



	Demographic Information
CCO Name: <cco name=""></cco>	
Project Leader Name:	Title:
Telephone Number:	Email Address:
PIP Title: < <u>PIP Topic></u>	
Submission Date:	
Resubmission Date:	





NA

0

	Evaluation Elements	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations								
Perf	Performance Improvement Project Validation										
1.	1. Review the Selected PIP Topic: The PIP topic should be selected based on data that identify an opportunity for improvement. The topic may also be required by the State. The PIP topic:										
C*	Was selected following collection and analysis										
	Results for Step 1										

				Results	fo	r Step 1				
Total Evaluation Elements Total Partially Not Met NA							Crit	ical Elements		
	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA		Critical Elements***	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	
1	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	

^{* &}quot;C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.

^{**} This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.

^{***} This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.





	Evaluation Elements	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations							
Per	Performance Improvement Project Validation									
2.	2. Review the PIP Aim Statement(s): Defining the statement(s) helps maintain the focus of the PIP and sets the framework for data collection, analysis, and interpretation. The statement:									
C*	Stated the area in need of improvement in clear, concise, and measurable terms. NA is not applicable to this element for scoring.	☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA								

				Results							
Total Evaluation Elements											
Total Evaluation Elements**	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA							
1	0	0	0	0							

•	foı	or Step 2												
		Critical Elements												
		Critical Elements***	Mot		Not Met	NA								
		1	0	0	0	0								

^{* &}quot;C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.

^{**} This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.

^{***} This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.





	Evaluation Elements	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations								
Perf	Performance Improvement Project Validation										
3.	3. Review the Identified PIP Population: The PIP population must be clearly defined to represent the population to which the PIP Aim statement and indicator(s) apply, without excluding members with special healthcare needs. The PIP population:										
C*	Was accurately and completely defined and captured all members to whom the PIP Aim statement(s) applied.	☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA									
	<i>NA</i> is not applicable to this element for scoring.										

				Results	fo	or Step 3				
	Total Eva	aluation Elem	ents				Crit	ical Elements		
Total Evaluation Elements**	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA		Critical Elements***	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA
1	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0

^{* &}quot;C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.

^{**} This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.

^{***} This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.





		Evaluation	Elements				Scoring		Comm	ents/Recomr	nendations
Perf	ormance In	nprovement	Project Valid	lation							
4.		to select mer	•	• •			valuation elemen methods are nece				
	1. Include indicate	•	ng frame size f	or each	☐ Met [Partially Met 🔲 I	Not Met □ N	'A		
C*	2. Include	ed the sample	size for each i	ndicator.	☐ Met		Partially Met 🔲	Not Met 🔲 N	IA		
		ed the margin or each indica	of error and co	onfidence	☐ Met [☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA					
	4. Describ	oed the metho	d used to selec	et the sample.	☐ Met [☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA					
C*	5. Allowe popula	_	eralization of r	esults to the	☐ Met [☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA					
					Results	fo	r Step 4				
		Total Ev	aluation Elem	ents				Crit	ical Elements		
	Total valuation ements**	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA		Critical Elements***	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA
	5	0	0	0	0		2	0	0	0	0

^{* &}quot;C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.

^{**} This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.

^{***} This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.





		Evaluation	Elements				Scoring		Comme	ents/Recomr	mendations	
Perf	erformance Improvement Project Validation											
5.	Review the Selected Performance Indicator(s): A performance indicator is a quantitative or qualitative characteristic or variable that reflects a discrete event or a status that is to be measured. The selected indicator(s) must track performance or improvement over time. The indicator(s) must be objective, clearly, and unambiguously defined, and based on current clinical knowledge or health services research. The indicator(s) of performance:											
C*	1. Were well-defined, objective, and measured changes in health or functional status, member satisfaction, or valid process alternatives.											
			which the ind lly developed.	\ /	☐ Met [Partially Met 🔲	Not Met 🔲 i	VA			
					Results	fo	r Step 5					
		Total Eva	aluation Elem	ents				Crit	ical Elements			
	Total Evaluation Elements** Met Partially Met Not Met				NA		Critical Elements***	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA	

0

1

0

0

0

Elements**

2

0

0

0

0

^{* &}quot;C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.

