

Report of the Evaluator Panel  
on Bids Submitted in Response to the  
Iowa Plan for Behavioral Health RFP

Submitted to the  
Directors of the Iowa Departments of Human  
Services and Public Health  
April 22, 2009

## Table of Contents

I. Evaluator Panel Meeting Process

II. Results of the Evaluator Panel Meeting

III. Recommendation of the Evaluator Panel

### Attachments

Attachment A: Section and Total Bid Evaluation Scores  
for Each Response

## **I. Evaluator Panel Meeting Process**

On April 13, 2009, a three-day Evaluator Panel meeting was convened for the purpose of evaluating bids submitted in response to the Request for Proposals for the Iowa Plan for Behavioral Health (Iowa Plan) issued by the Iowa Departments of Human Services and Public Health. On the afternoon of April 15, 2009, at the conclusion of the Evaluator Panel's evaluation process, a recommendation was made to the Director of the Iowa Department of Public Health (IDPH) regarding which of the bids should be awarded the contract to administer the Iowa Plan. Due to scheduling conflicts, a separate meeting was conducted on April 16, 2009 to present the recommendation to the Director of the Department of Human Services (DHS). A final meeting of the Directors of Human Services and Public Health was held on April 22, 2009, to make the determination of the final selection. The Directors accepted the recommendation of the evaluation panel. The following narrative describes the Evaluator Panel meeting process and the details of the evaluation.

### Evaluator Panel

The Evaluator Panel was comprised of the following people:

Pamela Alger - Bureau Chief for Children and Youth, Mental Health and Disability Services Division, DHS

Dean Austin<sup>1</sup> - Substance Abuse Bureau, IDPH

Christopher Counihan - independent evaluator

Dennis Janssen - Bureau Chief, Managed Care and Clinical Services, Iowa Medicaid Enterprise, DHS

Michael Norton - independent evaluator

Janet Zwick - independent evaluator

### Facilitators

The deliberations of the Evaluator Panel were facilitated by Michael Bailit, of Bailit Health Purchasing, LLC (Bailit). Notes on the Evaluators' deliberations were taken by Beth Waldman and Joshua Slen, also of Bailit.

### State Staff present

The following State staff were present for most or all of the three-day meeting:

Cynthia Tracy - Iowa Plan Program Manager, DHS

Kathy Stone - Behavioral Health Division Director, IDPH

State staff did not participate in the discussions of the bids except on occasion to clarify an aspect of the RFP or to provide information in response to questions.

---

<sup>1</sup> While Dean Austin was present for the entire Evaluator Panel three-day meeting, he had not completed a review of the bidders' complete responses and only participated in discussions and scored Section 7A.2.2 through 7A.2.7 and Section 7A.2.13. He did not participate in the final scoring of the bidder responses.

In addition, a limited number of state staff were asked to review specific sections of the bidder responses as subject matter experts and present their findings to the Evaluator Panel. That staff included:

DeAnn Decker, ACADC and Kevin Gabbert, ACADC, LISW, IDPH re: ASAM guidelines  
Dan Whitmore, IME systems analyst re: management information systems and claims payment  
Brad Neuweg, Budget Analyst, Fiscal Management Division, DHS re: financial information

### Bids Evaluated

Three bidders submitted RFP responses:

Cenpatico  
Magellan Behavioral Care of Iowa  
ValueOptions of Iowa

Prior to convening on April 13<sup>th</sup>, each Evaluator Panel member received an orientation and training on the proposal evaluation process. Evaluators were advised to evaluate one subsection for all bidders before moving on to review the next subsection. This approach was recommended to help the Evaluators ensure that they used the same internal reasoning across proposals when assessing each proposal. Evaluators were also advised to vary the order in which they evaluated the three bids as they moved from subsection to subsection.

The Evaluators then read and developed preliminary assessments of the Technical Components of each of the three bids. Evaluators utilized a qualitative rating scale in which the ratings were “Meets With Distinction”, “Meets”, “Partially Meets” and “Fails to Meet.” While the RFP asked for bidders to supply references in several places across the RFP, references were not provided to the Evaluator Panel as state staff had limited success in reaching those identified by the bidders and receiving their references.

### The Three-Day Evaluator Meeting Process

The Evaluators discussed each of the three bids, one subsection at a time. When discussing a subsection, Evaluators were each asked by the facilitator to describe those aspects of the response, relative to that subsection, that they felt were particularly strong and those that they felt were weak relative to RFP requirements. For each bidder for each sub-section, the strengths and weaknesses expressed were recorded on a flip chart pad for all Evaluators to see. The order that Evaluators were asked to share their views was rotated after each subsection. Similarly, the Evaluator Panel alternated which proposal was discussed first for each subsection discussed.

After each Evaluator had expressed his or her views, Evaluators were then asked as a group to arrive at a rating of “Meets with Distinction”, “Meets”, “Partially Meets”, or “Fails to Meet” for the subsection relative to the RFP requirements. If there was not clear agreement on a rating, the Evaluators would sometimes discuss and debate the response’s strengths and weaknesses and their respective rationales for the rating they believed the response should be assigned. After discussion, the rating agreed on by the majority was recorded as the Panel’s rating. The discussion moved onto the next two bidders’ responses for the same sub-section, which were evaluated in the same manner, with a test for consistency in Panel criteria application across bidders. The evaluation process then moved on to the next subsection.

### *The Process for Arriving at Section Scores*

The RFP was comprised of the following sections, each with an evaluation weight assigned within the RFP:

Section Title	Section Weight
Programmatic Overview	60%
Corporate Organization and Experience	15%
Project Organization and Experience	15%
Budget Narrative and Worksheet	10%

When all subsections within a section had been evaluated and rated by the group, the Evaluators were asked to arrive at a summary score for the section. In developing a section summary score, Evaluators were asked to translate qualitative ratings for each subsection into numeric scores and were instructed that an assessment of “Meets with Distinction” would be equal to a score of “400”, “Meets” would equal a score of “300”, “Partially Meets” would equal a score of “200” and “Fails to Meet” would equal a score of “100”. To aid the Evaluators’ review of the entire section, they were given a table that contained each of the subsections with the qualitative rating beside each subsection. Evaluators were urged to think about each subsection and its relative importance to the whole section when determining how to take the subsection assessments into account when rating the whole section. In addition, the Evaluators were told which subsections related to state priorities identified in the RFP. Evaluators were not instructed to average subsection scores or use any other quantitative methodology, but they were free to do so if they so chose. Evaluators were encouraged to think about a numeric score for the section that was not necessarily a round number (e.g., “200”, “300”) if doing so appeared appropriate.

