



New York Department of Health  
Delivery System Reform Incentive  
Payment (DSRIP) Program

DSRIP PPS Application Scoring Guide

September 29, 2014



## Table of Contents

1. Scoring and Funding Overview .....	3
2. PPS Organizational Score (30% of Each Project) .....	4
3. Project Scoring (70% of Each Project) .....	6
4. Summary of Scoring for Organizational (30%) and Project (70%) Scoring .....	9
5. Bonus Points .....	9
6. Minimum Standard for PPS Application (60%) .....	10



## 1. Scoring and Funding Overview

The NY DSRIP PPS Application Evaluation Process will be a competitive process that results in an approved plan and score for each qualifying Performing Provider System (PPS) project. Scores will reflect the overall quality of responses and commitments to implementing the project requirements of the DSRIP program. These scores will drive funding for a five year period contingent on satisfactory performance of each PPS and program.

- PPS funding is determined on a per-project basis
- Between 5 and 11 projects may be pursued by a PPS
- The application score is broken into two parts:
  - PPS Organizational Score
    - Maximum of 30% of the overall application score for each project
    - Organizational scores are based on the evaluation of a number of reviewers (i.e. 5-7)
  - PPS DSRIP Project-Specific Score
    - Maximum of 70% of the overall application score for each project
    - Project scores are (primarily) based on quantitative responses assigned points based on range of responses submitted.
  - Bonus points will be available

This document provides a comprehensive example of how one project would be scored for all sections. The data presented is for illustration purposes only.



## 2. PPS Organizational Score (30% of Each Project)

The Independent Assessor will form a team of evaluators that will independently score specific sections of the application. Each assessor will go through a comprehensive training program prior to the evaluation period. The training will include meetings with NY state agencies such as OMH, OASAS, OPH, and other stakeholders to develop program specific scoring methods. The Independent Assessor will implement a “Two-Pass Scoring Method”. The evaluators will read the PPS Application all the way through one time without scoring. Next, the Independent Assessor will go back and read each proposal again, assigning points to each section. This method helps ensure that the evaluators have a complete understanding of all the applications before points are awarded. The section specific PPS review order will be randomized after each section so that the same PPS is not reviewed in the same order each time. The sections to be scored by the evaluation team include the following; Governance, Community Needs Assessment, PPS Workforce Strategy, Data-Sharing, and Confidentiality & Rapid Cycle Evaluation, PPS Cultural Competency/Health Literacy, and Financial Sustainability.

For each section independent scores will be aggregated to determine the Median, Average, and Trimmed Average (adjusted for scores greater or less than 1.5 standard deviations from the mean). The table below provides an example of how the scoring will work. **We will award the prospective PPS the highest value of the 3 scores.** The example below provides a summary of how a PPS could score by section for each Organizational Score. In this example the 5 independent assessors developed scores for a PPS that ranged from 85.5% to 91.0% when taken individually.

Organizational Application Sections		Evaluator Scores				
Description	Points Possible	1	2	3	4	5
Governance	25.00	18.00	23.00	22.00	24.00	20.00
Community Needs Assessment	25.00	24.00	23.00	21.00	24.00	20.00
PPS Workforce Strategy	20.00	20.00	20.00	17.00	14.00	18.00
Data-Sharing, Confidentiality & Rapid Cycle Evaluation	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	4.00
PPS Cultural Competency/Health Literacy	15.00	14.00	13.00	15.00	12.00	15.00
Financial Sustainability	10.0	7.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	9.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>87.00%</b>	<b>91.00%</b>	<b>86.00%</b>	<b>85.50%</b>	<b>86.00%</b>



The Independent Assessor will then determine the Median, Average, and Trimmed Average (adjusted for scores greater or less than 1.5 standard deviations from the mean) for each project section. The largest value of these 3 calculations will be awarded to the PPS for the Organizational Score (30% of the 100% Score per Project).

Description	Points Possible	Median	Average	Standard Deviation	Trimmed Average
Governance	25.00	22.00	21.40	2.41	21.40
Community Needs Assessment	25.00	23.00	22.40	1.82	22.40
PPS Workforce Strategy	20.00	18.00	17.80	2.49	18.75
Data-Sharing, Confidentiality & Rapid Cycle Evaluation	5.00	4.00	3.90	0.55	4.13
PPS Cultural Competency/Health Literacy	15.00	14.00	13.80	1.30	13.80
Financial Sustainability	10.0	8.00	7.80	0.84	7.80
<b>Total</b>		<b>89.00%</b>	<b>87.10%</b>		<b>88.28%</b>

This score is for the PPS Organizational Application only and will be weighted by 30% in the Project Valuation calculation



### **3. Project Scoring (70% of Each Project)**

The PPS applicants for Domain 2, 3, and 4 projects will be scored based on the quality of the *Project Description and Justification* response, the scale of implementation, and the speed of implementation. The project-specific scoring will be based on a number of variables for each PPS. These metrics include:

- 1) Total number of providers, programs, facilities, or sites that the PPS intends to include for implementation of the project.
- 2) Percentage of safety net providers that the PPS intends to include for implementation of the project.
- 3) Total expected percentage of targeted patients the PPS intends to actively engage for the project.
- 4) Expected timeline for achieving all project requirements.
- 5) Expected timeline for engagement of targeted patients.

