



**Santrax® Payer Management**  
*Electronic Visit Verification® Solutions*

Increasing the Capacity to Care  
Improving the Process of Home Care

**The Federal EVV Mandate:  
Value Beyond Compliance  
For Providers and Payers**

Sandata Technologies, LLC  
www.sandata.com

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Agenda**

- Establishing EVV Credibility
- 21<sup>st</sup> Century Cures Act Overview
- What is Electronic Visit Verification?
- EVV Models and Scorecards
- Value Beyond Compliance

 2

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Establishing EVV Credibility**

SOLUTIONS	EXPERIENCE
<p><b>INCREASING THE CAPACITY TO CARE BY...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Optimizing the value of every in-home encounter</li> <li>✓ Maximizing the efficiency of homecare Providers</li> <li>✓ Enabling collaboration between Payers and Providers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Focused on homecare technology for over 38 years</li> <li>✓ Deployed EVV in 1994, held patent until 2010</li> <li>✓ Experience with 9 state Medicaid Agencies and 6 MCOs</li> <li>✓ Only vendor with experience with all 4 EVV models</li> </ul>
	SCALE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 180+ employees dedicated to the Home Care market</li> <li>✓ Mobile users: 60K+</li> <li>✓ 90+ integration points with homecare vendors</li> <li>✓ Customers in 45 states, Puerto Rico and Canada</li> <li>✓ Daily reach of 200K+ homes</li> <li>✓ 3K+ providers using Sandata to manage 500K+ patients</li> </ul>



 3

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## 21<sup>st</sup> Century Cures Act Overview

**Electronic Visit Verification System Required for Personal Care Services and Home Health Care Services Under Medicaid**

- States that do not comply by the mandated dates will face an escalating penalty:
  - Personal Care Services: January 1, 2019
  - Home Health Services: January 1, 2023
- The EVV system must verify the following:
 

**EVV qualifies for Enhanced Federal Match**

**90% Implementation Fees**  
**75% Operational Fees**

  - Location and Type of service;
  - Individuals Providing and Receiving service;
  - Date and Time the service Begins and Ends.
- States must:
  - Implement a process to seek input from beneficiaries and caregivers
  - Consult with Agencies and ensure the program:
    - Is minimally burdensome, HIPAA compliant, takes into account existing EVV systems
- CMS will publish best practices by Jan, 2018:
  - Training caregivers on the use of the system and the prevention of fraud
  - Educating family caregivers and members on the use of EVV to prevent fraud

CBO Scored EVV Mandate Positively

4

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## 21<sup>st</sup> Century Cures Act Overview

### CMS Guidance Has Largely Been Delivered For State Medicaid Directors

**A link to the CMS guidance:**

– <http://dhhs.ne.gov/medicaid/Documents/EVV-Presentation-Part2-1.10.18.pdf>

5

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Electronic Visit Verification (EVV): What is it?

**Electronic Visit Verification is a modular technology solution that provides transparency into home based care delivery, supporting provider network optimization while improving the member's quality of care. Modules typically include:**

- **Scheduling Module**
  - Scheduler contains data on provider, caregiver, member and authorizations;
  - Adherence to authorization is done at the point of scheduling, not after the service is delivered;
  - Missed or late scheduled visits create alerts to inform the provider that the member was not served according to the care plan.
- **Visit Verification Module**
  - When the caregiver arrives on site, they "check-in" using a variety of technologies (mobile, telephonic, device, etc.);
  - When they leave, they "check-out" via the same means;
  - The system accurately captures visit start, stop, duration, and tasks performed

6

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



## EVV Program Models

State-level Electronic Visit Verification (“EVV”) programs are a relatively new concept, and today there are 19 States who have programs deployed or in implementation. As these early adopters have explored EVV, four major models have evolved in the market:

**State Medicaid Directors Need to Choose an EVV Model**

1. **Provider Choice Model**  
(Used by three States);
2. **MCO Choice Model**  
(Used by three States);
3. **State Choice Model**  
(Used by eleven States);
4. **Open Vendor Model**  
(Used by two States).

**EVV Program Models**

- Provider Choice**  
No state involvement in EVV vendor selection
- MCO Choice**  
Minimal, if any, state involvement in EVV vendor selection
- State Choice**  
State is fully engaged in EVV vendor selection process
- Open Vendor**  
Hybrid model where state selects single EVV vendor while allowing providers / MCOs to continue using existing EVV vendor systems

Sandata 10

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Provider Choice

**States that have implemented this model include:**

- Missouri
- New York
- Washington

Sandata 11

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Provider Choice

In this model, the state generally requires the provider community to self-fund, select and implement an EVV solution of their choosing. Some states have offered a preferred vendor list for providers to select from, while other states have simply established a minimum set of standards for vendor selection.

