

Mid-Point Assessment Action Plans: PPS Progress through DY3, Q2

November 2017

Contents

Mid-Point Assessment Recommendation Review

Changes to PPS Reporting

PPS Progress on Mid-Point Assessment Action Plans



Mid-Point Assessment Review



Mid-Point Assessment Recommendation Themes

- 22 of 25 PPS had recommendations as a result of the Mid-Point Assessment process.
 - Total number of recommendations ranged from 1 (3 PPS) to 23 (1 PPS).
- Recommendations were organizational or project specific.
- The most common recommendation was the 'Standard Modification' recommendation from PAOP.
 - 14 of the 25 PPS received this recommendation.

The PPS must develop a detailed plan for engaging partners across all projects with specific focus on Primary Care, Mental Health, Substance Used Disorder providers as well as Community Based Organizations (CBOs). The Plan must outline a detailed timeline for meaningful engagement.

The Plan must also include a description of how the PPS will flow funds to partners so as to ensure success in DSRIP.

The PPS must also submit a detailed report on how the PPS will ensure successful project implementation efforts with special focus on projects identified by the IA as being at risk.

These reports will be reviewed and approved by the IA with feedback from the PAOP prior to April 1, 2017.



Mid-Point Assessment Action Plans

- PPS that received at least one recommendation as a result of the Mid-Point Assessment process were required to complete a Mid-Point Assessment Action Plan.
 - Action Plans were due to the IA by March 10, 2017.
 - Action Plans were available for PAOP and public comment on March 20, 2017.
 - Final IA Approval of the Action Plans was completed by April 30, 2017.
- PPS were required to implement Action Plans by the conclusion of DY3, Q2 (September 30, 2017).
- PPS updates on progress towards implementing the Action Plans were provided as part of the DY3, Q1 PPS Quarterly Report in July 2017 and will provide final updates as part of the DY3, Q2 PPS Quarterly Report in October 2017.



Changes to PPS Reporting



Changes to PPS Reporting

- During the PAOP meetings in February 2017, PPS noted limitations of the current reporting tool, the PIT, for Funds Flow and Partner Engagement.
- In response to this feedback, the IA and DOH, created a new tool, the PIT-Replacement to support the reporting of Funds Flow and Partner Engagement.
 - The PIT-Replacement tool provides PPS with more flexibility in identifying and reporting their partners in the category or categories that most accurately reflect how the partner has been engaged by the PPS.
 - The PIT-Replacement also allows PPS to report their 2nd Tier Funds Flow distributions.
 - The Hospital and Case Management/Health Home categories were broken out in to multiple categories to allow for more discrete reporting of Funds Flow.
- Additional clarification was also provided on the reporting of Funds Flow to the CBO Partner Type Category.
 - This category should represent only the Tier 1 CBOs that have received funds from the PPS. Tier 2 and Tier 3 CBOs would be reflected under the appropriate partner category, such as Mental Health, Substance Abuse, Clinic, or Case Management.



PPS Progress on Action Plans



PPS Progress on Mid-Point Action Plans – Funds Flow

• Through the DY3, Q2 PPS Quarterly Report, PPS have increased the amount of funding distributed to partners relative to the funding distributed at the time of the Mid-Point Assessment.

	Cumulative Funds Flow at MPA (DY2, Q2)	Cumulative Funds Flow at DY3, Q2	Additional Funds Flow since MPA	% Change in Funds Flow
Total Funds Flow	\$414,267,236	\$1,100,047,613	\$685,7800,376	166%
Non-Hospital / Non-PPS PMO Funds Flow	\$113,408,240	\$344,803,581	\$231,395,341	204%

• For the categories highlighted in the Mid-Point Assessment, PPS Funds Flow distributions increased by over 100%.

