

FY 14-15 CHILD MEDICAID CLIENT SATISFACTION REPORT

September 2015

This report was produced by Health Services Advisory Group, Inc. for the Colorado Department of Health Care Policy & Financing.



3133 East Camelback Road, Suite 100 • Phoenix, AZ 85016
Phone 602.264.6382 • Fax 602.241.0757

1. Executive Summary	1-1
Non-ACC FFS and RCCO Performance Highlights	1-2
General Child Results	1-2
CCC Results	1-5
DHMC and RMHP Performance Highlights	1-6
General Child Results	1-6
CCC Results	1-10
2. Survey Administration	2-1
Survey Administration and Response Rates	2-1
Survey Administration	2-1
Response Rates	2-3
Child and Respondent Demographics	2-5
Non-ACC FFS and RCCO Child and Respondent Demographics	2-5
DHMC and RMHP Child and Respondent Demographics	2-10
3. Non-ACC FFS and RCCO Results	3-1
General Child Results	3-1
Rates and Proportions	3-1
Global Ratings	3-2
Composite Measures	3-5
Individual Item Measures	3-9
Non-ACC and RCCO Comparisons	3-11
NCQA Comparisons	3-15
CCC Results	3-19
Chronic Conditions Classification	3-19
Global Ratings	3-21
Composite Measures	3-24
Individual Item Measures	3-28
CCC Composites and Items	3-30
Non-ACC and RCCO Comparisons	3-35
RCCO CCC Comparisons	3-37
4. DHMC and RMHP Results	4-1
General Child Results	4-1
Trend Analysis	4-1
Plan Comparisons	4-15
NCQA Comparisons	4-17
CCC Results	4-20
Chronic Conditions Classification	4-20
Trend Analysis	4-21
Plan Comparisons	4-38
5. Recommendations	5-1
General Recommendations	5-1
Priority Assignments	5-1
Global Ratings	5-3
Composite Measures	5-12
Accountability and Improvement of Care	5-21

6. Reader's Guide	6-1
Survey Administration.....	6-1
Survey Overview	6-1
Sampling Procedures.....	6-2
Survey Protocol.....	6-4
Methodology	6-6
Response Rates.....	6-6
Child and Respondent Demographics	6-6
General Child and CCC Results	6-6
Trend Analysis	6-7
Non-ACC and RCCO Comparisons	6-8
Plan Comparisons.....	6-9
NCQA Comparisons.....	6-9
Limitations and Cautions	6-11
Case-Mix Adjustment	6-11
Non-Response Bias	6-11
Causal Inferences	6-11
Survey Vendor Effects	6-11
Baseline FFS and RCCO Results	6-11
National Data Comparisons	6-12
Quality Improvement References	6-13
7. Survey Instrument.....	7-1
8. CD	8-1
CD Contents	8-1

1. Executive Summary

The State of Colorado requires annual administration of client satisfaction surveys to Medicaid clients enrolled in Fee-for-Service (FFS), Denver Health Medicaid Choice (DHMC), and Rocky Mountain Health Plans (RMHP). For FFS, surveyed clients included FFS clients not enrolled in the Accountable Care Collaborative (ACC) and FFS clients enrolled in the seven participating Regional Care Collaborative Organizations (RCCOs).¹⁻¹ The Colorado Department of Health Care Policy & Financing (the Department) contracts with Health Services Advisory Group, Inc. (HSAG) to administer and report the results of the Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS[®]) Health Plan Surveys.^{1-2,1-3,1-4} The goal of the CAHPS Health Plan Surveys is to provide performance feedback that is actionable and will aid in improving overall client satisfaction.

The standardized survey instrument selected for administration was the CAHPS 5.0 Child Medicaid Health Plan Survey with the Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS[®]) supplemental item set and the Children with Chronic Conditions (CCC) measurement set.^{1-5,1-6} The parents or caretakers of child clients enrolled in Colorado Non-ACC FFS, the seven participating RCCOs, DHMC, and RMHP completed the surveys from February to May 2015.

