

**The Primary Care Clinician (PCC) Plan
A Primary Care Case Management Plan
External Quality Review Technical Report
Calendar Year 2018**



This program is supported in full by the
Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Human Services, Office of Medicaid.



The source for certain health plan measure rates and benchmark (averages and percentiles) data (“the Data”) is Quality Compass® 2018 and is used with the permission of the National Committee for Quality Assurance (“NCQA”). Any analysis, interpretation, or conclusion based on the Data is solely that of the authors, and NCQA specifically disclaims responsibility for any such analysis, interpretation, or conclusion. Quality Compass is a registered trademark of NCQA. The Data is comprised of audited performance rates and associated benchmarks for Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set measures (“HEDIS®”) and HEDIS CAHPS® survey measure results. HEDIS measures and specifications were developed by and are owned by NCQA. HEDIS measures and specifications are not clinical guidelines and do not establish standards of medical care. NCQA makes no representations, warranties, or endorsement about the quality of any organization or clinician that uses or reports performance measures or any data or rates calculated using HEDIS measures and specifications and NCQA has no liability to anyone who relies on such measures or specifications. NCQA holds a copyright in Quality Compass and the Data and can rescind or alter the Data at any time. The Data may not be modified by anyone other than NCQA. Anyone desiring to use or reproduce the Data without modification for a non-commercial purpose may do so without obtaining any approval from NCQA. All commercial uses must be approved by NCQA and are subject to a license at the discretion of NCQA. ©2018 National Committee for Quality Assurance, all rights reserved.

CAHPS is a registered trademark of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ).

Contents

Section 1. Contributors	4
Section 2: Introduction	5
Scope of the External Quality Review Process.....	5
Primary Care Clinician (PCC) Plan Description	5
Section 3. The Masshealth Comprehensive Quality Strategy.....	6
Section 4. Performance Measure Validation	10
Methodology	10
Information Systems Capability Assessment	11
Performance Measure Results.....	13
Measure-Specific Validation Designation	14
PCC Plan Strengths	14
Opportunities	15
Recommendations	15
Follow Up to Calendar Year 2017 Recommendations	15
Conclusion	15
Appendix. Performance Measure Validation Worksheets	16

SECTION 1. CONTRIBUTORS

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Cassandra Eckhof, M.S.

Ms. Eckhof has over 25 years managed care and quality management experience and has worked in the private, non-profit, and government sectors. Her most recent experience was as director of Quality Management at a Chronic Condition Special Needs Plan for individuals with end-stage renal disease. Ms. Eckhof has a Master of Science degree in health care administration.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDATION REVIEWER

Katharine Iskrant, CHCA, MPH

Ms. Iskrant is a member of the NCQA Audit Methodology Panel and has been a Certified HEDIS® Compliance Auditor since 1998 directing more than 600 HEDIS®¹ audits. She directed the consultant team that developed the original NCQA Software Certification ProgramSM on behalf of NCQA. She is a frequent speaker at HEDIS® vendor and health plan conferences, such as National Alliance of State Health CO-OPs (NASHCO) conferences. Ms. Iskrant received her BA from Columbia University and her MPH from UC Berkeley School of Public Health. She is a member of the National Association for Healthcare Quality and is published in the fields of healthcare and public health.

¹ HEDIS® - The Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS®) is a registered trademark of NCQA.

SECTION 2: INTRODUCTION

The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was an omnibus legislative package enacted by the United States Congress with the intent of balancing the federal budget by 2002. Among its other provisions, this expansive bill authorized states to provide Medicaid benefits (except to special needs children) through managed care entities. Regulations were promulgated including those related to the quality of care and service provided by managed care entities to Medicaid beneficiaries. An associated regulation requires that an External Quality Review Organization (EQRO) conduct an analysis and evaluation of aggregated information on quality, timeliness, and access to the health care services that a managed care entity or its contractors furnish to Medicaid recipients. In Massachusetts, KEPRO has entered into an agreement with the Commonwealth to perform EQR services to its contracted managed care entities, i.e., managed care organizations, integrated care organizations, prepaid inpatient health plans, primary care case management plans, senior care organizations, and accountable care organizations.

