

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

COMPOSITE RATINGS

Criterion	Composite Rating	Rating Standards
<i>A. Quality and Value</i>		
1. Overall NCQA Rating	3	1. "Denied" or not accredited 2. "Provisional" 3. "Accredited" 4. "Commendable" 5. "Excellent"
2. Quality of written communication materials	3.8	1 - Consistently incomplete, confusing and unattractive. 2 - Significant problems in quality, but usually of a good quality of content, clarity, attractiveness and accessibility to diverse members. 3 - Rarely compelling, and some unevenness in quality, but usually of a good quality of content, clarity, attractiveness and accessibility to diverse members. 4 - Sometimes compelling, but always of a high quality of content, clarity, attractiveness and accessibility to diverse members. 5 - Consistently compelling; outstanding content, clarity, attractiveness and accessibility to diverse members.
3. Quality of website	4.3	Same as item 2 above.
4. Members' view of access to health care services	3	1 - Consistently long waits to see providers; most providers not accepting new patients; extremely difficult to access specialists. 2 - Often long waits to see providers, with some exceptions; many providers not accepting new patients; some difficulty in accessing specialists. 3 - Occasional long waits to see providers, but most waits are reasonable; some providers not accepting new patients; occasional difficulty accessing specialists. 4 - Almost all waits to see providers are reasonable, with infrequent exceptions; most providers are accepting new patients; infrequent difficulty accessing specialists. 5 - Waits to see providers are consistently short; rarely is a provider not accepting new patients; rarely any difficulty in accessing specialists.
5. Members' view of provider quality	3.5	Use any number from 1 to 5, where 1 is the worst provider quality and 5 is the best provider quality to rate the overall quality of the provider(s) accessed through the vendor's plan. Please include supporting comments for your rating.

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

COMPOSITE RATINGS

Criterion	Composite Rating	Rating Standards
6. Members' view of vendor's customer service	3	Use any number from 1 to 5, where 1 is the worst customer service and 5 is the best customer service to rate the overall quality of the customer service received through the vendor's plan. Please include supporting comments for your rating.
7. Overall quality of service to members	4.3	Use any number from 1 to 5, where 1 is the worst quality of both care and service and 5 is the best quality of care and service to rate the overall quality of the care and service provided through the vendor's plan. Please include supporting comments for your rating.
8. Overall value delivered	3.9	Use any number from 1 to 5, where 1 is the worst ratio of cost to quality and 5 is the best ratio of cost to quality to rate the overall value provided by the vendor's plan. Please include supporting comments for your rating.
<i>B. Responsiveness to HSS Needs and Concerns</i>		
1. Attendance and level of participation at relevant Health Service Board meetings	4.4	Use any number from 1 to 5, where 1 is the worst level of attendance and participation and 5 is the best level of attendance and participation to rate the overall attendance and participation of the vendor's plan representative(s). Please include supporting comments for your rating.
2. Responsiveness and flexibility in interactions with Board	4.5	Use any number from 1 to 5, where 1 is the worst level of responsiveness and flexibility and 5 is the best level of responsiveness and flexibility to rate the overall responsiveness and flexibility of the vendor's plan representative(s). Please include supporting comments for your rating.
3. Responsiveness and flexibility in interactions with HSS Staff	4.7	Use any number from 1 to 5, where 1 is the worst level of responsiveness and flexibility and 5 is the best level of responsiveness and flexibility to rate the overall responsiveness and flexibility of the vendor's plan representative(s). Please include supporting comments for your rating.
<i>C. Contracting and Performance Guarantees</i>		
1. Written contract in place?	1	1 – Written contract executed and delivered more than 90 days after effective date. 2 – Written contract executed and delivered within 90 days after effective date. 3 – Written contract executed and delivered within 60 days after effective date. 4 – Written contract executed and delivered within 30 days after effective date. 5 – Written contract executed and delivered prior to effective date.

