

State of Vermont
Agency of Human Services



Global Commitment to Health
Section 1115 Medicaid Demonstration
11-W-00194/1

Draft Demonstration Evaluation Design
Extension Period January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2021

Submitted to CMS February 21, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | GLOBAL COMMITMENT TO HEALTH OVERVIEW | 1 |
| A. | Demonstration Goals..... | 3 |
| B. | Public Managed Care Delivery System, Investments and All Payer Model | 4 |
| C. | Eligibility, Benefits and Cost Sharing | 7 |
| D. | Specialized Programs..... | 8 |
| E. | Special Considerations for Mental Health and Substance Use Disorder Treatment | 10 |
| II. | EVALUATION AND PROCUREMENT STRATEGY | 11 |
| A. | Comprehensive Quality Strategy and Rapid Cycle Assessment..... | 11 |
| B. | Summative Evaluation | 12 |
| C. | Procurement Strategy and Evaluator Qualifications | 13 |
| D. | Evaluation Budget and Timeline | 14 |
| III. | EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODS..... | 17 |
| A. | Hypothesis..... | 17 |
| B. | Study Populations..... | 17 |
| C. | Data Collection and Assurances | 18 |
| D. | Performance Measures, Data Source, Frequency and Sampling Methods | 19 |
| E. | Methods | 30 |
| F. | Data Analysis | 31 |
| G. | Data Reporting..... | 32 |
| H. | Baseline | 33 |
| IV. | MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER IMD EVALUATION..... | 34 |
| A. | History and Background | 34 |
| B. | Study Questions, Populations and Design | 35 |
| i. | Psychiatric IMD Treatment | 36 |
| ii. | Substance Use Disorder IMD Treatment..... | 41 |
| | APPENDIX 1. AHS Tentative Evaluation Budget..... | 43 |

I. GLOBAL COMMITMENT TO HEALTH OVERVIEW

The Vermont Global Commitment to Health Medicaid Section 1115(a) Demonstration was originally approved on September 27, 2005, and implemented on October 1, 2005. The Global Commitment to Health Section 1115(a) Demonstration is designed to use a multi-disciplinary approach to comprehensive Medicaid reform, including the basic principles of public health, the fundamentals of effective administration of a Medicaid managed care delivery system, public-private partnership, and program flexibility.

As of January 1, 2017, Vermont and CMS extended the Global Commitment to Health Demonstration to further promote delivery system and payment reform to meet the goals of the State working with the Center for Medicaid and CHIP Services, and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation (CMMI). Consistent with Medicare's payment reform efforts the Demonstrations allow for alignment across public payers. Specifically, Vermont expects to demonstrate its ability to achieve universal access to health care, cost containment, and improved quality of care.

Since 2005, the Global Commitment to Health Demonstration has reduced Vermont's uninsured rate from 11.4 percent in 2005 to approximately 2.7 percent in 2015 through expansion of eligibility and other Accountable Care Act reforms. The Demonstration has also enabled Vermont to address and eliminate bias toward institutional care and offer cost-effective, community-based services. For example, the proportion of Choices for Care participants served in the community has passed fifty percent and continues to increase. In addition, Vermont no longer has a waiting list for individuals in the Highest and High Need Groups under the Choices for Care component of the Demonstration.

Due to the expansion of eligibility under the Vermont State Plan, pursuant to the Affordable Care Act, expansion of eligibility is no longer the primary focus of the Demonstration. However, the Demonstration continues to promote delivery system reform and cost-effective community-based services as an alternative to institutional care. The State's goal in implementing the Demonstration is to improve the health status of all Vermonters by:

- Promoting delivery system reform through value based payment models and alignment across public payers;
- Increasing access to affordable and high quality health care by assisting lower-income individuals who can qualify for private insurance through the Marketplace;
- Improving access to primary care;
- Improving the health care delivery for individuals with chronic care needs; and
- Allowing beneficiaries a choice in long-term services and supports and providing an array of home and community-based (HCBS) alternatives recognized to be more cost-effective than institutional based supports.

The State employs four major elements in achieving the above goals:

1. **Program Flexibility:** Vermont has the flexibility to invest in certain specified alternative services and programs designed to achieve the Demonstration's objectives (including the Marketplace subsidy program).
2. **Managed Care Delivery System:** Under the Demonstration the Agency for Human Services (AHS) executes an annual agreement with the Department of Vermont Health Access (DVHA), which delivers services through a managed care-like model, subject to the requirements that would be applicable to a non-risk pre-paid inpatient health plan (PIHP) as defined by the Special Terms and Conditions (STCs).
3. **Removal of Institutional Bias:** Under the Demonstration, Vermont provides a choice of settings for delivery of services and supports to older adults, people with serious and persistent mental illness, people with physical disabilities, people with developmental disabilities, and people with traumatic brain injuries who meet program eligibility and level of care requirements.
4. **Delivery System Reform:** Under the Demonstration, Vermont supports systemic delivery reform efforts using the payment flexibility provided through the Demonstration to create alignment across public and private payers.

The initial Global Commitment to Health and Choices for Care Demonstrations were approved in September of 2005 and became effective October 1, 2005. The Global Commitment to Health Demonstration was extended for three years, effective January 1, 2011, and again for three (3) years, effective October 2, 2013. The Choices for Care Demonstration was extended for five (5) years effective October 1, 2010, and became part of the Global Commitment to Health Demonstration in January 2015. The following amendments have been made to the Global Commitment to Health Demonstration:

- 2007: A component of the Catamount Health program was added, enabling the State to provide a premium subsidy to Vermonters who had been without health insurance coverage for a year or more, have income at or below 200 percent of the FPL, and who do not have access to cost-effective employer-sponsored insurance, as determined by the state.
- 2009: The State extended Catamount Health coverage to Vermonters at or below 300 percent of the FPL.
- 2011: The State included a palliative care program for children who are at or below 300 percent of the FPL and have been diagnosed with life limiting illness that would preclude them from reaching adulthood. This program allows children to receive curative and palliative care services such as expressive therapy, care coordination, family training and respite for caregivers.
- 2012: CMS provided authority for the State to eliminate the \$75 inpatient admission co-pay and to implement nominal co-payments for the Vermont Health Access Plan (VHAP) as articulated in the Medicaid state plan.
- 2013: CMS approved the extension of the Global Commitment to Health Demonstration which included sun-setting the authorities for most of the Expansion Populations, including Catamount Health coverage, because these populations would be eligible for Marketplace coverage beginning January 1, 2014. The extension also added the New Adult Group under

the State Plan to the population affected by the Demonstration effective January 1, 2014. Finally, the extension also included premium subsidies for individuals enrolled in a qualified health plan whose income is at or below 300 percent of the FPL.

- 2015: In January 2015, the Global Commitment to Health Demonstration was amended to include authority for the former Choices for Care Demonstration. In addition, the State received Section 1115 authority to provide full Medicaid State Plan benefits to pregnant women who are determined presumptively eligible.

A. Demonstration Goals

The State's high-level goal for all health reforms is to create an integrated health system able to achieve the Institute of Medicine's "Triple Aim" goals of improving patient experience of care, improving the health of populations, and reducing per-capita cost.¹ This is supported in the Global Commitment to Health Demonstration through supporting innovative delivery system reforms, including Medicaid Accountable Care Organizations (ACO) and the development of progressive in-home and community based services and supports that are cost-effective and support persons who have long-term care service and support needs, complex medical, mental health and/or substance use disorder treatment needs. Overarching Demonstration goals are described below:

- **To increase access to care:** All enrollees must have access to comprehensive care, including financial, geographic, physical, and communicative access. This means having health insurance, appropriate providers, timely access to services, culturally sensitive services, and the opportunity for second opinions as needed.
- **To contain health care cost:** Cost-effectiveness takes into consideration all costs associated with providing programs, services, and interventions. It is measurable at the category-of-service, individual enrollee, aid category, and aggregate program levels.
- **To improve the quality of care:** Quality refers to the degree to which programs/services and activities increase the likelihood of desired outcomes. The six domains necessary for assuring quality health care identified by the Institute of Medicine (IOM, 2001) are:
 - **Effectiveness:** Effective health care provides evidence-based services to all who can benefit, refraining from providing services that are not of benefit.
 - **Efficiency:** Efficient health care focuses on avoiding waste, including waste of equipment, supplies, ideas, and energy.
 - **Equity:** Equal health care provides care without variation in quality due to gender, ethnicity, geographic location, or socioeconomic status.
 - **Patient Centeredness:** Patient-centered care emphasizes a partnership between provider and consumer.
 - **Safety:** Safe health care avoids injuries to consumers from care that is intended to help.
 - **Timeliness:** Timely health care involves obtaining needed care and minimizing

¹ Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington DC: National Academy Press, Institute of Medicine; 2001.

unnecessary delays in receiving care.

- ***To eliminate institutional bias:*** By allowing specialized program participants choices in where they receive long-term services and supports and by offering a cost-effective array of in-home and community services for older adults, people with serious and persistent mental illness, people with developmental disabilities and people with traumatic brain injuries who meet program eligibility and level of care requirements.

B. Public Managed Care Delivery System, Investments and All Payer Model

Vermont operates the Demonstration using a managed care-like model that complies with federal regulations at 42 CFR part 438 that would be applicable to a non-risk PIHP, including beneficiary rights and protections such as independent beneficiary support systems and formal grievance and appeal procedures.

In addition to the Demonstration, the State has also begun its first year of implementation planning for an All Payer Model, Section 1115 Medicare Demonstration through the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation (CMMI). The All Payer Model Medicare Demonstration and the Global Commitment to Health Medicaid Demonstration are expected to complement each other to support systemic delivery reform efforts. Using the payment flexibility provided through both Demonstrations, alignment across public and private payers is expected. A brief description of the Medicaid public managed care model and current reform efforts is provided below.

Public Managed Care Model

The Agency of Human Services (AHS), as Vermont's Single State Medicaid Agency, is responsible for oversight of the managed care-like Medicaid model. The Department of Vermont Health Access (DVHA) operates the Medicaid program as if it were a Managed Care Organization in accordance with federal managed care regulations. Program requirements and responsibilities are delineated in an inter-governmental agreement (IGA) between AHS and DVHA. DVHA also has sub-agreements with the other State entities that provide specialty care for Global Commitment (GC) enrollees (e.g., mental health services, developmental disability services, and specialized child and family services). As such, since the inception of the GC Demonstration, DVHA and its IGA partners have modified operations to meet Medicaid managed care requirements, including requirements related to network adequacy, access to care, beneficiary information, grievances, quality assurance, and quality improvement. Per the External Quality Review Organization's annual findings, DVHA and its IGA partners have achieved exemplary compliance rates in meeting Medicaid managed care requirements. Departments of Vermont State government that participate in the provision of covered services to enrollees under the Demonstration are outlined, in brief, below.

Department of Vermont Health Access (DVHA): DVHA, which operates the Medicaid program as if it were a public MCO under Global Commitment Demonstration, has a three-fold mission:

- To assist beneficiaries in accessing clinically appropriate health services;
- To administer Vermont's public health insurance system efficiently and effectively; and
- To collaborate with other health care system entities in bringing evidence-based practices to Vermont Medicaid beneficiaries.

Department of Mental Health (DMH): The mission of DMH is to promote and improve the mental health of Vermonters and to provide Vermonters with access to effective prevention, early intervention, and mental health treatment and supports as needed to live, work, learn, and participate fully in their communities. DMH consists of two programmatic divisions: Adult Mental Health Services Division and the Child, Adolescent, and Family Mental Health Services Division. DMH has primary responsibility for overseeing the quality of psychiatric and mental health care provided for two of Vermont's Special Health Needs populations defined under the Global Commitment Demonstration, including persons with a severe and persistent mental illness and children who are experiencing a severe emotional disturbance.

Department of Disabilities, Aging, and Independent Living (DAIL): DAIL assists older Vermonters and people with disabilities to live as independently as possible. It provides support to families of children with disabilities to help maintain them in their home. It helps adults with disabilities find and maintain meaningful employment, and it ensures quality of care and life for individuals receiving health care and/or long-term care services from licensed or certified health care providers. DAIL also protects vulnerable adults from abuse, neglect, and exploitation and provides public guardianship to elders and people with developmental disabilities. DAIL operates the several specialized Medicaid programs under the Demonstration including, Choices for Care, Developmental Disability Services and Traumatic Brain Injury Services.

Vermont Department of Health (VDH): VDH's goal is to have the nation's premier system of public health, enabling Vermonters to lead healthy lives in healthy communities. VDH leads the state and communities in the development of systematic approaches to health promotion, safety, and disease prevention. VDH continuously assesses, vigorously pursues, and documents measurable improvements to the health and safety of Vermont's population. VDH will succeed through excellence in individual achievement, organizational competence, and teamwork within and outside of VDH. VDH's division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs supports the innovated Medicaid Health Home program for Medication Assisted Opioid Treatment in partnerships with DVHA, as well as extensive outpatient and residential treatment and recovery support for alcohol and other drugs use disorders.

Department for Children and Families (DCF): DCF promotes the social, emotional, physical, and economic well-being of Vermont's children and families. It achieves this mission by providing Vermonters with protective, developmental, therapeutic, probation, economic, and other support services. To this end, DCF works in statewide partnership with families, schools, businesses, community leaders, and service providers. DCF offers specialized Medicaid services to children and families at risk of or experiencing trauma and early childhood intervention for families with children birth to age six with developmental needs.