The MassHealth Primary Care Clinician Plan is considered to be a primary care case management plan. Because it is a state-operated plan, it is not subject to the external quality review requirements of the Balanced Budget Act. The state voluntarily participates in the Performance Measure Validation process.

KEPRO's report on the Primary Care Clinician Plan follows.

SCOPE OF THE EXTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW PROCESS

KEPRO validated two administrative performance measures and one hybrid measure for the PCC Plan in the CY 2018 review cycle. It also conducted an Information Systems Capability Assessment.

PRIMARY CARE CLINICIAN (PCC) PLAN DESCRIPTION

The MassHealth Primary Care Clinician (PCC) Plan is a primary care case management managed care program administered by the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS). As of December 31, 2017, 435,642 individuals statewide were enrolled in the PCC Plan. Members' behavioral health services are managed through the Massachusetts Behavioral Health Partnership (MBHP), a Beacon Health Options company.

SECTION 3. THE MASSHEALTH COMPREHENSIVE QUALITY STRATEGY

Introduction

Under the Balanced Budget Act managed care rule 42 CFR 438 subpart E, Medicaid programs are required to develop a managed care quality strategy. The first MassHealth Quality Strategy was published in 2006. An updated version, the MassHealth Comprehensive Quality Strategy which focused not only to fulfill managed care quality requirements but to improve the quality of managed care services in Massachusetts, was submitted to CMS in November 2018. The updated version broadens the scope of the initial strategy, which focused on regulatory managed care requirements. The quality strategy is now more comprehensive and serves as a framework for EOHHS-wide quality activities. A living and breathing approach to quality, the strategy will evolve to reflect the balance of agency-wide and program-specific activities; increase the alignment of priorities and goals where appropriate; and facilitate strategic focus across the organization.

MassHealth Goals

The mission of MassHealth is to improve *the health outcomes of its diverse members by providing access to integrated health care services that sustainably promote health, well-being, independence, and quality of life.*

MassHealth defined its goals as part of the MassHealth Comprehensive Quality Strategy development process. MassHealth goals aim to:

1. *Deliver a seamless, streamlined, and accessible patient-centered member experience, with focus on preventative, patient-centered primary care, and community-based services and supports;*
2. *Enact payment and delivery system reforms that promote member-driven, integrated, coordinated care; and hold providers accountable for the quality and total cost of care;*
3. *Improve integrated care systems among physical health, behavioral health, long-term services and supports and health-related social services;*
4. *Sustainably support safety net providers to ensure continued access to care for Medicaid and low-income, uninsured individuals;*
5. *Maintain our commitment to careful stewardship of public resources through innovative program integrity initiatives; and*
6. *Create an internal culture and infrastructure to support our ability to meet the evolving needs of our members and partners.*

Stakeholder Involvement

MassHealth actively seeks input from a broad set of organizations and individual stakeholders. Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, members, providers, managed care entities, advocacy groups, and sister EOHHS agencies, e.g., the Departments of Children and Families and Mental Health. These groups represent an important source of guidance for quality programs as well as for broader strategic agency. To that end, KEPRO places an emphasis on the importance of the stakeholder voice.

MassHealth Delivery System Restructuring

In November 2016, MassHealth received approval from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to implement a five-year waiver authorizing a \$52.4 billion restructuring of MassHealth. The waiver included the introduction of Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs). In this model, providers have a financial interest in delivering quality, coordinated, member-centric care. Organizations applying for ACO status were required to be certified by the Massachusetts Health Policy Commissions set of standards for ACOs. Certification required that the organization met criteria in the domains of governance, member representation, performance improvement activities, experience with quality-based risk contracts, population health, and cross-continuum care. In this way, quality was a foundational component of the ACO program. Seventeen ACOs were approved to enroll members effective March 1, 2018.

Another important development during this period was the reprocurement of MassHealth managed care organizations. It was MassHealth's objective to select MCOs with a clear track record of delivering high-quality member experience and strong financial performance. The Request for Response and model contract were released in December 2016; selections were announced in October 2017. Tufts Health Public Plans and Boston Medical Center HealthNet Plan were awarded contracts to continue operating as MCOs. Contracts with the remaining MCOs (CeltiCare, Fallon Health, Health New England, and Neighborhood Health Plan) ended in February 2018.