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

COMPOSITE RATINGS

Criterion	Composite Rating	Rating Standards
2. Adherence to City's social policy legislation	4	1 – Contract omits more than two requested provisions. 2 – Contract omits two requested provisions. 3 – Contract omits one requested provisions. 4 – Contract includes all requested provision with minor modifications. 5 – Contract includes all requested provisions without modification.
3. Inclusion of performance guarantees	1	1 – Contract contains no performance guarantees. 2 – Contract contains performance guarantees, but none includes monetary penalties. 3 – Contract contains performance guarantees, but more than one does not include monetary penalties. 4 – Contract contains performance guarantees, but one does not include monetary penalties. 5 – Contract contains performance guarantees with monetary penalties attached to each guarantee.
4. Comprehensiveness and sufficiency of performance guarantees	N/A	Use any number from 1 to 5, where 1 is the worst level of comprehensiveness (i.e., omits major components of vendor's contractual performance requirements) and 5 is the best level of comprehensiveness (i.e., includes all major components of vendor's contractual performance requirements). Please include supporting comments for your rating.
5. Adherence to performance guarantees	N/A	1 – Failed to reach three or more of the guaranteed performance levels specified below. 2 – Failed to reach two of the guaranteed performance levels specified below. 3 – Failed to reach one of the guaranteed performance levels specified below. 4 – Exceeded or reached all guaranteed performance levels specified below. 5 – Exceeded all guaranteed performance levels specified below.
6. Prompt reporting and payment for breaches of performance guarantees	N/A	1 – Vendor failed to report performance or pay any applicable penalties within 30 days of applicable due dates under contract. 2 – Vendor reported performance and paid any applicable penalties within 30 days of applicable due dates under contract. 3 – Vendor reported performance and paid any applicable penalties within 15 days of applicable due dates under contract. 4 – Vendor reported performance and paid any applicable penalties within five days of applicable due dates under contract. 5 – Vendor reported performance and paid any applicable penalties on or prior to applicable due dates under contract.

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

Rating Panel Participants (Individual Ratings and Comments Follow Below):

Vendor Self-Rating:	Janet Findlay, Regional Vice President, Vision Service Plan
HSS Operations Staff:	Tess Navarro, Chief Financial Officer
HSS Finance Staff:	Jeffrey Hildebrant, Assistant Director
Active Member:	Richard Rothman, DPH
Retired Member:	Stephanie Lyons, RECCSF Vice President
HS Board Member	James Deignan, Commissioner

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

INDIVIDUAL PANELIST RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Criterion	Vendor's Self-Rating	HSS Operations Staff	HSS Finance Staff	Active Member	Retired Member	Board Member	Overall Rating
<i>A. Quality and Value</i>							
1. Overall NCQA Rating	3 VSP was awarded NCQA certification in 2005. VSP was the first vision care company to be certified. NCQA guidelines have been followed for years.						3
2. Quality of written communication materials	3.5 VSP program and materials are simple to administer and understand. HSS is currently using our member benefit summary and in some cases VSP member brochures.	4 Materials are concise and easy to understand.	4 Written materials are easy to read and informative.	3 No special message to the new Kaiser members.	3 Wordy; layout difficult to navigate. Type font too small for seniors and others with VISION problems! Hello! This is a vision care plan! You shouldn't need your glasses to read the fine print.	5 Communication information simply put forward.	3.8

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

INDIVIDUAL PANELIST RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Criterion	Vendor's Self-Rating	HSS Operations Staff	HSS Finance Staff	Active Member	Retired Member	Board Member	Overall Rating
3. Quality of website	4.4 VSP website is easy to understand and simple to navigate. Website functionality including member past service, doctor locations, doctor languages spoken, doctor specialty and member savings statements are all enhancements in the last 24 months.	4.8 Excellent on-line resource for vision plan coverage and claims information.	4.5 Had the opportunity to use VSP website for out of network claim submission and found the website impressive. It is attractive and user friendly. Claim form and step by step instructions are simple, clear and easy to follow.	3 No comments.	4 Easy to use, attractive. Make sure people know they can increase the size of the type font or else make the type font bigger overall. See #2 above.	5 Excellent.	4.3
4. Members' view of access to health care services				3 Central locations.	3 Kaiser transition difficult; better communication needed. Place articles in member newsletters; send letters home that clearly say "save this document" for further reference. Explain the pros and cons of the transition.		3

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

INDIVIDUAL PANELIST RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Criterion	Vendor's Self-Rating	HSS Operations Staff	HSS Finance Staff	Active Member	Retired Member	Board Member	Overall Rating
5. Members' view of provider quality				3 Had to go to many locations to find computer glasses.	4 Providers should explain the transfer of data to health care providers and explain what each test may show regarding other health issues (diabetes etc.). Privacy issues here.		3.5
6. Member's view of vendor's customer service				3 Fair.	3 Make it easier to get a live person on the phone. Make sure call center staff are updated on new problems as they arise. Have management staff call the call center "blind" and see what kinds of answers they get to various questions and whether they get the same answer from different operators.		3