Agency of Education (AOE): The AOE is responsible for overseeing coverage and reimbursement under the School-Based Health program. The Special Education Medicaid School-Based Health Services Program is used by the State to support health-related services provided to special education students who are enrolled in Medicaid and receive eligible services in accordance with their individualized education plans (IEPs). The AOE is established as an "Organized Delivery System" under Medicaid and is responsible for the program adherence to all State and Federal Medicaid and Education laws and regulations.

Delivery System Investments

Under the public managed care model, the Demonstration provides the State with flexibility to invest in health care innovations that:

- a. Reduce the rate of uninsured and/or underinsured in Vermont;
- b. Increase the access to quality health care by uninsured, underinsured, and Medicaid beneficiaries;
- c. Provide public health approaches and other innovative programs to improve the health outcomes, health status and quality of life for uninsured, underinsured and Medicaid-eligible individuals in Vermont; and
- d. Encourage the formation and maintenance of public-private partnerships in health care, including initiatives to support and improve the health care delivery system and promote transformation to value-based and integrated models of care.

In addition, CMS has provided the State with one-time spending authority to support Accountable Care Organizations and Medicaid community providers in delivery system reform through activities such as, but not limited to:

- Infrastructure improvement;
- Quality and health improvement information development and dissemination;
- Community related population health projects;
- Socio-economic risk assessment and mitigation; and
- Provider integration to build integration across physical health, mental health substance use disorder treatment and long-term services and supports.

Investment awards are expected to give preference to activities that promote collaboration, build capacity across the care continuum, consider social determinates of health, and promote an integrated health care system consistent with the framework set forth in the Vermont All-Payer Model Agreement and the Global Commitment Demonstration. Specifically, the State would like to encourage ACO-based provider led reform that features (a) collaboration between providers, (b) reimbursement models that move away from Fee-For-Service payment, and (c) rigorous quality measurement that aligns with the APM quality framework.

All Payer Model Alignment

The All-Payer Model agreement between the State and the Federal government was approved by the Green Mountain Care Board on October 26, 2016 and signed by the Governor and the Secretary of Human Services on October 27, 2016. The agreement includes a target for a sustainable rate of growth for health care spending in Vermont across Medicaid, Medicare, and commercial payers, and would build on past programs like Vermont's Medicaid and commercial Shared Savings Programs. When implemented, this model will focus on a set of health care services roughly equivalent to Medicare Parts A and B (hospital and physician services). The agreement includes quality and performance measurement and Next Generation's value-based payment models, such as capitation or global budgets. The State must provide a plan in 2019 for integrating any institutional long term services and supports in the total cost of care in the next Demonstration period.

The All-Payer Model (APM) Agreement and Global Commitment Medicaid Demonstration are complementary frameworks that support Vermont's health care reform efforts. Each agreement

provides federal support to further Vermont's strategic goal of creating an integrated health care system, including increased alignment across payers and providers.

C. Eligibility, Benefits and Cost Sharing

Eligibility under the Demonstration includes the following Medicaid and Demonstration groups:

Population 1: Mandatory State Plan populations (except for the new adult group). This group receives benefits as described in the Medicaid State Plan and may receive HCBS benefits described in the STCs if they meet additional program eligibility standards.

Population 2: Optional State Plan populations. This group receives benefits as described in the Medicaid State Plan and may receive HCBS benefits described in the STCs if they meet additional program eligibility standards.

Population 3: Affordable Care Act new adult group. This group receives benefits as described in the Medicaid State Plan and may receive HCBS benefits described in the STCs if they meet additional program eligibility standards.

Population 4: Individuals receiving home and community based waiver (HCBW)-like services who meet the clinical standard in the Choices for Care program for the Highest Need Group. This group receives benefits as described in the Medicaid State Plan and Choices for Care program benefits as described in the STCs.

Population 5: Individuals receiving HCBW-like services who met the clinical standard in the Choices for Care program for the High Need Group. This group receives benefits as described in the Medicaid State Plan and Choices for Care program benefits as described in the STCs.

Population 6: Individuals who are not otherwise eligible under the Medicaid State Plan and who would not have been eligible had the state elected eligibility under 42 CFR 435.217, but are at risk for institutionalization and need home and community-based services. This group receives a limited HCBW-like service benefit including Adult Day Services, Case Management, and Homemaker services in the Choices for Care program as outlined in the (STCs).

Population 7: Medicare beneficiaries who are 65 years or older or have a disability with income at or below 150 percent of the FPL, who may be enrolled in the Medicare Savings Program (MSP) but are not otherwise eligible for full benefits. This group receives a limited pharmacy benefit including Medicaid Prescriptions, eyeglasses and related eye exams; MSP beneficiaries also receive benefits as described in the Title XIX state plan.

Population 8: Medicare beneficiaries who are 65 years or older or have a disability with income above 150 percent and up to and including 225 percent of the FPL, who may be enrolled in the MSP, but are not otherwise eligible for full benefits. This group receives a limited pharmacy benefit including maintenance Drugs; MSP beneficiaries also receive benefits as described in the Title XIX state plan.

All covered services may be subject to review and prior approval by DVHA and/or its partner departments in the Agency of Human Services, based on medical appropriateness. A complete listing of covered services and limitations are contained in the Vermont approved Title XIX State Plan, Vermont statutes, regulations, and policies and procedures. Premiums and cost-sharing for populations 1, 2, and 3, must follow Medicaid requirements that are set forth in statute, regulation and policy. Standard Medicaid exemptions from cost-sharing set forth in 42 CFR 447(b) applies to the Demonstration. The state must not apply co-payment requirements to excluded populations (children under age 21, pregnant women or individuals in long-term care facilities) or for excluded services/supplies (e.g., family planning). Vermont charges premiums for children through age 18 with income above 195 percent of the FPL through 312 percent of the FPL. Premium populations are outlined in Exhibit 1 below.

Exhibit 1: Vermont Premium Populations

| Population | Premiums | Co-Payments | State Program Name |
|--|--|---|---|
| Children with income > 195% percent through 237% of the FPL | \$15/month/family | N/A | Dr. Dynasaur |
| Underinsured Children with income > 237% through 312% FPL | \$20/month/family | N/A | Dr. Dynasaur |
| Uninsured Children with income > 237% through 312% of the FPL | \$60/month/family | N/A | Dr. Dynasaur |
| Medicare beneficiaries with income at or below 150 percent of the FPL, who may be enrolled in the Medicare Savings Program but are not otherwise categorically eligible for full benefits (Demonstration Population 7). | 0-150% FPL: \$15/month/person | Not to exceed the nominal co-payments specified in the Medicaid State plan. | VHAP Pharmacy; VPharm1 |
| Medicare beneficiaries with income above 150 percent and up to and including 225 percent of the FPL, who may be enrolled in the Medicare Savings Program, but are not otherwise categorically eligible (Demonstration Population 8). | 151-175% FPL: \$20/month/person 176-225% FPL: \$50/month/person | Not to exceed the nominal co-payments specified in the Medicaid State plan. | VScript; VPharm2; VScript Expanded; VPharm3 |

D. Specialized Programs

Under the GC Demonstration, Vermont is authorized to provide an array of cost-effective in-home and community services. Providers of these services must meet designation, certification and/or additional licensing requirements to be approved by the State to serve the most vulnerable of Vermont's citizens. These specialized programs are designed to support a unique group of beneficiaries, each is outlined below.

- Choices for Care: long-term services and supports for persons with disabilities and older Vermonters. The Demonstration authorizes HCBS waiver-like and institutional services such as: nursing facility; enhanced residential care; personal care; homemaker services; companion care; case management; adult day services; and adult family care.

- *Developmental Disability Services*: provides long-term services and supports for persons with intellectual disabilities. The Demonstration authorizes HCBS waiver-like services, including service coordination, residential habilitation, day habilitation, supported employment, crisis services, clinical intervention, respite and self-directed care.
- *Traumatic Brain Injury Services*: provides recovery oriented and long-term services and supports for persons with a traumatic brain injury. The Demonstration authorizes HCBS waiver-like services including crisis/support services, psychological and counseling supports, case management, community supports, habilitation, respite care, supported employment, environmental and assistive technology and self-directed care.
- *Enhanced Family Treatment*: provides intensive in-home and community treatment services for children who are experiencing a severe emotional disturbance and their families. The Demonstration authorizes HCBS waiver-like services including service coordination, flexible support, skilled therapy services, environmental safety devices, counseling, residential treatment, respite, supported employment, crisis and community supports.
- *Community Rehabilitation and Treatment Program*: provides recovery oriented, in-home and community treatment services for adults who have a severe and persistent mental illness. The Demonstration authorizes HCBS waiver-like services including service coordination, flexible support, skilled therapy services, environmental safety devices, counseling, residential treatment, respite, supported employment, crisis and community supports.

Through a special provision as a Designated State Health Program, Community Rehabilitation and Treatment benefits can be extended to individuals with severe and persistent mental illness with incomes between 133 and 150 percent of the federal poverty level, under the Demonstration.

In addition, the Demonstration authorizes the:

- *Children's Palliative Care Program*: provides care coordination, respite care, expressive therapies, family training, and bereavement counseling, for children under the age of 21 years in populations 1, 2, and 3 who have been diagnosed with a life- limiting illness that is expected to be terminal before adulthood.
- *Adult Hospice Program*: allows for hospice services to be delivered concurrently with curative therapy to adults in populations 1, 2, and 3.

Lastly, as a Designated State Health Program, the Demonstration allows:

- *Marketplace Subsidies*: The State offer subsidies for premiums for individuals with incomes at or below 300 percent of the federal poverty level who are purchasing health care coverage from a Qualified Health plan in Marketplace. The program is known as Vermont Premium Assistance (VPA) as part of the state-based health benefits exchange.

E. Special Considerations for Mental Health and Substance Use Disorder Treatment

Since its inception, Vermont's Demonstration has included payment flexibilities to support cost-effective alternatives to traditional Medicaid State Plan benefits. The State has used this authority to provide a continuum of treatment programs for persons who need inpatient psychiatric treatment, detoxification and/or residential treatment for substance use disorder. In several cases services are rendered by providers whose bed capacity is over 16 beds. Thus, these programs are considered Institutions for Mental Disease (IMD) facilities. CMS is continuing time-limited expenditure authority for services in several facilities that meet the definition of an IMD pursuant to an evaluation of their role and effectiveness in Vermont's Medicaid Demonstration.

CMS is asking the State to perform an evaluation of its IMD expenditure authority in the context of system-wide service, payment, and delivery system reforms and the State's extensive investments in cost effective community-based alternatives to institutional care. The evaluation will help inform broader policy discussions about Medicaid funding for IMD and community based services.

In addition to the study of IMD related services, the State is exploring opportunities and options for delivery system reforms that will promote a continuum of Substance Use Disorder Treatment Services and the State's alignment with CMS's Substance Use Disorder opportunities outlined in its July 2015 guidance, entitled "New Service Delivery Opportunities for Individuals with a Substance Use Disorder." The State will include measures in the Demonstration evaluation design that will serve as baseline metrics for monitoring the full continuum of Substance Use Disorder Treatment services in the future.

II. EVALUATION AND PROCUREMENT STRATEGY

The evaluation strategy for the Global Commitment Demonstration is designed to measure the degree to which its purposes, aims, goals, and objectives have been achieved. The evaluation is designed to not only address the long-term impact, but also to provide intermediate and short-term data on its performance through rapid cycle assessments.

In addition to assessing its overall impact, the evaluation examines the specific effects of the innovative changes made possible because of the Demonstration. Thus, the plan utilizes both performance measurement results (providing more real-time data focused on whether a program is achieving measurable objectives) and more rigorous program evaluation findings that analyzes findings against national benchmarks, changes over time and attempts to isolate key variables influencing outcomes.

To ensure that the new aspects of the Demonstration extension are implemented as intended and achieve the related goals/objectives and desired outcomes, this evaluation plan includes full alignment with the State's Comprehensive Quality Strategy, Rapid Cycle Assessment and Summative evaluation designs. It will employ qualitative and quantitative methods to collect and analyze data. This evaluation will not focus on outcomes exclusively, but is interested in capturing any evidence that the Demonstration supports: increased access to care; improved quality of care; cost containment; and stable in-home and community alternatives to institutional care.

A. Comprehensive Quality Strategy and Rapid Cycle Assessment

Vermont has a Comprehensive Quality Strategy (CQS) that integrates all aspects of quality improvement programs, processes, and requirements across the State's Medicaid program. The CQS is intended to serve as a blueprint or road map for Vermont and its Medicaid managed care operations in assessing the quality of care that beneficiaries receive, as well as for setting forth measurable goals and targets for improvement. As approved by CMS, the CQS is the vehicle for demonstrating Vermont's compliance with the new HCBS regulations (comparable to 'transition plans' in other states). The CQS meets all requirements of 42 CFR 438 and includes LTSS and HCBS quality components. Key elements addressed in the CQS include: goals; responsibilities; performance improvement projects; performance measures; populations; timelines; monitoring and evaluation; and performance improvement accountability.

The Demonstration's evaluation will align with the goals, measures and monitoring activities outlined in the AHS CQS. AHS will regularly monitor the Demonstration on the key outcome measures and performance targets and make changes as appropriate (obtaining CMS or legislative approval where needed). The CQS is reviewed and updated as needed, but no less than once every three years.

