

ATLIS Year 2 Assessment Framework MCO Survey

This survey gathers Managed Care Organization (MCO) feedback on the overall Year 2 Assessment Framework design and strategic direction to inform potential refinements before the implementation of an updated ATLIS Data Reporting Tool and future program design. Your responses should focus on the program structure, not your specific organizational readiness.

Section A: Year 2 Transition to Assessment Framework

1. The shift from Year 1's binary (pass/fail) to Year 2's point-based system:

- Keep point-based - better than binary
- Prefer hybrid (point-based with pass/fail threshold)
- Prefer return to binary system
- Neither approach works well

2. The performance tier structure (Exceptional/Advanced/Developing/Basic/Emerging):

- Use as-is (5 tiers)
- Reduce to 3 tiers (High/Medium/Low)
- Create more granular tiers
- Replace with different classification system

3. The focus shift from "baseline assessment" to "progress measurement":

- Continue progress focus
- Add baseline reassessment component
- Split 50/50 baseline vs progress
- Return to baseline focus
- Create different measurement approach

Section B: Strategic Priority Evaluation

4. The four key focus areas (Connectivity Growth, Early Implementation, Quality Preparation, Workflow Integration):

- Keep all four focus areas
- Replace Quality Preparation with different focus
- Replace Workflow Integration with different focus
- Reduce to three focus areas
- Add additional focus area

5. Six-month reporting timeline (January to July progress expectations):

- Keep 6-month intervals
- Change to annual reporting in future years

Section C: Implementation Viability

6. The 100% data completion requirement for the first reporting period incentive payment:

- Keep 100% requirement
- Lower to 95% completion
- Lower to 90% completion

7. Six-month progress thresholds by baseline performance:

- Appropriate as designed
- Reduce all thresholds by 25 points
- Reduce all thresholds by 50 points
- Create uniform thresholds for all MCOs
- Eliminate minimum progress requirements

Section E: Priority Refinements

11. Most critical framework adjustment needed:

- Reduce point thresholds
- Simplify reporting requirements
- Extend implementation timeline
- Increase technical assistance
- Redesign incentive structure
- Framework ready as-is

12. Biggest implementation risk for Year 2 success:

- Point system complexity
- Timeline too aggressive
- Technical infrastructure gaps
- Staff resource constraints
- MCO readiness variation

13. Most promising aspect of Year 2 design:

- Progressive measurement approach
- Quality preparation focus
- Process establishment emphasis
- Bridge to outcome measurement
- Point-based flexibility

Section F: Strategic Feedback

14. Single most important change to improve Year 2 success: [Text field - 300 characters]

Enter your answer:

Consistent, clearly defined, and early released metrics with a specific outline on how points are earned and how they will affect the ability to draw down incentive funds. As of now HHSC has not released the metrics on what stakeholders will be evaluated on, and should the timeline and assessment follow last year, the January assessment would need to reflect the status as of September 1, 2025. Getting access to the metrics as early as possible, as well as ensuring any changes are requested in a timely manner, will be key to program success. Maximize capitation pool size if possible.

15. Specific concern about Year 2 framework not addressed above: [Text field - 300 characters]

Enter your answer:

There is not a clearly defined outline of how the points would be assigned and how they would affect the ability to draw down funds. Several MCOs, IMD facilities, and the STAR Participating providers in SDA's not previously eligible to participate in ATLAS Year 1 would not have a baseline. It has not been outlined how those stakeholders would be graded and how the varying status of stakeholders HIE Connectivity would affect the ability to draw ATLAS Incentive funds. If the survey follows the same standards as last year (being measured on the status as of September 1, 2025), there are concerns on implementation and ability to show growth, as there has not been a clear communication on what the metrics and desired growth will be,