Partner Category	Cumulative Funds Flow at MPA (DY2, Q2)	Cumulative Funds Flow at DY3, Q2	Additional Funds Flow since MPA	% Change in Funds Flow
Practitioner – Primary Care Provider (PCP)	\$14,659,935	\$63,754,315	\$49,094,381	335%
Mental Health	\$9,741,485	\$35,291,921	\$25,550,436	262%
Substance Abuse	\$4,319,963	\$12,780,469	\$8,460,506	196%
Community Based Organizations	\$11,993,454	\$33,990,664	\$21,997,210	183%



PPS Progress on Mid-Point Action Plans – Funds Flow

	As of MPA (DY2, Q2)		As of D	Y3, Q2	Changes since MPA	
	Funds Distributed	% of Funds Distributed	Funds Distributed	% of Funds Distributed	Funds Distributed	% increase in Funds Disbursed
Practitioner – Primary Care Provider (PCP)	\$14,659,935	3.54%	\$63,754,315	5.80%	\$49,094,381	335%
Practitioner – Non-Primary Care Provider (PCP)	\$2,654,701	0.64%	\$6,223,342	0.57%	\$3,568,641	134%
Hospital	\$121.775,967	29.40%	\$182,521398	16.59%	\$60,745,431	50%
Hospital – IP/ED^	\$0	0.00%	\$147,358,192	13.40%	\$147,358,192	100%
Hospital – Ambulatory^	\$0	0.00%	\$29,612,421	2.69%	\$29,612,421	100%
Clinic	\$29,687,182	7.17%	\$87,904,817	7.99%	\$58,217,635	196%
Case Management / Health Home	\$5,973,274	1.44%	\$17,408,904	1.58%	\$11,435,631	191%
Case Management [^]	\$0	0.00%	\$4,670,951	0.42%	\$4,670,951	100%
Health Home^	\$0	0.00%	\$3,255,815	0.30%	\$3,255,815	100%
Mental Health	\$9,741,485	2.35%	\$35,291,921	3.21%	\$25,550,436	262%
Substance Abuse	\$4,319,963	1.04%	\$12,780,469	1.16%	\$8,460,506	196%
Nursing Home	\$5,476,856	1.32%	\$18,177,581	1.65%	\$12,700,725	232%
Pharmacy	\$305,708	0.07%	\$1,461,616	0.13%	\$1,155,908	378%
Hospice	\$739,659	0.18%	\$3,279,031	0.30%	\$2,539,372	343%
Community Based Organization	\$11,993,454	2.90%	\$33,990,664	3.09%	\$21,997,210	183%
All Other	\$23,297,909	5.62%	\$39,802,885	3.62%	\$16,504,976	71%
Home Care^	\$0	0.00%	\$2,503,255	0.23%	\$2,503,255	100%
PPS PMO	\$179,083,029	43.23%	\$395,752,021	35.98%	\$216,668,992	121%
Other*	\$4,558,116	1.10%	\$14,298,017	1.30%	\$9,739,900	214%
TOTAL – All Categories	\$414,267,236		\$1,100,047,613		\$685,780,376	166%

* Other category includes Partner Type Categories for Uncategorized, Non-PPS Network, County Agency, CBO Tier 3.

^ Hospital – IP/ED, Hospital – Ambulatory, Case Management, Health Home, and Home Care categories are new following MPA.



Department

PPS Progress on Mid-Point Action Plans – Standard Modification Funds Flow

 For the 14 PPS that received the 'Standard Modification' recommendation from PAOP, the overall funding distribution and Non-Hospital/Non-PPS PMO distributions have increased since the Mid-Point Assessment.

	Cumulative Funds Flow at MPA (DY2, Q2)	Cumulative Funds Flow at DY3, Q2	Additional Funds Flow since MPA	% Change in Funds Flow
Total Funds Flow	\$264,754,674	\$699,604,489	\$434,849,814	164%
Non-Hospital / Non-PPS PMO Funds Flow	\$71,559,831	\$210,583,372	\$139,023,541	194%

• For the categories specifically highlighted in the 'Standard Modification' recommendation, PPS Funds Flow distributions increased by over 200%.