After some time for reflection, the Evaluators were each asked their opinion as to what numeric score should be given to the section. When each had suggested a score and it was apparent that there was not immediate consensus, Evaluators with high and low scores were asked to express their rationale for the score they proposed for the section. After each Evaluator had had an opportunity to present his or her views, the Evaluators were polled again. This process continued until, when polled, the five participating Evaluators agreed on the numerical score for the section.

The numeric score of each section was multiplied by the weight assigned to the section, and then added up to produce the final score of the bidder.

## **II. Results of the Evaluation Panel Meeting**

The following is a summary of the Evaluator Panel’s assessment of each bid, by section, and by sub-section, where applicable, and the noted strengths and weaknesses that support the Evaluator Panel’s assessment. In the case of each section, both the numeric score and the qualitative rating of the section are noted.

## 7A.2 Programmatic Overview ---- 60%

### 7A.2.2 Enrollees 65 and Older

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. development of the SeniorConnect program which would provide targeted outreach to seniors
2. plan to recruit geriatricians into the network
3. extensive experience in other states serving the elderly
4. good understanding of mental health challenges and ways to address such challenges, including use of peer specialists
5. strong transition plan
6. planning for ongoing services in partnership with the Stakeholder Circle

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. weak discussion of challenges and solutions relating to elders and substance abuse and medication management
2. questionable proposed use of wireless technology for the 65+ population

#### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. strong transition plan, including detailed description of continuity of care
2. identified challenges for elderly and crosswalked with solutions
3. use of the PharmaConnect program
4. strong outreach plan
5. experience with the senior population

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. did not suggest additions to the network or describe how would recruit PCPs into the network
2. did not discuss transitioning seniors with authorizations to allow for continuity of care
3. questionable efficacy of a proposed consultation line to engage PCPs

4. did not mention substance abuse disorder as part of discussion of medication issues

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. experience in serving the 65 and older population
2. well-researched understanding of behavioral health issues facing seniors, including substance abuse and suicide
3. inclusion of geriatric specialization as part of the team
4. inclusion of the Health Passport application, developed originally for foster children in Texas
5. inclusion of the Caring Voices program, which would provide pre-paid cell phones to seniors at discharge from hospitals to assist in transition to the community
6. inclusion of the Ambassadors programs, to assist seniors and certain other member to assist in the coordination of care
7. inclusion of the Pharmacy Management Utilization Review (PMUR) program to monitor pharmacy use of seniors and others within the Iowa Plan

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. response did not indicate how it would engage persons age 65 and older in service delivery
2. transition plan included in the proposal lacked detail

### **7A.2.3 Coordination and Integration of Services**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. provided good self-assessment to improve practice and engage clients
2. recognized need to focus on improving care coordination for children, and how to focus on other target populations
3. corporate experience and national focus
4. establishment of Iowa Peer Support Training Academy

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. focused most intensive services on the back end of high end care; did not address current system weaknesses and efforts to prevent high end care at the front end, in the community
2. did not provide enough detail to allow for evaluation of effectiveness of PCP communications plan
3. limited discussion of how it would address ethnicity issues
4. weak response regarding the MH/MR population
5. in discussion of children, did not provide sufficient detail, including failure to mention child welfare
6. inaccurate portrayal of bidder's role in supporting the Polk County pilot

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. system of care to promote coordination and integration of service providers
2. emphasized use of CCM and ICM
3. Connections system appropriate for identifying and monitoring high need individuals and clinical operations
4. proposed to track outcomes of structured coordination of services
5. commitment to work with eligibles and family members and overall philosophy of keeping kids with families
6. good discussion of harm reduction approach for substance abuse
7. use of peer supports

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. not clear how experience in Massachusetts and other states would be applied to Iowa Plan
2. did not adequately address child welfare and juvenile justice approach
3. failed to address provider choice
4. discussion of training did not include a needs assessment for training and what has been done previously in Iowa

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Partially Meets**. The Panel found the general lack of detail and substance in the proposed plan, plus the lack of specific service alternatives, to be significant weaknesses.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. team-based planning

2. use of the Health Passport, which would include key clinical information on the eligibles' care to assist with coordination of services
3. use of provider incentives for mental health and substance abuse treatment
4. proposed provision of care through regional networks, described as comprehensive service providers (CSPs), a model used in AZ
5. use of a community re-entry model

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. insufficient detail or substance in proposed plan
2. proposal lacked specific service alternatives
3. proposal lacked emphasis on consumer choice in recovery
4. no discussion of adult probation system
5. no discussion of how to coordinate or integrate care for a patient or provider that opts-out of Health Passport
6. no sense that consumers drive the planning process
7. weak description of how would coordinate across concurrent MH/MR

#### **7A.2.4 Rehabilitation, Recovery, and Strength-Based Approach to Services**

##### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. extensive history with establishing providers and community reinvestments putting recovery-based services in place
2. utilization of data and outcome measures to improve projects over time
3. model based on principles of rehabilitation and recovery
4. provided a multi-pronged system approach to engaging consumers, families and stakeholders
5. proposed a self-directed care program
6. proposed implementing a wraparound tool that has been used in Arizona
7. proposed providing internal and external training of staff on recovery and rehabilitation
8. understood need to obtain provider buy-in for strategy to be effective

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. model not well articulated, including role of consumer peer specialists
2. unclear that proposal to utilize e-learning will actually reach consumers
3. discussion of approach to providers was confusing
4. concern that there was too much focus on using community reinvestment funds for something where the Departments are trying to change the whole system

## ValueOptions

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The Panel found the bidder to convey a clear adoption of recovery and rehabilitation principles, including demonstrated experience in other states.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. demonstrated experience with recovery and rehabilitation models in other states (CO, CT)
2. clear articulation of culture of aspiration
3. well articulated goal, vision and plan
4. multi-prong approach to engage consumers through advisory councils and outreach, obtaining input at all levels of planning and system design
5. plan to employ consumers
6. plan applied to all ages

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. proposed training and cost of that training may not get buy-in from traditional providers
2. no clear substance abuse examples

