



State of Oregon 2024 PIP Validation Tool
<PIP Topic>
for <CCO Name>



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

Evaluation Elements	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation		
1.	Review the Selected PIP Topic: The PIP topic should be selected based on data that identify an opportunity for improvement. The topic may also be required by the State. The PIP topic:	
C*	1. Was selected following collection and analysis of data. <i>NA</i> is not applicable to this element for scoring.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>

Results for Step 1									
Total Evaluation Elements					Critical Elements				
Total Evaluation Elements**	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>	Critical Elements***	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

* "C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.
 ** This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.
 *** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

Evaluation Elements	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
---------------------	---------	--------------------------

Performance Improvement Project Validation		
---	--	--

2.	Review the PIP Aim Statement(s): Defining the statement(s) helps maintain the focus of the PIP and sets the framework for data collection, analysis, and interpretation. The statement:	
-----------	--	--

C*	1. Stated the area in need of improvement in clear, concise, and measurable terms. <i>NA</i> is not applicable to this element for scoring.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
-----------	--	--	--

Results for Step 2									
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Total Evaluation Elements					Critical Elements				
Total Evaluation Elements**	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>	Critical Elements***	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

* “C” in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.
 ** This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.
 *** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

Evaluation Elements	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation		
3.	Review the Identified PIP Population: The PIP population must be clearly defined to represent the population to which the PIP Aim statement and indicator(s) apply, without excluding members with special healthcare needs. The PIP population:	
C*	1. Was accurately and completely defined and captured all members to whom the PIP Aim statement(s) applied. <i>NA</i> is not applicable to this element for scoring.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>

Results for Step 3									
Total Evaluation Elements					Critical Elements				
Total Evaluation Elements**	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>	Critical Elements***	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

* “C” in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.
 ** This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.
 *** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

Evaluation Elements	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
---------------------	---------	--------------------------

Performance Improvement Project Validation

4.	Review the Sampling Method: (If sampling was not used, each evaluation element will be scored <i>Not Applicable [NA]</i>). If sampling was used to select members in the population, proper sampling methods are necessary to provide valid and reliable results. Sampling methods:		
	1. Included the sampling frame size for each indicator.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
C*	2. Included the sample size for each indicator.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
	3. Included the margin of error and confidence level for each indicator.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
	4. Described the method used to select the sample.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
C*	5. Allowed for the generalization of results to the population.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	

Results for Step 4

Total Evaluation Elements					Critical Elements				
Total Evaluation Elements**	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>	Critical Elements***	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>
5	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0

* “C” in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.
 ** This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.
 *** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

Evaluation Elements	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
---------------------	---------	--------------------------

Performance Improvement Project Validation		
---	--	--

5.	Review the Selected Performance Indicator(s): A performance indicator is a quantitative or qualitative characteristic or variable that reflects a discrete event or a status that is to be measured. The selected indicator(s) must track performance or improvement over time. The indicator(s) must be objective, clearly, and unambiguously defined, and based on current clinical knowledge or health services research. The indicator(s) of performance:	
C*	1. Were well-defined, objective, and measured changes in health or functional status, member satisfaction, or valid process alternatives.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>
	2. Included the basis on which the indicator(s) was developed, if internally developed.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>

Results for Step 5									
Total Evaluation Elements					Critical Elements				
Total Evaluation Elements**	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>	Critical Elements***	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>
2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

* “C” in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.
 ** This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.
 *** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

Evaluation Elements		Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
6.	Review the Data Collection Procedures: The data collection process must ensure that the data collected on the indicator(s) were valid and reliable. Validity is an indication of the accuracy of the information obtained. Reliability is an indication of the repeatability or reproducibility of a measurement. Data collection procedures included:		
	1. Clearly defined sources of data and data elements collected for the indicator(s). <i>NA is not applicable to this element for scoring.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
C*	2. A clearly defined and systematic process for collecting baseline and remeasurement data for the indicator(s). <i>NA is not applicable to this element for scoring.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
C*	3. A manual data collection tool that ensured consistent and accurate collection of data according to indicator specifications.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
	4. The percentage of reported administrative data completeness at the time the data are generated, and the process used to calculate the percentage.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	

Results for Step 6									
Total Evaluation Elements					Critical Elements				
Total Evaluation Elements**	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>	Critical Elements***	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>
4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0

* "C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.
 ** This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.
 *** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

Evaluation Elements		Scoring		Comments/Recommendations				
Performance Improvement Project Validation								
7.	Review Data Analysis and Interpretation of Results: Clearly present the results for each indicator. Describe the data analysis performed, the results of the statistical analysis, and a narrative interpretation for each indicator. Through data analysis and interpretation, real improvement, as well as sustained improvement, can be determined. The data analysis and interpretation of the indicator outcomes:							
C*	1. Included accurate, clear, consistent, and easily understood information in the data table.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>						
	2. Included a narrative interpretation of results that addressed all requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>						
	3. Addressed factors that threatened the validity of the data reported and ability to compare the initial measurement with the remeasurement.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>						
Results for Step 7								
Total Evaluation Elements				Critical Elements				
Total Evaluation Elements**	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	Critical Elements***	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>
3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

* "C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.
 ** This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.
 *** This is the total number of *critical* evaluation elements for this step.

