State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Demographic Information			
Behavioral Health Plan (BHP) Name	County of Ventura		
Project Leader Name	Sloane Burt	**Title**	QI Manager
Telephone Number	(805) 981-4214	**Email Address**	Sloane.burt@ventura.org
PIP Topic	*Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service*		
Submission Date	July 11, 2025	**Resubmission Date**	

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Evaluation Elements	Critical	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
Step 1. Selected PIP Topic: The topic must be selected based on data demonstrating an opportunity for improvement or selected by the State.			
1. The PIP topic was selected by the State and/or based on plan-specific data demonstrating an opportunity for improvement. This element will not be scored *N/A (Not Applicable)*.	C*	*Met*	
Results for Step 1			
Total Evaluation Elements**	**1**	**1**	**Critical Elements*****
Met	1	1	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	0	0	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

*   "C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element.
**   This is the total number of all evaluation elements for this step.
*** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Evaluation Elements	Critical	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
Step 2. Aim Statement(s): Defining the statement(s) sets the focus and framework for the PIP.			
1. The Aim statement included the population, improvement strategies, and time period. The Aim statement was clear, concise, and answerable. This element will not be scored *N/A (Not Applicable)*.	C*	*Met*	**General Comment:** HSAG will assess for statistically significant improvement once the PIP progresses to reporting Remeasurement 1 and Remeasurement 2 outcomes, and not for meeting or exceeding the BHP's goal of a 15 percent increase. The BHP will need to ensure that a 15 percent increase over the baseline performance will result in statistically significant improvement.
Results for Step 2			
Total Evaluation Elements**	**1**	**1**	**Critical Elements****
Met	1	1	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	0	0	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

* "C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element.
** This is the total number of all evaluation elements for this step.
*** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Evaluation Elements	Critical	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
Step 3. Identified PIP Population: The PIP population must be clearly defined to represent the population to which the Aim statement and performance indicator(s) apply.			
1. The PIP population was accurately and completely defined. This element will not be scored *N/A (Not Applicable)*.	C*	*Met*	
		Results for Step 3	
Total Evaluation Elements**	**1**	**1**	**Critical Elements*****
Met	1	1	Met
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	0	0	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

*   "C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element.
**   This is the total number of all evaluation elements for this step.
*** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Evaluation Elements	Critical	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
Step 4. Sampling Method: If sampling was used to select members of the population (denominator), proper sampling methods are necessary to ensure valid and reliable results. Sampling methods must be in accordance with accepted principles of research design and statistical analysis.			
1. The BHP documented the sampling frame size for each performance indicator.		*N/A*	
2. The BHP documented the sample size for each performance indicator.	C*	*N/A*	
3. The BHP documented the margin of error and confidence level for each performance indicator.		*N/A*	
4. The BHP described the method used to select the sample.		*N/A*	
5. The sampling methodology used allowed for the generalization of results to the population.	C*	*N/A*	
Results for Step 4			
Total Evaluation Elements**	**5**	**2**	**Critical Elements***
Met	0	0	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	5	2	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

*   "C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element.
**   This is the total number of all evaluation elements for this step.
*** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Evaluation Elements	Critical	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
Step 5. Selected Performance Indicator(s): A performance indicator is a quantitative measure that reflects a discrete event or a status that is to be measured. The selected indicator(s) must track performance or improvement over time. The indicator(s) must be objective, clearly, and unambiguously defined, and based on current clinical knowledge or health services research.			
1. The performance indicator(s) was well-defined, objective, and could track performance over time.	C*	*Met*	**General Comment**: There is only one required indicator for this PIP. The BHP should remove the second indicator from Step 5 and use that information internally for tracking purposes or to determine targeted interventions.
Results for Step 5			
Total Evaluation Elements**	**1**	**1**	**Critical Elements***
Met	1	1	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	0	0	*N/A (Not Applicable)*
* "C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element. ** This is the total number of all evaluation elements for this step. *** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.			

