

The CHIPRA Quality Demonstration Grant Program

In February 2010, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) awarded 10 grants, funding 18 States, to improve the quality of health care for children enrolled in Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Funded by the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (CHIPRA), the Quality Demonstration Grant Program aims to identify effective, replicable strategies for enhancing quality of health care for children. With funding from CMS, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) is leading the national evaluation of the program.

The 18 CHIPRA quality demonstration States are implementing 52 projects in five general categories:

- Using quality measures to improve child health care.
- Applying e-Health information technology on February 22, 2010 and was scheduled to

conclude on February 21, 2015. The national evaluation of the grant program started on August 8, 2010, and is expected to be completed by September 8, 2015.



How are CHIPRA quality demonstration States using quality reports to drive health care improvements for children?

Authors: Grace Anglin and Mynti Hossain

This *Evaluation Highlight* describes how six States are using quality reports to draw attention to State- or practice-level performance on quality measures in order to drive health care improvements for children. The *Highlight* focuses on how six States are using quality reports to draw attention to State- or practice-level performance on quality measures in order to drive health care improvements for children.

KEY MESSAGES

- States indicated that implementing a range of State- and practice-level initiatives to improve health care for children.
- States formed workgroups or held formal discussions to review quality reports to identify areas for improvement.
- Practices found reports helpful for identifying QI priorities but less useful for identifying specific areas for improvement.
- Practices needed technical assistance from the State to understand the quality measures.

These findings are based on data from the national evaluation of the CHIPRA Quality Demonstration Grant Program.

Six of these States are using quality reports to drive health care improvements for children. The States are using quality reports to identify areas for improvement and to draw attention to State- or practice-level performance on quality measures. The States are using quality reports to identify areas for improvement and to draw attention to State- or practice-level performance on quality measures.

Figure 1. How States Used Quality Reports to Drive QI at the State and Practice Levels

Note: All six States pursued State-level reporting and quality improvement activities. Maine, North Carolina, and Massachusetts produced practice-level reports from existing State-level data sources; only North Carolina and Maine helped practices use those reports for QI.

these data to develop reports on quality for practices in their States that serve... *Highlight* describes the reports States produced, how States used the reports to encourage QI at the State and practice levels, and the changes that

Findings

Quality reports helped spur State-level QI activities

Assessing statewide performance. Six States used statewide reports to

comes from semi-structured interviews conducted by the national evaluation... *Highlight* also draws on the semi-annual progress reports that

Evaluation Highlights described the technical and administrative steps States took to calculate quality measures at the... *Highlight* outlined how practices and health systems used data from electronic chart reviews to track their own quality

Several States indicated that selecting when groups new to QI were actively engaged or when a large number of groups were involved in the conversation, States included information in State-level reports that coincided with their priorities and Illinois are reporting measures for their a h

Policy and Programmatic Changes	
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•

Conclusion

Health care quality improvement reports to drive improvements in the quality of care for children. While change requires more than simply producing and disseminating reports, the States used reports on a variety of ways to engage stakeholders at the State and local levels. For example, the States used reports on a variety of ways to engage stakeholders about the quality of care for children. Health care quality improvement reports to drive improvements in the quality of care for children. While change requires more than simply producing and disseminating reports, the States used reports on a variety of ways to engage stakeholders at the State and local levels. For example, the States used reports on a variety of ways to engage stakeholders about the quality of care for children.

in claims processing and infrequent concrete changes, most practices needed technical assistance from the State to establish a QI process. In addition, most practices needed technical assistance from the State to establish a QI process. In addition, most practices needed technical assistance from the State to establish a QI process.

Implications

LEARN MORE

Additional publications from the CHIPRA Quality Demonstration Grant Program on quality measurement, reporting, and QI are available at <http://www.ahrq.gov/chipra/demoeval/>.

Calculating quality measures

- *Highlight 1: How are CHIPRA Demonstration States Approaching Practice-Level Quality Measurement and What are They Learning?*

Developing quality reports

- *Reports from States: Results from Massachusetts’s Family Focus Groups and Provider Interviews and Maine’s Provider Survey on Quality Reports*
- *State-level quality reports: Illinois CHIPRA Data Workbook, Maine Summary of Pediatric Quality Measures, Florida Performance Measure Reports*

Encouraging State-level QI

- *Implementation Guide 1: Engaging Stakeholders to Improve the Quality of Children’s Health Care*
- *Highlight 4: How the CHIPRA Quality Demonstration Elevated Children on State Health Policy Agendas*

Encouraging practice-level measurement and QI

- *Highlight 5: How Are CHIPRA Quality Demonstration States Encouraging Health Care Providers to Put Quality Measures to Work?*
- *Manuscript: Nine States’ Use of Collaboratives to Improve Children’s Health Care Quality in Medicaid and CHIP*

Use the tabs and information boxes on the Web page to also:

- Find out about the 52 projects being implemented in the 18 CHIPRA quality demonstration States.
- Get an overview of projects in each of the five CHIPRA quality demonstration grant categories.
- View other reports that the national evaluation team and the State evaluation teams have produced on specific evaluation topics and questions.
- Learn more about the national evaluation, including its objectives, evaluation design, and methods.
- Sign up for email updates from the national evaluation team.

Endnotes

- % We use the term “national evaluation” to distinguish our work from the activities of evaluators who, under contract to many of the grantees, are assessing the implementation and outcomes of State-level
- & : cf a cfY]bZfa U]cb'cb hY7< =DF5 7\]X 7cfYGzj]gh\hd.##k k k'a YX]W]X[cj # A YX]W]X[7< =D]Dfc[fUa !-bZfa U]cb# 6ntHd]W#Ei U]ht"

Acknowledgments

The national evaluation of the CHIPRA Quality Demonstration Grant Program and the *Evaluation Highlights* are supported by a contract (HHS29020090002191) from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) to Mathematica Policy Research and its partners, the Urban Institute and AcademyHealth. Special thanks are due to Cindy Brach and Linda Bergofsky at AHRQ, Barbara Dailey and Elizabeth Hill at CMS, and our colleagues for their careful review and many helpful comments. We particularly appreciate the help received from CHIPRA quality demonstration staff, providers, and other stakeholders in the six States featured in this *Highlight* and the time they spent answering many questions during our site visits and telephone calls and reviewing an early draft. The observations in this document represent the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or perspectives of any State or Federal agency.