Quality Evaluation

MassHealth evaluates the quality of its program using at least three mechanisms:

- Contract management – MassHealth contracts with plans include requirements for quality measurement, quality improvement, and reporting. MassHealth staff review submissions and evaluate contract compliance.
- Quality improvement performance programs – Each managed care entity is required to complete two Performance Improvement Projects (PIPs) annually, in accordance with 42 CFR 438.330(d).
- State-level data collection and monitoring – MassHealth routinely collects HEDIS® and other performance measure data from its managed care plans.

How KEPRO Supports the MassHealth Managed Care Quality Strategy

As MassHealth's External Quality Review Organization, KEPRO performs the three mandatory activities required by 42 CFR 438.330:

- 1) Performance Measure Validation – MassHealth Managed Care Quality Strategy. MassHealth has traditionally asked that three measures be validated.
- 2) Performance Improvement Project Validation – KEPRO validates two projects per year.
- 3) Compliance Validation – Performed on a triennial basis, KEPRO assesses plan compliance with contractual and regulatory requirements.

The matrix below depicts ways in which KEPRO, through the External Quality Review (EQR) process, supports the MassHealth Managed Care Quality Strategy:

EQR Activity	Support to MassHealth Quality Strategy
Performance Measure Validation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assure that performance measures are calculated accurately.• Offer a comparative analysis of plan performance to identify outliers and trends.• Provide technical assistance.• Recommend ways in which MassHealth can target goals and objectives in the quality strategy to better support improvement in the quality, timeliness, and access to health care services.
Performance Improvement Project Validation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure the inclusion of an assessment of cultural competency within interventions.• Ensure the alignment of MassHealth Priority Areas and Quality Goals with MassHealth goals.• Ensure that performance improvement projects are appropriately structured and that meaningful performance measures are used to assess improvement.• Ensure that Performance Improvement Projects incorporate stakeholder feedback.• Share best practices, both clinical and operational.• Provide technical assistance.• Recommend ways in which MassHealth can target goals and objectives in the quality strategy to better support improvement in the quality, timeliness, and access to health care services.

Compliance Validation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess plan compliance with contractual requirements. • Assess plan compliance with regulatory requirements. • Recommend mechanisms through which plans can achieve compliance. • Facilitate the Corrective Action Plan process. • Recommend ways in which MassHealth can target goals and objectives in the quality strategy to better support improvement in the quality, timeliness, and access to health care services.
-----------------------	---

SECTION 4. PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDATION

The Performance Measure Validation (PMV) process assesses the accuracy of performance measures reported by the managed care entity. It determines the extent to which the managed care entity follows state specifications and reporting requirements. In addition to validation processes and the reported results, KEPRO evaluates performance trends in comparison to national benchmarks as well as any interventions the plan has in place to improve upon reported rates and health outcomes. KEPRO validates three performance measures annually for the PCC Plan.

METHODOLOGY

The two-step Performance Measure Validation (PMV) process consists of a desk review of documentation submitted by the managed care organization. The desk review affords the reviewer an opportunity to become familiar with plan systems and data flows. For plans that do not undergo a formal HEDIS® audit, as is the case with the PCC Plan, an onsite review is conducted. At the onsite review, the reviewer confirms information contained in the Data Acquisition Questionnaire, inspects information systems, and by interviewing staff, obtains clarification about performance measurement and information transfer processes.

KEPRO bases its Performance Measure Validation on the quality of source data and the calculation of the measures, including data management structure, sources and collection, and logic and analytic framework for determining numerators and denominators. KEPRO conducts a Medical Record Review validation to verify the accuracy of the hybrid measure Medical Record Review. Finally, for each measure validated, KEPRO determines any changes in performance over time, including whether any improvement was sustained or statistically significant.

MassHealth requested the validation of three HEDIS® performance measures for the PCC Plans. KEPRO chose one hybrid adult measure, one hybrid pediatric measure, and one behavioral health measure:

Comprehensive Diabetes Care (CDC) – HbA1c poor control (>9.0%) - The percentage of members 18–75 years of age with diabetes (type 1 and type 2) who had poor HbA1c control (>9.0%).

Childhood Immunization Status (CIS)- Combination 2 – The percentage of children 2 years of age who had four diphtheria, tetanus, and acellular pertussis (DTaP); three polio (IPV); one measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR); three haemophilus influenza type B (HiB); three hepatitis B (HepB); and one chicken pox (VZV) vaccine by their second birthday.