The State must also routinely evaluate policy changes and new initiatives to rapidly assess effectiveness, promote continuous improvement and to identify success and barriers without delay. The State will retain responsibility for conducting rapid cycle assessments for any new payment and service delivery and/or payment reform implemented or supported by the Demonstration (e.g., Next Generation Medicaid ACO) as well as any new Delivery System Reform Investments. Results from the rapid cycle assessments will directly influence decision-making by giving AHS insights into any potential shortcomings, oversights and successes. Documenting the development of new initiatives and their operational impact provides an understanding of the reasons for successful or unsuccessful performance,

provides direction in shaping program modifications and improvement, and provides information about whether evaluation findings can be generalized.

This rapid analysis will be based on grantee reporting, key informant information from the AHS, as well as community leaders, administrators, physician leaders, and others directly responsible for, or knowledgeable about, the new initiative or investment. As appropriate, fiscal analysis will be conducted to analyze expenditure information. Reports will be used to provide program staff with specific details for the month, quarter, or year, and/or provide direction in shaping modifications that may be required to support more effective investments.

This type of rapid cycle approach blurs some of the classic differentiation between formative and summative evaluation approaches. The selection of similar evaluation methods for different purposes will allow the State and providers to focus on adjusting the process aspects of an innovation – while at the same time improving the impact of the innovation overall. It is important to note that the rigor of the evaluation should not be sacrificed for the sake of speed. To do so, advanced statistical methods to measure effectiveness should be used, including the appropriate selection of comparison groups whenever possible.

In practice, this commitment to alignment of performance oversight will create a feedback loop across evaluation activities, rapid cycle assessment reports and summative evaluation findings. This process of regularly measuring, monitoring, and making changes should result in continuous performance improvement in terms of achieving its performance targets and intended outcomes.

B. Summative Evaluation

In addition to the activities described above, summative evaluation techniques will be used to measure how the Demonstration has changed or improved the health and well-being of the GC population. The summative evaluation will address each of the hypotheses identified in Section III A.

Additionally, DVHA and its IGA partners are required to submit annual performance measurement data to AHS. These metrics will be used to help define and measure progress towards the Demonstration's ability to increase access to care; improve quality of care (including outcomes and consumer satisfaction); contain the cost of care and support stable in-home and community alternatives to institutional care for enrollees.

The required performance measures include HEDIS® (see Section III D). DVHA will also be required to report enrollee experience based on the Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS) or CAHPS-like model, with the potential for findings to be supplemented by targeted surveys for special needs populations. Specifically, the State is exploring the use of CAHPS-Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) module for participants in several of its specialized programs. Items under consideration for use are outlined in Exhibit 2 on the following page.

Exhibit 2: Potential CAHPS-HCBS Performance Measures

| Potential CAHPS-HCBS Measures | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Performance Area | Metric |
| Quality of Care | Percent of enrollees who rate the help they get from staff as very good or excellent |
| Health | Percent of enrollees who rate their overall health as good, very good or excellent |
| Courtesy and Respect | Percent of enrollees who report that in the last 3 months, staff usually or always treat them with courtesy and respect |
| Case Manager | Percent of enrollees who rate the help they get from their case manager as very good or excellent |
| Choice and Control | Percentage of people who report that in the last 3 months, their service plan included most or all of things that were important to them |
| Employment | Percent of enrollees who report that in the last 3 months, they usually or always could do things in the community that they liked, when they wanted |

In addition, inpatient and outpatient utilization, cost, and quality indicators for GC enrollees before and after their enrollment in specialized programs and Demonstration initiatives will be analyzed and compared to benchmarks and/or targets to assess the attainment of these goals. This analysis will determine whether statistically significant differences exist year to year in access to care; improved quality of care; cost containment; and stable in-home and community alternatives to institutional care. Annual data will be tracked and trended over time (when available).

Summative evaluation techniques will also be applied to study the impact and effectiveness of IMD services in the Vermont system of care for persons who are experiencing a psychiatric emergency and/or who have substance use disorder treatment needs.

C. Procurement Strategy and Evaluator Qualifications

Procurement for an evaluation contractor to assist the State in executing its Demonstration evaluation plan will be pursuant to the State of Vermont Agency of Administration Bulletin 3.5 processes [found here](#). The State will retain responsibility for rapid cycle assessment reports, monitoring delivery system and other investments and overall Demonstration performance monitoring. Global Commitment to Health HEDIS® measures are independently validated by the State's External Quality Review Organization (EQRO). To mitigate any potential conflict of interest, the evaluation contractor will be responsible for secondary analysis of the State's findings, benchmarking performance to national standards, evaluating changes over time, isolating key variables and interpreting results. As part of the focused IMD evaluation, the evaluator will have responsibility for final measure selection, identifying, if viable other State systems that may serve as comparisons, conducting all data analysis, measuring change overtime and developing sensitivity models as necessary to address study questions.

The State anticipates issuing one procurement for all summative evaluation activities and the production of required CMS reports. Bidders will have the option of working with a subcontractor on the IMD and/or other components of the design. Successful bidders will demonstrate, at a minimum, the following qualifications:

- The extent to which the evaluator can meet State RFP minimum requirements;
- The extent to which the evaluator has sufficient capacity to conduct the proposed evaluation, in terms of technical experience and the size/scale of the evaluation;

- The evaluator's prior experience with similar evaluations;
- Past references; and
- Value, e.g., the assessment of an evaluator's capacity to conduct the proposed evaluation with their cost proposal, with consideration given to those that offer higher quality at a lower cost.

D. Evaluation Budget and Timeline

The State's evaluation budget and timelines are tentative pending procurement of a final evaluation contractor. The budget may be modified if terms of the current Demonstration agreement are amended during the project period. AHS will report on progress and any known challenges to the evaluation budget, timelines and implementation in its quarterly and annual Demonstration reports to CMS. Appendix 1 provides an overview of the AHS tentative evaluation budget. Outlined below and on the following pages are the expected timelines and major evaluation related milestones.

Demo Year 12: (1/1/2017-12/31/2017)

| Activity/Milestone | Extension Year 1 (2017) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | Month | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| Draft Evaluation Design | X | X | | | | | | | | | | X |
| CMS Review | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Incorporate CMS Revisions | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Final Evaluation Design | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Publish Evaluation Design | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Procure Independent Evaluator | | | | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Finalize Research Methods | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Finalize Performance Measures | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Collect, Analyze, Interrupt Data | | | | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Disseminate AHS Rapid Cycle Assessment Findings for Feedback | | | | X | | | X | | | X | | |

Demo Year 13: (1/1/2018-12/31/2018)

| Activity/Milestone | Extension Year 2 (2018) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | Month | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| Collect, Analyze, Interpret Data | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Create Draft Interim Evaluation Report #1 | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disseminate Preliminary Findings for Feedback | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Submit Draft Interim Evaluation Report #1 to CMS (IMD focus) | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Submit Final Interim Evaluation Report #1 to CMS | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| Disseminate AHS Rapid Cycle Assessment Findings for Feedback | | | | X | | | X | | | X | | |

Demo Year 14: (1/1/2019-12/31/2019)

| Activity/Milestone | Extension Year 3 (2019) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | Month | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| Revise design as needed | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Collect, Analyze, Interpret Data | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Disseminate AHS Rapid Cycle Assessment Findings for Feedback | | | | X | | | X | | | X | | |

Demo Year 15: (1/1/2020 – 12/31/2020)

| Activity/Milestone | Extension- Year 4 (2020) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | Month | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| Collect, Analyze, Interpret Data | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Create Draft Interim Evaluation Report #2 | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| Disseminate Interim Evaluation Report #2 Findings for Feedback | | | | | | | | X | X | | | |
| Finalize Draft Interim Evaluation Report #2 | | | | | | | | | | X | X | |
| Submit Interim Evaluation Report #2 to CMS | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| Disseminate AHS Rapid Cycle Assessment Findings for Feedback | | | | X | | | X | | | X | | |

Demo Year 16: (1/1/2021-12/31/2021)

| Activity/Milestone | Extension Year 5 (2021) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | Month | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| Create Draft Summative Evaluation Report #1 | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Submit Draft Summative Evaluation Report #1 to CMS | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Incorporate CMS Comments | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Submit Final IMD Summative Evaluation Report #1 | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| Publish Final Summative Evaluation Report #1 | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Disseminate AHS Rapid Cycle Assessment Findings for Feedback | | | | X | | | X | | | X | | |

Post Demo: (1/1/2022-9/30/2022)

| Activity/Milestone | Post Extension (2022) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | Month | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| Create Draft Summative Evaluation Report #2 | X | X | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Disseminate Draft Summative Evaluation Report #2 Findings for Feedback | | | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Submit Draft Summative Evaluation Report #2 to CMS | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| Incorporate CMS Comment | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| Submit Final Summative Evaluation Report #2 to CMS | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| Publish Final Summative Evaluation Report #2 | | | | | | | | | X | | | |

III. EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODS

In updating its existing Medicaid Demonstration evaluation strategy as reflected in this document, the State has refined overarching Demonstration hypothesis and identified study populations and levels of stratification for specialized programs and projects. The design identifies additional data sources related to IMD study, reviews general methods, data analytics and defines on-going reporting requirements for the term of the Demonstration. However, final techniques, technical specifications and study groups will be determined following the successful procurement and engagement of the independent evaluator.

A. Hypothesis

The State has identified the following overarching hypotheses for the Demonstration.

- ✚ The Demonstration will result in improved access to care;
- ✚ The Demonstration will result in improved quality of care;
- ✚ Value-based payment models will promote access to care and appropriate use of resources;
- ✚ Improved access to preventive care will result in lower overall costs for the healthcare delivery system;
- ✚ Improved access to primary care will result in positive health outcomes;
- ✚ Enhanced care coordination will promote timely access to needed care;
- ✚ The Demonstration will result in enhanced community integration;
- ✚ The Demonstration will maintain or reduce spending in comparison to what would have been spent absent the Demonstration;

B. Study Populations

The evaluation will study the impact of the Demonstration on all enrollees (e.g., total Medicaid population) as well as provide stratification for various hypothesis and key measures by specialized program participants. In addition, focused analysis will address:

- The impact of marketplace subsidies for Qualified Health Plans on continuity of coverage;
- Access to care for children in families who are required to make premium payments;
- Access, cost and quality for substance use disorder and psychiatric IMD services.

An overview of each hypothesis and its expected study populations is provided in Exhibit 3 on the following page.

Exhibit 3: Hypotheses and Study Populations

| Summary of Study Populations by Hypotheses | |
|---|---|
| Demonstration Hypothesis | Study Populations & Levels of Stratification |
| The Demonstration will result in improved access to care | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Medicaid • Specialized Program Enrollees (CFC, CRT, DDS, SUD, TBI) • Children’s Premium Population • VT Premium Assistance (VPA-marketplace subsidies) population • IMD Service Recipients |
| The Demonstration will result in improved quality of care | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Medicaid • Specialized Program Enrollees (CFC, CRT, DDS, SUD, TBI) • Blueprint Advanced Primary Care Practice Enrollees • IMD Service Recipients |
| Value-based payment models will promote access to care and appropriate use of resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACO Attributed Enrollees |
| Improved access to preventive care will result in lower overall costs for the healthcare delivery system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Medicaid • Specialized Program Enrollees (CFC, CRT, DDS, SUD, TBI) |
| Improved access to primary care will result in positive health outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Medicaid • Specialized Program Enrollees (CFC, CRT, DDS, TBI) • Blueprint Advanced Primary Care Practice Enrollees |
| Enhanced care coordination will promote timely access to needed care | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACO Attributed Enrollees • Specialized Program Enrollees (CFC, CRT, DDS, SUD, TBI) • Blueprint Advanced Primary Care Practice Enrollees • VT Chronic Care Initiative Enrollees • IMD Service Recipients |
| The Demonstration will result in enhanced community integration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specialized Program Enrollees (CFC, CRT, DDS, SUD, TBI) • IMD Service Recipients |
| The Demonstration will maintain or reduce spending in comparison to what would have been spent absent the Demonstration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Medicaid |

C. Data Collection and Assurances

Vermont’s public managed care model is managed by AHS through delegation to DVHA. Encounter, claims and cost data is available through the MMIS and will be made available to evaluators as needed for purpose of evaluation. Existing agreements with departments require that all IGA partners under the Demonstration make data available to support evaluations and performance monitoring efforts. AHS does not anticipate problems with data collection and reporting.

AHS will use a variety of sources and methods to test the above hypotheses, including beneficiary surveys and provider claims data. AHS staff and independent evaluators will also analyze data from third-party sources, such as the U.S. Census Bureau and, if available through the All Payer Model, Medicare claims data. Vermont data sources used to evaluate performance against Demonstration goals will include:

- Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) encounter and utilization data from claims
- State Medicaid information system files that include eligibility and enrollment data

- VT Health Connect Premium Assistance (VPA) data files
- Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS)
- DAIL Social Assistance Management System (SAMS)
- ADAP Substance Abuse Treatment Information System (SATIS)
- DMH Monthly Service Reports (MSR)
- VT Health Care Quality Reports prepared by the state's External Quality Review Organization
- Quarterly Ombudsman Reports
- VT Department of Financial Regulation Household Health Insurance Surveys
- VT Department of Labor Employment (DOL)
- VT Department of Health, Healthy Vermonters 2020 Population Health Outcomes
- VT Department of Health, Substance Abuse Treatment Information System (SATIS)
- Vermont Health Care Uniform Reporting and Evaluation System (VHCURES)

To limit administrative burden on providers, consumers and staff and to eliminate duplicate evaluation efforts, this evaluation will coordinate and compile measures from existing evaluation and performance monitoring efforts aimed at studying the impact of various health care initiatives under the Demonstration. A preliminary inventory of existing and planned evaluation and performance monitoring projects are provided in Exhibit 4 below.