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

INDIVIDUAL PANELIST RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Criterion	Vendor's Self-Rating	HSS Operations Staff	HSS Finance Staff	Active Member	Retired Member	Board Member	Overall Rating
7. Overall quality of service to members	4.2 VSP continues to manage the overall eye health of HSS members. The in network utilization is currently at 93% demonstrating a high level of satisfaction with our network and the care they receive from our providers.	5 The quality of service to our members is commendable. VSP sets the standard for great customer service.	4.5 Telephone service- quick access, adequate information and staff courtesy, was impressive. The experience of claim submission was timely; the check was received in 5 days. Claims process time is cut short with pertinent information provided already by the member on the website and with payment just pending member's submission of receipts.	3 Fair.	4 If members understood all the services provided and made use of them, they would be very happy. VSP needs to do more outreach to let people know what they can get and why they should be sure to have comprehensive exams.	5 Superior benefit provided to members. I receive no member complaints.	4.3

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

INDIVIDUAL PANELIST RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Criterion	Vendor's Self-Rating	HSS Operations Staff	HSS Finance Staff	Active Member	Retired Member	Board Member	Overall Rating
8. Overall value delivered	4.2 VSP has been able to make plan recommendations that have resulted in stable premiums and improved benefits.	4 The current plan approved by the HSB provides a good overall value to members.	3 Consider having higher coverage for children's frames, as Optometrist recommends flexible ones for durability, and considering the 24-month waiting period for replacement.	3 Good value.	4 Again, if everyone used the services, this would be a good value indeed. People need to make use of the system, and first they need to know what's available to them.	5 Company is member service oriented. Best service available.	3.9
B. Responsiveness to HSS Needs and Concerns							
1. Attendance and level of participation at relevant Health Service Board meetings	3.8 VSP has been available for all meetings when vision care was discussed. HSS has been notified prior to any meeting where there was a conflict and a suitable VSP representative has been requested to attend.					5 VSP is very responsive.	4.4

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

INDIVIDUAL PANELIST RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Criterion	Vendor's Self-Rating	HSS Operations Staff	HSS Finance Staff	Active Member	Retired Member	Board Member	Overall Rating
2. Responsiveness and flexibility in interactions with Board	4 VSP worked diligently to meet all deadlines and to be responsive and knowledgeable with the board.					5 Always prepared and ahead of game.	4.5
3. Responsiveness and flexibility in interactions with HSS Staff	4.5 VSP returns calls promptly and has been proactive with the HSS staff. VSP meets bi- yearly for a VSP update and has been responsive in meeting all deadlines. VSP has a dedicated Account Manager also assigned to HSS.	5 VSP is always responsive and timely in its interactions with HSS operations staff.	4.5 VSP staff has worked well with the Finance Unit. Financial information exchange and bill payments process have been smooth.				4.7
<i>C. Contracting and Performance Guarantees</i>							
1. Written contract in place?							1
2. Adherence to City's social policy legislation							4

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

INDIVIDUAL PANELIST RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Criterion	Vendor's Self-Rating	HSS Operations Staff	HSS Finance Staff	Active Member	Retired Member	Board Member	Overall Rating
3. Inclusion of performance guarantees							1
4. Comprehensiveness and sufficiency of performance guarantees	<p>N/A No performance guarantee has ever been requested of VSP. However, VSP did provide yearly updates on VSP overall performance standards. VSP is proposing performance guarantees for the 2006 plan year. Proposed performance guarantees are widely accepted as being the best in our industry. VSP anticipates no problem in meeting these guarantees..</p>	<p>N/A Working with VSP to add appropriate performance guarantees for the 2006-2007 Plan Year.</p>	<p>N/A Working with VSP to add appropriate performance guarantees for the 2006-2007 Plan Year.</p>				N/A
5. Adherence to performance guarantees							N/A

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

INDIVIDUAL PANELIST RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Criterion	Vendor's Self-Rating	HSS Operations Staff	HSS Finance Staff	Active Member	Retired Member	Board Member	Overall Rating
6. Prompt reporting and payment for breaches of performance guarantees							N/A

**HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM
Vendor Report Card**

Vision Service Plan
February 2, 2006
Period Evaluated: July 1, 2004 – October 31, 2005

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OF FULL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for additional comments from the Full Health Service Board. The box is currently blank.