



2024 Performance Improvement Project Snapshot Report

Preventive Screening

March 2025



Table of Contents

1. Background	1-1
Methodology	1-1
Purpose	1-3
Contractors Reviewed	1-3
Population.....	1-4
Indicator Criteria	1-4
Data Sources.....	1-5
Measurement Periods	1-5
2. Performance Summary	2-1
Performance Indicator Results	2-1
Disparities.....	2-4
Data Validation.....	2-4
Validation Findings	2-7
Data Limitations	2-8
3. Conclusions and Recommendations	3-1
Conclusions	3-1
Recommendations	3-1
Appendix A. Acknowledgements and Copyrights	A-1
Appendix B. Performance Indicator Rates	B-1

1. Background

The Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) contracted with Health Services Advisory Group, Inc. (HSAG), a qualified external quality review organization (EQRO), to conduct evaluation and validation of its AHCCCS-mandated performance improvement projects (PIP). HSAG used the Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) publication, *Protocol 1. Validation of Performance Improvement Projects: A Mandatory EQR-Related Activity*, February 2023 (CMS EQR Protocol 1).¹

HSAG's evaluation of the PIP included two key components of the quality improvement (QI) process:

1. HSAG evaluated the technical structure of the PIP to ensure that the Contractor designs, conducts, and reports the PIP in a methodologically sound manner, meeting all State and federal requirements. HSAG's review determines whether the PIP design (e.g., aim statement, population, indicator(s), sampling methods, and data collection methodology) is based on sound methodological principles and could reliably measure outcomes. Successful execution of this component ensures that reported PIP results are accurate and capable of measuring sustained improvement.
2. HSAG evaluated the implementation of the PIP. Once the PIP is designed, a Contractor's effectiveness in improving outcomes depends on the systematic data collection process, analysis of data, and the identification of barriers and subsequent development of relevant interventions. Through this component, HSAG evaluates how well the Contractor improves its rates through implementation of effective processes (i.e., barrier analyses, intervention design, and evaluation of results).

The goal of HSAG's PIP validation was to ensure that AHCCCS and key stakeholders could have confidence that a Contractor executed a methodologically sound improvement project, and any reported improvement was related to and could be reasonably linked to the QI strategies and activities conducted by a Contractor during the PIP.



Methodology

Breast cancer is the most common female cancer in the United States for every major ethnic group, the second most common cause of cancer death in women,² and accounts for 15 percent of all new cancer

¹ Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. *Protocol 1. Validation of Performance Improvement Projects: A Mandatory EQR-Related Activity*, February 2023. Available at: <https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/quality-of-care/downloads/2023-eqr-protocols.pdf>. Accessed on: Jan. 16, 2025.

² Jemal A, Siegel R, Ward E, et al. Cancer Statistics, 2009. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2009 Jul-Aug;59(4):225- 49.Epub 2009 May 27. Available at: [Cancer Statistics, 2009 - Jemal - 2009 - CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians - Wiley Online Library](https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2009.16.3432). Accessed on: Jan. 16, 2025.

diagnoses in the United States.³ Ensuring that all women receive regular breast cancer screening is critically important in disease prevention, early detection, and treatment. In 2019, an estimated 268,600 new cases of invasive breast cancer will be diagnosed among women.⁴ Breast cancer screening for women is aimed at identifying breast abnormalities as early as possible, and ideally, before warning signs or symptoms are present when the chances of survival are the highest. Approximately one in eight women (13 percent) will be diagnosed with invasive breast cancer in their lifetime, and one in 39 women (3 percent) will die from breast cancer.⁵

Breast cancer is most frequently diagnosed among women ages 55–64 years with the median age of diagnosis at 62 years of age.² While there are other factors that affect a woman's risk of developing breast cancer, age is a primary risk factor. By age 40, the chances are one in 68; by age 50 it becomes one in 43; by age 60, it is one in 29.⁶ Even if breast cancer incidences cannot be substantially reduced for some women who are at high risk for developing the disease, the risk of death from breast cancer can be reduced by regular screenings.