Exhibit 4: Existing and Planned Evaluation and Monitoring Projects

| Existing or Planned VT Evaluation Projects | |
|---|--|
| All Payer Model | |
| Vermont Health Care Innovation Project | |
| Medicaid Health Home - Medication Assisted Opioid Treatment | |
| AHS Performance Monitoring Projects | |
| Global Commitment to Health Comprehensive Quality Measures, including HEDIS® | |
| AHS Results Based Accountability Scorecards | |
| Healthy Vermonters 2020 | |
| National Core Indicators Project, Developmental Disability, Aging and Other Disability Programs | |
| Medicaid ACO Quality Measures | |
| Blueprint for Health Multi-Payer Delivery Reform Initiative | |

D. Performance Measures, Data Source, Frequency and Sampling Methods

This Evaluation Plan incorporates the use of performance measures based on the following criteria: 1) evidenced based; 2) potential for improvement; 3) prevalence or incidence; 4) substantial impact on health status and/or health outcomes; 5) Alignment with national measures; and 6) to the extent possible, adaptable measures across various practice settings. The Demonstration uses HEDIS® and AHS Results Based Accountability Scorecards for most of the targeted performance measures. Additionally, the evaluation will align measures and priorities with those collected as part of the All Payer Model Medicare Demonstration Agreement Appendix 1 [Found Here](#) on page 36, which includes alignment with the development of the Global Commitment to Health Medicaid ACO.

Using these measures, AHS will determine whether efforts to improve access (e.g., primary care visits, ED visits, and providers accepting Medicaid), enhance quality (e.g., follow-up after hospitalization, medication management for those with asthma, and patient experience of care), contain costs (e.g., budget neutrality, inpatient, and ED) and improve community integration were achieved. Performance

measures specific to specialized programs and in-home and community services will also be included, such as ability of participants to live longer in their communities and experience an improved quality of life, choice and control.

The performance measures give trend information, which provides guidance in designing focused interventions for quality improvement. Reported HEDIS rates also can be benchmarked to NCQA Medicaid HEDIS means and percentiles, and compared to results from other states. Current performance targets and national benchmarks are identified in the States Comprehensive Quality Strategy [Found Here](#).

One other important source of information to initiate and guide improvement efforts is the beneficiary. The most widely used instrument for collecting reports and ratings of health care services from the beneficiary's perspective is the CAHPS. CAHPS survey data allows entities to: 1) analyze performance compared to benchmarks; 2) identify changes or trends in performance; and/or 3) consider other indicators of performance. Vermont will combine CAHPS data with information collected through periodic surveys of targeted groups of Demonstration enrollees.

Demonstration objectives and performance measures for each hypothesis are presented in Exhibits 5 through 10 starting on page 22. All Exhibits also address data collection methods for each measure, alignment with other State or National measures, sampling methodology, source of data, and frequency of measurement.

Three hypothesis (listed below) will be measured through evaluation efforts associated with the Blueprint for Health Multi-Payer Advance Primary Care Practice initiative:

- ✚ Improved access to primary care will result in positive health outcomes;
- ✚ Enhanced care coordination will promote timely access to needed care; and
- ✚ Improved access to primary care will result in overall lower cost for the healthcare delivery system.

The Blueprint for Health is a state-led, multi-payer program dedicated to achieving well-coordinated and seamless health services, with an emphasis on prevention and wellness. As such, the Blueprint employs several different approaches to incentivizing delivery system reform and increased quality and performance through payment reform. The foundation of the Blueprint model is a Multi-payer Advanced Primary Care Practice (MAPCP) program. Participation is optional for providers, but mandatory for Vermont's commercial payers (with the exception of self-insured plans) and Medicaid.

Current participating payers in the Blueprint for Health include Medicaid, Medicare, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Vermont, MPV and CIGNA. As such, some measures reflect population health outcomes across payers and are not specifically stratified for Medicaid enrollees. As feasible for given available resources, Blueprint performance and evaluation findings may include sub-analysis relative to Medicaid only participants.

Acronyms used in Exhibits 5 through 10 are outlined below:

ACO: Accountable Care Organization

APM: All Payer Model

CC: Chronic Condition

CFC: Choices for Care
CRT: Community Rehabilitation and Treatment
DDS: Developmental Disabilities Services
ED: Emergency Department
EPSDT: Early Periodic Screening Diagnosis & Treatment
HCBS: Home & Community Based Services
LTSS: Long Term Services and Supports
MAT: Medication Assisted Treatment
MMIS: Medicaid Management Information System
NCI-AD: National Core Indicators Aging & Disabilities
NCI-DD: National Core Indicators Developmental Disabilities
QHP: Qualified Health Plan
SUD: Substance Use Disorder
TBI: Traumatic Brain Injury
VCCI: VT Chronic Care Initiative
VPA: Vermont Premium Assistance

Exhibit 5: Access to Care Measures

| Hypothesis: The Demonstration Will Result in Improved Access to Care | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Sampling Methodology | Source of Data | Frequency of Measurement ² | Alignment |
| Ambulatory Care | Percent of adult enrollees who had an ambulatory or preventive care visit | Total Medicaid; Stratification for SUD, DDS, CFC, TBI & CRT | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Well-Child Visits | Percent of children under age 12 who received well-child care from a PCP in accordance with EPSDT periodicity schedule | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | CMS Child Core Set |
| Adolescent Well- Care Visits | Percent of adolescents ages 12 to 21 who receive one or more well-care visits with a PCP during the measurement year | Total Medicaid; Stratification for ACO Attributed Members | MMIS | Annual | CMS Child Core Set All Payer Model |
| Access to Dental Care | Percent of Medicaid enrollees with at least one dental visit | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Emergency Department Visits | Rate of ED visits per 1,000 member months | Total Medicaid; Stratification for SUD, DDS, CFC, TBI & CRT | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| | Rate of Potentially Avoidable ED Utilization | Total Medicaid; Stratification for SUD, DDS, CFC, TBI & CRT | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Inpatient Admissions | Rate of inpatient admissions per 1,000 member months | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| | All cause unplanned admissions for patients with multiple chronic conditions | Medicaid ACO Attributed Members | MMIS | Annual | All Payer Model |
| Effect of Children's Premiums | Percent of families that activate enrollment by paying the first month's premium | Total Premium | Eligibility Records | Annual | N/A |
| Impact of VPA Program | Percent of enrollees receiving VPA subsidy who maintain QHPs with no breaks in coverage | Total VPA | VPA Data | Annual | N/A |
| Getting Needed Care | Percent of survey respondents indicating they received necessary care | Random Medicaid | CAHPS (Adult, Child, Child w/CC) | Annual | CMS Adult & Child Core Measure Set |

² NCI-AD Surveys are expected to start in State Fiscal Year 2018 and be conducted annually thereafter.

Exhibit 5: Access to Care Measures

| Hypothesis: The Demonstration Will Result in Improved Access to Care | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Sampling Methodology | Source of Data | Frequency of Measurement ² | Alignment |
| Physician Participation in Medicaid | Percent of active physicians participating in Medicaid – primary care and specialists | Total Vermont | Vermont Medical Association and MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Health Coverage | Percent of uninsured Vermonters | Total Vermont | Vermont Household Insurance Survey | Every 3 years (2018, 2021) | N/A |
| Mental Health Utilization | Percent of enrollees receiving mental health services | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Substance Use Disorder Treatment Utilization | Percent of enrollees receiving substance use disorder treatment services | Total Medicaid; Stratification for CFC, CRT, DDS | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT) for Opioid Addiction | Number of people receiving MAT per 10,000 Vermonters age 18-64 | Total Vermont | VDH | Quarterly | All Payer Model |
| Drug Over Dose Deaths | Deaths related to drug overdose | Total Vermont | VDH | Annual | All Payer Model |

Exhibit 6: Quality of Care Measures

| Hypothesis: The Demonstration will Result in Improved Quality of Care | | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Sampling Methodology | Source of Data | Frequency of Measurement³ | Alignment |
| Medication Management for People with Asthma | Percent of enrollees receiving appropriate asthma medication management | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | All Payer Model |
| Breast Cancer Screening | Percent of female enrollees age 50 to 74 who receive screening at appropriate intervals | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | CMS Adult Core Set |
| Chlamydia Screening | Percent of female enrollees screened | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | CMS Adult Core Set |
| Follow up after Hospitalization for Mental Illness | Percent of enrollees discharged who had follow-up at 7 & 30 days | Total Medicaid; ACO Attributed Members | MMIS; MSR | Annual | CMS Adult & Child Core Measure Set |
| Substance Use Disorder Treatment | Percent of enrollees using substances who initiate and engage in treatment | Total Medicaid; ACO Attributed Members | MMIS | Annual | CMS Adult Core Set; All Payer Model |
| Health Wellness | The proportion of people who describe their overall health as poor | Random CFC & TBI | NCI-AD | Annual | NCI |
| Health Wellness | The proportion of people described as having poor health | Random DDS | NCI-DD | Annual | NCI |
| Health Plan | Enrollee rating of satisfaction with health plan | Random Medicaid | CAHPS (Adult, Child, Child w/CC) | Annual | CMS Adult & Child Core Measure Set |
| Quick Care | Enrollee rating of ability to get care quickly | Random Medicaid | CAHPS (Adult, Child, Child w/CC) | Annual | CMS Adult & Child Core Measure Set |
| Overall Rating of Care | Enrollee rating of care received | Random Medicaid | CAHPS (Adult, Child, Child w/CC) | Annual | CMS Adult & Child Core Measure Set |
| Customer Service | Enrollee rating of customer service | Random Medicaid | CAHPS (Adult, Child, Child w/CC) | Annual | CMS Adult & Child Core Measure Set |
| Communication | Enrollee rating of how well their physician explains things, listens to their concerns, shows respect and spends enough time with them | Random Medicaid | CAHPS (Adult, Child, Child w/CC) | Annual | CMS Adult & Child Core Measure Set |
| Chronic Care Management | Percent of enrollees with targeted chronic conditions enrolled in chronic care management program | Total VCCI | VCCI Ad hoc reports | Annual | N/A |

³ CAHPS-HCBS Module and NCI-AD Surveys are expected to start in State Fiscal Year 2018 and be conducted annually thereafter.

Exhibit 6: Quality of Care Measures

| Hypothesis: The Demonstration will Result in Improved Quality of Care | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Sampling Methodology | Source of Data | Frequency of Measurement ³ | Alignment |
| Getting Needed LTSS | Proportion of participants needing assistance who always get enough assistance with everyday activities when needed | Random CFC & TBI | NCI- AD | Annual | NCI |
| Getting Needed LTSS | The rate at which people report that they do not get the services they need | Random DDS | NCI- AD | Annual | NCI |

Exhibit 7: Value Based Payment Measures

| Value Based Payment Models will promote Access to Care and Appropriate Use of Resources | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Sampling Methodology | Source of Data | Frequency of Measurement | Alignment |
| ACO Attributed Members | Percent of Medicaid enrollees aligned with ACO | Total Medicaid | Enrollment Files (PCP selection) and MMIS | Annual | All Payer Model |
| ACO Cost Per Enrollee | Cost of Care for Medicaid enrollees aligned with ACO | ACO Attributed Members | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| ACO Access to Mental Health Treatment | 30-day follow-up after discharge from ED for mental health | ACO Attributed Members | MMIS | Annual | All Payer Model |
| ACO Access to Substance Use Disorder Treatment | 7 and 30-day follow-up after discharge from ED for alcohol or other drug dependence mental health | Total Medicaid; ACO Attributed Members | MMIS | Annual | All Payer Model |
| ACO Depression Screening and Follow-up | Screening for clinical depression and follow-up plan | ACO Attributed Members | MMIS; ACO Medical Records | Annual | All Payer Model |
| Prenatal Care | Timeliness of Prenatal Care | ACO Attributed Members | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Prevention | Developmental Screening in the first 3 years of life | ACO Attributed Members | MMIS; ACO Medical Records | Annual | N/A |
| Health Outcomes | Diabetes Mellitus: Hemoglobin A1c poor control (>9%) | ACO Attributed Members | MMIS | Annual | All Payer Model |
| Health Outcomes | Hypertension: Controlling High Blood Pressure | ACO Attributed Members | MMIS | Annual | All Payer Model |

Exhibit 8: Primary Care and Enhanced Care Coordination

| Hypotheses: Improved access to primary care will result in positive health outcomes; Enhanced care coordination will promote timely access to needed care; and Improved access to primary care will result in overall lower cost for the healthcare delivery system | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Sampling Methodology | Source of Data | Frequency of Measurement | Alignment |
| Cost | Total expenditures per capita, excluding specialized program services, for enrollees ages 1-64 years | Blueprint Medicaid Enrollees | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Cost | Specialized Medicaid expenditures per capita, for enrollees ages 1-64 years | Blueprint Medicaid Enrollees | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Access to Care | Enrollee rating of ability to get desired appointment or information | Random Blueprint | CAHPS -PCMH | Annual | Nat'l CAHPS-PCMH |
| Communication | Enrollee rating of how well their physician explains things, listens to their concerns, shows respect and spends enough time with them | Random Blueprint | CAHPS -PCMH | Annual | Nat'l CAHPS-PCMH |
| Health Outcomes & Cost | Number of continuously enrolled members, ages 18-75 whose Diabetes HbA1c was in control compared to those with poor control | Blueprint | VCHURES; Medical Records | Annual | All Payer Model |
| | Number of live births to women aged 15 to 19 years (as a proxy for the teen pregnancy rate). | Blueprint Women's Health Initiative | CDC's Vital Statistics System; Birth Certificate Records; and/or VHCURES. | Annual | Institute of Medicine's recommended indicator measure for unintended pregnancy |
| | Expenditures per capita for continuously enrolled members, ages 18-75 whose Diabetes HbA1c was in control compared to those with poor control | Blueprint | VCHURES; Medical Records | Annual | N/A |
| | Inpatient hospitalizations per 1,000 members for continuously enrolled members, ages 18-75 whose Diabetes HbA1c was in control compared to those with poor control | Blueprint | VCHURES; Medical Records | Annual | N/A |