## Cenpatico

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The Panel found the bidder to convey a clear adoption of recovery and rehabilitation principles, including demonstrated experience in other states.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. embedded the concept of recovery in all services
2. documented success in Arizona
3. use of incentives with providers to support transformation; fidelity audits and benchmarks related to recovery
4. use of consumer and family advisory councils
5. effective use of an employment theme
6. proposed hiring of consumers as advisors and recovery guides
7. use of peer specialists as mentors for consumers in their recovery

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. no link between CSP and recovery
2. lack of detail on developing rehabilitation and recovery services, except for crisis care
3. difficult to understand who serves on the mobile crisis team

4. plan focused on catching individual in crises; no description of how would engage consumers at the front end

### 7A.2.5 Person-Centered Care

#### Magellan

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The Panel found the proposal to fully incorporate a person-centered approach to service planning and delivery.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. provided data documenting effectiveness of active engagement and wrap-around fidelity tool
2. welcoming environment
3. use of joint treatment planning conferences that are inclusive
4. effective plan to include providers in process
5. emphasis on identifying through measurement the effectiveness of services for future planning and quality improvement
6. self-directed care

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. limited examples or stated experience regarding substance abuse
2. limited mention of use of peer supports
3. the process described for the exchange of case-specific information and policy updates was unclear

#### ValueOptions

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Partially Meets**. The Panel found the lack of documented experience and concerns about the viability of the proposed approach weakened the proposal

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. proposal laid out good vision and plan
2. built on consumers and families driving the process
3. use of natural supports and family and friends as part of their recovery program
4. use of intensive care coordinators
5. proposal to expand self-directed care pilots

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. did not describe or provide examples of how had previously used proposed strategies

2. concern that bidder would be stretching ICC teams thin
3. did not provide examples from other states

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The Panel found the proposal to fully incorporate a person-centered approach to service planning and delivery.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. espoused dedication to core principles of recovery and resiliency
2. strategies to monitor provider performance, including fidelity audits
3. use of crisis plans and wrap plans in Health Passport
4. use of contract requirements to both achieve adoption and incentives for providers, including incentives for use of peer supports
5. certification program for treatment team facilitators
6. solid discussion of person-centered planning
7. comprehensive approach to peer work force and peer-centered services, use of recovery guides

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. change strategy was heavily focused on training providers, but the bidder provided only one example to demonstrate it had done so in the past
2. concern about accomplishing the peer workforce model through a contracting approach
3. no specific mention or focus on substance abuse

### **7A.2.6 Covered Services, Required Services, Optional Services**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. comprehensive self-assessment leading to very specific list of enhancements by region
2. provided good case examples for integrated services
3. good consumer feedback approaches to develop new services
4. telehealth a creative approach to address gaps
5. in building statewide capacity focused on existing network of providers and building on current panel
6. use of network strategy committee as a vehicle for ongoing improvement of the system
7. gap analysis comprehensive (even if methodology unexplained)
8. good full discussion of the community reinvestment projects

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. gap analysis could have included more data and detail
2. disagreement with use of mental health expert to develop a substance abuse peer recovery coaching model
3. outreach and training plan did not seem to address challenges in sub-acute service delivery
4. inaccurate portrayal of ATR services being provided
5. crisis stabilization described only as a facility service and not a community-based service
6. limited discussion of detox needs lacked specific, objective measures
7. never described how integrated services would be authorized
8. no specificity on timeline to address gaps

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. provided detailed information on establishing current panel and using that panel to expand services
2. focused and specific strategies to address service gaps, supported by experience in other states
3. good job describing evidence-based practices
4. used claims data to identify gaps as part of detailed analysis; also incorporated listening to communities in their gap analysis
5. addressed recruitment strategies for rural areas
6. mobile crisis team included addiction specialists

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. did not adequately address how to fix gaps in statewide capacity; no details on how it would add to provider panel
2. did not address peer family support services related to substance abuse or co-occurring disorders
3. examples provided and their application to Iowa were vague
4. described use of medical necessity standards instead of psychosocial necessity standard
5. identified targeted case management as part of gap analysis, but provided no detail on how it would address the gap

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. good gap analysis of services in Iowa, including a survey of providers
2. provided state examples of where had used integrated mental health services
3. good proposal to utilize partial hospitalization as a step-down service
4. drew on evidence-based practice experience in Arizona, using a best practice committee and process that included stakeholder consumers and families

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. did not provide a clear plan for how it would address specific services, including Level 1 sub-acute, 24 -hour stabilization services, substance abuse peer support and coaching
2. in using CSP regional model as linchpin of its strategy to addressing the gaps in new service, did not adequately assess the feasibility of the CSP approach
3. timelines for implementation did not address specific actions or responsibilities and did not specify relationship to recovery and support services
4. provided no data to support gap analysis
5. did not plan to implement some key services – Level 1 sub-acute, 24-hour crisis stabilization, substance abuse – until June 2010
6. implementing 11 evidence-based practices may be overly ambitious

#### **7A.2.7 Organization of Utilization Management Staff**

##### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. utilization of regional approach and staff living in the communities, including ICM staff
2. staffing plan took into account the addition of the 65+ population
3. utilization management tool for recovery

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. limited child psychiatry resources on bidder staff
2. did not mention a role for peer reviewers
3. distribution of staffing hard to evaluate because responsibility for case management not well-defined and no general support for assumptions

##### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. regional structure of intensive care coordinators coupled with provider relations staff
2. staff living in community and understanding available resources
3. experience with ICM
4. substance abuse services and children's liaisons

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. did not provide roles and responsibilities for the ICC manager
2. limited child psychiatry staff
3. did not mention decategorization boards or the joint planning process
4. no substance abuse experience required on the regional level; only five staff overall that are required to have substance abuse experience

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. utilized a regional approach
2. UM staff organized to support the recovery system
3. expanded use of treatment teams and in-person contracts

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. insufficient substance abuse staff
2. no mechanism for managing across the regions
3. no discussion of child psychiatrists or peer reviewers and their roles
4. did not provide examples of experience with adults with SPMI

### **7A.2.8 Utilization Management**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The Panel found the proposal to comprehensively detail the proposed approach to UM, and to supplement the proposal with a level of flexibility, innovation and orientation towards measurement and improvement that distinguished the proposal.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. understood that treatment is not linear and therefore did not assume sequential approach; allowed for a flexible use of guidelines
2. no UM for community services, only for facility based services
3. UM guidelines were very detailed with examples throughout and description of special populations
4. discharge planning
5. self-evaluation based on data
6. waiving of UM for certain providers based on performance
7. use of psychosocial necessity in all public contracts

