



New York Department of Health  
Delivery System Reform Incentive  
Payment (DSRIP) Program

DSRIP Scoring Summary:  
*Mount Sinai Hospitals Group*

February 17 - 20, 2015



## Table of Contents

**PPS Informational Page and Proposal Overview ..... 3**

**Projects Selected – Summary Table ..... 4**

**Organizational and Project Scoring Summary Tables ..... 5**

**Organizational Component Scores ..... 5**

**Project Scores ..... 6**

**Final Application Score Calculation ..... 7**

**Organizational Scoring – Narrative Summary ..... 8**

**Bonus Scoring – Narrative Summary..... 10**

**Project Scoring Narrative Summaries ..... 11**

**Project 2.a.i ..... 11**

**Project 2.b.iv ..... 12**

**Project 2.b.viii ..... 13**

**Project 2.c.i ..... 14**

**Project 3.a.i ..... 15**

**Project 3.a.iii ..... 16**

**Project 3.b.i ..... 17**

**Project 3.c.i ..... 18**

**Project 4.b.ii ..... 19**

**Project 4.c.ii ..... 20**



## PPS Informational Page and Proposal Overview

**PPS Name:** Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

**PPS Lead Organization:** Mount Sinai Hospital

**PPS Service Counties:** Kings, New York, Queens

**Total Attributed Population:** 279,751

### Goals of the PPS:

1. Create an integrated delivery system, reduce avoidable hospitalizations and readmissions
2. Shift care delivery from inpatient care to coordinated, patient-centered care teams in the community
3. Develop the programming and infrastructure necessary to manage population health
4. Move towards a value-based and capitated payment

### Network Composition:

Provider Types	Total Providers in Network
Primary Care Physicians	1,540
Non-PCP Practitioners	5,639
Hospitals	13
Clinics	67
Health Home / Care Management	38
Behavioral Health	354
Substance Abuse	36
Skilled Nursing Facilities / Nursing Homes	43
Pharmacy	28
Hospice	4
Community Based Organizations	30
All Other	3,470



### Projects Selected – Summary Table

Project Selection	Project Title	Index Score	Number of PPS' Pursuing Project	% of PPS' Selecting Project
2.a.i	Create Integrated Delivery Systems focused on Evidence-based Medicine/Population Health Management	56	22	88%
2.b.iv	Care transitions intervention model to reduce 30-day readmissions for chronic health conditions	43	17	68%
2.b.viii	Hospital-Home Care Collaboration Solutions	45	7	28%
2.c.i	Development of community-based health navigation services	37	5	20%
3.a.i	Integration of primary care and behavioral health services	39	25	100%
3.a.iii	Implementation of evidence-based medication adherence programs (MAP) in community based sites for behavioral health medication compliance	29	2	8%
3.b.i	Evidence-based strategies for disease management in high risk/affected populations (adult only)	30	15	60%
3.c.i	Evidence-based strategies for disease management in high risk/affected populations (adult only)	30	10	40%
4.b.ii	Increase Access to High Quality Chronic Disease Preventive Care and Management in Both Clinical and Community Settings (Note: This project targets chronic diseases that are not included in domain 3, such as cancer)	17	11	44%
4.c.ii	Increase early access to, and retention in, HIV care	19	7	28%
	<b>Cumulative Index Score</b>	<b>345</b>		
	<b>PPS Rank by Cumulative Index Score</b>	<b>21</b>		

## Organizational and Project Scoring Summary Tables

### Organizational Component Scores

Please note, the organizational component score is worth 30% of the final score with the Project score representing 70% of the overall score for each DSRIP project.