Cervical cancer is a type of cancer that occurs in the cells of the cervix. All women are at risk for cervical cancer; however, it occurs most often in women over age 30.⁷ According to the American Cancer Society, in the United States for 2020 about 13,800 new cases of invasive cervical cancer will be diagnosed and about 4,290 women will die from the disease.⁸ The risk of developing cervical cancer can be reduced by having screening tests and receiving a vaccine that protects against human papillomavirus (HPV) infection. Women who smoke, had many children, used birth control pills for a long time, or have a human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection are at higher risk. Cervical cancer used to be the leading cause of cancer death for women in the United States. However, in the past 40 years, the number of cases and the number of deaths from cervical cancer have decreased significantly due to women getting screened regularly. The HPV vaccine protects against the types of HPV that most often cause cervical, vaginal, and vulvar cancers. However, the most important thing someone can do to help prevent cervical cancer is to have regular screenings starting at the age of 21 years.

-
- ³ Howlader N, Noone AM, Krapcho M, et al. SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1975-2016, National Cancer Institute. Bethesda, MD; 2016. Available at: [Cancer Statistics Review, 1975-2016 - SEER Statistics](#). Accessed on: Jan. 16, 2025.
- ⁴ American Cancer Society. Breast Cancer Facts & Figures 2019–2020. Atlanta: American Cancer Society, Inc. 2019. Available at: [Breast Cancer Facts & Figures 2019-2020](#). Accessed on: Jan. 16, 2025.
- ⁵ Howlader N, Noone AM, Krapcho M, et al. SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1975-2016, National Cancer Institute. Bethesda, MD; 2016. Available at: [Cancer Statistics Review, 1975-2016 - SEER Statistics](#). Accessed on: Jan. 16, 2025.
- ⁶ National Business Group on Health. 2011. “Pathways to Managing Cancer in the Workplace.” (May 8, 2012).
- ⁷ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program. About the Program. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/breast-cervical-cancer-screening/about/?CDC_AAref_Val=https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/nbccedp/about.htm <https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/nbccedp/about.htm> Accessed on: Jan. 16, 2025.
- ⁸ Fontham ETH, Wolf AMD, Church TR, et al. Cervical Cancer Screening for Individuals at Average Risk: 2020 Guideline Update from the American Cancer Society. CA Cancer J Clin. 2020. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21628>. Accessed on: Jan. 16, 2025.

Between 30 and 50 percent of all cancer cases are preventable.⁹ Breast and cervical cancer screenings increase the chances of detecting certain cancers early when they might be easier to treat. Prevention offers the most cost-effective long-term strategy for the control of cancer. Policies, programs, and projects should be implemented to raise awareness, to reduce exposure to cancer risk factors, and to ensure that individuals are provided with the information and support needed to participate in preventive screenings.



Purpose

For this year's 2024 validation, the Contractors continued this state-mandated clinical PIP topic: *Preventive Screening*. The topic addressed CMS' requirements related to quality outcomes—specifically, the quality, timeliness, and accessibility of care and services.

The purpose of the *Preventive Screening* PIP is to increase the number and percentage of breast and cervical cancer screenings. The aim of this PIP is to achieve, through ongoing measurements and interventions, significant improvement sustained over time.



Contractors Reviewed

AHCCCS maintains managed care agreements with several Contractors to administer its Medicaid Managed Care program. A general description of each AHCCCS program and the associated Contractors reviewed are included below.

Regional Behavioral Health Authority (RBHA)¹⁰/ACC-RBHA SMI-Designated Population Program

The RBHA Program was active through September 30, 2022, and provided integrated physical and behavioral health services to eligible Medicaid (Title XIX) and Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) KidsCare (Title XXI) covered members determined to have a serious mental illness (SMI) designation.

The ACC-RBHA Program was initiated October 1, 2022, and provides integrated physical and behavioral health services to eligible Medicaid (Title XIX) and CHIP KidsCare (Title XXI) covered members determined to have an SMI designation. ACC-RBHA Contractors are also responsible for providing crisis services to all individuals, including but not limited to crisis telephone services, community-based mobile crisis teams, and facility-based crisis stabilization services. Additionally,

⁹ World Health Organization. Health Topics: Cancer. Available at: https://www.who.int/health-topics/cancer#tab=tab_2. Accessed on: Jan. 16, 2025.