Exhibit 9: Enhanced Community Integration

| Hypothesis: The Demonstration Will Result in Enhanced Community Integration | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Sampling Methodology | Source of Data | Frequency of Measurement⁴ | Alignment |
| Eliminating Institutional Bias | Average number of people served per month by setting: nursing facility, home, licensed residential facility | Total CFC population | MMIS | Annual | LTSS Re-balancing |
| Community Access | Proportion of people who do things they enjoy outside of their home when and with whom they want to | Random CFC & TBI population | NCI-AD | Annual | NCI |
| Community Access | The proportion of people who regularly participate in everyday integrated activities in their communities | Random DDS population | NCI-DD | Annual | NCI |
| Choice and Control | Proportion of people who can choose or change what kind of services they get and determine how often and when they get them | Random CFC & TBI | NCI-AD | Annual | NCI |
| Choice and Control | The proportion of people who make choices about their everyday lives, including: housing, roommates, daily routines, jobs, support staff or providers, what to spend money on, and social activities | Random DDS | NCI-DD | Annual | NCI |
| Employment | Proportion of people who have a paying job in the community, either full-time or part-time | Random CFC & TBI | NCI-AD | Annual | NCI |
| Employment | Proportion of people who would like a job (if not currently employed) | Random CFC & TBI | NCI-AD | Annual | NCI |
| Employment | The proportion of people who have a job in the community | Random DDS | NCI-DD | Annual | NCI |
| Employment | The proportion of people who do not have a job in the community but would like to have one | Random DDS | NCI-DD | Annual | NCI |
| Employment | Employment rate of people of working age | DDS, TBI, CRT | Vermont Department of Labor; VT Division of Vocational Rehabilitation | Annual | N/A |

⁴ CAHPS-HCBS Module is expected to start in State Fiscal Year 2018 and be conducted annually thereafter.

Exhibit 10: Cost and Budget Neutrality

| The Demonstration will maintain or reduce spending in comparison to what would have been spent absent the Demonstration | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Sampling Methodology | Source of Data | Frequency of Measurement | Alignment |
| Emergency Department Cost | Average annual per enrollee cost of ED visits | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Inpatient Hospital Cost | Average annual per enrollee cost of inpatient hospital | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Pharmacy Cost | Average annual per enrollee cost of prescription drugs | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Total Cost per Enrollee | Average annual total cost per enrollee | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Total Cost per Major Aid Category | Average annual total cost per major aid category group | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Chronic Care Management Costs | Average annual per enrollee costs for chronic care management program participants | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | N/A |
| Budget Neutrality | Actual aggregate expenditures versus budget neutrality limit | Total Medicaid | MMIS | Annual | STC |

E. Methods

Both qualitative and quantitative methods will be used to address the research questions. Qualitative designs will be used to better understand the process of Demonstration implementation, and will include the use of purposeful sampling, interviews, and inductive analysis to discover patterns, themes, and interrelationships.

Quantitative methods will be used to better understand the impact of Demonstration implementation (i.e., the relationship that Demonstration participation has on: access to care; quality of care; cost containment; and stable in-home and community alternatives to institutional care) and will include the use of probability sampling, descriptive/inferential statistics, and deductive analysis to generate relationships between variables that can be generalized to the broader Medicaid population. Methodological considerations are provided below.

Isolation from Other Initiatives

In general, external factors are not expected to significantly affect the assessment of hypotheses presented in this evaluation plan. Over the past several years the State sought to align its health care reforms across all populations and payers. The final Medicaid Demonstration extension and Medicare All Payer Model were designed to create a seamless system. However, where market conditions and other contextual factors (e.g., provider or geographical differences) could have an impact, AHS and its evaluators will develop approaches to quantify and/or isolate the impact of such factors.

Generalizability of Results

Vermont's small size, statewide model and AHS single state agency 'umbrella' structure supports rapid adoption of programs. This provides an ideal environment for testing innovations that can be brought to scale in other states on a county or state-wide level. In several instances, Vermont's health care and long-term service and support programs have become models for other states (e.g., Blueprint for Health, Choices for Care, Self/Surrogate-directed care) It is expected that specific aspects of the Demonstration and its evaluation design will continue to support generalizability.

Data Limitations & Mitigation

Many participants in Vermont's specialized programs are dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid. The absence of Medicare claims data presents challenges for certain metrics such as total cost of care, rates of preventive screens, follow-up after hospitalization. If feasible, the AHS will seek access to Medicare data as part of its involvement in the All Payer Model Medicare Demonstration.

Vermont has been engaged in health care and payment reform since the inception of the Demonstration in 2005. In many cases, specialized programs no longer employ fee-for-service claiming and encounter data may be stored in multiple legacy systems across AHS. In cases where programs have moved away from fee-for-service payment models, modified HEDIS® protocols will be used to assure data is complete and accurately adjusted when stratified for specialized populations.

Two data sets available for benchmarking performance are the VDH Hospital Discharge data and VHCURES. These data warehouses provide valuable information on claims over time, however

information is de-identified. The Blueprint for Health and the Department of Mental Health have employed various techniques to match data and examine population trends overtime and by payer. The DMH technique involves the use of probabilistic estimation. Probabilistic Population Estimation (PPE) is a statistical technique used by DMH that measures the number of people represented in data sets that do not share unique person identifiers. PPE reports how many people are represented in and across data sets without the need for identifiable protected health information.⁵ These estimates are based on a comparison of the observed distribution of dates of birth in HIPAA-compliant "limited data sets" with the expected distribution of dates of birth. The validity and reliability of this procedure have been demonstrated by Banks and Pandiani (2001).⁶ This approach is unobtrusive and it protects the personal privacy of individuals and the confidentiality of medical records because it does not depend on personally identifying information⁷.

Through its analytics vendor Onpoint Health Data Blueprint to Health links clinical data to de-identified VHCURES claims data. Onpoint de-identifies the clinical data using the same algorithms to hash the identifiers as was used by insurers for the VHCURES data, using this method the vendor is able to link records between the two de-identified datasets using the hashed, or encrypted, identifiers.

F. Data Analysis

The evaluation data analysis will consist of both exploratory and descriptive strategies and incorporate univariate, bi-variate, and multi-variate techniques. SAS software will be used to systematically apply statistical and/or logical techniques to describe, summarize, and compare data within the state and across time, and to prepare data, wherever possible in a manner that permits comparison to results from other states applying the same methodology (e.g., HEDIS reports).

Descriptive statistics will be used to describe the basic features of the data and what they depict, and to provide simple summaries about the sample and the measures. Together with simple graphics analysis, the descriptive statistics form the basis of quantitative analysis of data. They are also used to provide simple summaries about the participants and their outcomes. An exploratory data analysis is used to compare many variables in the search for organized patterns. Data will be analyzed as rates, proportions, frequencies, measures of central tendency (e.g., mean, median, mode), and/or qualitatively analyzed for themes.

Whenever possible the evaluation will use longitudinal methods to measure change over time. As available, from other evaluation efforts related to the Demonstration (See Section III C), evaluators may employ secondary analysis to reexamine existing data to address Demonstration hypothesis or isolate Medicaid enrollees from the general population. Difference in Differences and Interrupted Time Series designs are proposed for various aspects of the design. Final determination of methods and analytics will be made following the procurement of an evaluation contractor and review of sample size and available data points over the life of the Demonstration.

⁵ NASMHPD Research Institute, Inc. (2006) <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/839b/1b6326b0142356fe6da4c43d241b41b2432b.pdf>.

⁶ Banks SM & Pandiani JA. (2001) Probabilistic population estimation of the size and overlap of data sets based on date of birth. *Statistics in Medicine*; 20: 1421-1430.

⁷ Pandiani JA, Banks SM & Schacht LM. (1998) Personal privacy vs. public accountability: A technological solution to an ethical dilemma. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research*; 25 (4): 456-463.

Inferential statistics will be used to try to reach conclusions that extend beyond the immediate data alone. Fundamentals statistics will be used to describe inferences about the populations from which they were drawn. Sensitivity analysis to address IMD study questions will be considered.

Comparison Groups

In Vermont's Demonstration, Medicaid eligibility is synonymous with public managed care enrollment making general comparison and/or control groups difficult. Whenever possible matched samples for participants in specialized programs or reform initiatives (e.g., ACO, Blueprint, and Chronic Care Initiative) and those not receiving programs services will be used to explore differences. Synthetic control techniques⁸ will be considered if suitable comparison states and/or data exists. When feasible given sample size, sub-sets of program participants may be compared to statewide or national benchmarks. Additionally, the State will work with its evaluation contractor to determine if neighboring New England or other states may be comparable in size, provider network and reform initiatives.

Population Stratification and Levels of Analysis

Levels of analysis will include the total Medicaid population, specialized program recipients and when appropriate to the study question major Medicaid aid category group (e.g., Aged Blind Disabled, Adults, Children, and MAGI). Please see Exhibits 5 through 10 for proposed stratification and levels of analysis by specialized program and measure.

G. Data Reporting

In addition to the four evaluation report deliverables listed below, the State will compile data and summarize Demonstration performance to-date for CMS in quarterly and annual reports. An independent evaluator will support all Demonstration evaluation reporting requirements.

- Interim Evaluation Report #1 (April 1, 2018)
- Interim Evaluation Report #2 (December 31, 2020)
- Summative Evaluation Report #1 (April 1, 2021)
- Summative Evaluation Report #2 (June 30, 2022)

The independent evaluator will support the State of Vermont efforts to complete rapid cycle assessments for new payment and service delivery reform models including but not limited to ACO model enhancements, efforts to support integration across providers and new delivery system investments.

⁸ Abadie Alberto, Alexis Diamond and Jens Hainmueller" Synthetic Control Methods for Comparative Case Studies: Estimating the Effect of California's Tobacco Control Program" Journal of American Statistical Association Vol. 105, No. 490, 2010 pp. 493-505.

H. Baseline

Vermont's Section 1115 Demonstration has been in operation for 11 years, Vermont's baseline data refers to historical data points available for review, trend analysis and longitudinal examination. Data from the following performance monitoring and existing evaluation efforts can be found online as outlined below.

Blueprint for Health [Found Here](#)

Medicaid HEDIS Measures [Found Here](#)

Medicaid CAHPS Survey Results [Found Here](#)

Medicaid ACO Shared Savings [Found Here](#)

Developmental Disability Services National Core Indicators Results [Found Here](#)

AHS Results Based Scorecards [Found Here](#)

IV. MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER IMD EVALUATION

CMS is continuing time-limited expenditure authority during the extension period (January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2021) for services in several facilities that are IMDs. This authority is pursuant to an evaluation of the IMD role and effectiveness in Vermont’s Medicaid Demonstration. Vermont has agreed to a planning related to IMD phasedown and/or inclusion in a Substance Use Disorder (SUD) treatment amendment, as appropriate, based on the findings of this evaluation and related system of care discussions. This Section of the evaluation plan provides an overview of IMD programs and allowances in Vermont, study questions and tentative design components for both psychiatric and substance use disorder treatment programs.

A. History and Background

As part of its original 1115 Demonstration for the Vermont Health Access Plan (VHAP) Medicaid Expansion, Vermont received a waiver of the IMD exclusion. This waiver, effective January 1, 1996, permitted Vermont to reimburse IMDs for individuals enrolled under the 1115 Demonstration. The rationale behind this waiver was to permit the use of IMDs as alternatives to potentially more costly, general acute hospital services.

The 1115 Demonstration was amended in April 1999 to include the Community Rehabilitation and Treatment (CRT) program for adults who had a severe and persistent mental illness. The CRT model recognized the Department of Mental Health as a managed care entity, responsible for the provision of all behavioral health services in exchange for a capitated payment. Capitation payments included funding for all inpatient hospital services, including the Vermont State Hospital and the Brattleboro Retreat. Prior to approval of the CRT managed care model, Vermont (like several other states) relied on Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) funding as the mechanism to bring federal Medicaid dollars to support its State Hospital.

In 2004, CMS elected to no longer grant IMD waivers under its 1115 Demonstration authority; states with existing IMD waivers (including Vermont) were given a schedule to phase out available Medicaid reimbursement. Under the phase-out terms Vermont was permitted to continue Medicaid reimbursement of IMD services through Calendar Year 2004; reimbursement was limited to 50% of allowable expenditures in Calendar Year 2005. When the former Vermont State Hospital (VT) lost its Medicare certification in 2005, CMS sought assurances that Medicaid funds would not be used to support VT. Vermont removed funding for VT from the CRT capitation rates in 2005. The IMD waiver was completely phased out January 1, 2006.