Follow-Up After Emergency Department Visit for Mental Illness, Seven-Day Rate (FUM) - The percentage of emergency department (ED) visits for members 6 years of age and older with a principal diagnosis of mental illness or intentional self-harm, who had a follow-up visit for mental illness within 7 days of the ED visit.

For the 2018 Performance Measure Validation, the PCC Plan submitted the documentation that follows:

Exhibit 1: Submitted Documentation

Document Submitted	Purpose of KEPRO Review
Data Acquisition Questionnaire	Reviewed to assess health plan systems and processes related to performance measure production.
2017 HEDIS® Interactive Data Submission System (IDSS) and previous two years IDSS, as available	Used to compile final rates for comparison to prior years' performance and industry standard benchmarks.
List of numerator positives for the Childhood Immunization Status and HbA1c Poor Control measures and medical records for randomly selected sample as requested by auditor	Used to generate a random sample of medical records for independent review to confirm accuracy of Medical Record Review process.
Follow-up documentation as requested by the reviewer	To obtain missing or incomplete information, support and validate plan processes, and verify the completeness and accuracy of information provided in the Data Acquisition Questionnaire, onsite interviews, and systems demonstrations.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

The focus of the Information Systems Capability Assessment is on the components of the PCC Plan's information systems that contribute to performance measure production. This is to ensure that the system can collect data on the enrollee, on provider characteristics, and on services furnished to enrollees through an encounter data system or other methods. The system must be able to:

- Ensure that data received from providers are accurate and complete;
- Verify the accuracy and timeliness of reported data;
- Screen the data for completeness, logic, and consistency; and
- Collect service information in standardized formats to the extent feasible and appropriate.

Claims and Encounter Data. PCC Plan claims and encounters are processed in the Massachusetts Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS). MMIS captures all

necessary fields for HEDIS® reporting. Standard coding was used, and there was no use of non-standard codes. Most claims were submitted electronically, and there were adequate monitoring processes in place to identify issues. MMIS had sufficient claims editing and coding review processes. For the small volume of paper claim submissions, MassHealth's Customer Service Vendor, Maximus, was responsible for the direct data entry function of paper claims. There were no concerns with the processing of electronic or manual claims.

The PCC Plan contracted with the Massachusetts Behavioral Health Partnership (MBHP) to process behavioral health claims. MBHP processed claims using all standard codes, standard claims forms, and the capture of all required fields. The plan had robust processes in place for the tracking and reporting of MBHP data.

The PCC Plan contracted with DXC, a Xerox company, to process pharmacy claims. DXC processed the pharmacy claims through the Pharmacy Online Payment System (POPS), and the PCC Plan paid the pharmacy claims. There were adequate processes in place to monitor pharmacy data, including processes to reconcile pharmacy reversals.

There were no concerns identified with data completeness. There were no issues identified with claims or encounter data processing.

Enrollment Data. The PCC Plan used the MMIS system to process enrollment data. All necessary enrollment fields were captured for HEDIS® reporting. The plan's member enrollment data was housed in the MMIS. Enrollment data were loaded into MMIS by the Health Insurance Exchange (HIX), which processed incoming applications and determined eligibility. In addition, the MA-21 system was used to capture disability and long-term needs eligibility. MAXIMUS served as the customer service center and updated eligibility information directly into the live system. Eligibility information from these sources was updated within 24 hours. The PCC Plan used eligibility information within MMIS and used the member's Medicaid identification number. There were no issues identified with enrollment processes.

Medical Record Review. Two of the three PMV measures were calculated using medical records in addition to claims/encounter data, i.e., Comprehensive Diabetes Care - HbA1c Poor Control, and Childhood Immunization Status - Combination 2. The Medical Record Review of these two measures was accurate. A sample of 30 numerator-positive hybrid cases was reviewed during the onsite visit for each of the measures. All records were found to be in full compliance with the HEDIS® specifications.

Supplemental Data. The PCC Plan did not use supplemental data sources. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

Data Integration. The PCC Plan had adequate processes to track the completeness and accuracy of data at each transfer point. Preliminary rates were thoroughly reviewed by the plan. During the onsite audit, MassHealth staff provided a system demonstration of Cognos, the

front-end view of the data warehouse. There were no issues identified with the HEDIS® data integration processes.