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. UM plan had some questionable exclusions regarding psychological testing
2. unclear description of mobile crisis team
3. role between ICM and TCM seemed to be ambiguous
4. description of how it would use four factors in retro authorizations not well explained

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. good description of ICM and its relationship to UM
2. good focus on pregnant and parenting women
3. no prior authorization requirement for services in the community balanced with a good authorization process for inpatient services
4. use of the registration process would be a robust way of tracking care, as opposed to waiting for claims to be processed
5. interactive voice response system

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. limited description of family involvement for special populations
2. no description of service need
3. insufficient description of high-need persons
4. ASAM criteria needed to be modified for Iowa and must include psychosocial criteria
5. self-evaluation focused on administrative services not on delivery of services
6. weak description of ACT program
7. ICM description didn't reference children and families

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. criteria for mental health emphasized strengths, recovery and rehabilitation
2. provided good list of measures for own evaluation
3. provided example of state experience in Georgia
4. no prior authorization requirement for community-based services; focused UM only on bed-based services
5. emphasized family involvement in PMIC admissions and with children in state mental health institutes
6. utilization review would be available 24/7
7. self-evaluation spoke to interrater reliability and monitoring
8. intensive clinical management well-defined
9. use retro reviews and post service profiling that measures outcomes and consumer satisfactions

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. limited description of how to match to special populations
2. not sure bidder understood purpose of administrative authorization
3. poor ASAM criteria use
4. insufficient in addressing psychosocial necessity for mental health
5. intensity of service guidelines were too general
6. NurseWise staff not located in Iowa, as required in the RFP
7. did not address subject of high-volume requests

#### **7A.2.9 Required Elements of Individual Service Coordination & Treatment Planning**

##### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. predictive modeling and algorithms; customized data-driven strategy
2. commendable approach to working with courts; a practical approach about what courts need to know; education and reference materials as well as a correction consultation line
3. good strategies for integration with PCPs, including co-location
4. lookout note in the ICM system to identify high-risk clients
5. crisis staff were well trained

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. highly reliant on the ICM program for high-risk enrollees
2. described cost issues, but not clinical/demographics of the high-risk population
3. did not include provider sanctions as part of compliance
4. court program only included one person for the entire state
5. interface with emergency crisis system not well-explained

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. as part of 24-hour crisis services, included transfer to local provider
2. good plan for meeting with Iowa practitioners to roll out the program
3. use of PharmaConnect system to track drug utilization and identify outliers
4. proposal to work collaboratively with the Departments and communities to develop the crisis response system
5. experience in other states, including Massachusetts, and emphasis on alternatives to hospitalization
6. court program included parole officers
7. would provide a rich array of crisis services including mobile teams and walk-in centers; demonstrated understanding of need for immediate access

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. weak description of training on the 24-hour crisis line
2. no specific criteria provided on how would determine high-risk/high-need individuals
3. did not provide any specific measures for ICM

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. utilized a 24/7 response
2. good description of flow
3. proposed working with and training of EMS employees
4. multi-level approach to crisis services
5. reliance on CSP model to deliver crisis services
6. utilization of community reinvestment dollars to get services in place initially
7. utilized Health Passport to assist integration
8. consumer empowerment

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. faxing discharge forms to PCPs would be insufficient
2. no clear description of CSP alternatives to hospitalization
3. Nursewise is out-of-state; RFP required UM services to be performed in-state

#### 7A.2.10 Children in Transition

##### Magellan

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. gathered ideas and strategies from numerous sources, including families and providers
2. provided six examples
3. history of joint treatment planning
4. good problem definition
5. good discussion of person-centered planning
6. engagement of family during stay; identified multiple strategies to get children home

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. while provided examples from six states, only one showed an outcome
2. did not explain how discharge planning would begin on admission
3. not clear how it would work with PMIC, family and school
4. focus only on the top 10% of those at risk of returning missed pieces of the population
5. did not put wraparound services in place

##### ValueOptions

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Partially Meets**. The Panel found that there was a significant amount of missing information from the bidder's proposal.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. utilization of a youth quality improvement sub-committee
2. good description of experience with family peer support services and how bidder had used them
3. good description of array of community supports to be provided at discharge
4. inclusion of a youth services liaison

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. no discussion of inpatient discharge, which should have been a major focus of the response
2. did not provide outcomes data to go with examples of children served
3. insufficient description of how would work with inpatient residential settings
4. focused on prevention rather than transition in the answer

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. included data for ICM that would support that using ICM as a step between inpatient and alternative services
2. experience in Texas showed effectiveness in reducing average lengths of stay
3. would work closely with families to identify strength of the family system and needed supports
4. good job in emphasizing the recovery model
5. would maintain administrative responsibility for children when in an inpatient setting

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. not clear if understood PMIC issue and need to transition children out of PMICs and into the community
2. has good programs in other states, but difficult to see how they would apply in Iowa
3. did not specify any transition services
4. did not reference any needs assessment of children, individually or collectively
5. plan did not clearly focus on shortening length of stay nor did it clearly articulate how the bidder would engage the facility

### **7A.2.11 Appeal Process**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. process described in detail and consistent with RFP requirements
2. good description of manager's oversight of the process
3. reported excellent results from EQRO review of appeals process
4. specifically mentioned that providers can initiate appeals

One weakness was identified in the bidder's response to the requirements of this subsection:

1. did not address continuity of benefits in sample letter

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. process described in detail and consistent with RFP requirements
2. invited providers to participate on appeals committee
3. would use peer counselors to assist enrollees in appeals process
4. would promote awareness of right to appeal, with multiple vehicles for doing so
5. member/provider relations staff would assist an eligible person in drafting written appeals

Some of the weakness identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. committee structure to review appeals may be inefficient and would require CMS approval
2. unclear why there would be a need to contact the Departments if the bidder needed to hold a telephone conference

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. use of an ombudsman
2. certified peer specialist available to advocate for an enrollee during the appeals process
3. process consistent with all RFP requirements
4. emphasized TTY availability
5. would provide expedited appeal decisions within 24 hours (less time than required within the RFP)

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. requirement regarding an estate representative not noted in response
2. the member would be afforded no opportunity to provide additional information if choosing an expedited appeal