The Global Commitment to Health Demonstration, approved in 2005, historically enabled Vermont to operate under a statewide, public managed care model. The Global Commitment Demonstration provides the State with additional flexibility regarding health care service financing, including the purchase of healthcare services that are not traditionally covered by Medicaid. In the past Vermont used this authority to purchase alternative services, provided that:

- Services are determined to be medically appropriate;
- Care is delivered by a licensed (and not Medicare de-certified) healthcare provider; and
- Coverage of the service achieves program objectives related to cost, quality and/or access to care in the least restrictive, clinically appropriate setting possible.

Since 2005 Vermont has used its “in lieu of” authority under Global Commitment to purchase in-state residential substance use disorder and inpatient psychiatric treatment in lieu of more costly hospital-based care from several private facilities; Brattleboro Retreat, The Lund Home, Valley Vista and Serenity House.

In 2011, the former State psychiatric hospital was shut down by Tropical Storm Irene. As part of the planning process for building a new 25-bed State psychiatric hospital, post- Tropical Storm Irene, Vermont sought clarification from CMS in 2012 regarding its authority to access Medicaid funding, once certified, to support the new facility. In response to this request, CMS indicated that costs of psychiatric inpatient services for individuals between the ages of 21 and 65 residing in an IMD could not be included in the calculating the annual Medicaid managed care POMPOM limits. However, Vermont was assured that it had authority under the Demonstration to fund IMD services by using its “managed care savings.” Facilities that will be involved in the focused study of mental health and substance use disorder IMD treatment services are described in Exhibit 11 below.

Exhibit 11: Type and Size of IMD Facilities

| Facility | Type and Target Group(s) | Treatment Focus | # of beds |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Lund Home | Residential treatment for pregnant and parenting women w/children under 5 years old. Both mothers and children live on-site. Pregnant women may enroll in the program for the length of their pregnancy and through a post-partum period based on their individual needs | Substance Use Disorder; Mental Health | 26 |
| Valley Vista | Residential treatment for women, men, and adolescents | Substance Use Disorder | 80 |
| Serenity House | Residential treatment adults | Substance Use Disorder | 24 |
| Brattleboro Retreat: Substance Use Disorder | Inpatient detoxification and treatment for adults | Substance Use Disorder | 30 |
| Brattleboro Retreat: Inpatient Psychiatric Hospital | Inpatient stabilization for adults | Psychiatric | 89 |
| Vermont Psychiatric Care Hospital | Inpatient stabilization for adults under the care and custody of DMH | Psychiatric | 25 |

B. Study Questions, Populations and Design

The State is seeking to examine variables related to psychiatric and substance abuse treatment in two separate analysis. Analysis from this study will help inform the State’s decisions related to next steps for substance use disorder and psychiatric treatment capacity, coverage and limitations in Vermont’s system of care. Variables identified for study include, but are not limited to:

- Emergency room utilization;
- Lengths of stay in emergency rooms;
- Access to acute inpatient treatment for mental health and substance use disorders;
- Lengths of stay in acute inpatient settings for treatment for those conditions;

- Quality of acute mental health or substance use disorder treatment;
- Quality of discharge planning in making effective linkages to community-based care;
- Readmissions for inpatient treatment;
- Cost of treatment for acute mental health or substance use disorder conditions;
- Access to care for co-morbid physical health conditions;
- Quality of care for co-morbid physical health conditions; and
- Overall cost of care for mental health and substance use disorders and co-morbid physical conditions combined.

Outlined in the following sub-sections are study questions and design elements for each of the two IMD target areas, psychiatric and substance use disorder treatment.

i. Psychiatric IMD Treatment

The State's two inpatient IMDs provided services for persons who are experiencing psychiatric crisis. Persons receiving inpatient treatment may be enrolled in the DMH Community Rehabilitation and Treatment program or be considered for involuntary admission. In both these cases, individuals must undergo a pre-placement screening by designated DMH crisis screeners. Enhanced care coordination and community service planning is also supported by DMH through utilization management staff in the central office and a network of designated and specialized program providers through-out the state. Persons who are receiving services from independent physicians, psychologists and/or other counselors, not overseen by DMH, are prior approved and reviewed for continued stay and discharge planning support by DVHA staff. The following study questions have been identified:

- ✚ What is the projected impact of eliminating psychiatric IMD capacity upon: emergency room utilization and lengths of stay; access to acute inpatient treatment and length of stay; and cost of community hospital care?
- ✚ Is there capacity in the current community hospital system in Vermont to absorb the downsizing necessary to eliminate IMD claiming?
- ✚ What is the projected impact of removing Federal Financial Participation (FFP) for psychiatric IMD on other services and providers in the community?
- ✚ Do IMD services result in improved quality of care and community integration as evidenced by: lower re-admission rates; stability of housing and/or access to primary care?

Psychiatric Design, Measures and Data Sources

Vermont's IMD facilities are statewide providers. Their state-wideness coupled with the historic nature of the State's funding and utilization of these programs, make evaluation design options such as pre/post Demonstration extension, regional or other in-state comparison groups difficult. However, due to damage to the state psychiatric hospital, associated with Tropical Storm Irene in August of 2011, the State may be in a unique situation to employ interrupted time series and/or sensitivity analysis related to the provision of psychiatric treatment services and impact in the community-based system of care pre/post Tropical Storm Irene.

Specifically, the former 54-bed Vermont State psychiatric hospital, funded primarily through the State general fund, was shut down due to damage sustained during Tropical Storm Irene. Patients and staff were moved into general hospital settings and retrofitted facilities across the State until a replacement facility could be built. During the ensuing 3-year period, the State invested significant resources into mobile outreach, crisis stabilization and psychiatric treatment services in the community. At that time, DMH also initiated a contract for the use of 14-beds at the Brattleboro Retreat.

DMH collects data that includes information on increased community hospital payments, emergency room utilization and wait times, and psychiatric inpatient services for persons who would have otherwise been served at the former State hospital and who require additional resources during their hospitalization (known as patients with a “Level 1” designation). Additionally, DMH has historic data on hospital and temporary facility staffing needed during Tropical Storm Irene. This data and the information available pre/post Tropical Storm Irene and following the opening of the new 25-bed Vermont Psychiatric Care Hospital in July of 2014, may provide valuable insights into the impact of IMD services on the overall service system. Data may allow for the construction of a mathematical model to support sensitivity analysis related to how future changes in psychiatric bed-capacity may impact cost and utilization of other community mental health services. Data sources available for this analysis are detailed below.

- **DMH Core Data Elements** – Identifiable information on all significant dates and times for adults and children waiting for inpatient care under the custody of the commissioner. Data are generally available mid-month after the month of interest.
- **DMH Adult Involuntary Tracking** – Identifiable information on all inpatient admissions under the custody of the commissioner. Data are generally available one month after the quarter of interest.
- **DMH Financials** – Financial tracking and accounting for all payments, including Medicaid that are not processed through the MMIS. Data are generally available one month after the month of interest.
- **DVHA Adult Inpatient Tracking** – Identifiable information on all Medicaid-paid inpatient admissions for adults, including Level 1 inpatient stays. Data are generally available mid-month after the month of interest.
- **VPCH Electronic Health Record** – Identifiable information on all inpatient stays at VPCH, the state-run IMD. VPCH stays are paid by MCO investment and therefore there are no claims presented to Medicaid for those stays. Data are close to real-time and would require HIPPA compliant procedures for access.
- **Brattleboro Retreat (BR) Electronic Health Record** – Identifiable information on all inpatient stays. Data are close to real-time and would require HIPPA compliant procedures for access.
- **VHCURES Data Warehouse** – Unidentifiable information on all paid claims for medical care in Vermont for insurers covering 200+ lives. Matches possible using probabilistic estimation. VPCH is not captured in VHCURES, but BR is captured. Data are generally available one year after quarter of interest.
- **DMH Monthly Service Report** – Identifiable information from community service providers (Designated Agencies) for all services provided via DMH-funded programs. Data are generally

available two months after the month of interest.

- **MMIS** – Identifiable information on all Medicaid-paid claims for care in Vermont. Data are generally available three months after the quarter of interest.
- **VDH General Hospital Discharge Dataset** – Unidentifiable information on all discharges from Vermont hospitals regardless of payer or ability to pay. Data are generally available two to three years after the year of interest.

A list of potential measures is outlined in Exhibit 12 on the following page. This Exhibit provides options for psychiatric IMD measurement. It is not expected that all measures will be included in the final design. Measures will be selected and finalized once procurement of an evaluation contractor is complete and evaluators have had an opportunity to review and discuss available data and sample sizes with AHS, DVHA and DMH staff.

Exhibit 12: Potential Measures for Psychiatric IMD Evaluation

| Potential Psychiatric IMD Treatment Evaluation Measures, Sampling Method & Data Source | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Alignment | Sampling Method | Data Source |
| Emergency Department (ED) Psychiatric Boarding ⁹ | Average number of people per day in ER waiting for inpatient psychiatric care | N/A | Persons in care and custody of DMH | DMH Core Data Elements |
| | Time from need for hospitalization to disposition, less time for medical clearance | | | |
| ED Room utilization ¹⁰ | % population with avoidable ED utilization | HEDIS® | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| | % population ED utilization | HEDIS® | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| Access to acute inpatient treatment for mental health | State Hospital Utilization per 1,000 population | SAMHSA URS | Total Vermont | MMIS |
| | Other Psychiatric Utilization per 1,000 population | SAMHSA URS | Total Vermont | MMIS |
| Lengths of stay (LOS) in acute inpatient psychiatric IMD | Median and Mean LOS for discharged patients | SAMHSA URS | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| | Median and Mean LOS for resident patients in facility ≤ 1 year | SAMHSA URS | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| | Median and Mean LOS for resident patients in facility > 1 year | SAMHSA URS | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| Quality of acute mental health IMD treatment | Hours of physical restraint use | HBIPS-2 | IMD admissions | DMH |
| | Hours of seclusion use | HBIPS-3 | IMD admissions | DMH |
| | Patients discharged on multiple antipsychotic medications with appropriate justification | HBIPS-5 | IMD admissions | Medical Records |
| | Alcohol use screening | SUB-1 | IMD admissions | Medical Records |
| | Alcohol use brief intervention provided or offered and the subset alcohol use brief intervention | SUB-2/-2A | IMD admissions | Medical Records |
| | Tobacco use screening | TOB-1 | IMD admissions | Medical Records |
| | Tobacco use treatment provided or offered and the subset tobacco use treatment | TOB-2/-2A | IMD admissions | Medical Records |
| | Screening for metabolic disorders | IPFQR ¹¹ FY2018 | IMD admissions | Medical Records |
| Experience of Care | Assessment of patient experience of care | IPFQR FY2018 | IMD admissions | CAHPS |
| Quality of discharge planning in making effective linkages to community - based care | Transition record with specified elements received by discharge patients | IPFQR FY2018 | IMD admissions | Medical Records |
| | Timely transition of transition record | IPFQR FY2018 | IMD admissions | Medical Records |
| | Follow-up after hospitalization for mental illness | HEDIS | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| | Transition record with specified elements received by discharge patients | IPFQR FY2018 | IMD admissions | Medical Records |

⁹ Vermont Statutes require people to go to the emergency dept. if inpatient care is needed and a placement cannot be made. Utilization is high because it is SOP for people to arrive at the ED prior to inpatient admission.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ FY2018 Inpatient Psychiatric Facility Quality Review (IPFQR) requirements, Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation: <https://manual.jointcommission.org/Manual/WebHome>.

Exhibit 12: Potential Measures for Psychiatric IMD Evaluation

| Potential Psychiatric IMD Treatment Evaluation Measures, Sampling Method & Data Source | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Alignment | Sampling Method | Data Source |
| Readmissions for IMD inpatient treatment | State Hospital Readmissions: 30 days | SAMHSA URS | IMD admissions | DMH |
| | State Hospital Readmissions: 180 days | SAMHSA URS | IMD admissions | DMH |
| Overall Cost of Care | Average cost per enrollee for IMD services | N/A | IMD admissions | MMIS; DMH Financial Data |
| | Average cost per enrollee for all mental health services | N/A | IMD admissions | MMIS; DMH Financial Data |
| | Average cost per enrollee for all Medicaid services | N/A | IMD admissions | MMIS; DMH Financial Data |
| Quality of care for co-morbid physical health conditions | Preventative care and screening: Adult BMI screening and follow up | CMS NQF 0419 | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| | Controlling high blood pressure (CBP-BH) | NCQA NQF 0018 | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| | Preventative care and screening: unhealthy alcohol use: screening and brief counseling (ASC) | AMA-PCP1 NQF 2152 | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| | Diabetes screening for people with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder who are using antipsychotic medications (SSD) | NCQA NQF 1932 | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| | Diabetes care for people with SMI: Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) poor control (>9.0%)(SMI-PC) | NCQA NQF 2607 | IMD admissions | MMIS |
| | Cardiovascular monitoring for people with cardiovascular disease and schizophrenia (SMC) | NCQA NQF 1933 | IMD admissions | MMIS |

II. Substance Use Disorder IMD Treatment

Substance Use Disorder placement is supported by multiple Medicaid programs across AHS. VDH-ADAP staff review programs and designate program as “preferred providers” certified to receive additional funding from ADAP for underinsured and uninsured Vermonters; while DVHA provides prior approval and level of care screening for residential treatment, detoxification and inpatient care at the Brattleboro Retreat, Valley Vista and Serenity House. Services at the Lund Home for pregnant and parenting women with young children under the age of 5 are authorized by DCF. The following study questions have been identified:

- ✚ How do initiation and engagement rates compare when the index event occurs at: (i) a residential IMD program (ii) a IMD hospital detoxification program (iii) any non-IMD facility?
- ✚ Do IMD services result in improved quality of care and community integration as evidenced by: lower re-admission rates; stability of housing and/or access to primary care?
- ✚ Is the projected amount and scope of IMD services currently planned for adequate to meet the need?
- ✚ What is the impact of IMD capacity on: emergency room utilization and lengths of stay? Access to acute inpatient treatment for substance use disorder and length of stay? Cost of community-based care?