<b>State</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The “Unfunded Mandate”</li> <li>• Enforcement has generally been “Pay and Chase”</li> <li>• Easiest model to implement</li> </ul>
<b>Providers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All costs are the responsibility of the providers</li> <li>• Small agencies &amp; Individual Providers ill-equipped</li> <li>• Generally low level of monitoring and compliance</li> </ul>
<b>Quality Monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited access to data</li> <li>• Disparity in EVV products - challenging to consolidate data</li> <li>• Retrospective audits are typically deployed</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no published studies showing savings attributed to the use of this model</li> </ul>

*This Model Can Be Improved With Aggregator Technology*

Sandata 12

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**MCO Choice**

States that have implemented this model include:

- Iowa
- New Mexico
- Tennessee

*Sandata* 13

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**MCO Choice**

The state requires the MCOs to fund, select and implement an EVV solution of their own choosing. States may or may not set minimum standards for vendor selection and require a minimum set of reporting on EVV activity.

**State**

- Low cost model to implement
- Data disparity can be a challenge with multiple EVV solutions
- MCOs may or may not enforce compliance

**Providers**

- Multiple MCOs with multiple EVV solutions – Disaster?

**Quality Monitoring**

- Data disparity creates challenges for reporting & monitoring
- Disparity in features/functionality from MCO to MCO
- MCOs generally have Analytics capabilities

**Outcomes**

- There are no published studies showing savings attributed to the use of this model

*This Model Can Be Improved With Aggregator Technology*

*Sandata* 14

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**State Choice**

States that have selected this model include:

- Alabama
- Connecticut
- Illinois
- Kansas
- Louisiana
- Massachusetts
- Mississippi
- Oklahoma
- Oregon
- Rhode Island
- South Carolina
- Texas

*Sandata* 15

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### State Choice

The state Medicaid program contracts with a single EVV vendors and mandates that all Providers use that vendor's EVV system The selected solution is implemented by the state, with states having direct management and oversight over the entire program.

- State**
  - Qualifies for 90% Implementation match by CMS
  - Qualifies for 75% Operational match by CMS
  - Requires active involvement and management by the state
- Providers**
  - Providers are provided EVV solution at "no cost"
  - Positive for small agencies or Individual Providers
  - Challenging for larger, technically sophisticated providers
- Quality Monitoring**
  - Highest level of demonstrated compliance
  - Consistency of real-time data enables transparency
  - Alerting and monitoring of gaps in care
- Outcomes**
  - Documented savings from 5-50% and Quality metrics have been produced from this model.

*Mature Model That Has Delivered Documented Outcomes*

Sandata 16

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Open Vendor

A new model currently employed by Ohio.

Florida recently procured an Open solution for the FFS members covered by AHCA.

Many new procurements are selecting this model.



Sandata 17

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Open EVV Choice

The Open Vendor Model is a new hybrid model where the state selects an EVV vendor, and allows Providers to use the state-selected solution at no-cost, or to continue using their current EVV solution. A vendor agnostic Aggregator solution receives data from all EVV systems and provides comprehensive oversight over the entire program – regardless of EVV system used.

- State**
  - Least disruptive environment, most complexity for state
  - Qualifies for CMS Enhanced match: 90% and 75%
  - Heavy involvement in procurement and system management
- Providers**
  - Maximum flexibility: use free system or system of their choice
  - Best suited for small and large providers
  - Will require integration with state Aggregator solution
- Quality Monitoring**
  - Expect high level of compliance
  - Real-time visit data available to the Payers and Providers
  - Alerts can be configured for quality assurance
- Outcomes**
  - There are no published studies showing savings attributed to the use of this model, but expect similar savings as the State Choice model (5-50%)

*Most States Are Considering This Model*

Sandata

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



### Nobody Likes a Mandate

*However, There is Value Beyond Compliance with the Cures Act*



- Validating Check-in and Check-out times
  - Yesterday's problem that has been solved with various solutions
- Required data should be viewed as the "minimum"
  - Leverage your daily interactions to capture real-time data
- If you have to use it...

Sandata 22

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Potential Value of EVV Solutions

*Three Ways to Drive Incremental Value*



1. Operational efficiencies
2. Differentiation in your market
3. Participation in new reimbursement models

Sandata 23

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Drive Value – Operational Efficiencies

- 1. Maximize Revenue**
  - Fill missed visits based on real-time alerts
  - Staff hard-to-fill cases with broadcast messaging
  - Prevent short visits with prompting
  - Avoid underutilization of Authorizations
  - Become a preferred provider in the network
- 2. Reduce Costs**
  - Reduce caregiver support costs: directions, schedules, payroll
  - Reduce scheduling costs
  - Reduce paper costs: timesheets, drive time, storage
  - Lower staffing costs: satisfaction, turnover
  - Lower audit risks and costs



Sandata 24

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