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Evaluation Elements	Critical	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
Step 6. Data Collection Procedures: The data collection process must ensure that the data collected on each performance indicator(s) were valid and reliable.			
1. The BHP included clearly defined sources of data and data elements collected for each performance indicator. This element will not be scored *N/A (Not Applicable)*.		*Met*	
2. The BHP included a clearly defined and systematic process for collecting baseline and remeasurement data. This element will not be scored *N/A (Not Applicable)*.	C*	*Met*	
3. A copy of the manual data collection tool used was provided, if applicable.	C*	*N/A*	
4. The BHP included the percentage of administrative data completeness at the time the data were generated, and the process used to calculate the reported percentage.		*N/A*	
Results for Step 6			
Total Evaluation Elements**	**4**	**2**	**Critical Elements***
Met	2	1	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	2	1	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

* "C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element.
** This is the total number of all evaluation elements for this step.
*** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Results for Step 1 - 6			
Total Evaluation Elements	**13**	**8**	**Critical Elements**
Met	6	5	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	7	3	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Evaluation Elements	Critical	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
Step 7. Data Analysis and Interpretation of Results: The interpretation of performance indicator results and the required statistical testing must be reported accurately for each performance indicator.			
1. The BHP included all required data and statistical testing for all performance indicators. The data and statistical testing information were accurate, clear, and could be replicated.	C*	*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to reporting performance indicator data.
2. The BHP documented possible reasons for the lack of improvement, lessons learned, and next steps for each performance indicator.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to reporting performance indicator data.
3. The BHP documented the threats to validity for each measurement period and the threats to comparability between the baseline and each remeasurement period.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to reporting performance indicator data.
Results for Step 7			
Total Evaluation Elements	**3**	**1**	**Critical Elements***
Met	0	0	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	0	0	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

*   "C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element.
**   This is the total number of all evaluation elements for this step.
*** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Evaluation Elements	Critical	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
Step 8. Improvement Strategies: Interventions were developed to target the identified barriers to improvement and were evaluated for effectiveness.			
1. The BHP completed the Quality Improvement (QI) Team table, described the QI tool(s) used, or selected and attached the completed QI tool(s).	C*	*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to the point of developing and initiating improvement strategies.
2. The BHP clearly described each intervention and the intervention addressed root causes/barriers identified through data analysis and/or QI tools.	C*	*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to the point of developing and initiating improvement strategies.
3. The BHP completed an intervention worksheet for each listed intervention in the Step 8 Barriers/Interventions table. Each intervention worksheet was completed to the point of intervention progress.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to the point of developing and initiating improvement strategies.
4. The BHP tested interventions to a point in the remeasurement period that could reasonably drive improvement in performance indicator outcomes.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to the point of developing and initiating improvement strategies.
5. The BHP developed a methodologically sound measure(s) or process to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of each intervention.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to the point of developing and initiating improvement strategies.
6. The BHP documented an accurate summary of intervention testing results.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to the point of developing and initiating improvement strategies.
7. The BHP documented lessons learned, challenges encountered, and solutions to challenges for each intervention tested.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to the point of developing and initiating improvement strategies.
8. The BHP documented the status of each intervention (Adopt, Adapt, Abandon, Continue Evaluating) and the rationale for the selected status.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to the point of developing and initiating improvement strategies.
Results for Step 8			
Total Evaluation Elements**	**8**	**2**	**Critical Elements*****
Met	0	0	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	0	0	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

*   "C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element.
**   This is the total number of all evaluation elements for this step.
*** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Results for Step 7 - 8			
Total Evaluation Elements	**11**	**3**	**Critical Elements**
Met	0	0	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	0	0	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Evaluation Elements	Critical	Scoring	Comments/Recommendations
Performance Improvement Project Validation			
Step 9. Likelihood that Significant and Sustained Improvement Occurred (Outcomes): Improvement in performance is evaluated based on evidence that there was statistically significant improvement over the baseline performance. Sustained improvement is assessed after statistically significant improvement over baseline has been demonstrated. Sustained improvement is achieved when improvement is maintained with a subsequent measurement period.			
1. The remeasurement methodology was the same as the baseline methodology for all performance indicators.	C*	*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to being assessed for this evaluation element.
2. There was improvement over baseline performance across all performance indicators for the current reported remeasurement period.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to being assessed for this evaluation element.
3. There was statistically significant improvement (95 percent confidence level, $p < 0.05$) over the baseline across all performance indicators for the current reported remeasurement period.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to being assessed for this evaluation element.
4. For any applicable indicator, sustained statistically significant improvement compared to the baseline result was demonstrated with a subsequent reported remeasurement period.		*Not Assessed*	The BHP had not progressed to being assessed for this evaluation element.
Results for Step 9			
Total Evaluation Elements**	**4**	**1**	**Critical Elements*****
Met	0	0	*Met*
Partially Met	0	0	*Partially Met*
Not Met	0	0	*Not Met*
N/A (Not Applicable)	0	0	*N/A (Not Applicable)*

*   "C" in this column denotes a critical evaluation element.
**   This is the total number of all evaluation elements for this step.
*** This is the total number of critical evaluation elements for this step.