Source Code. CareSeed software received NCQA measure certification to produce the performance measures under the scope of this review. There were no source code issues identified.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS

Graphs that depict the PCC Plan's performance in measures selected by MassHealth for validation follow. The Quality Compass®² 2018 90th percentile is included for comparison purposes.

HbA1c Poor Control

The PCC Plan's HEDIS® 2018 HbA1c Poor Control performance rate is 35.52%. In this performance measure, a low percentage represents better performance. The PCC Plan's performance is between the 50th and 66.67th Quality Compass 2018 percentiles.

Childhood Immunization Status – Combo 2

The PCC Plan's HEDIS® 2018 performance on the Combo 2 Childhood Immunization Status rate was 75.67%. The PCC Plan's performance is between the 50th and 66.67th Quality Compass 2018 percentiles.

Seven-Day Follow-Up After Emergency Department Visit for Mental Illness

The PCC Plan's 82.56% Seven-Day Follow-Up After Emergency Department Visit for Mental Illness rate of 82.56% exceeds the Quality Compass 2018 90th percentile. The PCC Plan's performance is above the Quality Compass 2018 95th percentile.

² Quality Compass® - Quality Compass® is a registered trademark of NCQA.

MEASURE-SPECIFIC VALIDATION DESIGNATION

The table below depicts the validation designation for each of the measures validated by KEPRO in Calendar Year 2017.

Exhibit 2. Measure-Specification Validation Designation

Measure-Specific Validation Designation		
Performance Measure	Validation Designation	Definition
Comprehensive Diabetic Care (CDC) Poor Control	Valid measure (no bias)	Measure data were compliant with NCQA specifications, and the data, as reported, were valid.
Childhood Immunization Status (CIS) Combo 2	Valid measure (no bias)	Measure data were compliant with NCQA specifications, and the data, as reported, were valid.
Seven-Day Follow-Up After Emergency Department Visit for Mental Illness (FUM)	Valid measure (no bias)	Measure data were compliant with NCQA specifications, and the data, as reported, were valid.

PCC PLAN STRENGTHS

The PCC Plan:

- Uses an NCQA-certified vendor for the HEDIS® code.
- Collects, reports, and undergoes an audit of performance measures on a voluntary basis, which provides transparency and accountability of performance.
- Has staff who are knowledgeable and proficient in performance measure data collection and reporting processes.
- Scored well above the Quality Compass 95th percentile for the HEDIS® measure, Follow-Up After Emergency Department Visit for Mental Illness (7-day numerator). This is mainly due to the behavioral health vendor's Emergency Services Program/Mobile Crisis Intervention (ESP/MCI). The mission of the ESP/MCI is to deliver quality, culturally competent, clinically and cost-effective, integrated community-based behavioral health crisis assessment, intervention, and stabilization services that promote resiliency, rehabilitation, and recovery. A primary goal of ESP/MCI is to make emergency behavioral health services accessible in the community by offering viable service alternatives to hospital emergency departments. Every ESP/MCI provides behavioral health crisis assessment, intervention, and stabilization services 24/7 through four service components: Mobile Crisis Intervention services for youth, adult mobile

services, ESP community-based locations, and Community Crisis Stabilization (CCS) services for ages 18 and over.

OPPORTUNITIES

- None identified.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- KEPRO recommends that the PCC Plan consider using supplemental data for performance measure reporting.

FOLLOW UP TO CALENDAR YEAR 2017 RECOMMENDATIONS

CMS requires that EQROs follow up on the status of recommendations made in the prior reporting year. An update on calendar year 2017 PMV recommendations follows:

Exhibit 3: Update on PCC Plan 2017 Recommendations

Recommendations Made in 2017	2018 Follow Up
KEPRO recommends that the PCC Plan consider using supplemental data for performance measure reporting.	This recommendation stands.

CONCLUSION

In summary, KEPRO's validation review of the selected performance measures indicates that the Primary Care Clinician Plan's measurement and reporting processes were fully compliant with specifications and were methodologically sound.