It is important to note that in state fiscal year (SFY) 2014-2015, the sampling approach utilized for the Colorado FFS child population was modified from previous years. In SFY 2014-2015, the sampling approach was modified to 1) select a FFS population not enrolled in a RCCO (i.e., non-ACC clients), 2) only sample RCCO clients that were attributed to a primary care provider (PCP), and 3) select separate samples for each RCCO. Additionally, SFY 2014-2015 is the first year the CAHPS 5.0 Child Medicaid Health Plan Survey with the CCC measurement was administered to non-ACC and RCCO child clients. Given these modifications, the 2015 Colorado Non-ACC FFS and RCCO CAHPS results presented in this report represent a **baseline** assessment of parents'/caretakers' satisfaction with Colorado Non-ACC FFS and participating RCCOs.^{1-7,1-8} Therefore, caution should be exercised when interpreting these results. Table 1-1, on the following page, lists the RCCOs for each region.

¹⁻¹ RCCOs are regional entities of the Accountable Care Collaborative (ACC).

¹⁻² CAHPS[®] is a registered trademark of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ).

¹⁻³ The DHMC CAHPS Child Medicaid Survey administration was performed by Morpace. The RMHP CAHPS Child Medicaid Survey administration was performed by the Center for the Study of Services (CSS).

¹⁻⁴ DHMC and RMHP are managed care plans that serve approximately 8 percent of Colorado's Medicaid population.

¹⁻⁵ HEDIS[®] is a registered trademark of the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA).

¹⁻⁶ It is important to note that for the Colorado Non-ACC FFS, Colorado ACC FFS Program, and seven participating RCCOs, the Department elected not to present the CAHPS survey results for the Rating of Health Plan global rating question and Customer Service composite measure for either the general child or CCC populations; therefore, the CAHPS survey results for the global ratings and composite measures are limited to three global ratings (Rating of All Health Care, Rating of Personal Doctor, and Rating of Specialist Seen Most Often) and four composite measures (Getting Needed Care, Getting Care Quickly, How Well Doctors Communicate, and Shared Decision Making).

¹⁻⁷ The Colorado Non-ACC FFS results presented throughout this report represent the survey results for FFS child clients not enrolled in a RCCO (i.e., non-ACC clients).

¹⁻⁸ The RCCO-level and Colorado FFS ACC Program aggregate-level CAHPS results presented throughout this report represent the survey results for FFS child clients enrolled in one of the seven participating RCCOs who are also attributed to a PCP.

Table 1-1 Participating Colorado RCCOs
Region 1: Rocky Mountain Health Plans
Region 2: Colorado Access
Region 3: Colorado Access
Region 4: Integrated Community Health Partners
Region 5: Colorado Access
Region 6: Colorado Community Health Alliance
Region 7: Community Care of Central Colorado

Non-ACC FFS and RCCO Performance Highlights

The Non-ACC FFS and RCCO Results Section of this report details the CAHPS results for the general child and CCC populations for Colorado Non-ACC FFS, clients enrolled in one of seven participating RCCOs, and the Colorado FFS ACC Program in aggregate (i.e., seven RCCOs combined).

General Child Results

The Non-ACC FFS and RCCO General Child Results subsection of this report details the CAHPS results for the general child population for Colorado Non-ACC FFS, the Colorado FFS ACC Program, and the seven participating RCCOs. The following is a summary of the general child CAHPS performance highlights. The performance highlights are categorized into two major types of analyses performed on the general child CAHPS survey data:

- ◆ Non-ACC and RCCO General Child Comparisons
- ◆ Priority Assignments

The detailed results of the general child CAHPS survey analysis are described in the Non-ACC FFS and RCCO Results Section beginning on page 3-1.

Non-ACC and RCCO General Child Comparisons

In order to identify performance differences in client satisfaction between the non-ACC and ACC general child populations, case-mix adjusted results for Colorado Non-ACC FFS and the Colorado FFS ACC Program were compared to one another using standard statistical tests. In order to identify performance differences in RCCO client satisfaction, case-mix adjusted results for each RCCO were compared to the Colorado FFS ACC Program average using standard statistical tests.¹⁻⁹ These comparisons were performed on the three global ratings, four composite measures, and two individual item measures. The detailed results of the non-ACC and RCCO comparative analysis are described in the Non-ACC FFS and RCCO Results Section beginning on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 1-2 presents the statistically significant results from the non-ACC and ACC general child population comparisons.¹⁻¹⁰

