

11 - 0377



2009 Performance Measure Project Report

*An independent audit conducted by MetaStar of 2009 performance measures produced by
The Minnesota Department of Human Services*

December 2010

Conducted by:

MetaStar
Suite 300
2909 Landmark Place
Madison, Wisconsin 53713
(800) 362-2320
www.metastar.com

For More Information Contact:

Robert Lloyd, Manager
Minnesota Department of Human Services
Performance Measurement and Quality Improvement
Health Program Quality
540 Cedar Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55101-2208
Telephone: (651) 431-2613
Fax: (651) 431-7422

E-mail: Robert.Lloyd@state.mn.us This document is available on the Minnesota Department of Human Services website
<http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/healthcare/studies>

This information is available in other forms to people with disabilities by contacting:
651-215-6260 (voice)

TDD users can call the Minnesota Relay at 711 or 1-800-627-3529
For the Speech-to-Speech Relay, call 1-877-627-3848

This document may be reproduced without restriction.
Citation of the source is appreciated.

December 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</i>	1
<i>2009 PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROJECT REPORT</i>	2
PROJECT BACKGROUND	2
PERFORMANCE MEASURE PROCESS ASSESSMENT	3
DATA INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT	6
IMPROVEMENTS IN THE 2009 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROJECT	7
STRENGTHS OF THE 2009 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROJECT	7
OPPORTUNITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010	8
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	9

Executive Summary

Standardized performance measures are required for all state Medicaid managed care programs by federal law.¹ The Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS) fulfilled this requirement by calculating performance measures from encounter data submitted by its contracted managed care organizations (MCOs). DHS retained MetaStar to conduct an independent audit of DHS' 2009 performance measures and processes.

MetaStar, Inc.'s (MetaStar's) audit included a review of DHS' information systems. The review was designed to collect information documenting the effect DHS' management practices had on the performance measurement process. The review was not intended to evaluate the overall effectiveness of DHS' systems. Rather, its focus was on evaluating aspects of DHS' systems that specifically influence the ability to accurately report performance measures. In essence, DHS needs to demonstrate that it has the automated systems, management practices, data control procedures, and computational procedures necessary to ensure that all performance measure information is adequately captured, translated, stored, analyzed and reported.

DHS selected 24 performance measures for examination, all of which are based on Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS[®]) 2010 Technical Specifications.² DHS selected measures suited to encounter data and its limitations, internal quality improvement objectives, and other state agency requirements.

This year's Performance Measurement Project showed continued success and enhanced methods for producing Performance Measurement Project Reports. Changes in Performance Measurement and Quality Improvement (PMQI) staff identified areas for improvement in processes. These improvements focused MetaStar and DHS staff towards better communication tactics and highlighted process change needs that were addressed during the reporting period. The final project teleconference included discussions on the direction of changes to be made in the future.

The project exhibited several strengths. The PMQI reporting team was able to replicate the past effectiveness and efficiency of internal and external resources using a system that has been shown to be easily adaptable to accurately report all 24 measures. Year-to-year performance measure variability was once again shown to be minimal. DHS maintained efficiencies regarding the production of information and deliverables for both federal and state statutory program requirements. DHS has been able, due to its methodology, to create reports specific to Medicaid populations and across programs. Also, DHS performance measurement data are used in contract and performance incentive decision-making.

This report addresses important opportunities and recommendations for future validation projects. Opportunities focus on improving project and team communication, maintaining gains in process efficiency and project timeliness in the upcoming years.

¹ BBA (42 CFR 438.358 (b) (2)).

² HEDIS[®] is a registered trademark of the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA).

2009 Performance Measures Project Report

Project Background

Performance measures are designed to provide data on health care processes or outcomes. Over time, performance measures are used to quantify the impact of changes and improve the quality of health care. Standardized performance measures are required for all state Medicaid managed care programs by federal law. States utilize these performance measures to direct improvements in the quality of care. MCOs can utilize performance measures to implement appropriate interventions to gain or maintain momentum for quality. Like Minnesota, several other states have chosen to meet their federal obligation to produce performance measures by calculating performance measures using encounter data.³

DHS believes that in addition to the primary objective of producing performance measures, utilizing encounter data will result in:

- A decreased administrative and financial burden for MCOs;
- Increased performance measure consistency from year-to-year;
- Providing DHS with the ability to examine performance measures for specific populations and subpopulations;
- Providing DHS with the opportunity to specify measurement time frames and enrollment criteria that are most useful in purchasing the highest quality health care services at the most economical cost; and
- Improving the quality of the encounter data submitted by MCOs.