Section Points Possible		Reviewer Scores						Subjective Scores				Objective Score	Final Org Score <sup>2</sup>
Section	Points Possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	Median	Average	Trimmed Average	Selected Subjective Score <sup>1</sup>	Workforce Score	
Executive Summary	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	N/A	Pass
Governance	25	22.88	22.67	23.92	24.79	21.06	25.00	23.40	23.39	23.85	23.85	N/A	<b>23.85</b>
Community Needs Assessment	25	23.06	24.86	23.75	23.75	23.89	22.29	23.75	23.60	23.86	23.86	N/A	<b>23.86</b>
Workforce Strategy	20	15.07	16.00	15.75	15.55	15.05	16.00	15.65	15.57	15.57	15.65	2.00	<b>17.65</b>
Data Sharing, Confidentiality & Rapid Cycle Evaluation	5	5.00	4.72	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	4.93	4.97	5.00	N/A	<b>5.00</b>
PPS Cultural Competency/Health Literacy	15	14.17	15.00	15.00	15.00	12.50	15.00	15.00	14.44	14.83	15.00	N/A	<b>15.00</b>
DSRIP Budget & Flow of Funds	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	N/A	Pass
Financial Sustainability Plan	10	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	8.89	10.00	10.00	9.81	10.00	10.00	N/A	<b>10.00</b>
<b>Total</b>												<b>95.36</b>	

<sup>1</sup> **Selected Subjective Score** is the highest of the median, average, and trimmed average

<sup>2</sup> **Final Org Score** is the sum of the *Selected Subjective Score* and *Workforce Score*

### Project Scores

Please note, the project scores are worth 70% of the final score with the Organizational score representing 30% of the overall score for each DSRIP project.

Points Possible		Reviewer Scores						Subjective Scores				Objective Scores		Total Project Score <sup>2</sup>
Project #	Subjective Points Possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	Median	Average	Trimmed Average	Selected Subjective Score <sup>1</sup>	Scale Score	Speed Score	
2.a.i	40	31.67	40.00	35.00	40.00	36.67	40.00	38.33	37.22	38.33	38.33	15.27	31.11	84.71
2.b.iv	20	18.67	20.00	16.00	20.00	16.00	20.00	19.33	18.44	18.44	19.33	27.83	33.14	80.30
2.b.viii	20	18.67	18.67	16.00	20.00	18.67	20.00	18.67	18.67	19.20	19.20	32.42	33.14	84.77
2.c.i	20	18.67	18.67	20.00	20.00	17.33	20.00	19.33	19.11	19.47	19.47	33.05	35.50	88.02
3.a.i	20	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	17.33	20.00	20.00	19.56	20.00	20.00	24.78	33.50	78.28
3.a.iii	20	18.33	18.33	15.00	20.00	15.00	20.00	18.33	17.78	17.78	18.33	35.22	40.00	93.55
3.b.i	20	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	17.33	20.00	20.00	19.56	20.00	20.00	25.17	31.25	76.42
3.c.i	20	17.33	18.67	20.00	20.00	16.00	20.00	19.33	18.67	19.20	19.33	26.85	35.00	81.18
4.b.ii	100	77.78	94.44	94.44	94.44	77.78	100.00	94.44	89.81	89.81	94.44	0.00	0.00	94.44
4.c.ii	100	88.89	100.00	94.44	94.44	77.78	100.00	94.44	92.59	95.56	95.56	0.00	0.00	95.56

<sup>1</sup> **Selected Subjective Score** is the highest of the median, average, and trimmed average

<sup>2</sup> **Final Org Score** is the sum of the *Selected Subjective Score* and *Workforce Score*