Table 1-2 Non-ACC and ACC Comparisons Highlights: General Child	
Colorado Non-ACC FFS	Colorado FFS ACC Program
↑ Rating of All Health Care	↓ Rating of All Health Care
↑ Rating of Personal Doctor	↓ Rating of Personal Doctor
↑ Statistically better than the comparative population ↓ Statistically worse than the comparative population	

Table 1-3 presents the statistically significant results from the RCCO general child population comparisons.¹⁻¹¹

Table 1-3 RCCO Comparisons Highlights: General Child						
Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7
↑ Shared Decision Making	↑ Getting Needed Care	↑ Rating of All Health Care	↓ Rating of All Health Care	↑ Rating of All Health Care	↓ Getting Needed Care	↓ Shared Decision Making
			↑ Getting Needed Care			
↑ Statistically better than the Colorado FFS ACC Program Average ↓ Statistically worse than the Colorado FFS ACC Program Average						

¹⁻⁹ CAHPS results are known to vary due to differences in respondent age, respondent education level, and member health status. Therefore, the results for the non-ACC and ACC population comparisons and RCCO comparisons were case-mix adjusted for differences in these demographic variables.

¹⁻¹⁰ Caution should be exercised when evaluating the non-ACC and ACC population comparisons, given that population differences may impact results.

¹⁻¹¹ Caution should be exercised when evaluating the RCCO comparisons, given that RCCO differences may impact results.

Priority Assignments

Based on the results of the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) comparisons, priority assignments were derived for each measure.^{1-12,1-13} Measures were assigned into one of four main categories for quality improvement (QI): top, high, moderate, and low priority. Table 1-4 presents the top and high priorities for Colorado Non-ACC FFS and each RCCO.

Table 1-4 Top and High Priorities							
Non-ACC FFS	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7
◆ Getting Needed Care	◆ Rating of All Health Care	◆ Rating of Personal Doctor	◆ Getting Needed Care	◆ Rating of All Health Care	◆ Getting Needed Care	◆ Rating of All Health Care	◆ Rating of All Health Care
◆ Getting Care Quickly	◆ Rating of Personal Doctor ◆ Getting Care Quickly ◆ How Well Doctors Communicate	◆ Getting Care Quickly ◆ How Well Doctors Communicate	◆ Getting Care Quickly	◆ Getting Care Quickly	◆ Getting Care Quickly	◆ Rating of Personal Doctor ◆ Rating of Specialist Seen Most Often ⁺ ◆ Getting Needed Care ◆ Getting Care Quickly	◆ Rating of Personal Doctor ◆ Getting Needed Care ◆ Getting Care Quickly ◆ How Well Doctors Communicate

Please note: CAHPS scores with fewer than 100 respondents are denoted with a cross (+). If there are fewer than 100 respondents for a CAHPS measure, caution should be exercised when interpreting these results.

¹⁻¹² Priority assignments were derived for Non-ACC FFS and each RCCO based on the general child population CAHPS results.

¹⁻¹³ As previously noted, NCQA does not publish benchmarks and thresholds for the Shared Decision Making composite measure, and Coordination of Care and Health Promotion and Education individual item measures; therefore, priority assignments could not be derived for these CAHPS measures.

CCC Results

The Non-ACC FFS and RCCO CCC Results subsection of this report details the CAHPS results for Colorado Non-ACC FFS, the Colorado FFS ACC Program, and the seven participating RCCOs CCC populations. The following is a summary of the CAHPS performance highlights. The detailed results of this analysis are described in the Non-ACC FFS and RCCO Results Section beginning on page 3-31.

Non-ACC and RCCO CCC Comparisons

In order to identify performance differences in the satisfaction of parents/caretakers of children with chronic conditions between the non-ACC and ACC CCC populations, the CCC results for Colorado Non-ACC FFS and the Colorado FFS ACC Program were compared to one another. These comparisons were performed on the three global ratings, four composite measures, two individual item measures, and the five CCC composites and CCC items. Table 1-5 presents the statistically significant results from the non-ACC and ACC CCC population comparisons.