APPENDIX. PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDATION WORKSHEETS

KEPRO uses the following ratings for Performance Measure Validation review elements:

- **Met:** The PCC Plan correctly and consistently evidenced review element;
- **Partially met:** The PCC Plan partially or inconsistently evidenced review element; and
- **Not met:** The PCC Plan did not evidence review element or incorrectly evidenced review element.

Performance Measure Validation:

Comprehensive Diabetes Care (CDC) - HbA1c Poor Control (>9.0%)

Methodology for Calculating Measure:	Administrative	Medical Record Review	Hybrid
---	-----------------------	------------------------------	---------------

Review Element	Rating	Comments
DENOMINATOR		
<u>Population</u>		
The Medicaid population was appropriately segregated from other product lines.	Met	
Members aged 18–75 years as of December 31 of the measurement year.	Met	
Members enrolled all of the measurement year allowing for a one-month break, but not in December.	Met	
Individuals with diabetes were appropriately identified using both specified methods. There are two ways to identify members with diabetes: by claim/encounter data and by pharmacy data. The PCC Plan must use both methods to identify the eligible population, but a member only needs to be identified by one method to be included in the measure. Members may be identified as having diabetes during the measurement year or the year prior to the measurement year.	Met	
<u>Geographic Area</u>		
Includes only those Medicaid enrollees served in the PCC Plan's reporting area.	Met	
NUMERATOR – HBA1C POOR CONTROL		
<u>Counting Clinical Events</u>		
Standard codes listed in NCQA specifications or properly mapped internally developed codes were used.	Met	
Data sources and decision logic used to calculate the numerators (e.g., claims files, including those for members who received the services outside the plan's network, as well as any supplemental data sources) were complete and accurate.	Met	
Members whose most recent HbA1c level (performed during the measurement year) is >9.0% or is missing, or was not done during the measurement year, as documented through automated laboratory data or Medical Record Review.	Met	
<u>Data Quality</u>		
Based on the Information Systems (IS) assessment findings, the data sources for this denominator were accurate.	Met	
Appropriate and complete measurement plans and programming specifications exist that include data sources, programming logic, and computer source code.	Met	

Review Element	Rating	Comments
<u>Proper Exclusion Methodology in Administrative Data</u>		
Members who did not have a diagnosis of diabetes in any setting during the measurement year or the year prior to the measurement year, and who had a diagnosis of gestational diabetes or steroid-induced diabetes in any setting during the measurement year or the year prior to the measurement year. (optional exclusion)	Not Applicable	
<u>Medical Record Review Documentation Standards</u>		
Record abstraction tool required notation of all key numerator fields.	Met	
<u>Data Quality</u>		
The eligible population was properly identified.	Met	
Based on the IS assessment findings, data sources used for this numerator were accurate.	Met	
If a hybrid measure was used, the integration of administrative and medical record data was adequate.	Met	
If the hybrid method was used, the PCC Plan passed auditor review for the accuracy of 30 randomly selected abstracted charts for good HbA1c control.	Met	
SAMPLING		
<u>Unbiased Sample</u>		
As specified in the NCQA specifications, systematic sampling method was utilized.	Met	
<u>Sample Size</u>		
After exclusions, the sample size was equal to 1) 411, 2) the appropriately reduced sample size, which used the current year's administrative rate or preceding year's reported rate, or 3) the total population.	Met	
<u>Proper Substitution Methodology in Medical Record Review</u>		
Excluded only members for whom MRR revealed 1) contraindications that correspond to the codes listed in appropriate specifications as defined by NCQA, or 2) data errors.	Met	
Substitutions were made for properly excluded records, and the percentage of substituted records was documented.	Met	

Performance Measure Validation: Childhood Immunization Status (CIS) – Combination 2

Methodology for Calculating Measure:	Administrative	Medical Record Review	Hybrid
--------------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------