Substance Use Disorder Design, Measures and Data Sources

Vermont’s substance use disorder IMD treatment facilities are statewide providers. Their state-wideness coupled with the historic nature of the State’s funding and utilization of these programs, make evaluation design options such as pre/post Demonstration extension, regional or other in-state comparison groups difficult. The IMD evaluation is designed to measure outcomes for persons who receive residential services in an IMD. Wherever possible IMD enrollees will be compared to non-enrollees on standard measures of cost, quality and access.

Measures supporting the review of quality of care, community integration and the projected impact of including substance use disorder IMD services in the Demonstration are provided on Exhibit 13 on the following page.

Exhibit 13: Potential Measures for SUD IMD Evaluation

| Potential SUD IMD Treatment Evaluation Measures, Sampling Method & Data Source | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Performance Measure | Metric | Sampling Method | Data Source |
| ED Room utilization | % population ED utilization | Total SUD; IMD Admissions | MMIS |
| Inpatient Utilization | Inpatient Utilization per 1,000 population | Total SUD; IMD Admissions | MMIS |
| Access to Residential SUD Treatment | Residential Utilization per 1,000 population | Total Medicaid | MMIS |
| Lengths of stay (LOS) in Residential SUD Treatment | Median and Mean LOS for discharged patients | Total SUD | MMIS |
| Quality of Care | Assessment of patient experience of care | IMD Admissions | Survey |
| Quality of discharge planning in making effective linkages to community -based care | Percent of IMD enrollees using substances who initiate and engage in treatment | IMD Admission | MMIS |
| | Percent of persons discharged who have PCP visit (well or sick) within 30 days of discharge from IMD | IMD Admission | MMIS |
| Readmissions for Same Level of Care | SUD IMD Readmissions: 30 days | Total Medicaid | MMIS |
| | SUD IMD Readmissions: 180 days | Total Medicaid | MMIS |
| | Readmission rates by length of stay (<16 days, 30+ days) | Total Medicaid | MMIS |
| Overall Cost of Care | Average cost per enrollee for IMD services | IMD Admissions | MMIS |
| | Average cost per enrollee for all SUD services | Total Medicaid; IMD Admissions | MMIS |
| | Average cost per enrollee for all Medicaid services | Total Medicaid; IMD Admissions | MMIS |

APPENDIX 1. AHS Tentative Evaluation Budget

Below is the tentative budget for the Vermont Global Commitment to Health 1115 Demonstration Evaluation. The budget includes total estimated costs for each year of the demonstration, as well as an annual breakdown of estimated staff, contractual, administrative, and other costs for all aspects of the evaluation such as any survey and measurement development, quantitative and qualitative data collection and cleaning, analyses, and reports generation.

COST ESTIMATE FOR GLOBAL COMMITMENT TO HEALTH WAIVER EVALUATION for YEAR 12: July 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017

| ITEM | TITLE | RATE per HOUR | Hours | Evaluation Management | Evaluation Design and Planning (Framework, Research Questions, Hypothesis, Survey/Measure development, etc.) | Evaluation Implementation (develop tools, train staff, collect data, etc.) | Data Analysis (data cleaning, etc.) | Communication (prepare reports, communicate, etc.) | Estimated Salary and Contractual Cost | Estimated Fringe Benefits (Internal Staff) | Total Estimated Cost |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| Personnel/Contractual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1115 Waiver | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 52 | x | x | | | x | 2,351.96 | 823.19 | 3,175.15 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 26 | | x | | | x | 1,013.74 | 354.81 | 1,368.55 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 920.14 | 322.05 | 1,242.19 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,014.00 | 354.90 | 1,368.90 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,219.14 | 426.70 | 1,645.84 |
| DVHA | Health Care Project Director | 43.04 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,119.04 | 391.66 | 1,510.70 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|----|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|--------|-----------|
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 52 | x | x | x | | x | 10,400.00 | - | 10,400.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 26 | | x | x | | x | 3,900.00 | - | 3,900.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 26 | | | x | x | x | 2,600.00 | - | 2,600.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 26 | | | x | | x | 1,950.00 | - | 1,950.00 |
| IMD | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 52 | x | x | x | | x | 2,351.96 | 823.19 | 3,175.15 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 26 | | x | x | | x | 1,013.74 | 354.81 | 1,368.55 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 920.14 | 322.05 | 1,242.19 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,045.98 | 366.09 | 1,412.07 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,014.00 | 354.90 | 1,368.90 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,168.18 | 408.86 | 1,577.04 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 52 | x | x | x | | x | 10,400.00 | | 10,400.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 52 | | x | x | x | | 7,800.00 | | 7,800.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 26 | | | | x | | 2,600.00 | | 2,600.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 26 | | | | x | x | 1,950.00 | | 1,950.00 |
| INVESTMENTS | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 52 | x | x | x | x | x | 2,351.96 | 823.19 | 3,175.15 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|--------|----|---|---|---|---|---|----------|--------|----------|
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 52 | x | x | x | x | x | 2,027.48 | 709.62 | 2,737.10 |
| DCF | Director of Operations | 55.59 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,445.34 | 505.87 | 1,951.21 |
| DCF | Senior Policy & Operations | 42.94 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,116.44 | 390.75 | 1,507.19 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 920.14 | 322.05 | 1,242.19 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,045.98 | 366.09 | 1,412.07 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,219.14 | 426.70 | 1,645.84 |
| DAIL | Financial Director II | 40.31 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,048.06 | 366.82 | 1,414.88 |
| DVHA | Quality Improvement Admin | 36.53 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 949.78 | 332.42 | 1,282.20 |
| DVHA | Financial Director IV | 50.52 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,313.52 | 459.73 | 1,773.25 |
| VDH | Performance Improvement Programs | 32.27 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 839.02 | 293.66 | 1,132.68 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 26 | | x | x | x | x | 1,168.18 | 408.86 | 1,577.04 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 26 | x | | | | x | 5,200.00 | | 5,200.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 12 | | | x | | | 1,800.00 | | 1,800.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 0 | | | | | | - | | - |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 12 | | | | | x | 900.00 | | 900.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Salary & Contractual: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Estimated Internal Salary & Fringe Cost | | | | | | | | | 30,597.06 | 10,708.97 | 41,306.03 |
| Total Estimated Contractual Cost | | | | | | | | | 49,500.00 | - | 49,500.00 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | 80,097.06 | 10,708.97 | 90,806.03 |
| Administrative Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Travel | | | | | | | | | | | 1,500.00 |
| Supplies | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Meetings | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | 2,000.00 |
| Other Direct Admin Cost | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | 2,500.00 |
| Indirect Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indirect Cost | 10% of Internal Staff Salary Cost | | | | | | | | 3,059.71 | | 3,059.71 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | 3,059.71 | | 3,059.71 |
| Total Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State of Vermont YR12 Estimated Total Cost: | Grand Total | | | | | | | | SOV YR12 Total | | 96,365.74 |

COST ESTIMATE FOR GLOBAL COMMITMENT TO HEALTH WAIVER EVALUATION for YEAR 13: January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2018

| ITEM | TITLE | RATE per HOUR | Hours | Evaluation Management | Evaluation Design and Planning (Framework, Research Questions, Hypothesis, Survey/Measure development, etc.) | Evaluation Implementation (develop tools, train staff, collect data, etc.) | Data Analysis (data cleaning, etc.) | Communication (prepare reports, communicate, etc.) | Estimated Salary and Contractual Cost | Estimated Fringe Benefits (Internal Staff) | Total Estimated Cost |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| Personnel/Contractual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1115 Waiver | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 52 | | | x | | x | 2,027.48 | 709.62 | 2,737.10 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,028.00 | 709.80 | 2,737.80 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,438.28 | 853.40 | 3,291.68 |
| DVHA | Health Care Project Director | 43.04 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,238.08 | 783.33 | 3,021.41 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 20,800.00 | - | 20,800.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 52 | | | x | | x | 7,800.00 | - | 7,800.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 5,200.00 | - | 5,200.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 3,900.00 | - | 3,900.00 |
| IMD | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | x | x | | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 52 | | x | x | | x | 2,027.48 | 709.62 | 2,737.10 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,091.96 | 732.19 | 2,824.15 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,028.00 | 709.80 | 2,737.80 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,336.36 | 817.73 | 3,154.09 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 104 | x | x | x | | x | 20,800.00 | | 20,800.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 104 | | x | x | x | | 15,600.00 | | 15,600.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 52 | | | | x | | 5,200.00 | | 5,200.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 52 | | | | x | x | 3,900.00 | | 3,900.00 |
| INVESTMENTS | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | x | x | x | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 104 | x | x | x | | x | 4,054.96 | 1,419.24 | 5,474.20 |
| DCF | Director of Operations | 55.59 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,890.68 | 1,011.74 | 3,902.42 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------|----|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| DCF | Senior Policy & Operations | 42.94 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,232.88 | 781.51 | 3,014.39 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,091.96 | 732.19 | 2,824.15 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,438.28 | 853.40 | 3,291.68 |
| DAIL | Financial Director II | 40.31 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,096.12 | 733.64 | 2,829.76 |
| DVHA | Quality Improvement Admin | 36.53 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,899.56 | 664.85 | 2,564.41 |
| DVHA | Financial Director IV | 50.52 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,627.04 | 919.46 | 3,546.50 |
| VDH | Performance Improvement Programs | 32.27 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,678.04 | 587.31 | 2,265.35 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,336.36 | 817.73 | 3,154.09 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 52 | x | | | | x | 10,400.00 | | 10,400.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 24 | | | x | | | 3,600.00 | | 3,600.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 0 | | | | | | - | | - |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 24 | | | | | x | 1,800.00 | | 1,800.00 |
| Salary & Contractual: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Estimated Internal Salary & Fringe Cost | | | | | | | | | 61,194.12 | 21,417.94 | 82,612.06 |
| Total Estimated Contractual Cost | | | | | | | | | 99,000.00 | - | 99,000.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | 160,194.12 | 21,417.94 | 181,612.06 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Travel | | | | | | | | | | | 1,500.00 |
| Supplies | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Meetings | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | 2,000.00 |
| Other Direct Admin Cost | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | 2,500.00 |
| Indirect Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indirect Cost | 10% of Internal Staff Salary Cost | | | | | | | | 6,119.41 | | 6,119.41 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | 6,119.41 | | 6,119.41 |
| Total Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State of Vermont YR13 Estimated Total Cost: | Grand Total | | | | | | | | SOV YR13 Total | | 190,231.47 |

COST ESTIMATE FOR GLOBAL COMMITMENT TO HEALTH WAIVER EVALUATION for YEAR 14: January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019

| ITEM | TITLE | RATE per HOUR | Hours | Evaluation Management | Evaluation Design and Planning (Framework, Research Questions, Hypothesis, Survey/Measure development, etc.) | Evaluation Implementati on (develop tools, train staff, collect data, etc.) | Data Analysis (data cleaning, etc.) | Communication (prepare reports, communicate, etc.) | Estimated Salary and Contractual Cost | Estimated Fringe Benefits (Internal Staff) | Total Estimated Cost |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| Personnel/Contractual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1115 Waiver | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | | | | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 52 | | | | | x | 2,027.48 | 709.62 | 2,737.10 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,028.00 | 709.80 | 2,737.80 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,438.28 | 853.40 | 3,291.68 |
| DVHA | Health Care Project Director | 43.04 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,238.08 | 783.33 | 3,021.41 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 20,800.00 | - | 20,800.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 52 | | | x | | x | 7,800.00 | - | 7,800.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 5,200.00 | - | 5,200.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 52 | | | x | | x | 3,900.00 | - | 3,900.00 |
| IMD | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 52 | | | x | | x | 2,027.48 | 709.62 | 2,737.10 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,091.96 | 732.19 | 2,824.15 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,028.00 | 709.80 | 2,737.80 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,336.36 | 817.73 | 3,154.09 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 20,800.00 | | 20,800.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 104 | | | x | x | | 15,600.00 | | 15,600.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 52 | | | | x | | 5,200.00 | | 5,200.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 52 | | | | x | x | 3,900.00 | | 3,900.00 |
| INVESTMENTS | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | x | x | x | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 104 | x | x | x | x | x | 4,054.96 | 1,419.24 | 5,474.20 |
| DCF | Director of Operations | 55.59 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,890.68 | 1,011.74 | 3,902.42 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------|----|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| DCF | Senior Policy & Operations | 42.94 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,232.88 | 781.51 | 3,014.39 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,091.96 | 732.19 | 2,824.15 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,438.28 | 853.40 | 3,291.68 |
| DAIL | Financial Director II | 40.31 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,096.12 | 733.64 | 2,829.76 |
| DVHA | Quality Improvement Admin | 36.53 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,899.56 | 664.85 | 2,564.41 |
| DVHA | Financial Director IV | 50.52 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,627.04 | 919.46 | 3,546.50 |
| VDH | Performance Improvement Programs | 32.27 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,678.04 | 587.31 | 2,265.35 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,336.36 | 817.73 | 3,154.09 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 52 | x | | | | x | 10,400.00 | | 10,400.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 24 | | | x | | | 3,600.00 | | 3,600.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 0 | | | | | | - | | - |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 24 | | | | | x | 1,800.00 | | 1,800.00 |
| Salary & Contractual: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Estimated Internal Salary & Fringe Cost | | | | | | | | | 61,194.12 | 21,417.94 | 82,612.06 |
| Total Estimated Contractual Cost | | | | | | | | | 99,000.00 | - | 99,000.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | 160,194.12 | 21,417.94 | 181,612.06 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Travel | | | | | | | | | | | 1,500.00 |
| Supplies | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Meetings | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | 2,000.00 |
| Other Direct Admin Cost | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | 2,500.00 |
| Indirect Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indirect Cost | 10% of Internal Staff Salary Cost | | | | | | | | 6,119.41 | | 6,119.41 |
| | Subtotal | | | | | | | | 6,119.41 | | 6,119.41 |
| Total Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State of Vermont YR14 Estimated Total Cost: | Grand Total | | | | | | | | SOV YR14 Total | | 190,231.47 |