Utilizing encounter data to produce performance measures required DHS to contract with MetaStar to test and validate that its performance measures are consistent with federal requirements. MetaStar's review of DHS performance measures also helps identify potential data integrity improvement opportunities.⁴

Overall, the purpose of the 2009 Performance Measures Project Report is to assess activities conducted to produce the 2009 performance measures and make recommendations that lead to greater accuracy and efficiencies in next year's project.

³ Other states calculate performance measures using encounter data: Iowa, North Carolina, Ohio, Maryland, and Wisconsin, among others.

⁴ See 2006 Data Integrity Report for MetaStar's improvement opportunity analysis.

Performance Measure Process Assessment

The process of data validation consisted of auditing the general project processes used by DHS, reviewing the data flow between the MCOs and DHS, reviewing all documentation used to calculate the performance measures, and the demonstration of DHS' capacity to produce reliable, accurate performance measures. This began with a review of DHS processes and concluded with review of the final measurement results.⁵

- Federal Regulation and HEDIS Technical Specification Review. MetaStar assessed the extent to which DHS' information system meets the requirements set forth in BBA protocol 42 CFR 438.242 and the CMS Protocols regarding External Quality Review standards. The system's ability to collect, analyze, integrate, and report data was crucial to meeting these requirements, as well as ensuring accurate performance measure reporting. Because DHS' system uses MCO encounter data, the assessment included examinations of DHS' ability to monitor the data for accuracy and completeness. Validation consisted of a review of DHS' data management processes, evaluation of algorithmic compliance with specifications, and verification and benchmarking of the final performance measures selected for review. To assess DHS' performance measures, MetaStar adopted a three-phase validation process approach: pre-on-site, on-site, and post-on-site activities, consistent with the CMS Protocols.

MetaStar and DHS chose to use an approach with as much stringency as called for in other performance measure reviews, including the strict methodology used in HEDIS Compliance Audits^{TM6}. The validation process began with the pre-on-site phase of a complete review and updating of the Information System Capabilities Assessment (ISCA) system documentation. During the on-site, MetaStar staff and DHS staff held a detailed discussion of individual measure coding, possible anomalies and results using trending data from previous years, known benchmarks regionally and nationally, and HEDIS rate results when known. Post-on-site activities included further investigation into outliers and anomalies with analysis of potential impact on rates. Throughout the process, source code review was performed at a line-by-line level to ensure that measure specifications were met exactly; where measure specifications could not be met due to lack of complete or accurate data, reviewers determined using statistical analysis whether final measure rates were reportable or biased based on those issues.

- Process Assessment Findings. DHS has adequate processes for accepting encounter data from MCOs and transferring encounter data to its Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) and to its data warehouse. A number of encounter reports are generated and reviewed by both the Encounter Data Quality Unit (EDQU) of Health Care Operations and Performance Measurement and Quality Improvement (PMQI) staff. Specifically, PMQI staff work with DHS data warehouse staff in April of each year to determine the readiness of the data warehouse for performance measure reporting based on various member and claims-volume reports and comparisons. If deficiencies are identified by the PMQI analyst and not corrected by the MCO, the performance measure rates could be inaccurately reported.

⁵ See: 2009 Performance Measure Validation Report for details of the process.

⁶ HEDIS Compliance AuditTM is a trademark of the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA).

In addition, if the MCO is allowed to provide additional encounters, the performance measure rate production may be delayed.

The MMIS system electronically verifies an enrollee's social security number and the Medicare number with the appropriate federal agency. The system also contains edits for specific fields to aid in the prevention of data errors. Although the enrollee data was appropriate for performance measure calculation, there is no documentation regarding formal oversight of data entry as required under this standard because data for eligibility and enrollment are entered by the counties. These enrollment data are then loaded into MMIS for use in the data warehouse. Because enrollment data is entered by the counties, there are no opportunities by DHS for improvement of the process prior to being loaded into MMIS. This issue is common for all states that utilize county resources for eligibility and enrollment processing. MCOs have continued to work to maintain the accuracy of eligibility and enrollment data and have worked with DHS and county systems appropriately to maintain a system that is as free from error as possible. No measures were excluded from performance measure reporting due to specific concerns with accuracy of member-level data.