¹⁰ Referred to as Regional Behavioral Health Authority prior to October 1, 2022.

ACC-RBHA Contractors are responsible for providing services to the ACC (Non-SMI-Designated) population.

Table 1-1—ACC-RBHA SMI-Designated Population Program Contracted MCOs

ACC-RBHA SMI-Designated Population Program Contractors*	
Contractor Name	Contractor Abbreviation
Arizona Complete Health – Complete Care Plan	AzCH-CCP ACC-RBHA
Mercy Care	Mercy Care ACC-RBHA

*The ACC-RBHA Contractors serve both the SMI-Designated population (under the ACC-RBHA program) and the Non-SMI-Designated population (under the ACC program).



Population

For the *Breast Cancer Screening (BCS)* indicator, the population included women 50 to 74 years of age who are continuously enrolled with no more than one gap in enrollment of up to 45 days during the measurement period, in alignment with the associated measure specifications.

For the *Cervical Cancer Screening (CCS)* indicator, the population included women 21 to 64 years of age who are continuously enrolled with no more than one gap in enrollment of up to 45 days during the measurement period, in alignment with the associated measure specifications.



Indicator Criteria

The focus of the *Preventive Screening* PIP was to increase the number and percentage (overall and by Contractor) of enrolled women receiving breast and cervical cancer screenings. The PIP had one aim statement: *The goal is to demonstrate a statistically significant increase in the number and percentage of 1) breast cancer screenings and 2) cervical cancer screenings, followed by sustained improvement for one consecutive year.*

Table 1-2 outlines the indicator criteria for each performance indicator for the *Preventive Screening* PIP.

Table 1-2—Performance Indicator Criteria for *Preventive Screening* PIP

Performance Indicator	Numerator (N) and Denominator (D)
Indicator 1: BCS	
The percentage of women 50–74 years of age who had a mammogram to screen for breast cancer.	<p>N—Number of women who had one or more mammograms any time on or between October 1 two years prior to the measurement year and December 31 of the measurement year.*</p> <p>D—The eligible population.</p>

Performance Indicator	Numerator (N) and Denominator (D)
Indicator 2: CCS	
<p>The percentage of women 21–64 years of age who were screened for cervical cancer using either of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women ages 21 to 64 years who had cervical cytology performed within the last three years. • Women ages 30 to 64 years who had cervical high-risk human papillomavirus (hrHPV) testing performed within the last five years. • Women ages 30 to 64 years who had cervical cytology/hrHPV cotesting within the last five years. 	<p>N—Number of women who were screened for cervical cancer as outlined in the associated technical specifications.</p> <p>D—The eligible population.</p>

**Cervical cytology performed any time on or between October 1 three years prior to the measurement year and September 30 of the measurement year or hrHPV testing/cervical cytology and hrHPV cotesting any time on or between October 1 five years prior to the measurement year and September 30 of the measurement year for CYE 2019 measurement year only.*

Data Sources

The PIP was conducted by using administrative data collection methodologies in alignment with the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS®) technical specifications. AHCCCS administrative encounter data and Contractor-specific claims were used to identify performance indicator data.

Measurement Periods

For contract year ending (CYE) 2024 validation, the Contractors submitted Remeasurement 2 data for the *Preventive Screening* PIP. The measurement period dates for the PIP are listed below. Table 1-3 presents the measurement periods for the *Preventive Screening* PIP.

Table 1-3—Measurement Periods for *Preventive Screening* PIP

PIP— <i>Preventive Screening</i>				
CYE 2019	Calendar Year (CY) 2020	CY 2021	CY 2022	CY 2023
Baseline Measurement (10/1/2018–09/30/2019)	Intervention Year 1 (01/01/2020–12/31/2020)	Intervention Year 2 (01/01/2021–12/31/2021)	Remeasurement Year 1 (01/01/2022–12/31/2022)	Remeasurement Year 2 (01/01/2023–12/31/2023)

Typically, PIPs include one intervention year; however, to account for the impact of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) public health emergency (PHE), the *Preventive Screening* PIP includes two intervention years within its design during which Contractors implemented strategies and interventions to improve performance. CYE 2019 served as the baseline year. To evaluate performance indicator improvement, the remeasurement years align with CYs: the first remeasurement year is reflective of CY 2022 (January 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022), and the second remeasurement year is reflective of CY 2023 (January 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023).