**Final Application Score Calculation**  
 30% Organizational Score, 70% Project Score + Bonuses

Project #	Organizational Score	Weighted Organizational Score (0.3)	Project Score	Weighted Project Score (0.7)	Bonus (2.a.i IDS)	Bonus (Workforce)	Bonus (2.d.i Project)	Final Application Score
2.a.i	95.36	28.61	84.71	59.30	3	1.00	N/A	<b>91.91</b>
2.b.iv	95.36	28.61	80.30	56.21	N/A	1.00	N/A	<b>85.82</b>
2.b.viii	95.36	28.61	84.77	59.34	N/A	1.00	N/A	<b>88.94</b>
2.c.i	95.36	28.61	88.02	61.61	N/A	1.00	N/A	<b>91.22</b>
3.a.i	95.36	28.61	78.28	54.80	N/A	1.00	N/A	<b>84.40</b>
3.a.iii	95.36	28.61	93.55	65.49	N/A	1.00	N/A	<b>95.09</b>
3.b.i	95.36	28.61	76.42	53.50	N/A	1.00	N/A	<b>83.11</b>
3.c.i	95.36	28.61	81.18	56.83	N/A	1.00	N/A	<b>86.43</b>
4.b.ii	95.36	28.61	94.44	66.11	N/A	1.00	N/A	<b>95.72</b>
4.c.ii	95.36	28.61	95.56	66.89	N/A	1.00	N/A	<b>96.50</b>

## Organizational Scoring – Narrative Summary

Section	Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
Executive Summary	Pass	Pass/Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PPS' Executive Summary received passing evaluation from all scorers</li> </ul>	
Governance	23.85	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response adequately describes how the Project Advisory Committee was formed, the timing in which it was formed, and its membership</li> <li>• Response sufficiently describes the PPS' process for monitoring performance</li> <li>• Borough-level workgroups allow PPS to respond to regional differences, customizing activities in each area</li> <li>• Good plan for incorporating patient feedback into provider performance</li> <li>• PPS will assist beneficiaries with identifying new providers if their provider is removed from network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response identifies members and titles of the governing body, but does not fully explain roles and responsibilities</li> <li>• Unclear whether the composition of the governing body includes sufficient representation across all providers</li> <li>• Unclear description of the decision making/voting process</li> <li>• Compliance training not yet developed and does not describe the use of existing compliance training programs</li> </ul>
Community Needs Assessment	23.86	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response adequately explains the leading causes of hospitalization and preventable hospitalizations by demographic groupings</li> <li>• Response includes each of the needs that the PPS is intending to address through its program and projects</li> <li>• Response successfully explains community resources that need to be modified to meet the needs of the community – transportation, safe food, and affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response needs a tighter linkage showing how strategies and plans address the identified gaps</li> <li>• The narrative describes that there was a provider survey, but it is unclear how the public was involved in development of the CNA</li> <li>• Response did not specifically outline excess capacity of institutional beds and lacked a clear statement of repurposing bed capacity tied to specific new community-based services</li> <li>• Response does not fully answer question of number and types of focus groups conducted</li> </ul>



Section	Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
Workforce Strategy	15.65	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good plan to use current workforce in workforce strategy and avoid layoffs</li> <li>• PPS provides complete description of a multi-stakeholder redeployment program and its commitment to working with the TEF Employment Center</li> <li>• Response sufficiently describes the role of labor (intra/inter-entity) representatives in workforce strategy development</li> <li>• Response lists four ongoing collaborations with state and federal agencies for worker retraining</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response does not adequately address how retraining and redeployment processes will impact wages and benefits of existing employees</li> <li>• Stakeholder engagement process lacks sufficient detail regarding number of meetings, locations and types of employees included in the development of the workforce strategy</li> <li>• Response does not effectively explain how PPS has and will continue to engage the frontline workers in the planning and implementation of system change</li> </ul>
Data Sharing, Confidentiality, and Rapid Cycle Evaluation	5.00	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear response showing the PPS' understanding of all participating providers' current IT capacity and usage of patient-sharing technologies</li> <li>• PPS will leverage experience with Mt. Sinai monitoring over 500 metrics across 5 domains</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of RCE performance dashboards could have been more specific in terms of how the dashboards will be deployed within the provider community</li> </ul>
Cultural Competency/Health Literacy	15.00	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response sufficiently describes how PPS will contract with CBO's toward achieving and maintaining cultural competence</li> <li>• PPS will reassess landscape periodically to adapt cultural competency planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of health literacy initiatives could have been more specifically tied to identified needs of the community</li> </ul>
DSRIP Budget & Flow of Funds	Pass	Pass/Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PPS received passing evaluations in all five Budget &amp; Flow of Funds categories from all scorers</li> </ul>	
Financial Sustainability Plan	10.00	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PPS provides a good plan to assist financially fragile provider through technical assistance</li> <li>• Response clearly explains how the PPS will sustain outcomes after the conclusion of the program</li> <li>• Response articulates the PPS' vision for transforming to value based reimbursement methodologies, engaging Medicaid managed care organizations in this process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response could be more specific in describing which financial indicators will be put in place for reporting</li> </ul>
<b>Final Organizational Score</b>	<b>95.36</b>	<b>100</b>		