## 7A.2.12 Grievance and Complaint Processes

### Magellan

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. would resolve all within 30 days (less than the RFP allowance of 90 days)
2. would use a recovery advisory committee to analyze grievances
3. would track satisfaction with the grievance process
4. inclusion of IDPH-participant complaints in the process

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. response did not state that the bidder would refer complaints about substance abuse treatment programs to IDPH

### ValueOptions

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. included a very good logging system
2. executive management team would review grievances and resolutions
3. provided a clear process

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. no treatment program reference

### Cenpatico

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. use of an external and consumer-run ombudsman
2. proposed outreach process
3. multiple vehicles for having appeals
4. process to look at all grievances in the aggregate and with a number of different committees, and then applying the data for performance improvement mechanisms

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. did not highlight providers right to file an appeal
2. no discussion of IDPH role in the process and the need to work with IDPH

### **7A.2.13 Requirements for the Provider Network**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. use of committee to analyze service gaps
2. experience in providing rehabilitation and recovery interventions in models for adults, particularly intensive care model with use of self-directed care and the psych rehab model
3. experience with SAPT block grants in Iowa and Arizona
4. monitoring adherence in three different ways
5. good description of how the bidder would assess GeoAccess data and include analysis of cultural and linguistic needs
6. use of committee to analyze service gaps, and using that analysis to then do some targeted recruitment of providers
7. strong description of telehealth and commitment to capacity in all 99 counties by 2012
8. using website to highlight updates with provider network

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. no clear description of its web-based initiative
2. no clear description on how will develop new services; proposal did not address examples of children, sub-acute care and emergency services
3. insufficient detail on use of the PCP child psych consult line and how often it is used and its impact
4. weak discussion of ACT
5. did not address (no strategy) improved access to underserved communities
6. estimate of injection drug users looks low

#### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. use of physician extenders to address MD shortage
2. expansion of telehealth model, including piloting peer support by telehealth
3. child psych consultation based on the MA model of enlisting child psychiatrists to provide consultation
4. success in developing peer and education support
5. experience with large scale implementations
6. expanded network to address public health and school-based clinics, FQHCs and rural clinics, as well as inclusion of the Indian Health Service
7. review of GeoAccess reports as well as adequacy reports and caseloads
8. use of local credentialing committee to address adequacy of network
9. use of recovery learning communities

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. weak description of how will adequately ensure provider network in underserved communities
2. insufficient description of efforts to address psychiatrist shortages in other states
3. did not address areas where it may need to actively recruit providers aside from psychiatry
4. did not specifically commit to a timeframe for putting network together
5. did not document any analysis of Iowa network development issues
6. did not address how access will be maintained or improved for three RFP-cited populations
7. did not provide an overall strategy for service development in underserved areas
8. did not provide examples of where the bidder had managed SAPT Block Grant funds, although the Panel was aware it does so in Kansas

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. plan to build off of existing network
2. would utilize multiple tools to identify gaps in existing network
3. use of CSP regional service providers, which would be required to provide evening and weekend appointments and bear responsibility for high need populations
4. experienced in managing SABPT Block Grant funds
5. proposal to invest dollars to fund programs at community colleges to enhance workforce, include behavioral health certification programs
6. increasing telehealth emergency crisis teams
7. use of Psychotropic Medical Utilization Review (PMUR) process, particularly in being more discreet about how children get medications
8. good job of describing what services it would develop, including wrap-around, rehab, peer support, in-home service delivery, mobile crisis teams, ACT, etc.
9. effective crosswalk of services with impact of people

10. philosophy of continuity of care and keeping eligibles with current providers, particularly pregnant women and teens, where possible

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. limited detail on how would put CSP-based network together and no detail of a feasibility analysis of CSP network approach in Iowa
2. insufficient description of how the bidder would use the PMUR process to give consultation to PCPs
3. description of how had provided services in underserved communities in other states came across as simplistic; more detailed descriptions of how it would be done and logistics behind it were missing, as well as outcome data from other states
4. did not address how would provide network services for seniors, children or how would develop sub-acute capacity
5. misunderstanding of how the bidder could use community reinvestment funds

#### **7A.2.14 Network Management**

##### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. good content in provider profile, including addition of principles of recovery
2. good performance incentive model including pay-for-performance and reduction of use of utilization review based on provider performance and sharing of best practices
3. provider integration committee, allowing for a collaborative process to identify improvement opportunities across the network
4. would benchmark performance against National Outcome Measurement System (NOMS)
5. described reasonable process for monitoring, rewarding and penalizing
6. good process to distribute information and hold forums
7. UM incentives for good utilization performance

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. intended use for profiles not well-articulated
2. profiles did not appear to be severity-adjusted
3. weak sanctions for providers
4. not clear which staff would be responsible for following up on provider profiles
5. QI example focused only on denied claims; nothing specifically about quality of care
6. most of incentives would be provided to the top four or five providers; some belief within panel that would not be enough to incentivize the larger provider network
7. weak description of network management activities in other states

## **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. examples of profile reports from MA and PA were rich and responsive to requirements
2. would provide reward for adoption of evidence practice and improvements
3. use of satisfaction survey, completed either through a call or on-line
4. would utilize NOMS-based measures and grievance data to develop the profile report
5. would provide incentives and reduced administrative burdens to reward providers for quality performance (ValueSelect program)
6. although not clear from the bidder's response in this section, Panel aware that the bidder does do severity adjustments within its profiling reports elsewhere
7. use of "intelligence connect" system with real time performance profiles on line, refreshed with claims run

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. description did not clearly link provider profiles to improving services
2. use of satisfaction survey limited to ValueSelect providers
3. would only provide education and other training to ValueSelect providers when many others could benefit from such training
4. profile reports did not seem to include IDPH participants
5. would only have communication with providers where poor performance; should touch all providers to support continuous quality improvement
6. insufficient description of corrective action plan
7. overstated the bidder's role in network management profiling of primary care clinicians in MA

## **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. well written section showed network development plus network management means something in terms of meeting goal of recovery system
2. addressed concrete program management requirements and metrics
3. mechanisms in place to discourage inappropriate utilization through use of best practices and fact sheets
4. strong provider profile reports that look across time and provider, providers communication with staff and providers at least quarterly
5. provided strong examples from Indiana

6. strong clinical review process
7. feedback to providers to improve their recovery and resiliency focus on individual service plans
8. proposed to profile all CSPs
9. intervention and follow-up
10. would review top ten clients as part of the profiling of providers
11. clear description of how would ensure accuracy of the I-SMART data
12. sharing of incentives from the state with providers