^{**} This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.

^{***} This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.





Page 7

	Evaluation Elements Description of the Data Collection Procedures: The data valid and reliable. Validity is an indication of the or reproducibility of a measurement. Data collected 1. Clearly defined sources of data and data elements collected for the indicator(s). NA is not applicable to this element for scoring. 2. A clearly defined and systematic process for collecting baseline and remeasurement data for						Scoring	Comme	ents/Recomn	nendations	
Perf	ormance In	nprovement	Project Valid	lation							
6.	valid and r	eliable. Valid	ity is an indic	ation of the a	ccuracy of th	e i	nformation obtai			•	•
	collecte	ed for the indic	cator(s).		☐ Met [<u></u>	Partially Met 🔲 1	Not Met 🗌 N	'A		
C*	collecti the indi	-	d remeasurem	ent data for	☐ Met [☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA					
C*	3. A manu consiste	ual data collectent and accura	tion tool that e	nsured f data	☐ Met [☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA					
	comple	rcentage of rep teness at the ti process used	me the data ar	e generated,	☐ Met [<u> </u>	Partially Met 🔲 1	Not Met 🗌 N	YA		
					Results	fo	r Step 6				
		Total Eva	aluation Elem	ents				Crit	ical Elements		
_	Total Evaluation Elements** Partially Not Met						Critical Elements***	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA
	4	0	0	0	0		2	0	0	0	0

[&]quot;C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.

^{**} This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.

^{***} This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.





		Evaluation	Elements				Scoring	Comme	Comments/Recommendations		
Perfo	ormance In	nprovement	Project Valid	ation							
7.	Review Data Analysis and Interpretation of Results: Clearly present the results for each indicator. Describe the data analysis performed, the results of the statistical analysis, and a narrative interpretation for each indicator. Through data analysis and interpretation, real improvement, as well as sustained improvement, can be determined. The data analysis and interpretation of the indicator outcomes:										
C*			clear, consistention in the da	•	☐ Met ☐		Partially Met 🔲 .	Not Met 🔲 i	VA		
		led a narrative ddressed all re	e interpretatio equirements.	n of results	☐ Met ☐	☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA					
	of the	data reported	hat threatened and ability to t with the rem	compare the	Met [☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA					
					Results	fo	r Step 7				
		Total Eva	aluation Elem	ents				Crit	ical Elements		
Eva	Total aluation ments**	Not Met	NA		Critical Elements***	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA		
	3	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0

^{* &}quot;C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.

^{**} This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.

^{***} This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.





Evaluation Elements						Scoring Co					nendations	
Perfo	rmance Im	provement	Project Valid	ation								
8.	Assess the Improvement Strategies: Interventions were developed to address causes/barriers identified through a continuous cycle of data measurement and data analysis. The improvement strategies were developed from an ongoing quality improvement process that included:								-			
C*	A causal/barrier analysis with a clearly documented team, process/steps, and quality improvement tools.				□ Ме.	☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA						
2. Interventions that were logically linked to identified barriers and have the potential to impact indicator outcomes.				t Me	☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA							
3. Interventions that were implemented in a timely manner to allow for impact of indicator outcomes.					☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA							
C* 4. An evaluation of effectiveness for each individual intervention.				al Met	· [Partially Met	Not Met	NA				
	5. Interventions that were adopted, adapted, abandoned, or continued based on evaluation data.				☐ Met	☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA						
	Results for Step 8											
Total Evaluation Elements							Critical Elements					
Ev	Total valuation Met ements**		Partially Met	Not Met	NA		Critical Elements***	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA	

0

5

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

[&]quot;C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element.

^{**} This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.

^{***} This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.





