

KanCare Meaningful Measures Collaborative (KMMC) Meeting
Friday, September 6, 2019, 1:00PM - 3:30PM
Kansas Health Institute (KHI) & Zoom

KMMC Meeting Notes

Agenda item: KMMC Meeting (Committee of the Whole; 1:00pm - 2:50pm)

Welcome & Introductions

Aaron Dunkel, chair of the KMMC Executive Committee, welcomed the group to the September KMMC meeting.

Carlie Houchen, KHI and KMMC staff support, then provided an overview of the breakout sessions the group would be participating in from 1:10pm-2:50pm. The breakout sessions were an opportunity for Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) members to provide feedback on work completed by the Data Resources Working Group (DRWG).

Houchen described that at the July 12 KMMC meeting, DRWG members volunteered to work on the SWG consolidated questions, with DRWG members working to refine the initial, consolidated questions from SWG as more precise research questions and pair those refined questions with possible measures. In the breakout sessions, SWG members would have the opportunity to provide feedback on that initial work, to ensure the DRWG was still capturing SWG priority areas and potential measures of interest.

The group then split into two breakout sessions, comprised of a mix of both DRWG and SWG members, to discuss the work of the DRWG.

Breakout Session #1

Breakout session #1 discussed five of the nine SWG consolidated questions, including: quality assurance; care coordination; no access; pregnancy outcomes; and setting of choice. The document discussed during the breakout session can be found here:

https://www.khi.org/assets/uploads/news/14860/2019.09.06_breakoutsession1_v2.00.pdf

Quality Assurance: Wen-Chieh Lin, KHI, presented the drafted research questions and possible measures for the topic “Quality Assurance.” The breakout group discussed that it would be helpful to have a clear definition of quality assurance. Breakout group members discussed the importance of having a third-party vendor collect information from consumers. Finally, one breakout group member questioned whether quality of life should fit within quality assurance, or if it belongs in a different topic area.

Care Coordination: Lynne Valdivia, Kansas Foundation for Medical Care (KFMC), introduced the draft research questions and measures for the topic of “Care Coordination.” Breakout group members discussed that it would be helpful to have definitions of care coordination, continuity and coordinated, as used in the research questions. In addition to requesting definitional clarity, the breakout group discussed the divide between some of the research questions and the data and measures that are currently available to address the research questions. The group also discussed the difficulty of measuring effectiveness at a large level (e.g., program-wide). The breakout group decided to revise the research questions to better reflect the intent of the consolidated question, and breakout group members were asked if there was interest in assisting on revising the questions.

No Access: Anna Purcell, UnitedHealthcare, presented on the topic of “No Access.” In her overview, Purcell indicated that there were multiple ways that “individuals who cannot access care” could be defined. Potential options included:

- No [Medicaid] eligibility
 - Application denied
 - Member refused coverage
 - Member did not recertify
- No provider available in service area
 - Statewide provider shortage
 - Network inadequacy
- No provider capacity in service area
 - Providers exist in area, but not enough to serve member need

The breakout group discussed that the original intent of the question had been to focus on individuals who are on waitlists and individuals who experience delays in eligibility. The group also discussed that the second and third bullets (no provider available in service area, no provider capacity in service area) could potentially be collapsed and may fit with network adequacy. The group discussed the need to drill down on what outcomes are of interest, and one group member suggested parsing out urgent care visits from emergency room visits. Finally, the group discussed the link between this question and the social determinants of health (e.g., transportation to needed care, health education), and whether additional determinants were also impacting whether an individual could not access care.

Pregnancy Outcomes: Anna Purcell, UnitedHealthcare, presented the drafted research questions and possible measures for the topic “Pregnancy Outcomes.” Breakout group members asked about potential benchmarks for the research question, which could be longitudinal improvement or could involve a non-Medicaid comparison. The group also discussed the lack of focus on maternal mental health in the current question and outcomes. Members discussed whether rates for post-partum depression screenings could be added as a measure, and another member indicated that the Prenatal and Postpartum Care (PPC) measure from Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS) may capture depression screenings, although it includes information

beyond screening. Additionally, members discussed the Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS) survey may be an additional data source for this topic.

Setting of Choice: Lynne Valdivia, Kansas Foundation for Medical Care (KFMC), introduced the draft research questions and measures for the topic of “Setting of Choice.” The breakout group suggested rewording RC2 and breaking it into two questions. Suggested modifications include: RC2a. “Are KanCare Waiver participants’ living independently, by living in their setting of choice? and RC2b. “Are KanCare Waiver participants’ participating in their desired levels of community activities, employment, and socialization?” Members discussed that some of the new home and community-based services (HCBS) Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS) survey questions focus on community inclusion and empowerment could be considered for this topic.

Breakout session #2

Breakout session #2 discussed four of the nine SWG consolidated questions, including: enrollee treatment; application processing; social determinants; and network adequacy. The document discussed during the breakout session can be found here:

https://www.khi.org/assets/uploads/news/14860/2019.09.06_breakoutsession2.pdf

Enrollee Treatment: Scott Bruner, Aetna Better Health of Kansas, introduced the research questions and measures he drafted as the DRWG lead on the topic “Enrollee Treatment.” The breakout group discussed that the research questions and drafted measures aligned well with stakeholder interest. An additional area of interest in enrollee treatment at times of transition (e.g., from institutional care settings or a correctional setting into community-based care settings).