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. insufficient description of actions it would take with poorly performing providers
2. unable to see where the PCP contact is in the profile
3. did not describe the intervention and remeasurement that would come from results of provider profiles
4. did not describe use of severity adjustment
5. sample profile benchmarked against means rather than best practices or goals
6. hypothetical examples used in this section left reviewers unsure of whether the bidder had actually done the work of developing and completing provider profiles
7. overreliance on training to manage providers; proposal should have identified additional management strategies
8. no substance abuse profile

#### **7A.2.15 Quality Assessment and Performance Improvement Program**

##### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The Panel found the response to be particularly distinguished by the combined effect of the adoption of Six Sigma, a focus on the RFP's defined priority populations, evidence of effectiveness in other states and the overall integration of the approach.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. adopting a robust QI vision, moving from a more traditional PDSA approach to a Six Sigma approach, which is state-of-the-art for quality improvement and significantly more stringent and demanding than PDSA
2. building on robust solid foundation and vision
3. proposed efforts to reach out to communities through use of community liaisons
4. provided documented evidence of QI effectiveness in other states
5. use of multiple tools to improve services, including Magellan 360 and Recovery Assessment Scale
6. focused on continuing quality improvement on the RFP's defined priority populations
7. good support for consumer and family involvement
8. well integrated overall strategy

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. no examples of how the bidder would work with providers to facilitate adoption
2. did not describe effectiveness of PCP consult line
3. one evaluation example only had an “n” of 62
4. capacity to perform pharmacy analysis not yet established
5. did not discuss retrospective review for recovery services
6. tool examples largely limited to mental health

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder’s response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**. The panel found that while the response had many strengths, these were countered by the bidder’s failure to provide convincing evidence of effectiveness of efforts in other states.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. attended well to questions laid out in this section
2. plan included multi-pronged approach to quality improvement
3. would engage providers, peers and consumers in the QA process
4. showed willingness to work with Division of MHDS on developing outcome measures
5. would utilize the Recovery Oriented System Indicators (ROSI)
6. provided suggestions of opportunities in Iowa, including utilizing local systems of care, and reducing inpatient and residential utilization
7. would utilize the PharmaConnect, which utilizes national guidelines, a robust system of alerts and notices generated to notify of gaps in adherence, early discontinuation of prescriptions and other events needing attention
8. utilized consumer satisfaction team example
9. comprehensive example of QA plan from Pennsylvania, including list of goals, measures and objectives and reports outcomes of activities related to each objective

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. did not provide convincing evidence of effectiveness and impact of efforts
2. plan did not provide enough of a focus on special populations prioritized in the RFP
3. no coherent long-term QI strategy; the proposed QI process identified measures but did not identify how the bidder would follow-up and improve quality

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder’s response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. use of quality improvement coordinators to determine access in the community (e.g., when is first available urgent and first available routine care appointment)
2. use of MHSIP in order to allow comparison across other states
3. would utilize many avenues to obtain consumer and family input
4. provided strong examples from other states
5. would use multi-prong approach to gathering data from a number of different sources
6. plan to use peer-to-peer counseling with physician prescribers regarding medication management program
7. would utilize a Recovery Advisory Committee to provide input into all aspects of the QI plan
8. proposed to transform the system to one of recovery orientation

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. insufficient documentation of impact of efforts on members
2. did not specify planned interventions and follow-up based on outcome measure
3. response not convincing that psychotropic medical utilization review process could be appropriately utilized for analyzing other pharmacy data and related measures of performance
4. approached QA through a narrow philosophy focused on addressing deficient provider processes

#### **7A.2.16 Prevention and Early Intervention**

##### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The Panel made particular note of the use of the SPF, documented results from other states, and the proposed evaluation using both quantitative and qualitative information.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. utilized the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF)
2. focus on both mental health and substance abuse
3. plan targeted most of the RFP's priority areas, including targeting the 65+ population for screening for depression and substance abuse
4. plan included a sound evaluation component using qualitative and quantitative assessments
5. provided examples and results from work in other states
6. thorough and comprehensive response
7. collaborative effort on selection of screening tools, recognizing the importance of buy-in

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. response did not speak to the age 0-5 population

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Partially Meets**. The Panel made particular note of the proposal's singular, narrow focus on the population of children age 0-5.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. provided a well-planned and well-conceived strategy to meet contract requirements
2. proposed prevention or early intervention initiatives focused on appropriate and critical areas of concern
3. focus on strengthening families program

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. response was too narrow in focusing intervention solely on the age 0-5 population; state was looking for early intervention for all populations
2. proposal did not include secondary prevention strategies

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The Panel found use of the SPF, the Ambassador program, documented experience in other states, and the perinatal depression program to be particularly notable strengths.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. utilizes the Strategic Prevention Framework, which is well attuned to IA
2. inclusion of the Ambassadors program, a model with documented effectiveness and a tie to the RFP's priority on adding the age 65 and older population
3. provided strong and compelling examples from other states
4. proposal focused on a number of important RFP priority populations and services
5. good utilization of asset mapping
6. addressed secondary prevention
7. sound perinatal depression program
8. addressed substance abuse as well as mental health

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. did not address young children

### **7A.2.17 Management Information System**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. sophisticated IT system
2. had dashboards in place with strong emphasis on reports for providers and consumers
3. identified specific reports for special populations, including age 65 and older and information from the Mental Health Institutes
4. would provide ad hoc reporting within 2 days, exceeding the 5-day standard set forth within the RFP
5. updated platform to the IBM iSeries, which increased analytic and reporting capabilities

No weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. sophisticated IT system that includes a suite of Connections applications and uses an IBM iSeries platform
2. able to accept braided funding
3. demonstrated experience and organizational capacity to manage the Iowa Plan
4. narrative well-documented and comprehensive
5. demonstrated a clear understanding of the direct funding model with IDPH and DDS as relating to women and children

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. response stated would utilize a 10-day turnaround on ad hoc reports
2. provide insufficient detail on PharmaConnect
3. did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the direct funding model with IDPH and DDS for populations other than women and children

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. experience in supporting nine publicly funded managed care contracts; demonstrated organizational capacity
2. system provides flexibility to reconcile eligibility fluctuations or changes and to ensure payment from appropriate funding source

