

**Clinical Workgroup  
MEETING MINUTES**

DATE AND TIME	LOCATION
Friday, March 17, 2023 9:00 – 10:00am EST	VIRTUAL via TEAMS
ADVISORY COMMITTEE	
<b>Member List Below</b>	
<b>Meeting Cadence: Bi-Weekly Meetings via Webex Meeting:</b> WV NF Clinical Workgroup	

**Attendees\*:**

	Present?	Attendee	Present?	Attendee
Invitees:	X	Alex Montileone		Kourtney Pennington
		Barbara Skeen	X	Lori Greer-Harris
	X	Catie Mellott		Marty Wright
		Dan Brendel		Mary Agnes Argento
		Dee Adkins		Matthew Campbell
		Holly Estel		Melanie Dempsey
	X	Jeff Bush		Terry McGee
	X	Jennifer Gregory		Todd Jones
	X	Kerry Weaver		Nathan Hanshaw

\*Not inclusive of Call-in Users.

AGENDA ITEMS	LEAD	DURATION (MINS)
<b>1. Roll Call and Housekeeping</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above attendance</li> </ul>	Myers and Stauffer	1
<b>2. VBP Model Discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workgroup: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Had a call and still evaluating Special Considerations, looking at them from a Tier stand point because at any point our centers (not many) could fall out of the Tiers period.</li> <li>When seeing those 1-2 centers falling out or a new facility comes on board, are they able to still receive dollars? What would we have to look at for cut points to make sure they got in?</li> </ul> </li> <li>M&amp;S: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If have anything can share with us between calls, please do, so we can work on the modeling because looking at the end of April for having decisions made and finalizing rule language.</li> <li>Could build into the formula that they get put at State-wide average or use the middle Tier point values.</li> <li>There are two different situations for facilities without sufficient data. Either they have data in some categories but not all, or they are</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Workgroup	7

<p>blank across the board. Consider State-wide average across the board for new facilities or low volume. Recommend for blanks within the data set, but not low volume or new facility, pull State average for just the missing score.</p>		
<p><b>3. Special Population Analysis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M&amp;S: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Looking at just the Behavioral indicators we did some additional modeling. Looking at the same markers as the Massachusetts’s model and just looking at a percentage total, and impacted days at a \$50 payment rate. That comes to about \$6 - \$6.5 million for that pool of payments. Took that and added it to the total Quality Add-on pool, and the Special Population pool at \$6.3 million. That leaves \$50 million for the Quality metrics above. Added columns so can see the total Quality payments in an annualized per diem. Which is inclusive of the Quality metrics and the Special Population payment.</li> <li>○ The actual incentive marker is up in the air, but if can agree on an approach, then we can start looking at what makes a facility qualified to participate in this pool. The idea is have to quality to participate in this pool, then the pool of qualified provider days is what’s used to determine your payout. That way no money is left in the pool because only looking at qualified days, not the total State-wide days. Only the Medicaid days that would match the assessment of this trigger that would be used for the calculation of payment from this pool.</li> <li>○ Will put a note at the bottom of the draft Model explaining exactly what markers are being used.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Workgroup: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kind of like a Foundation payment. Facility does something specific per quarter and that would make them eligible to participate in receiving the funds.</li> <li>○ Wants the draft of the Model to evaluate with the other groups.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Myers and Stauffer</p>	<p>13</p>
<p><b>4. Decision Matrix Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M&amp;S: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will be able to finalize the last Decisions once have some updated Modeling information and after some additional discussions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Myers and Stauffer</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><b>5. Open Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workgroup: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Nursing home compare information data won’t come out until mid-April, so we can see how it would pull into this Model.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• M&amp;S: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will have that data the 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday in April.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>All</p>	<p>2</p>

MEETING ACTION ITEMS AND DECISIONS MADE		
Status	Task	Assigned To
<b>Pending</b>	<p><b>Action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M&amp;S: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Send updated draft of Model to Workgroup</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Myers and Stauffer</p>

<b>Complete</b>	<b>Decision Made:</b>	<b>All</b>
-----------------	-----------------------	------------