

	Scores for States Surveyed							
	(1 = Meets criteria; 0 = Does Not meet criteria; Blank = info not available)							
Criteria * = SIS	Arizona	Washington*	Georgia*	Florida (Davis Deshaies)	Maine (Davis Deshaies)	Utah (<i>not pursuing</i>)*	Missouri	Tennessee (<i>not pursuing</i>)
Similar to Oregon size and services in system, roles and responsibilities	1	0		0	1	1	1	
State has an individual budget resource Allocation Method or Model	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
State has a complete & well developed rate-setting system	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	6 tiered system
Uses 3rd party for gathering cost or pricing information (credibility and objectivity)	1	1	0	1	1		0	
Age of System provides Experience and	1			1	0		0	
Clear rule and state responsibility	1	0	0	1	0		0	
Clear service definitions	1	1		1	1		1	
Clear Units of Service	1	1		1	1		1	
Clear identification of rate assumptions, allowable and non allowable	1	1		1	1		0	
Transparency understandable by all	1	1		0	0		0	
Addresses Difference Actual Costs and Funds Available	1	0		1	NA		0	
Address Capacity or Administrative costs does rate address	1	1		1	1		1	
Addresses non direct service prep	1	1		1			1	
Addresses Economy of Scale or Group services?	1	1		1	1		1	
Recognizes Regional Differences	1			1			0	
State features and or incentives encourage good outcomes?		0		0	0		0	
Flexibility Responds to emergencies	1	1			1			
Portability individual can move without destabilizing provider	1						0	
Provider Qualifications clearly stated	1			1			0	
Exception process clear and State can identify level of use	1	1		0	0			
Formal process for problem resolution	1	1			1		1	
System Simple and get same rate for same service	0.5	1		1	1		0	
Method and frequency for adjusting rates is clear	1	1		0	0			
Total Score	20.5	15	1	14	12	3	8	1