

**Summary of Proposals, YH18-0031, Prop 206 Impact on Network Adequacy**

	<b>Burns and Assoc.</b>	<b>HSAG</b>	<b>Mercer</b>	<b>Navigant</b>	<b>Sellers/Dorsey</b>
<b>Quote</b>	927.75 hours totaling \$194,656	1,484 hours totaling \$178,940	746 Hours totaling \$212,590	1,452 hours totaling \$289,862	385 hours totaling \$89,932
<b>Project Timeline</b>	Call with AHCCCS on encounter/enrollment information 10/9, data request to AHCCCS 10/11/17, report and databook by 1/2/18	Draft to AHCCCS 1/2/18	Information request to AHCCCS 10/10/17, Final report 1/2/18	Project kickoff meeting October, draft report January	No overall timelines for report, estimated completion of their methods each have their own completion date. Last completion date is December 15.
<b>Methodology/ Approach</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use AHCCCS enrollment, provider enrollment and encounter data from CY 2016 to baseline service utilization for the 11 services in the task order</li> <li>• Will also review travel time and distance</li> <li>• Use secondary data including reports collected by AHCCCS, MCOs, contracts and the DDD rate study</li> <li>• B&amp;A intends to build a web-based survey of providers with 10-12 questions (November 6)</li> <li>• Will do a focus group in November with ALTCS MCOs</li> <li>• Will meet with MCOs separately as well</li> <li>• Will compare baselined data by GSA to results of secondary data and surveys/focus groups</li> <li>• Will segment members into county cohorts, then determine the universe of services for services by billing code</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task 1 - Online three-week provider survey with prior e-mail announcement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will include all providers</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Task 2 – analysis of non-provision of service report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ From data analysis in step 9</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Task 3 – Analysis of Provider Terms report</li> <li>• Task 4 – Focus Group held at their offices</li> <li>• Task 5 – Review of AHCCCS, MCO and DDD Contracting PnPs, with an eye to making recommendations for improvement</li> <li>• Task 6 – Review of Network Plans to find gaps and develop recommendations for improvement</li> <li>• Task 7 -Review of existing network standards for NF and the HCBS services listed in the scope, develop recommendations for improvement, including looking at peer states</li> </ul>	<p>Outlines four areas of activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provider Survey of Workforce Capacity – Conduct web-based survey of wages, sick leave, staffing and skills training issues</li> <li>• Network Adequacy – Combination of reviewing AHCCCS reports and looking at historic trends in utilization data and provider participation in plan networks, 4 focus groups of members, providers and MCOs</li> <li>• ALTCS MCOs and AHCCCS Specific Analysis – Look at AHCCCS and MCO policies, contracts, audits and CAPs</li> <li>• Additional Data Analysis – Will need encounter and claims data for network analysis, and ED, hospital and NF utilization data to see if their use is increasing due to lack of network</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task 1 – Initiate project, define data requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Meet to discuss document request, ask data availability</li> <li>○ Will use existing documents supplement it with focus groups and survey</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Task 2 – Review and Analyze ALTCS networks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Compare provider networks pre and post change</li> <li>○ Develop member to provider ratios, look at change</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Task 3 – Review and Analyze reports and policies</li> <li>• Task 4- Collect and Analyze provider survey data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Statistically significant sample of all ALTCS providers on WFD and LTC issues</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Task 5 Multiple MCO focus groups</li> <li>• Task 6 - Develop report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey of providers distributed by stakeholders and associations, supplemented by targeted interviews.</li> <li>• Review of non-provision reports and compliant data</li> <li>• Review of providers who have reduced service provision or termed contracts due to rates through a review of utilization data</li> <li>• Focus groups of MCO staff held in each GSA</li> <li>• Review of MCO policies and practices related to contracting</li> <li>• Review of plan Network plans</li> <li>• Review of AHCCCS network standards for ALTCS and the Gap reports</li> <li>• Review DDD’s title XIX rate review</li> <li>• Request claims data compare against Gap reports to determine workforce issues and support other findings</li> </ul>

**Summary of Proposals, YH18-0031, Prop 206 Impact on Network Adequacy**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task 8 - Review of Annual Title XIX Rate Reimbursement Study – Preliminary work suggests economies of scale impacting DDD network, they want to test that</li> <li>• Task – 9 - Using claims and encounter data, they will calculate non-provision of service and service reduction rate</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Provider Survey Proposal</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web based survey of providers</li> <li>• Wants to survey all providers with threshold</li> <li>• Test the survey</li> <li>• 10-12 questions on             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Raw employee wages, turnover/vacancy rates, wages as business costs, recruitment challenges and actions, steps taken as a result of wage increases, special questions for those who report reducing or eliminating services</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web based survey</li> <li>• Providers get multiple e-mail notifications of survey</li> <li>• Open for 3 weeks</li> <li>• Will survey all providers in each of the 11 groups (AHCCCS registered, on in networks?)</li> <li>• Few details on survey content</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web based</li> <li>• Work with cohort of providers to test the survey</li> <li>• Can supplement survey through structured interviews</li> <li>• Groups providers into 3 groups for analysis for purposes of determining the number of providers to survey</li> <li>• Topics - wages, sick leave, staffing and GSA, skills training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web based</li> <li>• Statistically significant sample</li> <li>• Survey based upon literature suggestions, to include             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ WF volume, stability, composition, wages and benefits</li> <li>○ Sample data table on page 23</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Pilot test it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distributed through associations, key stakeholders</li> <li>• Of a statistically significant number of each provider in target groups</li> <li>• Supplement with targeted interviews</li> <li>• Topics             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Retention rates, turnover, current vacancies, recruitment strategies, financial implications of 206, challenges, notable trends</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Focus Group Proposal</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One combined MCO focus group</li> <li>• 1:1 meetings with each MCO             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ask questions for each MCO on provider policies, network plan, and other documents in work order</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will host a focus group with questions identified by its experts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of its effort to examine network adequacy – supplements Non Provision reports and provider data</li> <li>• 3 Focus group webinars MCOs, DDD, and provider reps. MCO/DDD to focus on service provision, choice, provider webinar on GSA,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus groups of staff from different MCO departments, 6-9 people responding to semi structured questions</li> <li>• 60-90 minutes per group</li> <li>• 1x DDD, 1xMCO in Phoenix, 1xMCO in Tucson and 1xWebinar focus group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 focus group in each of the areas</li> <li>• Question guide covering             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monitoring access to care</li> <li>○ Trends since 206 for access, member choice, member satisfaction,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Summary of Proposals, YH18-0031, Prop 206 Impact on Network Adequacy