DHS has a formal and well-documented process for populating the performance measure data repository from which all performance measures are calculated. These processes meet all data requirements, include extensive quality assurance procedures, and contain a procedure for updating the performance measure data repository in the event repository requirements change. Review of the documentation for the performance measure repository and the repository itself showed that it contained all required elements.

Initial review of the programs used to calculate performance measures showed some deviations from specifications. These deviations were communicated to PMQI staff who revised the program, retested and resubmitted to MetaStar for additional review until all deviations were corrected or were found to be non-material. Final calculations for all measures included in the study met all performance measure specifications. There were no measures excluded from the study due to PMQI programming concerns.

- Performance Measure Outcomes. DHS selected 24 performance measures for examination. All performance measure specifications were based on HEDIS 2010 Technical Specifications. DHS selected measures based on their understanding of encounter data and its limitations, internal quality improvement objectives and other state agency requirements.

MetaStar and DHS staff used various methodologies to determine whether performance measure rates calculated by DHS were reasonable. Because DHS chose to use measurement year specifications "frozen" in time, and have then used those specifications to calculate four years of reports for each organization for each measure applicable, clear trends can be shown. This is an obvious strength of the DHS performance measure process over other nationally recognized performance measure systems.

Using 2009 project specifications and calculating rates for each organization for the previous four years, reviewers were able to identify where true rate changes had occurred, versus those that were the result of changes in specifications. All changes in measure rates from measurement year to measurement year greater than or equal to five percentage points were

examined. For 2009 reporting, no specific trends emerged showing issues with any one particular organization's rate changes over any other, or where changes were noted, they were explainable or corrected in source code prior to reporting. Taking into account changes in programs during 2009 and small denominators for small health plans, few discrepancies were noted using the frozen specifications. This evaluation supports the theory that the DHS data warehouse is stable and that changes in measure rates are more likely from true change versus variation by health plan. DHS continues to review the few outliers.

One potential caveat to using current year HEDIS Technical Specifications and using one year's specification to analyze data as old as four years previous is that coding practices can change, sometimes substantially, from one year to the next. HEDIS Technical Specifications account for this change by updating measure methodology and included CPT and other medical codes from year to year. Due to the washout period for codes used in HEDIS, there have never been any recognizable issues with the changing in codes between specification years, however, DHS should consider evaluating specific code changes included in each new Technical Specification to determine any potential impact on utilization of new codes on older data.

As part of analysis of outliers as noted above, MetaStar staff use HEDIS-reported data from health plans to determine potential issues with data comparability. When outliers are found, MetaStar and DHS use HEDIS data or DHS knowledge of MCO data patterns in an attempt to identify means for further analysis. The addition of the use of the plan's reported HEDIS data from that, previous years, and the use of known benchmarks in that regard aid DHS in understanding data variation where it occurs. *The auditors recommend DHS continue to use all known data sources in review and analysis of outlier comparability.*

- Performance Measure Result Caveats. Several important caveats exist in understanding reported DHS performance measure results. These caveats are necessary to communicate to ensure audiences understand the proper interpretation of the results and comparability or non-comparability of data to other performance measure systems.

Certain HEDIS measures have always required identification of provider type (e.g., primary care provider). Due to the lack of reporting of consistent provider types by MCOs, some performance measures produced by DHS have not been able to appropriately include coding for specific provider types. Since the diagnosis and procedure codes included in these measures would generally only be used by the type of provider required in the measure, the impact on rates should be limited. However, lack of complete provider-type data in the warehouse makes analyses of discrepancies with HEDIS reports difficult. However, this does not affect comparison of trending of DHS performance measures from year-to-year.

Also, MCOs may have access to administrative data that are not submitted to DHS. These may include internally and externally generated supplemental data sources. Examples of internal supplemental data sources include data from immunization surveys or registries, databases meant to capture optional exclusions for HEDIS measures, or breast or cervical cancer screening surveys, among others. Supplemental internal administrative data may also be generated as part of a case, disease, or utilization management program. External administrative data may be generated through data supplied by hospitals, laboratories, or

individual providers. *In particular, MCO use of supplemental data sources for capturing optional exclusions for some measures has shown to have the potential to affect rates by more than five percentage points. The coding for optional exclusions should be considered by DHS where possible.* This will allow DHS a better understanding of administrative data and its potential affect on encounter data reporting.