3. provides open access to providers and eligibles
4. flow chart provided a detail description of the system
5. allows for system users to develop own reports and provides a help desk to assist

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. insufficient level of detail provide to allow for full assessment of capacity
2. description of AMISYS and data warehouse was unclear in regards to what reports would be generated from which applications

#### **7A.2.18 Financial Requirements**

##### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. strong cash balance and current ratio showed a strong financial picture
2. provided transparency to its finances

No weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

##### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Partially Meets**. The panel found that a combination of missing information and information of concern distinguished this response.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. company is a going concern
2. had started up new business similar to the Iowa Plan in other states

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. did not specify how would fund initial reserve accounts
2. substantial judgment pending appeal
3. low cash reserves
4. lost a number of contracts recently that made up a high percentage of revenue; those losses present a concern to the financial picture
5. specified that will place reserve funds in escrow account rather than in a restricted reserve account that can only be drawn on with both the Contractor and state's signature

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

The one noted strength of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. parent company had sufficient cash on hand

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. did not provide financials for Cenpatico, but for Centene which is the parent corporation and sole owner of Cenpatico
2. showed a loss in a recent fiscal year

### **7A.2.19 Claims Payment by the Contractor**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The panel found that the bidder went beyond state expectations with its response.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. IA performance exceeded the state's claim payment timeliness requirements
2. proposed to increase target percentages for claims processing above the contract requirements
3. supportive of electronic submission by providers

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

#### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. payment system could manage braided funding streams
2. supportive of electronic submission by providers
3. strong experience that would allow the bidder to hit the ground running

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. response referred to a 14-day standard, not the 12-day standard referenced in the amended RFP
2. description of potential need for multiple check runs was confusing

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. provided a detailed start-up plan that included five months of monitoring post-implementation
2. made a substantial investment in claims processing personnel and training
3. acknowledged previous issues in other contracts head on and put processes in place to prevent those issues in Iowa

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. example of performance showed high failure rate in testing in previous contract with Kansas, unable to hit the ground running
2. description of triple-layered oversight process lacked detail

### **7A.2.20 Fraud & Abuse**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. the response included examples of effective action
2. would utilize a hotline
3. Special Investigations Unit, which is part of the corporate entity and independent of Magellan of Iowa
4. inclusion of a random enrollee survey to determine whether services were actually received
5. robust data mining process
6. well-described process for identifying and recovering overpayments

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

#### **Value Options**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. provided a comprehensive response
2. corporate-based Special Investigations Unit
3. would utilize a hotline
4. member of the National Healthcare Anti-Fraud Association

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. no examples were provided in this section

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. framed response to "waste, fraud and abuse"
2. included a toll-free external hotline operated by an external vendor
3. focused on updating codes and polices to prevent fraud

One weakness identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. the response did not include examples that showed strong results

### **Discussion of Summary Score for Programmatic Overview for Magellan:**

The Evaluators reviewed the scoring of each of the subsections of the Programmatic Overview. After discussion, the Evaluator Panel arrived at a quantitative rating of **340** for this section.

### **Discussion of Summary Score for Programmatic Overview for ValueOptions:**

The Evaluators reviewed the scoring of each of the subsections of the Programmatic Overview. After discussion, the Evaluator Panel arrived at a quantitative rating of **294** for this section.

### **Discussion of Summary Score for Programmatic Overview for Cenpatico:**

The Evaluators reviewed the scoring of each of the subsections of the Programmatic Overview. After discussion, the Evaluator Panel arrived at a quantitative rating of **319** for this section.

### **7A.3 Corporate Organization and Experience --- 15%**

#### **7A.3 Corporate Organizational and Experience**

##### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

One noted strength of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection was the following:

1. experience with contracts of comparable size

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

##### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. experience with contracts of comparable size
2. creative initiatives with peer-run programs

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

##### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

One noted strength of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection was the following:

1. experience with contracts of comparable size

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. unclear whether bidder had a statewide PCCM program-linked contract like the Iowa Plan

#### **7A.3.1 Organizational Information**

##### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. corporate staffing appropriate
2. corporate executives had appropriate qualifications

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

#### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. corporate staffing appropriate
2. corporate executives had appropriate qualifications

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

#### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. corporate staffing appropriate
2. no key vacancies
3. corporate executives had appropriate qualifications
4. explained corporate relationships

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

### **7A.3.2 Disclosure of Financial or Related Party Interest**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. no conflicts of interest (with provider groups)

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. did not explain the value of the relationship with SAMI

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

One noted strength of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection was the following:

1. no conflicts of interest (with provider groups)

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

One noted strength of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection was the following:

1. no conflicts of interest (with provider groups)

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

### **7A.3.3 Disclosure of Legal Actions**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

No strengths were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. two penalties in the past two years

#### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

No strengths were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. recent court judgment with large potential payment
2. significant number of issues in several states
3. eight contractual penalties in the past two years, including fines for late deliverables.  
The penalties were mostly not about access to care.

**Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

No strengths were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. five notices to cure and four contractual penalties in the past two years

**Discussion of Summary Score for Corporate Organization and Experience for Magellan:**

The Evaluators reviewed the scoring of each of the subsections of the Corporate Organization and Experience section. After discussion, the Evaluator Panel arrived at a quantitative rating of **300** for this section.

**Discussion of Summary Score for Corporate Organization and Experience for ValueOptions:**

The Evaluators reviewed the scoring of each of the subsections of the Corporate Organization and Experience section. After discussion, the Evaluator Panel arrived at a quantitative rating of **300** for this section.

**Discussion of Summary Score for Corporate Organization and Experience for Cenpatico:**

The Evaluators reviewed the scoring of each of the subsections of the Corporate Organization and Experience section. After discussion, the Evaluator Panel arrived at a quantitative rating of **300** for this section.