### Bonus Scoring – Narrative Summary

Section	Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
Bonus Points – Population Health Management	3.00	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPS has population health management experience with New York Medicaid population</li> </ul>	
Bonus Points - Workforce	1.00	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPS intending to contract with an entity that has proven healthcare workforce restructuring experience to help carry out the PPS' workforce strategy of retraining, redeploying, and recruiting employees</li> </ul>
Bonus Points – 2.d.i	TBD	TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPS is not pursuing project 2.d.i</li> </ul>



## Project Scoring Narrative Summaries

### Project 2.a.i

**PPS Name:** Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

**DSRIP Project Number:** 2.a.i

**DSRIP Project Title:** Create Integrated Delivery Systems that are focused on Evidence Based Medicine/ Population Health Management

**Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project:** 22


**Final Application Score**  
**91.91**

#### Individual Project Score:

Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
38.33	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response effectively addresses gaps identified by the CNA and links these findings with the project design and sites included</li> <li>PPS identified a call center as a new resource to be developed to assist with patient navigation</li> <li>PPS will employ hotspotting to identify target population</li> <li>PPS identified key milestones and steps necessary to achieve IDS goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the plan seems sufficient, there appears to have been little work done to date on how the PPS will coordinate with others</li> <li>Response does not describe how the project's governance strategy will evolve all participants into an integrated healthcare delivery system and does not include specific governance strategy milestones</li> </ul>

#### Project Scale and Speed:

PPS	Category	PPS Submission	Points Achieved	Possible Points
Mount Sinai Hospitals Group: 2.a.i	Percent Safety Net Committed	42.25%	6.97	10
	Project Requirements Achieved	DY4 Q1/Q2	31.11	40
	Total Committed	11262	8.19	10





Project 2.b.iv

PPS Name: Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

DSRIP Project Number: 2.b.iv

DSRIP Project Title: Care transitions intervention model to reduce 30-day readmissions for chronic health conditions

Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project: 17


**Final Application Score**  
**85.82**

**Individual Project Score:**

Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
19.33	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response clearly describes resources of resources within the provider network</li> <li>Response sufficiently identifies project challenges or anticipated issues the PPS will encounter in implementing this project and describes how these challenges will be appropriately addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More details to the specific assets that will be repurposed to meet the needs of the community are needed</li> <li>The response indicates a willingness to coordinate with other PPS', but little appears to have been done to date</li> </ul>

**Project Scale and Speed:**

PPS	Category	PPS Submission	Points Achieved	Possible Points
Mount Sinai Hospitals Group: 2.b.iv	Patients Actively Engaged	DY4 Q3/Q4	16.00	20
	Percent Actively Engaged	8.94%	13.86	20
	Percent Safety Net Committed	11.79%	6.17	10
	Project Requirements Achieved	DY3 Q1/Q2	17.14	20
	Total Committed	2821	7.50	10





Project 2.b.viii

PPS Name: Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

DSRIP Project Number: 2.b.viii

DSRIP Project Title: Hospital-Home Care Collaboration Solutions

Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project: 7


**Final Application Score**  
**88.94**

Individual Project Score:

Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
19.20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response indicates good command of current assets/resources that will be mobilized for this project</li> <li>Response sufficiently identifies project challenges or anticipated issues the PPS will encounter in implementing this project and describes how these challenges will be appropriately addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response indicates a willingness to coordinate with other PPS', but it appears little has been done to date</li> </ul>

Project Scale and Speed:

PPS	Category	PPS Submission	Points Achieved	Possible Points
Mount Sinai Hospitals Group: 2.b.viii	Patients Actively Engaged	DY4 Q3/Q4	16.00	20
	Percent Actively Engaged	7.15%	16.39	20
	Percent Safety Net Committed	11.13%	6.04	10
	Project Requirements Achieved	DY3 Q1/Q2	17.14	20
	Total Committed	25	10.00	10





Project 2.c.i

PPS Name: Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

DSRIP Project Number: 2.c.i

DSRIP Project Title: Development of community-based health navigation services

Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project: 5


**Final Application Score**  
**91.22**

**Individual Project Score:**

Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
19.47	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response identifies project challenges and describes how these challenges will be addressed</li> <li>Response provides a sufficient summary of the current assets/resources</li> <li>Training of the health navigator workforce is the cornerstone of the PPS' strategy to achieve goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response does not provide sufficient details regarding PPS coordination</li> <li>Response does not provide a clear explanation of a specific patient population PPS is expecting to engage</li> </ul>

**Project Scale and Speed:**

PPS	Category	PPS Submission	Points Achieved	Possible Points
Mount Sinai Hospitals Group: 2.c.i	Patients Actively Engaged	DY4 Q3/Q4	18.00	20
	Percent Actively Engaged	22.34%	18.05	20
	Percent Safety Net Committed	0.00%	5.00	10
	Project Requirements Achieved	DY3 Q3/Q4	17.50	20
	Total Committed	250	10.00	10





Project 3.a.i

PPS Name: Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

DSRIP Project Number: 3.a.i

DSRIP Project Title: Integration of primary care and behavioral health services

Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project: 25


Final Application Score 84.40

Individual Project Score:

Table with 4 columns: Subjective Points, Points Possible, Strengths, and Comments. Row 1: 20.00, 20, [Strengths: Response provides a sufficient summary of the current assets/resources to be mobilized for this project to meet the needs of the community; Response sufficiently identifies project challenges and describes how these challenges will be appropriately addressed; Training of the health navigator workforce is the cornerstone of the PPS' strategy to achieve goals], [Comments: No significant weaknesses identified for this project]

Project Scale and Speed:

Table with 5 columns: PPS, Category, PPS Submission, Points Achieved, Possible Points. Rows include: Patients Actively Engaged (DY4 Q3/Q4, 16.00, 20), Percent Actively Engaged (35.75%, 14.47, 20), Percent Safety Net Committed (2.83%, 5.31, 10), Project Requirements Achieved (DY3 Q3/Q4, 17.50, 20), Total Committed (558, 5.00, 10)





Project 3.a.iii

PPS Name: Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

DSRIP Project Number: 3.a.iii

DSRIP Project Title: Implementation of evidence-based medication adherence programs (MAP) in community based sites for behavioral health medication compliance

Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project: 2


**Final Application Score**  
**95.09**

**Individual Project Score:**

Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
18.33	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response indicates good command of CNA to support project selection</li> <li>Use of peer specialists for coaching of patients will ensure project goals are met</li> <li>Good training plan for staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response does not contain specific information regarding the targeted population's geography, demographics, or social needs</li> <li>Response offers plans to address challenges without clearly stating which challenges are being addressed</li> <li>Response indicates several conversations with PPS', but a specific coordination strategy is not clearly developed</li> </ul>

**Project Scale and Speed:**

PPS	Category	PPS Submission	Points Achieved	Possible Points
Mount Sinai Hospitals Group: 3.a.iii	Patients Actively Engaged	DY4 Q3/Q4	20.00	20
	Percent Actively Engaged	16.09%	17.93	20
	Percent Safety Net Committed	3.72%	7.29	10
	Project Requirements Achieved	DY3 Q3/Q4	20.00	20
	Total Committed	563	10.00	10