Evaluation Elements							Scori		Comments/ Recommendations				
Perf	Performance Improvement Project Validation												
9.	Assess the likelihood that Significant and Sustained Improvement Occurred: Improvement in performance is evaluated based on evidence that there was improvement over baseline indicator performance. Sustained improvement is assessed after improvement over baseline indicator performance has been demonstrated. Sustained improvement is achieved when repeated measurements over comparable time periods demonstrate continued improvement over baseline indicator performance.												
C*	1.		nsurement r nethodology	nethodology w y.	as the same a	s the	☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA						
	2. There was improvement over baseline performance across all performance indicators.						☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA						
3. There was statistically significant improvement (95 percent confidence level, $p < 0.05$) over the baseline across all performance indicators.							Met 🗌 Partially Me	et 🗌 Not M	et NA				
	4. Sustained statistically significant improvement over baseline indicator performance across all indicators was demonstrated through repeated measurements over comparable time periods.					☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ NA							
	Results for Step 9												
Total Evaluation Elements							Critical Elements						
		valuation ents**	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA		Critical Elements***	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	NA	
	-	4	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	

[&]quot;C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.

This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.

^{***} This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.





	Table 1—2024 PIP Validation Tool Scores for <pip topic=""> for <cco name=""></cco></pip>										
	Review Step	Total Possible Evaluation Elements (Including Critical Elements)	Total <i>Met</i>	Total Partially Met	Total Not Met	Total <i>NA</i>	Total Possible Critical Elements	Total Critical Elements <i>Met</i>	Total Critical Elements Partially Met	Total Critical Elements Not Met	Total Critical Elements NA
1.	Review the Selected PIP Topic	1					1				
2.	Review the PIP Aim Statement(s)	1					1				
3.	Review the Identified PIP Population	1					1				
4.	Review the Sampling Method	5					2				
5.	Review the Selected Performance Indicator(s)	2					1				
6.	Review the Data Collection Procedures	4					2				
7.	Review Data Analysis and Interpretation of Results	3					1				
8.	Assess the Improvement Strategies	5					3				
9.	Assess the Likelihood that Significant and Sustained Improvement Occurred	4					1				
	Totals for All Steps	26					13				





Table 2—2024 Overall Confidence of Adherence to Acceptable Methodology for All Phases of PIP (Step 1 through Step 8). for <pip topic=""> for <cco name=""></cco></pip>						
TOT CPTP TOPICS TOT CCCO Names						
Percentage Score of Evaluation Elements <i>Met*</i>	%					
Percentage Score of Critical Elements Met**	%					
Confidence Level***	<high confidence,="" confidence,<br="" low="" moderate="">No Confidence></high>					

Table 3—2024 Overall Confidence That the PIP Achieved Significant Improvement (Step 9). for <pip topic=""> for <cco name=""></cco></pip>						
Percentage Score of Evaluation Elements Met*	%					
Percentage Score of Critical Elements Met**	%					
Confidence Level***	<high confidence,="" confidence,<br="" low="" moderate="">No Confidence></high>					

The Not Assessed and Not Applicable scores have been removed from the scoring calculations.

- The percentage score of evaluation elements *Met* is calculated by dividing the total *Met* by the sum of all evaluation elements *Met*, *Partially Met*, and *Not 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*.
- Confidence Level: See confidence level definitions on next page.





EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF PIP RESULTS

HSAG assessed the CCO's PIP based on CMS Protocol 1 to determine whether the CCO adhered to an acceptable methodology for all phases of design and data collection and conducted accurate data analysis and interpretation of PIP results. HSAG's validation of the PIP determined the following:

High Confidence: High confidence in reported PIP results. All critical evaluation elements were Met, and 90 percent 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 percent to 89

percent of all evaluation elements were Met across all steps.

Low Confidence: Low confidence in reported PIP results. Across all steps, 65 percent 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.

Confidence Level for Acceptable Methodology: <High Confidence, Moderate Confidence, Low Confidence, No Confidence>





EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF PIP RESULTS

HSAG assessed the CCO's PIP based on CMS Protocol 1 and determined whether the CCO produced evidence of significant improvement. HSAG's validation of the PIP determined the following:

High Confidence: All performance indicators demonstrated statistically significant improvement over the baseline.

To receive *Moderate Confidence* for significant improvement, one of the three scenarios below occurred:

Moderate Confidence:

- 1. All performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline, **and** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
- 2. All performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline, **and** none of the performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
- 3. 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.

Confidence Level for Significant Improvement: < High Confidence, Moderate Confidence, Low Confidence, No Confidence>