Data Integrity Assessment

Several processes occur in the flow of information from the time that health services occur until receipt and acceptance into the DHS warehouse. In all of these processes, potential data errors may occur. Although errors at any point in the process may be small, cumulative errors may cause serious bias in reporting. Utilizing the DHS data flowchart as a map, MetaStar examined each of the steps involved in data flow. Potential integrity issues were identified, such as providers not submitting data to the MCO, the MCO submitting duplicate data or incomplete data, or potential for loss of data integrity after receipt by DHS.

There exist several possible methods for assessing and monitoring integrity issues. These include:

- Requiring MCOs to provide an assessment of the completeness and accuracy of provider submissions;
- Monitoring encounter volume;
- Monitoring reasons encounters are not accepted by the DHS Encounter System;
- Comparing DHS-generated performance measure reports with MCO-generated HEDIS performance measures submitted to the Minnesota Department of Health; and
- Utilizing the Encounter Data Quality Unit to work one-on-one with MCOs who exceed acceptable thresholds for encounter submission.

Because both the MCO's HEDIS data reports and DHS' encounter data reports follow HEDIS technical specifications, a useful comparison can be made between the two. This comparison can be used to identify any potential issues with DHS processes or programming or with data integrity issues. This comparison allows DHS to identify possible areas for necessary intervention to ensure encounter reports are as accurate and meaningful as possible.

When a non-explainable, significant discrepancy of larger than five percentage points is identified by comparing a health plan's HEDIS reported administrative rate for a measure and the DHS rate, the auditors recommend that DHS communicate with the MCOs to identify potential reasons, where possible.

Improvements in the 2009 Performance Measurement Project

It is important to continually improve because improvements will allow for fewer resources spent over time to ensure better outcomes and focus resources on areas where they make the most impact.

- Information Systems Capabilities Assessment Completion and Follow-up. DHS incorporated changes from previous MetaStar recommendations to enhance completeness data provided with the ISCA. Included in the ISCA was a more detailed comparison of measurement year to prior year per member per year data counts. This improvement helps to ensure a good understanding of data for performance measurement reporting. It was also clear that DHS staff were thorough and complete in the submission of the ISCA for measurement year 2009. This aids in assuring an efficient audit and accurate reporting.
- HEDIS Knowledge Maintenance. PMQI staff responsible for producing measures have been encouraged to attend relevant National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) HEDIS conferences. This dedication to continuing HEDIS education ensures the DHS team stays up-to-date with HEDIS Technical Specifications and aids staff in understanding and adhering to audit processes.
- Encounter Data Quality Unit. DHS has the Encounter Data Quality Unit (EDQU) to work with MCOs on quality improvement projects regarding encounter data reporting issues and concerns. This had led to more timely identification and understanding of encounter data reporting problems and to better communication with MCOs about issues and methods for correction. In 2009, there were fewer encounter data problems and data compliance issues were addressed with greater ease. These occurrences had little or no impact on data reporting.
- Data Submission Processes. Even in light of change in PMQI staff in 2009, data were presented for audit timely and the project was completed as desired. Changes in data submission for benchmarking made the audit processes more efficient and effective overall.
- Handling of Staffing Changes and Back-up Processes. As part of changes in reporting staff, PMQI implemented the use of back-up reporting staff for this performance measurement project. This helps to assure all processes can be followed consistently and efficiently under changing circumstances. Additionally, documentation implemented by previous reporting staff in clear and thorough project documentation assured a smooth and successful data submission in 2010.

Strengths of the 2009 Performance Measurement Project

- Trending Variability Continues to Be Minimal. Again, in 2009, evaluation of trends has shown little discrepancy by using the same specifications for comparison. This allows DHS to see true rate changes that might be attributable to MCO quality interventions or to improvements in encounter data accuracy and completeness. Using these findings, MCOs and DHS can more efficiently focus efforts toward quality over time.

- Federal and Statutory Program Efficiencies. Because DHS has chosen to use an internal performance measurement reporting process to meet federal statutory and waiver program obligations, these obligations can be met with efficiency. Using performance measurement from encounter data to meet external quality review requirements results in greater use of required encounter data. Also, using administrative measures based on encounter data helps to ensure that performance measures are less prone to variability and reduce the inefficient use of chart abstractions for hybrid performance measures.
- Opportunity for Measure Specificity to Medicaid Subpopulations. Again due to DHS' use of standard specifications across data collected from all programs and subprograms including waiver programs in Medicaid, and the use of enrollment data across programs and organizations, final rates are more robust. Additional analysis can be performed by DHS staff to identify trends in health care in Medicaid regardless of organization, and useful comparisons can be made between organizations, programs, and subprograms when necessary. Because of HEDIS continuous enrollment criteria, similar comparisons cannot be made; services could potentially be lost from analysis in alternate measurement systems where member data is not available between programs, subprograms, or organizations. DHS continually uses performance measure results in an attempt to identify disparities between programs and systems. Additionally, it is common that legislators request data on certain Medicaid populations or subpopulations; DHS' system allows these requests to be met with no additional data burden on health plans.
- Data Availability for Contract Decisions. DHS is able to use available, audited, comparable data to identify points for contract decision-making. Increasingly across the nation, such performance measure programs are being used to identify contract incentives or pay-for-performance program specifications. Again, the use of stringently audited and produced administrative data rates aids the assurance of comparability of these data when used for these reasons.