Table 1-5 Non-ACC and ACC Comparisons Highlights: CCC	
Colorado Non-ACC FFS	Colorado FFS ACC Program
↓ Rating of Specialist Seen Most Often	↑ Rating of Specialist Seen Most Often
↑ How Well Doctors Communicate	↓ How Well Doctors Communicate
↑ Family Centered Care (FCC): Getting Needed Information	↓ FCC: Getting Needed Information
↑ Statistically better than the comparative population ↓ Statistically worse than the comparative population	

RCCO CCC Comparisons

In order to identify performance differences in the satisfaction of parents/caretakers of children with chronic conditions between the seven participating RCCOs, the CCC results for each RCCO were compared to the Colorado FFS ACC Program average. These comparisons were performed on the three global ratings, four composite measures, two individual item measures, and the five CCC composites and CCC items. Table 1-6 presents the statistically significant results from the RCCO CCC population comparisons.

Table 1-6 RCCO Comparisons Highlights: CCC						
Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7
None	None	↑ Rating of All Health Care	↓ Rating of All Health Care	None	None	↓ Rating of All Health Care
↑ Statistically better than the Colorado FFS ACC Program Average ↓ Statistically worse than the Colorado FFS ACC Program Average						

DHMC and RMHP Performance Highlights

The DHMC and RMHP Results Section of this report details the CAHPS results for the general child and CCC populations for DHMC, RMHP, and the Colorado Medicaid managed care plans in aggregate (i.e., DHMC and RMHP combined).

General Child Results

The DHMC and RMHP General Child Results subsection of this report details the CAHPS results for the general child population for DHMC, RMHP, and the Colorado Medicaid Managed Care Program. The following is a summary of the general child CAHPS performance highlights. The performance highlights are categorized into four major types of analyses performed on the general child CAHPS survey data:

- ◆ Trend Analysis
- ◆ Plan Comparisons
- ◆ NCQA Comparisons
- ◆ Priority Assignments

The detailed results of the general child CAHPS survey analysis are described in the DHMC and RMHP Results Section beginning on page 4-1.

Trend Analysis

In order to evaluate trends in the Colorado Medicaid managed care plans' client satisfaction for the general child population, HSAG performed a stepwise trend analysis, where applicable. The first step compared the 2015 general child CAHPS results to the 2014 CAHPS results. If the initial 2015 and 2014 trend analysis did not yield any significant differences, then an additional trend analysis was performed between the 2015 and 2013 results for the general child population. The detailed results of the trend analysis are described in the DHMC and RMHP Results Section beginning on page 4-1. Table 1-7 presents the statistically significant results from this analysis.

Table 1-7 Trend Analysis Highlights			
	Colorado Medicaid Managed Care Program	DHMC	RMHP
Global Ratings			
Rating of Personal Doctor	▲	▲	
Composite Measures			
Getting Needed Care	▼		▼
Getting Care Quickly		▼	
How Well Doctors Communicate	▼		
Individual Item Measures			
Health Promotion and Education			▼
▲ Indicates the 2015 score is significantly higher than the 2014 score ▼ Indicates the 2015 score is significantly lower than the 2014 score ▲ Indicates the 2015 score is significantly higher than the 2013 score ▼ Indicates the 2015 score is significantly lower than the 2013 score			

Plan Comparisons

In order to identify performance differences in client satisfaction between the Colorado Medicaid managed care plans' general child populations, case-mix adjusted results for each were compared to one another using standard statistical tests.¹⁻¹⁴ These comparisons were performed on the four global ratings, five composite measures, and two individual item measures. The detailed results of the comparative analysis are described in the DHMC and RMHP Results Section beginning on page 4-15. Table 1-8 presents the statistically significant results from this comparison.¹⁻¹⁵

Table 1-8 Plan Comparisons Highlights: General Child	
DHMC	RMHP
↓ Getting Care Quickly	↑ Getting Care Quickly
↓ How Well Doctors Communicate	↑ How Well Doctors Communicate
↑ Health Promotion and Education	↓ Health Promotion and Education
↑ Statistically better than the comparative plan ↓ Statistically worse than the comparative plan	

¹⁻¹⁴ CAHPS results are known to vary due to differences in respondent age, respondent education level, and member health status. Therefore, the results were case-mix adjusted for differences in these demographic variables.