## **7A.4 Project Organization and Staffing --- 15%**

### **7A.4.1 Organizational Chart**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. delineated the direct lines of support for Iowa clearly
2. dedicated corporate training models to recovery

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

#### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

One noted strength of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection was the following:

1. delineated the direct lines of support for Iowa clearly

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

#### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

One noted strength of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection was the following:

1. responsive to requirements

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

### **7A.4.2 Chart or Other Presentation**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. explained exactly who would be involved and their roles
2. proposed executive director was qualified

3. comprehensive response
4. two co-occurring specialists

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. only two people assigned to network management

### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. explained exactly who would be involved and their roles
2. committed to ICM program
3. separate staffing by member type (adult and child)

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. 27 corporate FTEs that were not adequately explained

### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. explained exactly who was to be involved and their roles
2. proposed executive Director was qualified
3. proposed a grant writer position who could assist providers
4. proposed recovery advisory positions
5. explained understanding of recovery principles expertise of personnel

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. confusing explanation of Austin staff dedicated to Iowa and reporting to Austin
2. too many core functions located in Texas

### **7A.4.3 Chart or Other Presentation**

#### **Magellan**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. adequately described proposed subcontractors
2. the number of subcontractors appeared adequate

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

#### **ValueOptions**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

One noted strength of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection was the following:

1. explained that the bidder proposed no subcontractors

No weaknesses were identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection.

#### **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Partially Meets**. The location of crisis services out-of-state was the deciding factor in the Evaluator Panel's decision.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. adequately described proposed subcontractors
2. the number of subcontractors appear adequate

One weakness was identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection:

1. Crisis services (NurseWise) located out-of-state, in conflict with state requirement - should not be subcontracted as proposed

### **Discussion of Summary Score for Project Organization and Experience for Magellan:**

The Evaluators reviewed the scoring of each of the subsections of the Project Organization and Staffing section. After discussion, the Evaluator Panel arrived at a quantitative rating of **300** for this section.

**Discussion of Summary Score for Project Organization and Experience for ValueOptions:**

The Evaluators reviewed the scoring of each of the subsections of the Project Organization and Staffing section. After discussion, the Evaluator Panel arrived at a quantitative rating of **300** for this section.

**Discussion of Summary Score for Project Organization and Experience for Cenpatico:**

The Evaluators reviewed the scoring of each of the subsections of the Project Organization and Staffing section. After discussion, the Evaluator Panel arrived at a quantitative rating of **290** for this section.

## 7A.5 Budget Worksheet and Narrative - 10%

### 7A.5 Budget Worksheet and Narrative (RFP Section 9.3)

#### Magellan

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**. The committee found significant strengths and weaknesses which on balance resulted in a "Meets" score.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. proposed administrative cost percentages for Medicaid (12.5%) and IDPH (2.9%) were below the maximum allowed in the RFP
2. process for community reinvestment is clearly understood
3. highlighted the age 65 and older population

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. community reinvestment and services for children should be more extensive
2. very small increases in rehab peer-oriented services over time
3. no funding for mobile crisis or mobile counseling
4. no spending for substance abuse recovery services

#### ValueOptions

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets with Distinction**. The Panel found that the proposal to charge a Medicaid administrative fee below the maximum allowed by the RFP distinguished this proposal.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. proposed administrative costs percentage for Medicaid (12.75%) was below the maximum allowed in RFP
2. good Community Reinvestment Account proposals for substance abuse and telehealth
3. budgeted a decrease in inpatient spending and an increase in peer support and integrated mental health and supports spending

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. ACT utilization decrease from year one to year two of the contract
2. crisis services flat over time - but did allocate funds for it

## **Cenpatico**

The Evaluator Panel determined that the bidder's response in this subsection deserved a rating of **Meets**.

Some of the noted strengths of the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. narrative was consistent with RFP response recovery theme for mental health
2. Community Reinvestment Account budget was consistent with written descriptions
3. budget worksheet was consistent with proposed model, except for substance abuse

Some of the weaknesses identified in the response pursuant to the requirements of this subsection included the following:

1. nothing budgeted under substance abuse for recovery services
2. concern that pushing full risk to CSPs for non-inpatient services in year 2 would be too soon, especially given the new status of the entities
3. the community reinvestment proposals may not be feasible

### **Discussion of Summary Score for Budget Worksheet and Narrative for Magellan:**

The Evaluator Panel assessed the identified strengths and weaknesses of the budget worksheet and narrative. The Panel decided upon a summary score for this section of: **330**

### **Discussion of Summary Score for Budget Worksheet and Narrative for ValueOptions:**

The Evaluator Panel assessed the identified strengths and weaknesses of the budget worksheet and narrative. The Panel decided upon a summary score for this section of: **360**

### **Discussion of Summary Score for Budget Worksheet and Narrative for Cenpatico:**

The Evaluator Panel assessed the identified strengths and weaknesses of the budget worksheet and narrative. The Panel decided upon a summary score for this section of: **300**

### III. Recommendation of the Evaluator Panel

The Evaluators completed the evaluation of all three bids on Wednesday afternoon, April 15, 2009. The Evaluators reviewed the scores they had given each bidder on each of the sub-sections and sections, and the total score that each bidder earned (the total score was calculated by applying the section weights laid out in the RFP to the section scores and summing them). They then determined that while all three bidders achieved a cumulative score of Meets Expectations, their recommendation was to support selection of the highest scoring bidder, Magellan Behavioral Care of Iowa, which had a total bid score of 327 out of a possible 400, and had scored better, in several sub-sections and sections, than either of the other bidders. The total score for Cenpatico was 310 and the total score for ValueOptions of Iowa was 302. The Panel's section and total bid evaluation scores for each bidder are provided in **Attachment A**.

In making the recommendation to the Directors, the Evaluators demonstrated that the Evaluator Panel meeting process had been a thoughtful, thorough and fair one. Each Evaluator had had the opportunity to express his or her own views, to listen to and be persuaded by, (or not), the arguments of the other Evaluators. The recommendation of the Evaluator Panel accurately reflected each Evaluator's opinion.

The Evaluators also felt that the specific strengths and weaknesses identified in the process of evaluating the bid should be used by state staff when developing and implementing its process for monitoring the performance of the selected bidder as it administers the Iowa Plan for Behavioral Health.

**ATTACHMENT A**

	EVALUATOR PANEL'S SCORE FOR MAGELLAN	EVALUATOR PANEL'S SCORE FOR VALUE OPTIONS	EVALUATOR PANEL'S SCORE FOR CENPATICO
<b>RFP SECTION</b>			
<b>PROGRAMMATIC OVERVIEW (60%) Section Score</b>	340	294	319
<b>CORPORATE ORGANIZATION AND EXPERIENCE (15%) Section Score</b>	300	300	300
<b>PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND EXPERIENCE (15%) Section Score</b>	300	300	290
<b>BUDGET NARRATIVE AND WORKSHEET (10%) Section Score</b>	330	360	300
<b>TOTAL BID EVALUATION SCORE</b>	327	302	310