

Feedback							
There are no errors that do not impact eligibility of approved or denied individuals	Dept Response/Next Steps	There are no errors that impact the eligibility of approved or denied individuals	Dept Response/Next Steps	Measure Elevation	Dept Response/Next Steps	Overall	Dept Response/Next Steps
<p>This is a double negative maybe re-phrase?</p> <p>Could we consider using a word other than "error" something that was incorrect but didn't actually cause an incorrect eligibility determination?</p> <p>reduced to what? Very vague</p> <p>this appears to be a double negative again - confusing; also I think NO errors is unrealistic and sets up everyone for failure</p>	<p>We agree that this is a double-negative and have rephrased to "There are no errors that don't impact eligibility." We welcome feedback if this helps clarify the language. Melissa and Josh M</p> <p>"Error" aligns with federal audit methodology, and our overall goal is to reduce our federal errors; thus, it's best to keep the language in alignment. In addition, we decided to split the measures by impact instead of using terms that could be confusing. Melissa and Josh M</p> <p>In this part of the exercise, we are trying to find sensory evidence of the result happening. It's not a specific target for this project, just what we hope/expect to happen by improving eligibility accuracy. Melissa</p> <p>Result oriented goals are a state of performance that can be continually improved. While no errors may not be realistic to achieve, it should be the goal that we continually strive to achieve. While the goal would be no errors, we understand with system and processes this is unrealistic and will set targets to reach with individual benchmarks for sites as needed- Nicole</p> <p>Although the goal we continually strive to achieve would be no errors, counties would not be held contractually accountable, or corrective actions put in place, when a county does not achieve no errors. Contractual accountability and corrective actions would take place based on benchmarks and targets determined through the PUMP process in coordination with counties.</p>	<p>Shouldn't these be divided by the number of individuals in the sample as a whole instead of by the individuals with an incorrect elig determination?</p> <p>Will there be a definition for an "insufficient guidance error"? It seems very subjective. I agree with the concept, but I also believe that the state and county's definition of "insufficient" could be very different.</p> <p>How would an "insufficient guidance" error be identified/determined during the case review?</p> <p>Shouldn't these be divided by total number of cases - and not incorrect cases? For 1 error divided by 1 incorrect case = 100%, or 1 error divided by 50 cases = 2% (0.02%). The calculation doesn't seem right on some of these-- looks like it will be calculated by error but then out of individuals with errors?</p> <p>"Incorrect Approval Rate" and "Incorrect Denial/Termination Rate" measure descriptions are confusing. It sounds like the goal of the measure is to identify the subset of incorrect approvals and denials/denials, within the subset of incorrect determinations, but it takes several re-readings to get there. Perhaps ask "Approved, denied and terminated" at the end of the sentence to define what "total number of individuals with incorrect eligibility determination" means?</p> <p>These are pretty vague - What makes a "Netel LAC measure" not being called out? Also - what constitutes "less money on" membership increases but error rate stays the same - did we get it?</p> <p>Are numbers 1 and 2 for incorrect or correct determinations essentially the same? For example, we would have a correct rate of 97% and an incorrect rate of 3%. Are both needed?</p> <p>For number 5, if a case has numerous data entry errors would the calculation be impacted if each error rate to be included in the numerator individually? If the case has 1 data entry error or 10 data entry errors, would it be included as 1 in the numerator?</p> <p>On 4-8, shouldn't the denominator be the total number of individuals in the sample size too?</p> <p>For number 6, would it be county responsibility to the missing documentation, if you tell us that another county processed the documentation we will request it from other county or pull it from their document management system if we have access. Melissa</p> <p>I also would agree that if there is a possibility that previous counties be sent requests for verifications from case files that it would be very beneficial to the current county and QC as well.</p>	<p>Yes, the denominator will be changed to number of individuals in the sample. Melissa</p> <p>Yes, we agree that "insufficient guidance" is unclear and could have different definitions. For now, insufficient guidance means that written guidance doesn't exist so the county had to act without proper direction. This definition may evolve over time. Melissa and Josh M</p> <p>See above - for now, insufficient guidance means that the caseworker had to act without proper direction because the state has not issued written guidance. For example, entering bank statements into CBMS. For the SOC, caseworkers are supposed to enter the ending account balance. This requirement is not in writing - it is delivered verbally in the Long-Term care training. Should QA identify an error where the caseworker entered the wrong account balance, the error would go to the state for insufficient guidance. Melissa and Josh M</p> <p>We are re-working the data entry and missing documentation calculations. Melissa</p> <p>Same as above. Melissa</p> <p>I updated the measure so it is no longer identifying the subset of incorrect approvals/denials within the subset of incorrect determinations. The denominator has been changed from individuals with incorrect determinations to individuals sampled. This should make it less confusing. Melissa</p> <p>In this part of the exercise, we are trying to find sensory evidence of the result happening. It's not a specific benchmark/target for this. LAC going well is subjective, but would be sensory evidence. i.e. HCPF Executive Director testimony is less contentious with elected officials. Melissa and Josh M</p> <p>I agree that these are the same measures. Both are not needed so I selected incorrect determination rate and removed the correct determination rate. Melissa</p> <p>We are re-working the data entry and missing documentation error rates and will share those at a later date. Melissa</p> <p>We are re-working these calculations because the original denominator (number of individuals with an incorrect determination) didn't make sense. Melissa</p> <p>No. You will not be required to ask other counties for missing documentation. If you tell us that another county processed the documentation we will request it from other county or pull it from their document management system if we have access. Melissa</p> <p>This is our plan. For example - QA samples an individual with a 1/220 income change. The client provided Anapahoe with check-stubs from their new job. However, the case has been open for 3 years and Denver processed the citizenship verification on 1/1/17. Anapahoe will be required to send the check-stubs to QA, note that another county processed the citizenship, and QA will request the citizenship documentation from Denver. Melissa</p>	<p>This describes incorrect approvals and incorrect denials/denials should this be broken down further to include incorrect approval/denial of MA aid case?</p> <p>Yes, this will be broken down further to highlight which incorrect determinations caused the client to be approved for the incorrect category of assistance. For those that were incorrectly denied and had their benefits terminated, we may track which category of assistance the client SHOULD have been enrolled in. Melissa</p>	<p>Out of the 13 Measures under no errors that impact and don't impact eligibility, will counties be held to a certain percentage in all of these measures or just the rate that calculates the total errors of the total sample under each?</p> <p>Will there be a measure for the correct category or program?</p> <p>What are weasel words?</p>	<p>Generally speaking, measures that are classified as Compliance or Outcome with the Director elevation will be used as accountability measures for corrective action plans and contracts. However, the Department is still determining how the measures selected will be used ongoing. Josh M</p> <p>Yes, these measure(s) will be added. Melissa</p> <p>A "Weasel Word" is a word that has no specific, obvious and singular meaning. Weasel words are identified in the PUMP (Performance Measurement Process) to get result oriented goals everyone understands so that performance measures can be developed around a common understanding of what we are trying to achieve. Nicole</p>	