¹⁻¹⁵ Caution should be exercised when evaluating plan comparisons, given that population and plan differences may impact results.

NCQA Comparisons

Overall client satisfaction ratings for four CAHPS global ratings (Rating of Health Plan, Rating of All Health Care, Rating of Personal Doctor, and Rating of Specialist Seen Most Often) and four composite measures (Getting Needed Care, Getting Care Quickly, How Well Doctors Communicate, and Customer Service) were compared to NCQA’s 2015 HEDIS Benchmarks and Thresholds for Accreditation.^{1-16,1-17} This comparison resulted in ratings of one (★) to five (★★★★★) stars on these CAHPS measures, where one was the lowest possible rating and five was the highest possible rating. The detailed results of this analysis are described in the DHMC and RMHP Results Section beginning on page 4-17. Table 1-9 presents the highlights from this comparison.

Table 1-9 NCQA Comparisons Highlights		
Colorado Medicaid Managed Care Program	DHMC	RMHP
★★★ Rating of Health Plan	★★★★ Rating of Health Plan	★★ Rating of Health Plan
★★★★★ Rating of All Health Care	★★★★★ Rating of All Health Care	★★★★ Rating of All Health Care
★★★★★ Rating of Personal Doctor	★★★★★ Rating of Personal Doctor	★★★★★ Rating of Personal Doctor
★★★★★ Rating of Specialist Seen Most Often	★★★★★ ⁺ Rating of Specialist Seen Most Often	★★★★ ⁺ Rating of Specialist Seen Most Often
★ Getting Needed Care	★ Getting Needed Care	★★ Getting Needed Care
★ Getting Care Quickly	★ Getting Care Quickly	★★★ Getting Care Quickly
★★★★ How Well Doctors Communicate	★★★ How Well Doctors Communicate	★★★★★ How Well Doctors Communicate
★ Customer Service	★ Customer Service	★ Customer Service

Please note: CAHPS scores with fewer than 100 respondents are denoted with a cross (+). If there are fewer than 100 respondents for a CAHPS measure, caution should be exercised when interpreting these results.

¹⁻¹⁶ National Committee for Quality Assurance. *HEDIS Benchmarks and Thresholds for Accreditation 2015*. Washington, DC: NCQA, August 4, 2015.

¹⁻¹⁷ NCQA does not publish benchmarks and thresholds for the Shared Decision Making composite measure, and Coordination of Care and Health Promotion and Education individual item measures; therefore, overall client satisfaction ratings could not be derived for these CAHPS measures.

Priority Assignments

Based on the results of the NCQA comparisons and trend analysis for DHMC’s and RMHP’s general child populations, priority assignments were derived for each measure.¹⁻¹⁸ Measures were assigned into one of four main categories for QI: top, high, moderate, and low priority. Table 1-10 presents the top and high priorities for each plan.

Table 1-10 Top and High Priorities	
DHMC	RMHP
◆ Getting Needed Care	◆ Getting Needed Care
◆ Getting Care Quickly	◆ Rating of Health Plan
◆ Customer Service	◆ Customer Service

CCC Results

The DHMC and RMHP CCC Results subsection of this report details the CAHPS results for the DHMC and RMHP CCC populations. The following is a summary of the highlights of the CCC CAHPS performance highlights. The detailed results of this analysis are described in the DHMC and RMHP Results Section beginning on page 4-20.

CCC Comparisons

In order to identify performance differences in the satisfaction of parents/caretakers of children with chronic conditions between the Colorado Medicaid managed care plans, the CCC population results for each were compared to one another. These comparisons were performed on the four global ratings, five composite measures, two individual item measures, and the CCC composites and CCC items. Table 1-11 presents the statistically significant results from this analysis.

Table 1-11 Plan Comparisons Highlights: CCC	
DHMC	RMHP
↓ Getting Care Quickly	↑ Getting Care Quickly
↑ Statistically better than the comparative plan ↓ Statistically worse than the comparative plan	

¹⁻¹⁸ Priority assignments were derived for each plan based on their general child population CAHPS results.