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

Table 1 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool Scores for *Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service (PSS)* for County of Ventura										
Review Step	**Total Possible Evaluation Elements (Including Critical Elements)**	**Total** *Met*	**Total** *Partially Met*	**Total** *Not Met*	**Total** *N/A*	**Total Possible Critical Elements**	**Total Critical Elements** *Met*	**Total Critical Elements** *Partially Met*	**Total Critical Elements** *Not Met*	**Total Critical Elements** *N/A*
1. Selected PIP Topic	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
2. Aim Statement(s)	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
3. Identified PIP Population	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
4. Sampling Method	5	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	2
5. Selected Performance Indicator(s)	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
6. Data Collection Procedures	4	2	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	1
7. Data Analysis and Interpretation of Results	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
8. Improvement Strategies	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
9. Likelihood that Significant and Sustained Improvement Occurred	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Totals for All Steps	**28**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**12**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**3**

Table 2 2025-26 Overall Confidence of Adherence to Acceptable Methodology for All Phases of the PIP for *Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive PSS* for County of Ventura	
Percentage Score of Evaluation Elements *Met* *	*100%*
Percentage Score of Critical Elements *Met* **	*100%*
Confidence Level*	*High Confidence*

Table 3 2025-26 Overall Confidence That the PIP Achieved Significant Improvement for *Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive PSS* for County of Ventura	
Percentage Score of Evaluation Elements *Met* *	*Not Assessed*
Percentage Score of Critical Elements *Met* **	*Not Assessed*
Confidence Level*	*Not Assessed*

The *Not Assessed* and *Not Applicable* scores have been removed from the scoring calculations.

* The percentage score of evaluation elements *Met* is calculated by dividing the total number *Met* by the sum of all evaluation elements *Met*, *Partially Met*, and *Not Met*.

** The percentage score of critical elements *Met* is calculated by dividing the total critical elements *Met* by the sum of the critical elements *Met*, *Partially Met*, and *Not Met*.

*** Confidence Level: See confidence level definitions on next page.

State of California 2025-26 PIP Validation Tool
Increase the Percentage of Members Who Receive at Least One Peer Support Service
for County of Ventura

EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF PIP RESULTS

HSAG assessed the BHP's PIP based on CMS EQR Protocol 1 to determine whether the BHP adhered to an acceptable methodology for all phases of design and data collection, and conducted accurate data analysis and interpretation of PIP results. HSAG's validation of the PIP determined the following:

High Confidence: *High confidence* in reported PIP results. All critical evaluation elements were *Met,* and 90 percent to 100 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met* across all steps.

Moderate Confidence: *Moderate confidence* in reported PIP results. All critical evaluation elements were *Met,* and 80 percent to 89 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met* across all steps.

Low Confidence: *Low confidence* in reported PIP results. Across all steps, 65 percent to 79 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met;* or one or more critical evaluation elements were *Partially Met.*

No Confidence: *No confidence* in reported PIP results. Across all steps, less than 65 percent of all evaluation elements were *Met;* or one or more critical evaluation elements were *Not Met.*

Confidence Level for Acceptable Methodology: *High Confidence*

HSAG assessed the BHP's PIP based on CMS EQR Protocol 1 and determined whether the BHP produced evidence of significant improvement. HSAG's validation of the PIP determined the following:

High Confidence: All performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.

Moderate Confidence: To receive *Moderate Confidence* for significant improvement, one of the three scenarios below occurred:

     1. All performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline, **and** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.

     2. All performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline, **and** none of the performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.

     3. Some but not all performance indicators demonstrated improvement over baseline, **and** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over baseline.

Low Confidence: The remeasurement methodology was not the same as the baseline methodology for at least one performance indicator **or** some but not all performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline and none of the performance indicators demonstrated *statistically significant* improvement over the baseline.

No Confidence: The remeasurement methodology was not the same as the baseline methodology for all performance indicators **or** none of the performance indicators demonstrated improvement over the baseline.

Confidence Level for Significant Improvement: *Not Assessed*