Partner Category	Cumulative Funds Flow at MPA (DY2, Q2)	Cumulative Funds Flow at DY3, Q2	Additional Funds Flow since MPA	% Change in Funds Flow
Practitioner – Primary Care Provider (PCP)	\$11,703,793	\$51,322,092	\$39,618,299	339%
Mental Health	\$6,735,971	\$25,234,622	\$18,498,651	275%
Substance Abuse	\$2,669,425	\$8,255,026	\$5,585,601	209%
Community Based Organizations	\$4,283,943	\$13,638,510	\$9,354,567	218%



PPS Progress on Mid-Point Action Plans – Standard Modification Funds Flow

Practitioner – Primary Care Provider (PCP) Practitioner – Non-Primary Care Provider (PCP) Hospital Hospital – IP/ED^ Hospital – Ambulatory^	Funds Distributed \$11,703,793 \$2,136,190 \$72,126,205	% of Funds Distributed 4.42% 0.81%	Funds Distributed \$51,322,092	% of Funds Distributed	Funds Distributed	% of Funds Distributed
Practitioner – Non-Primary Care Provider (PCP) Hospital Hospital – IP/ED^ Hospital – Ambulatory^	\$2,136,190		\$51,322,092			
Hospital Hospital – IP/ED^ Hospital – Ambulatory^		0.919/		7.34%	\$39,618,299	339%
Hospital – IP/ED^ Hospital – Ambulatory^	\$72 126 205	0.01%	\$5,576,547	0.80%	\$3,440,357	161%
Hospital – Ambulatory^	<i>ф. 2, 120,200</i>	27.24%	\$100,475,721	14.36%	\$28,349,516	39%
	\$0	0.00%	\$117,828,496	16.84%	\$117,828,496	100%
linic	\$0	0.00%	\$15,982,839	2.28%	15,982,839	100%
	\$17,886,239	6.76%	\$49,520,263	7.08%	\$31,634,025	177%
Case Management / Health Home	\$3,462,626	1.31%	\$7,214,609	1.03%	\$3,751,982	108%
Case Management [^]	\$0	0.00%	\$1,966,990	0.28%	\$1,996,990	100%
lealth Home^	\$0	0.00%	\$1,145,040	0.16%	\$1,145,040	100%
Nental Health	\$6,735,971	2.54%	\$25,234,622	3.61%	\$18,948,651	275%
Substance Abuse	\$2,669,425	1.01%	\$8,255,026	1.18%	\$5,585,601	209%
Jursing Home	\$1,233,657	0.47%	\$6,340,459	0.91%	\$5,106,802	414%
Pharmacy	\$277,797	0.10%	\$1,214,378	0.17%	\$936,581	337%
lospice	\$563,842	0.21%	\$1,395,542	0.20%	\$831,700	148%
Community Based Organization	\$4,283,943	1.62%	\$13,638,510	1.95%	\$9,354,567	218%
All Other	\$18,748,126	7.08%	\$28,934,675	4.14%	\$10,186,548	54%
Iome Care^	\$0	0.00%	\$1,311,535	0.19%	\$1,311,535	100%
PPS PMO	\$121,068,638	45.73%	\$254,734,060	36.41%	\$133,665,422	110%
Dther*	\$1,858,224	0.70%	\$7,513,086	1.07%	\$5,654,863	304%
OTAL – All Categories	\$264,754,674		\$699,604,489		\$434,849,814	

* Other category includes Partner Type Categories for Uncategorized, Non-PPS Network, County Agency, CBO Tier 3.

^ Hospital – IP/ED, Hospital – Ambulatory, Case Management, Health Home, and Home Care categories are new following MPA.

STATE OF OPPORTUNITY.

PPS Progress on Mid-Point Action Plans – Partner Engagement

- PPS have also made progress in increasing the number of partners engaged across the DSRIP Projects since the Mid-Point Assessment.
 - One PPS saw decreases in the number of engaged partners across multiple categories following the Mid-Point Assessment and has been excluded from these figures to avoid skewing the progress made by the remaining 24 PPS.

	Partner Commitments at DSRIP Application	Partners Engaged at MPA	Partners Engaged as of DY3, Q2	Additional Partners Engaged	% Change in Partners Engaged
Partners Engaged	244,977	228,601	530,188	301,587	132%

- Partner Engagement is defined as the PPS having a direct relationship with a partner as evidenced by a contract or other formal agreement.
 - The contract or formal agreement should identify the services to be provided by the partner on behalf of the PPS and the compensation from the PPS to the partner.
 - Partner compensation may be financial or through the provision of centralized service such as IT or staffing.