COST ESTIMATE FOR GLOBAL COMMITMENT TO HEALTH WAIVER EVALUATION for YEAR 15: January 1, 2020 – December 31, 2020

| ITEM | TITLE | RATE per HOUR | Hours | Evaluation Management | Evaluation Design and Planning (Framework, Research Questions, Hypothesis, Survey/Measure development, etc.) | Evaluation Implementati on (develop tools, train staff, collect data, etc.) | Data Analysis (data cleaning, etc.) | Communication (prepare reports, communicate, etc.) | Estimated Salary and Contractual Cost | Estimated Fringe Benefits (Internal Staff) | Total Estimated Cost |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| Personnel/Contractual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1115 Waiver | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | x | | | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 52 | | x | | | x | 2,027.48 | 709.62 | 2,737.10 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,028.00 | 709.80 | 2,737.80 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,438.28 | 853.40 | 3,291.68 |
| DVHA | Health Care Project Director | 43.04 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,238.08 | 783.33 | 3,021.41 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 104 | x | x | x | | x | 20,800.00 | - | 20,800.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 52 | | | x | | x | 7,800.00 | - | 7,800.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 5,200.00 | - | 5,200.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 52 | | | x | | x | 3,900.00 | - | 3,900.00 |

| IMD | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----------|-----------|
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 52 | | | x | | x | 2,027.48 | 709.62 | 2,737.10 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,091.96 | 732.19 | 2,824.15 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,028.00 | 709.80 | 2,737.80 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,336.36 | 817.73 | 3,154.09 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 20,800.00 | | 20,800.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 104 | | | x | x | | 15,600.00 | | 15,600.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 52 | | | | x | | 5,200.00 | | 5,200.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 52 | | | | x | x | 3,900.00 | | 3,900.00 |
| INVESTMENTS | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | x | x | x | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 104 | x | x | x | x | x | 4,054.96 | 1,419.24 | 5,474.20 |
| DCF | Director of Operations | 55.59 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,890.68 | 1,011.74 | 3,902.42 |
| DCF | Senior Policy & Operations | 42.94 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,232.88 | 781.51 | 3,014.39 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,091.96 | 732.19 | 2,824.15 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,438.28 | 853.40 | 3,291.68 |
| DAIL | Financial Director II | 40.31 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,096.12 | 733.64 | 2,829.76 |
| DVHA | Quality Improvement Admin | 36.53 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,899.56 | 664.85 | 2,564.41 |
| DVHA | Financial Director IV | 50.52 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,627.04 | 919.46 | 3,546.50 |
| VDH | Performance Improvement Programs | 32.27 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,678.04 | 587.31 | 2,265.35 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,336.36 | 817.73 | 3,154.09 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 52 | x | | | | x | 10,400.00 | | 10,400.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 24 | | | x | | | 3,600.00 | | 3,600.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 0 | | | | | | - | | - |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 24 | | | | | x | 1,800.00 | | 1,800.00 |
| Salary & Contractual: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Estimated Internal Salary & Fringe Cost | | | | | | | | | 61,194.12 | 21,417.94 | 82,612.06 |
| Total Estimated Contractual Cost | | | | | | | | | 99,000.00 | - | 99,000.00 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | 160,194.12 | 21,417.94 | 181,612.06 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------|--|-------------------|
| Administrative Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Travel | | | | | | | | | | | 1,500.00 |
| Supplies | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Meetings | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | | 2,000.00 |
| Other Direct Admin Cost | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | | 2,500.00 |
| Indirect Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indirect Cost | 10% of Internal Staff Salary Cost | | | | | | | | 6,119.41 | | 6,119.41 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | 6,119.41 | | 6,119.41 |
| Total Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State of Vermont YR15 Estimated Total Cost: | Grand Total | | | | | | | | SOV YR15 Total | | 190,231.47 |

COST ESTIMATE FOR GLOBAL COMMITMENT TO HEALTH WAIVER EVALUATION for YEAR 16: January 1, 2021 – December 31, 2021

| ITEM | TITLE | RATE per HOUR | Hours | Evaluation Management | Evaluation Design and Planning (Framework, Research Questions, Hypothesis, Survey/Measure development, etc.) | Evaluation Implementa tion (develop tools, train staff, collect data, etc.) | Data Analysis (data cleaning, etc.) | Communication (prepare reports, communicate, etc.) | Estimated Salary and Contractual Cost | Estimated Fringe Benefits (Internal Staff) | Total Estimated Cost |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| Personnel/Contractual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1115 Waiver | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | | | | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 52 | | | | | x | 2,027.48 | 709.62 | 2,737.10 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,028.00 | 709.80 | 2,737.80 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,438.28 | 853.40 | 3,291.68 |
| DVHA | Health Care Project Director | 43.04 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,238.08 | 783.33 | 3,021.41 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 20,800.00 | - | 20,800.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 52 | | | x | | x | 7,800.00 | - | 7,800.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 5,200.00 | - | 5,200.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 52 | | | x | | x | 3,900.00 | - | 3,900.00 |

| IMD | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----------|-----------|
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 52 | | | x | | x | 2,027.48 | 709.62 | 2,737.10 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,091.96 | 732.19 | 2,824.15 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,028.00 | 709.80 | 2,737.80 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 52 | | | x | x | x | 2,336.36 | 817.73 | 3,154.09 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 104 | x | | x | | x | 20,800.00 | | 20,800.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 104 | | | x | x | | 15,600.00 | | 15,600.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 52 | | | | x | | 5,200.00 | | 5,200.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 52 | | | | x | x | 3,900.00 | | 3,900.00 |
| INVESTMENTS | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 104 | x | x | x | x | x | 4,703.92 | 1,646.37 | 6,350.29 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 104 | x | x | x | | x | 4,054.96 | 1,419.24 | 5,474.20 |
| DCF | Director of Operations | 55.59 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,890.68 | 1,011.74 | 3,902.42 |
| DCF | Senior Policy & Operations | 42.94 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,232.88 | 781.51 | 3,014.39 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,840.28 | 644.10 | 2,484.38 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,091.96 | 732.19 | 2,824.15 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,438.28 | 853.40 | 3,291.68 |
| DAIL | Financial Director II | 40.31 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,096.12 | 733.64 | 2,829.76 |
| DVHA | Quality Improvement Admin | 36.53 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,899.56 | 664.85 | 2,564.41 |
| DVHA | Financial Director IV | 50.52 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,627.04 | 919.46 | 3,546.50 |
| VDH | Performance Improvement Programs | 32.27 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 1,678.04 | 587.31 | 2,265.35 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 52 | | x | x | x | x | 2,336.36 | 817.73 | 3,154.09 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 52 | x | | | | x | 10,400.00 | | 10,400.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 24 | | | x | | | 3,600.00 | | 3,600.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 0 | | | | | | - | | - |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 24 | | | | | x | 1,800.00 | | 1,800.00 |
| Salary & Contractual: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Estimated Internal Salary & Fringe Cost | | | | | | | | | 61,194.12 | 21,417.94 | 82,612.06 |
| Total Estimated Contractual Cost | | | | | | | | | 99,000.00 | - | 99,000.00 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | 160,194.12 | 21,417.94 | 181,612.06 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------|--|-------------------|
| Administrative Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Travel | | | | | | | | | | | 1,500.00 |
| Supplies | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Meetings | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | | 2,000.00 |
| Other Direct Admin Cost | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | | 2,500.00 |
| Indirect Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indirect Cost | 10% of Internal Staff Salary Cost | | | | | | | | 6,119.41 | | 6,119.41 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | 6,119.41 | | 6,119.41 |
| Total Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State of Vermont YR16 Estimated Total Cost: | Grand Total | | | | | | | | SOV YR16 Total | | 190,231.47 |

COST ESTIMATE FOR GLOBAL COMMITMENT TO HEALTH WAIVER EVALUATION for Post Demo: January 1, 2022 – September 30, 2022

| ITEM | TITLE | RATE per HOUR | Hours | Evaluation Management | Evaluation Design and Planning (Framework, Research Questions, Hypothesis, Survey/Measure development, etc.) | Evaluation Implementation (develop tools, train staff, collect data, etc.) | Data Analysis (data cleaning, etc.) | Communication (prepare reports, communicate, etc.) | Estimated Salary and Contractual Cost | Estimated Fringe Benefits (Internal Staff) | Total Estimated Cost |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| Personnel/Contractual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1115 Waiver | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 78 | x | | | | x | 3,527.94 | 1,234.78 | 4,762.72 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 39 | | | | | x | 1,520.61 | 532.21 | 2,052.82 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,380.21 | 483.07 | 1,863.28 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,521.00 | 532.35 | 2,053.35 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,828.71 | 640.05 | 2,468.76 |
| DVHA | Health Care Project Director | 43.04 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,678.56 | 587.50 | 2,266.06 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 78 | x | | | | x | 15,600.00 | - | 15,600.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 39 | | | | | x | 5,850.00 | - | 5,850.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 39 | | | | x | x | 3,900.00 | - | 3,900.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 39 | | | | | x | 2,925.00 | - | 2,925.00 |

| IMD | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|--------|----|---|--|--|---|---|-----------|----------|-----------|
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 78 | x | | | | x | 3,527.94 | 1,234.78 | 4,762.72 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 39 | | | | | x | 1,520.61 | 532.21 | 2,052.82 |
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,380.21 | 483.07 | 1,863.28 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,568.97 | 549.14 | 2,118.11 |
| VDH | Director of Perf Mgt & Evaluation | 39.00 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,521.00 | 532.35 | 2,053.35 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,752.27 | 613.29 | 2,365.56 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 78 | x | | | | x | 15,600.00 | | 15,600.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 78 | | | | x | | 11,700.00 | | 11,700.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 39 | | | | x | | 3,900.00 | | 3,900.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 39 | | | | x | x | 2,925.00 | | 2,925.00 |
| INVESTMENTS | | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| AHS | AHS Quality Improvement Manager | 45.23 | 78 | x | | | x | x | 3,527.94 | 1,234.78 | 4,762.72 |
| AHS | Financial Director II | 38.99 | 78 | x | | | | x | 3,041.22 | 1,064.43 | 4,105.65 |
| DCF | Director of Operations | 55.59 | 39 | | | | x | x | 2,168.01 | 758.80 | 2,926.81 |
| DCF | Senior Policy & Operations | 42.94 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,674.66 | 586.13 | 2,260.79 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------|----|---|--|--|---|---|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| DMH | Quality Mgmt Director | 35.39 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,380.21 | 483.07 | 1,863.28 |
| DMH | Financial Director III | 40.23 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,568.97 | 549.14 | 2,118.11 |
| DAIL | Director Policy, Planning & Analysis | 46.89 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,828.71 | 640.05 | 2,468.76 |
| DAIL | Financial Director II | 40.31 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,572.09 | 550.23 | 2,122.32 |
| DVHA | Quality Improvement Admin | 36.53 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,424.67 | 498.63 | 1,923.30 |
| DVHA | Financial Director IV | 50.52 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,970.28 | 689.60 | 2,659.88 |
| VDH | Performance Improvement Programs | 32.27 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,258.53 | 440.49 | 1,699.02 |
| VDH | Financial Manager III | 44.93 | 39 | | | | x | x | 1,752.27 | 613.29 | 2,365.56 |
| Contractor | Project Director | 200.00 | 39 | x | | | | x | 7,800.00 | | 7,800.00 |
| Contractor | Evaluation Lead | 150.00 | 18 | | | | x | | 2,700.00 | | 2,700.00 |
| Contractor | Data Analyst | 100.00 | 0 | | | | | | - | | - |
| Contractor | Evaluation Support | 75.00 | 18 | | | | | x | 1,350.00 | | 1,350.00 |
| Salary & Contractual: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Estimated Internal Salary & Fringe Cost | | | | | | | | | 45,895.59 | 16,063.46 | 61,959.05 |
| Total Estimated Contractual Cost | | | | | | | | | 74,250.00 | - | 74,250.00 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | 120,145.59 | 16,063.46 | 136,209.05 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Administrative Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Travel | | | | | | | | | | | 1,500.00 |
| Supplies | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| Meetings | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | | 2,000.00 |
| Other Direct Admin Cost | | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | | | 2,500.00 |
| Indirect Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indirect Cost | 10% of Internal Staff Salary Cost | | | | | | | | 4,589.56 | | 4,589.56 |
| Subtotal | | | | | | | | | 4,589.56 | | 4,589.56 |
| Total Cost: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State of Vermont Post Demo Estimated Total Cost: | Grand Total | | | | | | | | SOV Post Demo Total | | 143,298.61 |