Opportunities and Recommendations for 2010

MetaStar and DHS identified several opportunities for improvement during the 2009 Performance Measurement Project. Opportunities focus on additional process efficiencies and improved communications to ensure an effective project implementation each year. These opportunities and recommendations are discussed below.

- Project Timeline and Work Plan. DHS should include a more detailed timeline in the work plan to include tasks such as data submission for benchmarking, code submission per measure and ISCA submission to MetaStar. The entire work plan should be provided to all reporting staff internally to assure deadlines are met for all minor deliverables as well as major ones.
- Mercer Report. Information about the Mercer Report could be left out of the ISCA in the future. Instead more current information regarding encounter data deliverables and successes should be included. This change helps to assure the most current knowledge

regarding data quality, integrity and completeness is reviewed for audit pre-onsite.

- Complete Diagnosis Code Reporting. As seen previously, DHS cannot verify which MCOs are submitting all or fewer than all diagnoses from a standard claim. DHS believes that all of the large and medium size MCOs are likely submitting all diagnoses because of the financial losses possible in risk adjustment. It is possible that one or more than one MCO is not submitting all possible diagnoses on a claim. Due to the shift to the UB-04 inpatient claim in 2008, some MCOs likely did not have claims systems in place that accommodated all possible codes and some still did not in 2009. *The auditors recommend that the DHS continue to address this issue in the coming year to determine both the relevance of the issue to performance reporting and any possible impact. The DHS might consider implementing a fairly simple prevalence study among the number of codes received in the encounter data set to identify differences between MCOs before initiating corrective action.*
- Special Needs Population (SNP) Reporting. DHS and the State of Minnesota have frequently been shown to be forward-thinking regarding the need for performance reporting of MCOs offering services to CMS-defined SNPs. Due to the nature of the reporting performed centrally by DHS, members in this performance measure project can be tracked between and among MCOs as well as between programs, ensuring a more robust view of SNP member care in the entire state. *The auditors recommend DHS continue its current method for reporting that includes continuous tracking of members between care sites and program levels. Due to small numbers of enrollees per MCO, the bundling of final rates to the state level can be performed by DHS and should be useful in determining impact of interventions state-wide on various programs. The robustness of the DHS dataset should provide unique opportunities for aggregate level to drilldown level reporting to ensure the most appropriate and effective care is being provided to this resource-intense population.*

Summary and Conclusions

In the 2009 project, PMQI continued its steady and efficient rate production and substantially enhanced the performance measure system in various ways. The system remained otherwise stable and usable and trending analysis again showed comparability with previously reported rates. Since the beginning of the performance measure project, DHS has been able to identify process gaps and improvements and has acted on them to ensure an effective project and process outcome. As in previous years of the project, the validation of the performance measures verified the stability of the processes reviewed during the prior year. Enhancements made to the encounter data quality in 2008 and carrying into 2009 show a continued commitment by DHS to the reaching the most effective methods in performance measure reporting.

The 2009 Performance Measure Validation Report contains details regarding actual performance measure validation. DHS was required to meet the same standards as MCOs for the measures included in this report. As demonstrated by the report status of the measures, DHS produced accurate performance measures. Without an audit and review of details for selected measures, programming errors may occur or small process changes could have an adverse affect on measure results. *If these*

were not identified through the audit process, the performance measure reports would be less accurate, and business decisions would be made on inaccurate data. It is for those reasons MetaStar believes DHS should continue to undergo an annual validation of its performance measures.

DHS has demonstrated the overall validity of the system used to produce performance measures. The 2010 Performance Measurement Project Report should be focused on additional process improvements including continued efficiencies in the validation process and continued focus on accuracy and comparability of outlier measure results.