2. Performance Summary




Performance Indicator Results

ACC-RBHA SMI-Designated Population Program

For each Contractor, the performance indicator results for baseline, Remeasurement 1, and Remeasurement 2 are compared in Figure 2-1 and Figure 2-2 below. Additionally, a table of all performance indicator rates can be found in Appendix B. Performance Indicator Rates. To account for the impact of the COVID-19 PHE, this PIP is inclusive of two intervention years.¹¹

Figure 2-1—ACC-RBHA Program Preventive Screening PIP—BCS Rates by Contractor



Baseline Results

Contractor *BCS* rates ranged from a low of 35.8 percent (Mercy Care-RBHA) to a high of 38.5 percent (AzCH-CCP-RBHA). The RBHA Program Aggregate baseline rate was 36.9 percent. The baseline rate for one of the three Contractors exceeded the RBHA Program Aggregate rate.

¹¹ To account for the impact of the COVID-19 PHE, the *Preventive Screening* PIP includes two intervention years within its design during which Contractors implemented strategies and interventions to improve performance.

Remeasurement 1 Results

Contractor indicator rates demonstrated an increase at Remeasurement 1 compared to baseline rates. As a result, the RBHA Program Aggregate¹² rate increased at Remeasurement 1.

For Performance Indicator 1, two Contractors showed an increase in the rates between baseline and Remeasurement 1, with a 3.4 percentage point increase for the RBHA Program Aggregate rate. Mercy Care-RBHA had a statistically significant 5.3 percentage point increase from 35.8 percent to 41.1 percent, while AzCH-CCP-RBHA had a non-statistically significant 0.6 percentage point increase from 38.5 percent to 39.1 percent. The HCA-RBHA contract with AHCCCS ended September 30, 2022. As such, there were no Remeasurement 1 performance indicator results reported for this Contractor.

Remeasurement 2 Results


Contractor indicator rates demonstrated an increase at Remeasurement 2 compared to baseline rates. As a result, the ACC-RBHA Program Aggregate¹³ rate increased at Remeasurement 2.

For Performance Indicator 1, both Contractors showed a statistically significant increase in the rates between baseline and Remeasurement 2, with an 8.1 percentage point increase for the ACC-RBHA Program Aggregate rate. AzCH-CCP ACC RBHA had a statistically significant 7.6 percentage point increase from 38.5 percent to 46.1 percent. Mercy Care ACC-RBHA had a statistically significant 8.6 percentage point increase from 35.8 percent to 44.4 percent. The HCA-RBHA contract with AHCCCS ended September 30, 2022. As such, no Remeasurement 2 performance indicator results were reported for this Contractor.

¹² HCA RBHA data may have been included in the CY 2022 Remeasurement 1 RBHA Program Aggregate rate for both indicators.

¹³ HCA RBHA data was not included in the CY 2023 Remeasurement 2 RBHA Program Aggregate rate for both indicators as the Contractor's contract ended with AHCCCS on September 30, 2022.

Figure 2-2—ACC-RBHA Program Preventive Screening PIP—CCS Rates by Contractor



*Data calculated via the administrative methodology is not available for Indicator 2 or CY 2022 and CY 2023.

Baseline Results

Contractor CCS rates ranged from a low of 41.0 percent (HCA-RBHA) to a high of 43.9 percent (AzCH-CCP-RBHA). The ACC-RBHA Program Aggregate baseline rate was 43.2 percent. The baseline rate for one of the three Contractors exceeded the RBHA Program Aggregate rate.

Remeasurement 1 Results

Contractor indicator rates demonstrated a decrease at Remeasurement 1 compared to baseline rates.

For Performance Indicator 2, two Contractors showed a decrease in the rates between baseline and Remeasurement 1. The RBHA Program Aggregate administrative rate was not available for CY 2022. AzCH-CCP-RBHA and Mercy Care-RBHA had a 7.2 percentage point and a 6.1 percentage point decrease from the baseline rate to the Remeasurement 1 rate, respectively. The HCA-RBHA contract with AHCCCS ended September 30, 2022. As such, there were no Remeasurement 1 performance indicator results reported.

