

Quality First Update – September 2012

The table below represents the current estimated star rating for **758 providers** (1 provider’s assessment is not “complete” as of this report date, so is not included in this number). The estimated star rating is based on each of the provider’s latest assessments. For some providers, the latest assessment could be their 1st assessment scores (Initial/Initial Rating), 2nd assessment (progress) or 3rd assessment. If a provider has completed all three QF assessments, including ERS, CLASS and the QF Point Scale, their rating is inclusive of all three assessments. For those providers whose QF Point Scale score is pending, the rating is reflective of their ERS and CLASS score combination. Aggregated provider ratings by Regional Partnership Council are found in the attached report, *Quality First Estimated Star Level for Enrolled Providers by Regional Partnership Council - September 2012*.

| Current Estimated Quality First Star Rating | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Total Providers | 758 | 66 | 623 | 55 | 12 | 2 |
| Initial Enrolled in FY 12 (Providers newly enrolled in SFY 2012 with one assessment) | 102 | 13 | 80 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Initial Enrolled prior to FY 12 (Providers without a progress assessment) | 86 | 12 | 64 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Progress (Providers with 2 assessments) | 440 | 34 | 373 | 26 | 6 | 1 |
| 3rd Assessment (providers with 3 assessments) | 130 | 7 | 106 | 14 | 3 | 0 |

Of the total providers currently enrolled in QF, **130 providers** have had 3 assessments points (*average time between each assessment point is 12 to 18 months based on the implementation of the provider’s Quality Improvement Plan*). Providers’ gain scores in estimated star rating over 3 time points were analyzed using paired t-tests.

Preliminary analysis of data from those 130 providers, comparing their Initial (1st) assessment to Progress (2nd) assessment rating scores, using 2- tailed paired t-test, showed the overall mean of provider estimated quality rating as a **significant** increase from a mean of **1.70 to 1.92**; $t(129) = 4.11, p = .000$. In other words, results show that from initial to progress assessment, this group of initial providers on average showed movement, using an estimated star rating, from 1 Star to 2 Star, which indicated quality improvement in the right direction.

Follow up analysis of the same 130 providers’ data, comparing their progress rating (2nd) to their 3rd assessment, using 2- tailed paired t-test, showed the overall mean of provider estimated quality rating as a **significant** increase from a mean of **1.92 to 2.10**; $t(129) = 3.71, p = .000$. In other words, results show that from 2nd assessment to the 3rd assessment point, providers on average are making a visible move from an estimated star rating of 1 Star to 2 Star.

Of the total providers currently enrolled in QF, **102 providers** (Center = 72, Home = 30) were newly enrolled in SFY 2012. The preliminary analysis of the estimated star ratings show the mean estimated star rating based on their initial assessment is **1.97**. Preliminary review suggests that mean rating of SFY 2012 providers at their initial point is comparable to the mean rating of previously enrolled providers at their 2nd assessment point. In other words, providers are now entering Quality First at a higher level of initial quality.