			<p>service types, auth times and 206 impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fourth focus group with members and providers giving services on their view of 206 impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will collect info on challenges, of MCOs, impact of 206, member access, choice, and designed to evaluate WF capacity and establish standard</li> </ul>	<p>member wait times and wait lists, other trends</p>
<b>Use of Encounter Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use AHCCCS enrollment, provider enrollment and encounter data from CY 2016 to baseline service utilization for the 11 services in the task order by county then GSA</li> <li>• Will use encounter date to identify high utilized providers for survey</li> <li>• Will map driving distance from members to their providers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recognizes some HCBS services are delivered in home, so will discuss with us the utility of running this</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ties use of encounter data into analysis of 'Non-provision of service' analysis</li> <li>• Will use encounter date from, January 2014 to September 2017 to calculate a non provision of service and service reduction rate for each provider type</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will ask for encounter and claims data for LTSS to cross reference with other data to identify types, locations of services impact</li> <li>• Will also ask for ED, hospital and NF encounter data by GSA to look for increased volume</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Given the accelerated timeframe, our aim will be to use as much existing information as possible, while supplementing with survey and focus group information. As such, we will look to use MCO reports rather than create our own primary analysis.</li> <li>• Have done heat maps showing provider volume of services based upon encounters, offers option to do this if requested by AHCCCS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will ask for 2 years of encounter data for services in the task order and compare them to the Ball vs. Biedess Gap reports to identify workforce issues</li> <li>• Will also be used to support other findings</li> </ul>
<b>Experience and Capability</b>	<p>In its 11 year history, B&amp;A has worked with 31 state agencies in 24 states and 9 projects for 8 clients in the last 5 years, including DDD rate analysis.</p>	<p>Arizona's EQRO for Arizona and some other states, familiar with Arizona's ALTCS program. Experience in network analysis, administering surveys</p>	<p>Local teams have conducted several projects with DDD, AHCCCS and DBHS (DDD Integrated RFP), several BH related AHCCCS projects. Also other HCBS projects in other states</p>	<p>A variety of network review experiences from other states, conducted focus reviews for DES, workforce development survey for DES, worked on DES rate rebase</p>	
<b>Staffing/ Resumes</b>	<p>Project Manager is Mark Podrazik.</p>	<p>Paul Niemann, Project Director, Kim Elliott and Mary Wiley handling task 5 and 6</p>	<p>Michael Smith is project leader, others Dan Wendt</p>	<p>Tamyra Porter/Greg Abdouch</p>	<p>Pam Coleman</p>
<b>Status Updates</b>	<p>4 in person meetings with AHCCCS, plus planned or ad hoc meetings. Will also meet with the MCOs</p>	<p>Didn't really address on an overall basis</p>	<p>Didn't really address</p>	<p>Initial meeting, then monthly status reports 5<sup>th</sup> of each month</p>	<p>Do not discuss overall, but some steps discuss contact with AHCCCS.</p>
<b>Evaluation Group Comments</b>	<p>Detailed analytics on a tight timeframe, less on focus groups</p>	<p>Understood bias, bad conclusion on cost shifting</p>	<p>Pretty weak, not a lot of detail. Underwhelmed</p>	<p>As much qualitative as quantitative. Proactive WF development goals. Effort in line with what was</p>	<p>Proposed methodology does not meet the needs or expectations of the agency.</p>

**Summary of Proposals, YH18-0031, Prop 206 Impact on Network Adequacy**

<p>Knowledge base on spinning data around.</p> <p>Clarification – Geo-mapping for some services – We agree, tells us which services you think are geo-mapping.</p> <p>Clarification - EPD data how comfortable with our provider</p> <p>Need to clarify how will they identify providers/e-mails for distribution</p> <p>Flexible approach – qualitative and quantitative approaches blended nicely</p> <p>Proposed methodology, timelines and pricing best suits the needs of the State.</p> <p>Recommend for Award.</p>	<p>Proposed methodology does not meet the needs or expectations of the agency.</p>	<p>Proposed methodology does not meet the needs or expectations of the agency.</p>	<p>required.</p> <p>Dashboards, ratios, but didn't explain how they would be used.</p>	
---	--	--	--	--