Remeasurement 2 Results

Contractor indicator rates demonstrated a decrease at Remeasurement 2 compared to baseline rates.

For Performance Indicator 2, both Contractors showed a decrease in the rates between baseline and Remeasurement 2. The ACC-RBHA Program Aggregate administrative rate was not available for CY 2023. AzCH-CCP ACC-RBHA and Mercy Care ACC-RBHA had a 1.7 percentage point and a 5.3

percentage point decrease from the baseline rate to the Remeasurement 2 rate, respectively. The HCA-RBHA contract with AHCCCS ended September 30, 2022. As such, no Remeasurement 2 performance indicator results were reported.



Disparities

AHCCCS requires each of its Contractors to conduct and include subpopulation and disparity analysis findings for the *Preventive Screening* PIP. The Contractors must also ensure that interventions are initiated to address specific data analysis findings.

HSAG identified that each Contractor provided evidence that the required subpopulation, disparity analysis, and interventions were present in the *Preventive Screening* PIP reported and submitted for annual validation.



Data Validation

For the project to achieve real improvements in care and for interested parties to have confidence in the reported improvements, the PIPs must be designed, conducted, and reported using sound methodology and must be completed in a reasonable time. This structured method of assessing and improving Contractor processes is expected to have a favorable effect on health outcomes and member satisfaction.

The primary objective of PIP validation is to determine the validity and reliability of a PIP through assessing a Contractor’s compliance with State and federal requirements. For CYE 2024, AHCCCS required Contractors to conduct PIPs in accordance with Title 42 Code of Federal Regulations (42 CFR) §438.330(b)(1) and §438.330(d)(2)(i–iv). In accordance with §438.330(d)(2)(i–iv), each PIP must include:

Figure 2-3—PIP Validation Requirements

	Measuring performance using objective quality indicators
	Implementing system interventions to achieve improvement in quality
	Evaluating effectiveness of the interventions
	Planning and initiating of activities for increasing or sustaining improvement

HSAG used the AHCCCS PIP Report, which each Contractor completed and submitted to HSAG, for its review and validation. The AHCCCS PIP Report standardizes the process for submitting information regarding PIPs and ensures alignment with the CMS protocol requirements.

HSAG, with AHCCCS’ input and approval, developed a PIP Validation Tool to ensure a uniform validation of the PIPs. Using this tool, HSAG evaluated each of the PIPs according to CMS EQR Protocol 1. The HSAG PIP Team consisted of, at a minimum, an analyst with expertise in statistics, PIP design, and performance improvement processes, and a clinician with expertise in performance improvement processes. CMS EQR Protocol 1 identifies nine steps that should be validated for each PIP. The nine steps included in the PIP validation tool are listed below:

Table 2-1—CMS EQR Protocol 1 Steps

Protocol Steps	
Step Number	Description
1	Review the Selected PIP Topic
2	Review the PIP Aim Statement
3	Review the Identified PIP Population
4	Review the Sampling Method
5	Review the Selected Performance Indicator(s)
6	Review the Data Collection Procedures
7	Review the Data Analysis and Interpretation of PIP Results
8	Assess the Improvement Strategies
9	Assess the Likelihood that Significant and Sustained Improvement Occurred

HSAG used the methodology described below to evaluate PIPs conducted by the Contractors to determine PIP validity and to rate the compliance with CMS EQR Protocol 1.

Each required step is evaluated on one or more elements that form a valid PIP. The HSAG PIP Review Team scores each evaluation element within a given step as *Met*, *Partially Met*, *Not Met*, *Not Applicable*, or *Not Assessed*. HSAG designates evaluation elements pivotal to the PIP process as “critical elements.” For a PIP to produce valid and reliable results, all critical elements must be *Met*. Given the importance of critical elements to the scoring methodology, any critical element that receives a *Not Met* score results in an overall rating of *No Confidence* for the PIP. The Contractor is assigned two confidence levels, the overall confidence of adherence to acceptable methodology for all phases of the PIP and the overall confidence that the PIP achieved significant improvement.

