 1. The increase in the denominator incidates that plans were able to make contact by the 120th day of enrollment with members they had been unable to locate within the first 90 days.

Charts 3 and 4 show the percentage of assessments completed out of the total number of One Care members with an enrollment date of January 1, February 1, or March 1 of 2015, including individuals who refused to participate in an assessment and members the plans were unable to locate (members who did not respond after three or more attempts to contact them). Charts 3 and 4 also break these percentages out by plan. The “pending” category includes members who have not yet had an assessment within 90 days, have not refused an assessment, and who the plan has unsuccessfully attempted to contact at least three times. Note that the number of enrolled members in Chart 4 is lower than in Chart 3 on account of members in the ‘unable to locate’ or ‘refused’ categories who disenrolled between their 90th and 120th day of enrollment.

For example, Chart 3 shows that for members with January, February, or March 2015 effective enrollment dates, Commonwealth Care Alliance conducted assessments with 66% of those members within 90 days; made at least 3 outreach attempts to 28% of those members and did not receive a response; and received refusals from 4% of those members. In total, the plan met its contractual requirements for approximately 98% of members, while approximately 2% of members were in the “pending” category. The proportion of Commonwealth Care Alliance members with relevant effective enrollment dates who were in the “pending” category declined to 0% at 120 days of enrollment, as did the percentage of members who did not respond to the plan’s three attempts to contact them within the first 90 days (unable to locate).

The charts show variation between each of the three plans in the number of members who were newly enrolled during this period (identified in the chart as “N”), and the status of members’ assessment completions. These charts also show that all of the One Care plans had members they were unable to locate with at least three contact attempts, although the actual numbers and percentages vary.

Chart 4 again demonstrates that the number of completed assessments increases by 120 days of enrollment, while the number of members whose assessments have been pending decreases. In this quarter, the percentage of members the plans were unable to locate decreased between 90 and 120 days, indicating that the plans were later able to make contact with many of the members in this enrollment cohort. Tufts Health Plan (Tufts) experienced the largest decline in this category (12%), with many of these members moving into the “pending category,” indicating that contact was made but an assessment was not yet completed during this time frame. One Care plans are expected to continue outreach to members they are unable to locate by attempting to contact them at least once every three months.

Chart 5 shows how many members whose effective enrollment dates were January 1, February 1, or March 1 of 2015 (the denominator for each column), received a comprehensive assessment within 90 days; how many were determined by the plan to be in need of LTSS[[1]](#footnote-1); and how many members were offered a referral to an LTS Coordinator (the numerators for each of the columns). For example, this chart shows that for members with January, February or March 2015 effective enrollment dates: Commonwealth Care Alliance assessed 98% of those members who they could locate and agreed to participate in an assessment within 90 days; Commonwealth Care Alliance reported offering a referral to an LTS Coordinator to 100% of those members; and 53% of those members were identified as having a need for LTSS. The One Care plans are contractually required to offer a referral to an LTS Coordinator to all of their enrollees when they make contact with them (including members who may not yet have had an assessment). In this time period, the number of people who were offered a referral to an LTS Coordinator was significantly higher than the number of people identified as having a need for LTSS. Members who initially decline a referral to an LTS Coordinator may request one at any time.

The percentage of members who are offered a referral to an LTS Coordinator may actually be slightly higher than the percentage of those who received an assessment, resulting in a percentage that is greater than 100%. For example, Tufts assessed all of the 35 new members who they were able to locate within 90 days, all of whom were offered a referral to an LTS Coordinator. Tufts was also able to offer a referral to an LTS Coordinator to 2 additional members who refused a full assessment, resulting in a percentage of 106% (where the total number of members who received an assessment (35) is the denominator, and the total number of members who were offered a referral to an LTS-C (37) is the numerator).

Note that enrollment in Chart 5 excludes members who were unwilling to participate in an assessment or who the plans were unable to locate, as with Charts 1 and 2.

Chart 6 shows how many members, of the total who were offered an LTS Coordinator referral (the purple column in Chart 5), either declined the offer of a referral or accepted and were subsequently referred to an LTS-C Agency.[[2]](#footnote-2) Because in some cases members may not have made an affirmative choice to be referred or decline a referral to an LTS Coordinator agency within the 90 day time period or the plan may not have completed a referral, percentages may not always add up to 100%. Chart 7 shows how many of the members with an identified need for LTSS (Chart 5) either declined the offer of an LTS Coordinator referral, or accepted and were subsequently referred to an LTS Coordinator Agency.

As might be expected, these charts demonstrate that uptake of the LTS Coordinator referral is much higher among individuals with an identified LTSS need, though some individuals with identified LTSS needs chose not to have an LTS Coordinator referral. It is important to understand that choosing not to receive an LTS Coordinator referral does not mean the member is not receiving LTSS. This chart is only looking at a member’s choice to accept an LTS Coordinator referral or not, and does not indicate receipt of LTSS.

Data from the Early Indicators Project (EIP) indicate that there may be some confusion among members about the role of the LTS Coordinator. MassHealth is working closely with stakeholders to understand both LTSS need and LTS Coordinator uptake, and to educate both members and providers about the role of the LTS Coordinator. For example, MassHealth worked with stakeholders to create a [one-page informational sheet](http://www.mass.gov/eohhs/docs/masshealth/onecare/lts-long-term-supports-coordinator.pdf) on a member’s right to an LTS Coordinator (released in July 2014), that One Care plans have been instructed to give to each of their enrolled members; and also to develop a [webinar](https://onecarelearning.ehs.state.ma.us/pdf/LTS-Coordinator-Roles-and-Benefits.pdf) on the role and benefits of the LTS Coordinator for members (September of 2014).

1. The need for LTSS may be identified by the assessment, by the enrollee, by other Interdisciplinary Care Team (ICT) members, or by any other party as identified in Section 2.5C (4)(g) of the three-way contract:

   * At any time at an Enrollee’s request;
   * During Comprehensive Assessments for all Enrollees in C3 and F1 Rating Categories, and for all Enrollees in any Rating Category who request it;
   * When the need for community-based LTSS is identified by the Enrollee or ICT;
   * If the Enrollee is receiving targeted case management, is receiving rehabilitation services provided by the Department of Mental Health, or has an affiliation with any state agency; or
   * In the event of a contemplated admission to a long-term care facility

   [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In One Care, all members who choose to have an LTS Coordinator are referred to an independent agency that is contracted with the member’s One Care plan to provide the plan’s members with LTS-C services. This chart does not reflect how many members who were referred to the agency actually met with an LTS Coordinator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)