Evaluation Elements	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation		
8.	Assess the Improvement Strategies: Interventions were developed to address causes/barriers identified through a continuous cycle of data measurement and data analysis. The improvement strategies were developed from an ongoing quality improvement process that included:	
C*	1. A causal/barrier analysis with a clearly documented team, process/steps, and quality improvement tools. <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
C*	2. Interventions that were logically linked to identified barriers and have the potential to impact indicator outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
	3. Interventions that were implemented in a timely manner to allow for impact of indicator outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
C*	4. An evaluation of effectiveness for each individual intervention. <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	
	5. Interventions that were adopted, adapted, abandoned, or continued based on evaluation data. <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>	

Results for Step 8									
Total Evaluation Elements					Critical Elements				
Total Evaluation Elements**	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>	Critical Elements***	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>
5	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0

* "C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.
 ** This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.
 *** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

Evaluation Elements		Scoring		Comments/ Recommendations					
Performance Improvement Project Validation									
9.	Assess the likelihood that Significant and Sustained Improvement Occurred: Improvement in performance is evaluated based on evidence that there was improvement over baseline indicator performance. Sustained improvement is assessed after improvement over baseline indicator performance has been demonstrated. Sustained improvement is achieved when repeated measurements over comparable time periods demonstrate continued improvement over baseline indicator performance.								
C*	1. The remeasurement methodology was the same as the baseline methodology.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>							
	2. There was improvement over baseline performance across all performance indicators.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>							
	3. There was statistically significant improvement (95 percent confidence level, $p < 0.05$) over the baseline across all performance indicators.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>							
	4. Sustained statistically significant improvement over baseline indicator performance across all indicators was demonstrated through repeated measurements over comparable time periods.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Met</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>NA</i>							
Results for Step 9									
Total Evaluation Elements				Critical Elements					
Total Evaluation Elements**	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>	Critical Elements***	<i>Met</i>	<i>Partially Met</i>	<i>Not Met</i>	<i>NA</i>
4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

* "C" in this column denotes a *critical* evaluation element.
 ** This is the total number of *all* evaluation elements for this step.
 *** This is the total number of *critical* evaluation elements for this step.

Table 1—2024 PIP Validation Tool Scores
 for <PIP Topic> for <CCO Name>

Review Step	Total Possible Evaluation Elements (Including Critical Elements)	Total Met	Total Partially Met	Total Not Met	Total NA	Total Possible Critical Elements	Total Critical Elements Met	Total Critical Elements Partially Met	Total Critical Elements Not Met	Total Critical Elements NA
1. Review the Selected PIP Topic	1					1				
2. Review the PIP Aim Statement(s)	1					1				
3. Review the Identified PIP Population	1					1				
4. Review the Sampling Method	5					2				
5. Review the Selected Performance Indicator(s)	2					1				
6. Review the Data Collection Procedures	4					2				
7. Review Data Analysis and Interpretation of Results	3					1				
8. Assess the Improvement Strategies	5					3				
9. Assess the Likelihood that Significant and Sustained Improvement Occurred	4					1				
Totals for All Steps	26					13				

Table 2—2024 Overall Confidence of Adherence to Acceptable Methodology for All Phases of PIP (Step 1 through Step 8). for <PIP Topic> for <CCO Name>	
Percentage Score of Evaluation Elements <i>Met</i> *	%
Percentage Score of Critical Elements <i>Met</i> **	%
Confidence Level***	<High Confidence, Moderate Confidence, Low Confidence, No Confidence>

Table 3—2024 Overall Confidence That the PIP Achieved Significant Improvement (Step 9). for <PIP Topic> for <CCO Name>	
Percentage Score of Evaluation Elements <i>Met</i> *	%
Percentage Score of Critical Elements <i>Met</i> **	%
Confidence Level***	<High Confidence, Moderate Confidence, Low Confidence, No Confidence>

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

* The percentage score of evaluation elements *Met* is calculated by dividing the total *Met* by the sum of all evaluation elements *Met*, *Partially Met*, and *Not Met*.

** The percentage score of critical elements *Met* is calculated by dividing the total critical elements *Met* by the sum of the critical elements *Met*, *Partially Met*, and *Not Met*.

*** Confidence Level: See confidence level definitions on next page.

EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF PIP RESULTS

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

- High Confidence:*** *High confidence* in reported PIP results. All critical evaluation elements were *Met*, and 90 percent to 100 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met* across all steps.
- Moderate Confidence:*** *Moderate confidence* in reported PIP results. All critical evaluation elements were *Met*, and 80 percent to 89 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met* across all steps.
- Low Confidence:*** *Low confidence* in reported PIP results. Across all steps, 65 percent to 79 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met*; or one or more critical evaluation elements were *Partially Met*.
- No Confidence:*** *No confidence* in reported PIP results. Across all steps, less than 65 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met*; or one or more critical evaluation elements were *Not Met*.

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

EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF PIP RESULTS

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

- High Confidence:** All performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
- To receive *Moderate Confidence* for significant improvement, one of the three scenarios below occurred:
- Moderate Confidence:**
1. All performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline, **and** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
 2. All performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline, **and** none of the performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
 3. Some but not all performance indicators demonstrated improvement over baseline, **and** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over baseline.
- Low Confidence:** The remeasurement methodology was not the same as the baseline methodology for at least one performance indicator **or** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline and none of the performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.
- No Confidence:** The remeasurement methodology was not the same as the baseline methodology for all performance indicators **or** none of the performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline.

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