In addition to the two overall confidence levels, HSAG assigns the PIP a percentage score for all evaluation elements (including critical elements) for each confidence level. HSAG calculates the percentage scores by dividing the total number of elements scored as *Met* by the total number of elements scored as *Met*, *Partially Met*, and *Not Met* with *Not Assessed* and *Not Applicable* elements removed. HSAG also calculates a critical element percentage score by dividing the total number of critical elements scored as *Met* by the sum of the critical elements scored as *Met*, *Partially Met*, and *Not Met* with *Not Assessed* and *Not Applicable* elements removed. HSAG assessed the PIP’s results for the two confidence levels using the following methods.

1. Overall Confidence of Adherence to Acceptable Methodology for All Phases of the PIP

- *High Confidence*: High confidence in reported PIP results. All critical evaluation elements were *Met*, and 90 to 100 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met* across all steps.
- *Moderate Confidence*: Moderate confidence in reported PIP results. All critical evaluation elements were *Met*, and 80 to 89 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met* across all steps.
- *Low Confidence*: Low confidence in reported PIP results. Across all steps, 65 to 79 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met*; or one or more critical evaluation elements were *Partially Met*.
- *No Confidence*: No confidence in reported PIP results. Across all steps, less than 65 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met*; or one or more critical evaluation elements were *Not Met*.

2. Overall Confidence That the PIP Achieved Significant Improvement

- *High Confidence*: All performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
- *Moderate Confidence*: To receive Moderate Confidence for significant improvement, one of the three scenarios below occurred:
 - All performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline **and** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
 - All performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline **and** none of the performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
 - Some but not all performance indicators demonstrated improvement over baseline **and** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over baseline.
- *Low Confidence*: The remeasurement methodology was not the same as the baseline methodology for at least one performance indicator **or** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline and none of the performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
- *No Confidence*: The remeasurement methodology was not the same as the baseline methodology for all performance indicators **or** none of the performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline.

The Contractors had the opportunity to receive initial PIP validation scores and detailed feedback, request technical assistance and guidance from HSAG, make any necessary corrections, and resubmit the PIP for final validation. HSAG provided the completed validation tools to AHCCCS and the Contractors.



Validation Findings

HSAG’s validation evaluates the technical methods of the PIP (i.e., the design, data analysis, implementation, and outcomes). Based on its review, HSAG determined the overall methodological validity of the PIP. Table 2-2 summarizes the Contractors’ *Preventive Screening* PIP validated during the review period with an overall confidence level of *High Confidence*, *Moderate Confidence*, *Low Confidence*, or *No Confidence* for the two required confidence levels identified below. In addition, Table 2-2 displays the percentage score of evaluation elements that received a *Met* validation score, as well as the percentage score of critical elements that received a *Met* validation score. Critical elements are those within the PIP Validation Tool that HSAG has identified as essential for producing a valid and reliable PIP.

Table 2-2 displays the overall confidence levels for the *Preventive Screening* PIP for the ACC–RBHA Program.

Table 2-2—ACC–RBHA Program *Preventive Screening* PIP Overall Confidence Levels

Contractor	Validation Rating 1			Validation Rating 2		
	Overall Confidence of Adherence to Acceptable Methodology for All Phases of the PIP			Overall Confidence That the PIP Achieved Significant Improvement		
	Percentage Score of Evaluation Elements <i>Met</i> ¹	Percentage Score of Critical Elements <i>Met</i> ²	Confidence Level ³	Percentage Score of Evaluation Elements <i>Met</i> ¹	Percentage Score of Critical Elements <i>Met</i> ²	Confidence Level ³
AzCH-CCP ACC-RBHA	100%	100%	<i>High Confidence</i>	33%	100%	<i>Moderate Confidence</i>
Mercy Care ACC-RBHA	100%	100%	<i>High Confidence</i>	33%	100%	<i>Moderate Confidence</i>

¹ **Percentage Score of Evaluation Elements *Met***—The percentage score is calculated by dividing the total elements *Met* (critical and non-critical) by the sum of the total elements of all categories (*Met*, *Partially Met*, and *Not Met*).

² **Percentage Score of Critical Elements *Met***—The percentage score of critical elements *Met* is calculated by dividing the total critical elements *Met* by the sum of the critical elements *Met*, *Partially Met*, and *Not Met*.