Review Element	Rating	Comments
DENOMINATOR		
<u>Population</u>		
Medicaid population was appropriately segregated from other product lines.	Met	
Children who turned 2 years of age during the measurement year and were enrolled in the PCC Plan on their second birthday.	Met	
Children enrolled 12 months prior to their second birthday with no more than a one-month gap in enrollment during this period.	Met	
NUMERATOR – COMBINATION 2		
<u>Counting Clinical Events</u>		
Standard codes listed in the NCQA specifications or properly mapped internally developed codes were used.	Met	
Data sources and decision logic used to calculate the numerator (e.g., claims files, including those for members who received the services outside the plan's network, as well as any supplemental data sources) were complete and accurate.	Met	
Members meeting the measure requirements for DTap, IPV, MMR, HiB, HepB, and VZV vaccinations.	Met	
<u>Data Quality</u>		
Based on the IS assessment findings, the data sources for this denominator were accurate.	Met	
Appropriate and complete measurement plans and programming specifications exist that include data sources, programming logic, and computer source code.	Met	
<u>Proper Exclusion Methodology in Administrative Data</u>		
Exclude children who had a contraindication for a specific vaccine only if administrative data do not indicate that the contraindicated immunization was rendered in its entirety. (optional exclusion)	Not Applicable	
<u>Medical Record Review Documentation Standards</u>		
Record abstraction tool required notation of all key numerator fields for Combination 2.	Met	
<u>Data Quality</u>		
The eligible population was properly identified.	Met	
Based on the IS assessment findings, data sources used for this numerator were accurate.	Met	
<u>Hybrid Measure</u>		
If hybrid measure was used, the integration of administrative and medical record data was adequate.	Met	
If the hybrid method was used, the PCC Plan passed auditor review for the accuracy of 30 randomly selected abstracted charts for Combination 2.	Met	

Review Element	Rating	Comments
SAMPLING		
<u>Unbiased Sample</u>		
As specified in the NCQA specifications, systematic sampling method was utilized.	Met	
<u>Sample Size</u>		
After exclusions, the sample size was equal to 1) 411, 2) the appropriately reduced sample size, which used the current year's administrative rate or preceding year's reported rate, or 3) the total population.	Met	
<u>Proper Substitution Methodology in Medical Record Review</u>		
Excluded only members for whom Medical Record Review revealed 1) contraindications that correspond to the codes listed in appropriate specifications as defined by NCQA, or 2) data errors.	Met	
Substitutions were made for properly excluded records, and the percentage of substituted records was documented.	Met	

Performance Measure Validation: Follow-Up After Emergency Department Visit for Mental Illness (FUM) – 7-Day Rate

Methodology for Calculating Measure:	Administrative	Medical Record Review	Hybrid
--------------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------

Review Element	Rating	Comments
DENOMINATOR		
<u>Population</u>		
The Medicaid population was appropriately segregated from other product lines.	Met	
Members continuously enrolled on or before the date of the ED visit that had a principal diagnosis of mental illness on or between January 1 and December of the measurement year.	Met	
The denominator for this measure is based on Emergency Department (ED) visits, not on members. If a member has more than one ED visit, identify all eligible ED visits between January 1 and December 1 of the measurement year and do not include more than one visit per 31-day period.	Met	
<u>Geographic Area</u>		
Includes only those Medicaid enrollees served in the PCC Plan's reporting area.	Met	
<u>Age & Sex: Enrollment Calculation</u>		
Members 6 years and older as of the date of the ED visit.	Met	
Members continuously enrolled on or before the date of the qualifying ED visit that had a principal diagnosis of mental illness on or between January 1 and December of the measurement year.	Met	
<u>Data Quality</u>		
Based on the IS assessment findings, the data sources for this denominator were accurate.	Met	
Appropriate and complete measurement plans and programming specifications exist that include data sources, programming logic, and computer source code.	Met	
<u>Proper Exclusion Methodology in Administrative</u>		
Exclude ED visits followed by admission to an acute or non-acute inpatient care setting on the date of the ED visit or within the 30 days after the ED visit, regardless of principal diagnosis for the admission.	Met	

Review Element	Rating	Comments
NUMERATOR – 7-DAY FOLLOW-UP RATE		
<i>Administrative Data: Counting Clinical Events</i>		
Standard codes listed in NCQA specifications or properly mapped internally developed codes were used.	Met	
All code types were included in analysis, including CPT, ICD10, and HCPCS procedures, and UB revenue codes, as relevant.	Met	
Data sources used to calculate the numerator (e.g., claims files, provider files, and pharmacy records, including those for members who received the services outside the plan's network, as well as any supplemental data sources) were complete and accurate.	Met	