*No individually scored project can achieve less than 50% of the points for any project.*

#### **Example of Scoring of Subjective Area of Project Plan Application**

Each Project Plan Application will have a subjective scoring section. Most projects will have 20% of the application points defined by the Project Description and Justification. Some projects will require more subjectively scored areas and others require less. The breakdown of each project is below:

- Project 2.a.i has 40% as subjective and 60% as objective
- Projects 2.a.ii – 2.c.ii and Projects 3.a.i – 3.g.ii have 20% as subjective and 80% as objective
- All Domain 4 projects will be 100% as subjective

For the purposes of this exercise we will assume that the PPS for Project 2.b.i scored 14% of the 20% available for the Ambulatory ICU project.

This score is for the PPS Project Application and will be added to the objective score and then weighted by 70% in the Project Valuation calculation.



Example Scoring of Objective Areas

The example below demonstrates how the Independent Assessor will review a group of 13 PPS(s) that completed an application for Project 2.b.i (Ambulatory ICU). The methodology for 2.b.i requires scoring for 4 individual sections; 1) Number of Ambulatory ICUs, 2) Percentage (%) of Safety Net Providers, 3) Percentage (%) of Targeted Patients Actively Engaged, and 4) Number of Years to Project Implementation. The table below provides an example of how the raw data could be scored for the 13 PPSs.

PPS #	Number of Ambulatory ICUs	Percentage (%) of Safety Net Providers	Percentage (%) of Targeted Patients Actively Engaged	Number of Years to Project Implementation
1	8	50%	10%	3
2	5	60%	20%	3.5
3	6	60%	25%	3
4	8	45%	15%	2
5	12	50%	25%	3
6	10	60%	10%	4
7	11	40%	10%	4
8	10	55%	10%	3.5
9	9	55%	20%	3.5
10	8	60%	16%	3
11	4	65%	15%	2
12	6	50%	15%	3.5
13	18	45%	10%	4



Once the data is grouped the Independent Assessor will divide the dataset for each scored section into four tiers based on the highest response submitted of the 13 PPSs. We then assign each PPS a score (10, 13.33, 16.66, or 20 in this example) based on the individual rank within the 4 quadrants. The table below indicates each PPS(s) score.

PPS #	Number of Ambulatory ICUs (20 Possible Points)	Percentage (%) of Safety Net Providers (20 Possible Points)	Percentage (%) of Targeted Patients Actively Engaged (20 Possible Points)	Number of Years to Project Implementation (20 Possible Points)	Objective Score (80 Possible Points)	Subjective Score (20 Possible Points)	Total Score for Project 2.b.i (as a % of 100 Points)
1	13.3	10.0	10.0	20.0	53.3	14.0	67.3%
2	10.0	16.7	20.0	13.3	60.0	19.0	79.0%
3	10.0	16.7	20.0	20.0	66.7	18.0	84.7%
4	13.3	10.0	13.3	20.0	56.6	18.0	74.6%
5	20.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	70.0	14.0	84.0%
6	16.7	16.7	10.0	10.0	53.4	20.0	73.4%
7	20.0	10.0	10.0				65.0%
8	16.7	13.3	10.0				67.3%
9	16.7	13.3	20.0				80.3%
10	13.3	16.7	16.7	20.0	66.7	14.0	80.7%
11	10.0	20.0	13.3	20.0	63.3	18.0	81.3%
12	10.0	10.0	13.3	13.3	46.6	19.0	65.6%
13	20.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	15.0	65.0%

The objective and subjective score are added together for each project and then weighted by 70% in the Project Valuation calculation





**4. Summary of Scoring for Organizational (30%) and Project (70%) Scoring**

The example provided above produces a total score for Project 2.b.i. The project will be scored and multiplied by the PMPM value for the project. For this example we assume the PPS submitted more than 9 projects and the valuation is \$4.88 PMPM. The PPS Project Score (0.7\*84% = 58.80%) and PPS Organization Score (0.3\*89% = 26.70%) are added together to establish a Total Project Score of 85.50%.

**[\$ per member per month] x [# of members] x [% Application Score] x [# of months] = Project Value**

A	B	C	D (B*C)	E	F	G	H (F+G)	I	J (D*H*I)
Project #	Project Index Score (36/60)	Valuation Benchmark	PMPM	Medicaid Beneficiaries	PPS Project Score (0.7 * 84%)	PPS Organization Score (0.3 * 89%)	PPS Total Score	# of DSRIP Months	Project Value
Project 2.b.i	.60	\$4.88	\$2.93	100,000	58.80%	26.70%	85.50%	60	\$15,020,640.00

**5. Bonus Points**

The PPS will have the opportunity to achieve bonus points on the application for focused initiatives that will help promote the goals of the DSRIP program. The bonus points will be awarded in addition to the calculated application score. The PPS cannot achieve an application score greater than 100% (i.e. the bonus points cannot push a PPS over 100 points).

- Population Health Management (3 Additional Points to Application Score) – Bonus points can be earned if the lead PPS organization has experience and success working on population health management strategies to improve care coordination and decrease hospitalizations within the IDS. The PPS will need to document success (only for Project 2.a.i).
- Workforce Strategies (3 Additional Points to Application Score) – Bonus points can be earned if a PPS has or intends to contract with a proven and experienced entity to help carry out the PPS’ workforce strategy of retraining, redeploying, and recruiting employees. Please provide statistics that demonstrate the results.
- Project 2.d.i - Bonus points will be available for those PPS’ pursuing the 11<sup>th</sup> project.



**6. Minimum Standard for PPS Application (60%)**

Each prospective PPS must achieve a minimum passing score to participate in the DSRIP program. The Independent Assessor will score each project and average the scores across the projects submitted. If the PPS scores **less than an average score of 60%** across all their projects, the application will be failed and sent back to the PPS for remediation.