³ **Confidence Level**— Based on the scores assigned for individual evaluation elements and the confidence level definitions provided in the PIP Validation Tool.

All Contractors adhered to acceptable methodology through all phases of the PIP. Both AzCH-CCP ACC-RBHA and Mercy Care ACC-RBHA achieved statistically significant improvement between the *BCS* baseline rate and Remeasurement 2 rate, resulting in a *Moderate Confidence* level for achieving significant improvement. The HCA-RBHA contract with AHCCCS ended September 30, 2022. As such, no Remeasurement 1 or Remeasurement 2 performance indicator results were reported.



Data Limitations

The following data limitations were noted as part of the AHCCCS *Preventive Screening* PIP:

- As of CYE 2020, AHCCCS has transitioned to Contractor-calculated performance measure rates reflective of CY measurement periods for evaluating Contractor performance to support MCO oversight and external quality review (EQR) annual reporting. As such, the baseline measurement period did not use the same 12-month period as the Remeasurement 1 period. The baseline measurement period was October 1, 2019, through September 30, 2020. The Remeasurement 1 measurement period was CY 2022—January 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022, and the Remeasurement 2 measurement period was CY 2023—January 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations



Conclusions

All Contractors adhered to acceptable methodology through all phases of the *Preventive Screening* PIP. All Contractors were able to measure the effectiveness of interventions and perform accurate statistical testing between the baseline rate and the Remeasurement 2 rate. Both Contractors were able to achieve statistically significant improvement for Performance Indicator 1 *BCS* when comparing the baseline rate to the Remeasurement 2 rate. The ACC-RBHA Program Aggregate rate was not available for Remeasurement 1 or Remeasurement 2. As such, an ACC-RBHA Program Aggregate rate comparison between the baseline and Remeasurement 2 rate was not possible.



Recommendations

To support successful progression of the *Preventive Screening* PIP in the next CY, HSAG recommends that the Contractors:

- Seek technical assistance from HSAG to understand the PIP submission requirements, if needed.
- Revisit the causal/barrier analysis used to develop interventions and adjust the existing interventions or develop new interventions to facilitate improvement for the *CCS* performance indicator.
- Continue to implement identified interventions with clearly defined intervention effectiveness measures to assess the effectiveness of each intervention.
- HSAG recommends that AHCCCS consider retiring the *Preventive Screening* PIP based on both Contractors achieving statistically significant improvement for the *BCS* performance indicator and all Contractors progressing through baseline and two remeasurements required by CMS EQR Protocol 1. Additionally, both Contractors' *CCS* performance indicator Remeasurement 2 rate remained below the baseline rate. As such, HSAG recommends AHCCCS consider starting a new PIP with a new baseline focused only on the *CCS* performance indicator.

Appendix A. Acknowledgements and Copyrights

HEDIS® refers to the Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set and is a registered trademark of the NCQA.

Appendix B. Performance Indicator Rates

ACC-RBHA Program Preventive Screening PIP—BCS Rates by Contractor

ACC-RBHA Program BCS Rates by Contractor			
Contractor	CYE 2019	CY 2022 Remeasurement 1	CY 2023 Remeasurement 2
AzCH-CCP-ACC-RBHA	38.5%	39.1%	46.1%
HCA-RBHA	36.6%	<i>Not Applicable</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Mercy Care-ACC-RBHA	35.8%	41.1%	44.4%
ACC-RBHA Program Aggregate Rate	36.9%	40.3%	45.0%

ACC-RBHA Program Preventive Screening PIP—CCS Rates by Contractor

ACC-RBHA Program CCS Rates by Contractor			
Contractor	CYE 2019	CY 2022 Remeasurement 1	CY 2023 Remeasurement 2
AzCH-CCP-ACC-RBHA	43.9%	36.7%	42.2%
HCA-RBHA	41.0%	<i>Not Applicable</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Mercy Care-ACC-RBHA	43.5%	37.4%	38.2%
ACC-RBHA Program Aggregate Rate*	43.2%	<i>Not Applicable</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>

*Data calculated via the administrative methodology is not available for Indicator 2 for CY 2022 and CY 2023.