Project 3.b.i

PPS Name: Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

DSRIP Project Number: 3.b.i

DSRIP Project Title: Evidence-based strategies for disease management in high risk/affected populations (adult only)

Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project: 15


**Final Application Score**  
**83.11**

Individual Project Score:

Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
20.00	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response effectively addresses gaps identified by the CNA and links these findings with the project design and sites included</li> <li>Good coordination with other, similar projects</li> <li>Response identifies PPS partners with experience in telemonitoring and medication adherence</li> <li>Partnerships with CBO's allows for regional expertise and good use of resources</li> <li>Good focus on expansion of IT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response indicates several conversations with PPS', but a specific coordination strategy is not clearly developed</li> </ul>

Project Scale and Speed:

PPS	Category	PPS Submission	Points Achieved	Possible Points
Mount Sinai Hospitals Group: 3.b.i	Patients Actively Engaged	DY4 Q3/Q4	15.00	20
	Percent Actively Engaged	15.00%	13.61	20
	Percent Safety Net Committed	12.25%	5.63	10
	Project Requirements Achieved	DY3 Q3/Q4	16.25	20
	Total Committed	3132	5.93	10





Project 3.c.i

PPS Name: Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

DSRIP Project Number: 3.c.i

DSRIP Project Title: Evidence-based strategies for disease management in high risk/affected populations (adults only)

Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project: 10


**Final Application Score**  
**86.43**

**Individual Project Score:**

Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
19.33	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response effectively addresses gaps identified by the CNA and links these findings with the project design and sites included</li> <li>Response provides a sufficient summary of the current assets/resources to be mobilized to help this project meet the needs of the community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While challenges are identified, more detail around how these challenges will be overcome by the PPS is needed</li> <li>Response indicates several conversations with PPS', but a specific coordination strategy is not clearly developed</li> </ul>

**Project Scale and Speed:**

PPS	Category	PPS Submission	Points Achieved	Possible Points
Mount Sinai Hospitals Group: 3.c.i	Patients Actively Engaged	DY3 Q3/Q4	17.50	20
	Percent Actively Engaged	10.37%	13.53	20
	Percent Safety Net Committed	12.56%	6.02	10
	Project Requirements Achieved	DY3 Q3/Q4	17.50	20
	Total Committed	3219	7.22	10





Project 4.b.ii

**PPS Name:** Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

**DSRIP Project Number:** 4.b.ii

**DSRIP Project Title:** Increase Access to High Quality Chronic Disease Preventive Care and Management in Both Clinical and Community Settings (Note: This project targets chronic diseases that are not included in domain 3, such as cancer)

**Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project:** 11

**Final Application Score**

**95.72**

**Individual Project Score:**

Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
94.44	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community assets/resources to be mobilized for this project include best practice hospitals for cancer screening</li> <li>Response effectively addresses gaps identified by the CNA and links these findings with the project design and sites included</li> <li>Response sufficiently identifies project challenges PPS will encounter implementing this project and describes how challenges will be addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Milestones are identified but timelines are not provided</li> <li>Response does not contain specific information regarding the targeted population's geography, demographics, or social needs</li> </ul>



Project 4.c.ii

PPS Name: Mount Sinai Hospitals Group

DSRIP Project Number: 4.c.ii

DSRIP Project Title: Increase early access to, and retention in, HIV care

Number of PPS' Pursuing This Project: 7

Final Application Score

96.50

Individual Project Score:

Subjective Points	Points Possible	Strengths	Comments
95.56	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good command of CNA to support project selection</li> <li>• Use of peer navigation services will assure intervention success</li> <li>• Good command of existing resources within the network</li> <li>• Response clearly outlines the PPS' plans to coordinate with other PPS' serving overlapping area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response does not contain specific information regarding the targeted population's demographics or social needs</li> <li>• Response indicates milestones, however timelines are not provided</li> </ul>