PPS Progress on Mid-Point Action Plans – Partner Engagement

		As of MPA (DY2, Q2)		As of D	As of DY3, Q2		Changes since MPA	
	Committed (in DSRIP project Plan Application)	Partners Engaged	% of Committed Partners Engaged	Partners Engaged	% of Committed Partners Engaged	Additional Partners Engaged	% increase in Partners Engaged	
Practitioner – Primary Care	53,417	37,424	70%	84,125	157%	46,701	125%	
Practitioner – Non-Primary Care	106,666	101,356	95%	256,892	241%	155,536	153%	
Hospital	254	700	276%	1,150	453%	450	64%	
Clinic	1,709	1,863	109%	3,105	182%	1,242	67%	
Case Management / Health Home	1,298	1,242	96%	2,199	169%	957	77%	
Mental Health	9,750	9,273	95%	24,113	247%	14,840	160%	
Substance Abuse	1,235	960	78%	1,781	144%	821	86%	
Nursing Home	860	1,104	128%	1,329	155%	225	20%	
Pharmacy	979	324	33%	689	70%	365	113%	
Hospice	96	174	181%	225	234%	51	29%	
Community Based Organization	2,771	2,064	74%	3,303	119%	1,239	60%	
All Other	65,942	72,117	109%	151,277	229%	79,160	110%	
TOTAL – All Partners	244,977	228,601	93%	530,188	216%	301,587	132%	

*Note: Count of committed and engaged partners does not reflect an unduplicated count. PPS could commit to and engage the same partner across multiple projects.

NEW YORK STATE OF

OPPORTUNITY.

Department

PPS Progress on Mid-Point Action Plans – Standard Modification Partner Engagement

- 13 PPS have also made progress in increasing the number of partners engaged across the DSRIP Projects since the Mid-Point Assessment.
 - One PPS saw decreases in the number of engaged partners across multiple categories following the Mid-Point Assessment and has been excluded from these figures to avoid skewing the progress made by the remaining 13 PPS.

	Partner Commitments at DSRIP Application	Partners Engaged at MPA (DY2, Q2)	Partners Engaged as of DY3, Q2	Additional Partners Engaged	% Change in Partners Engaged
Partners Engaged	164,201	147,858	322,818	105,348	71%

 For the categories specifically highlighted in the 'Standard Modification' recommendation, PPS partner engagement increased for those 13 PPS.

	Partner Commitments at DSRIP Application	Partners Engaged at MPA (DY2, Q2)	Partners Engaged as of DY3, Q2	Additional Partners Engaged	% Change in Partners Engaged
Practitioner Primary Care	35,383	23,613	52,118	28,505	121%
Mental Health	6,238	6,145	16,488	10,343	168%
Substance Abuse	751	462	917	455	98%
Community Based Organizations	1,768	469	651	182	39%



PPS Progress on Mid-Point Action Plans – Standard Modification Partner Engagement

		As of MPA	(DY2, Q2)	As of D	Y3, Q2	Changes since MPA	
	Committed (in DSRIP project Plan Application)	Partners Engaged	% of Committed Partners Engaged	Partners Engaged	% of Committed Partners Engaged	Additional Partners Engaged	% increase in Partners Engaged
Practitioner – Primary Care	35,383	23,613	67%	52,118	147%	28,505	121%
Practitioner – Non-Primary Care	74,035	70,819	96%	160,220	216%	89,401	126%
Hospital	150	469	313%	750	500%	281	60%
Clinic	998	1,046	105%	1,659	166%	613	59%
Case Management / Health Home	751	649	86%	1,152	153%	503	78%
Mental Health	6,238	6,145	99%	16,488	264%	10,343	168%
Substance Abuse	751	462	62%	917	122%	455	98%
Nursing Home	467	692	148%	811	174%	119	17%
Pharmacy	849	141	17%	297	35%	156	111%
Hospice	54	113	209%	158	293%	45	40%
Community Based Organization	1,768	469	27%	651	37%	182	39%
All Other	42,757	43,240	101%	87,597	205%	44,357	103%
TOTAL – All Partners	164,201	147,858	90.05%	322,818	197%	174,960	118%

*Note: Count of committed and engaged partners does not reflect an unduplicated count. PPS could commit to and engage the same partner across multiple projects.

NEW YORK STATE OF

OPPORTUNITY.

Department