Application Processing: Wen-Chieh Lin, KHI, presented the drafted research questions and possible measures for the topic “Application Processing.” The group discussed that the questions and measures for this topic appeared to be straightforward. Additional questions were raised about how the allowable 45-day review period is defined. Also, the breakout group discussed possible rephrasing of the research question to avoid suggesting that it is the “fault” of a member when there is a delay in an eligibility determination. The rephrased research question may be, “What are the eligibility characteristics associated with the delay (>45 days) in KanCare new applications and redeterminations, respectively?” Rather than beginning, “What member characteristics...” Eligibility characteristics may then include items such as the number of insurance policies or other aspects of an application that frequently correspond with delay.

Social Determinants: Trisa Hosford, Sunflower Health Plan, introduced the draft research questions and measures for the topic of “Social Determinants of Health.” The breakout group discussed that several promising sources of data are under-development, but none are sufficiently complete presently. Specifically, the group

discussed data from the MCO Health Risk Assessments and z-codes as eventual sources of information related to social determinants for KanCare members. While discussing these data sources, the group noted that determining the most appropriate data source should also consider the type of intervention that data may inform. For example, community interventions may be best informed by community data sources such as BRFSS.

Network Adequacy: Wen-Chieh Lin, KHI, presented the draft research questions and possible measures related to “Network Adequacy.” The breakout group discussed the possible benchmarks that could be considered should this topic be put forward for additional work. Suggested benchmarks include peer states (e.g., Iowa, Nebraska, Colorado) or vs. private pay networks in Kansas. Other discussion, particularly in regard to HCBS, centered around the portion of the allotted service hours for which KanCare members were able to access providers.

Agenda item: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting (3:00pm - 3:30pm)

Debrief on Breakout Sessions

Working group members provided updates on discussion points from each breakout session. From the discussion, working group members acknowledged that some consolidated questions require additional clarity, particularly around definitions (e.g., care coordination). SWG members were encouraged to let KHI staff know if they are interested in helping better define specific consolidated questions to address concerns raised in the discussion. Members also indicated that they liked the inclusion of the Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS) survey as a potential data source.

It was noted that data for some of the consolidated questions is limited. One suggestion for prioritization was for the Executive Committee (EC) to assess how well the existing questions fit with the data sources provided by the DRWG. The EC could then prioritize questions where there is a strong match with current data and measures. One suggestion for a question where the current data fits well with the question is application processing. Members also indicated that there were multiple data sources available for enrollee treatment, while the current data sources measuring social determinants of health are challenging. Finally, the group indicated that data is currently available for network adequacy, although additional information may be needed to assess all questions of interest to stakeholders (e.g., choice versus access).

Due to the need for additional clarity on a few of the consolidated questions, SWG members were also encouraged to indicate if they were interested in a specific consolidated question. If needed, those who are interested in specific questions can help with the issue of definitional clarity moving forward

Consumer Engagement Update

Scott Wituk, of the Community Engagement Institute, provided a brief update on the status of KMMC consumer engagement. A handout highlighting the information provided in the update can be found here:

https://www.khi.org/assets/uploads/news/14860/kmmc_consumer_engagement_update_cei_9-5-2019.pdf

Wituk noted that a few organizations that initially intended to participate had been unable to due to timing constraints and that UnitedHealthcare had also agreed to engage members, although they are not listed on the handout. Annette Graham indicated that the Central Plains Area Agency on Aging would be conducting about 30 consumer interviews. Audrey Schremmer of Three Rivers and the Kansas Association of Centers for Independent Living (KACIL) indicated that she could assist with additional engagement efforts.

Vice Chair Election

Sydney McClendon, KHI and KMMC staff support, informed the group that Denise Cyzman would no longer be serving as SWG Vice Chair due to other commitments, although she will remain a member of the KMMC and the SWG. To fill this leadership vacancy, SWG members were asked to email nominations for the Vice Chair role to KMMC@khi.org. McClendon said she would send a follow up email to the SWG after the meeting regarding this task.

Agenda item: Data Resources Working Group Meeting (3:00pm - 3:30pm)

Debrief on Breakout Sessions

The Data Resource Working group was updated on the content of discussion in both breakout sessions by members who participated in those discussions. Some of the areas discussed, such as “Care Coordination” and “No Access” may need clarification before additional work can be done. The group also noted that some measures showed up in multiple times across topic areas. This recurrence may be one strategy by which high priorities could be identified.

The group also noted that more general education on the data sources within KanCare is likely needed so that KMMC members have an understanding of HEDIS measures, CAHPS, HCBS CAHPS, National Outcomes Measures and the information available within the KanCare Evaluation Report. The group pointed to the Data Map that is currently under-development as one way that KMMC members will be able to access this information.

The group agreed that more work between meetings by the DRWG was likely needed once the KMMC Executive Committee has provided some direction on priorities. Task-

base work groups may convene in the interim, but the next full meeting of the DRWG will be at the KMMC meeting on Friday, November 1.

Agenda item: Adjourn

The next KMMC meeting will be November 1, 2019 from 1:00pm – 4:00pm at the Kansas Health Institute and via Zoom.