MES Oversight Design Principles

Design principles help everyone involved in building and supporting MES Oversight stay focused and aligned on a shared vision of what it means to **truly orient the funding and oversight of MES investments toward directly improving Medicaid & CHIP program outcomes.** The principles should be specific enough to drive clear decisions, and broad enough to apply to all parts of MES Oversight.

Our top-voted principles

Keep people at the heart of everything we do.

The point of our work is to improve the lived experience of *real people*, not just improving processes and systems. Everything we do is in service of Medicaid & CHIP beneficiaries. We are investing in improving the working relationship between states and the MES team because their combined efforts have a huge impact on beneficiaries' experience of our programs.

Tie every decision back to program outcomes and end-user needs.

All technology investments should clearly and directly support a measurable improvement in outcomes for end users and/or the Medicaid & CHIP programs overall, and each of our interactions with states should reinforce this expectation. Impact on end users should be the most important factor in decision-making, whether those users are members of the public, healthcare providers, or state and federal employees.

Minimize burden at every opportunity.

MES oversight should enable and support states to use technology to improve program outcomes, while minimizing interference and unnecessary burden for all involved. Oversight should feel like a natural and supportive part of states' service delivery efforts, adapting to and

taking advantage of each state's existing project management approach wherever possible vs. imposing a one-size-fits-all approach that creates excessive overhead to the state.

Make consistently transparent and evidence-based decisions.

We use both current project plans and historical evidence and patterns to inform our funding and support decisions, and foster transparency by regularly communicating with our state partners throughout the entire lifecycle of each MES investment. We proactively communicate our expectations and decision criteria in a way that is understandable and actionable to our state partners.

Possible unintended consequence(s):
- There's an element of "gut" work in making decisions—you can't quantify everything without risking rejecting projects that don't look good on paper but would have otherwise worked out
- Risk of creating some sort of prediction algorithm that is bad/not effective

Be discerning stewards of public funds.

Our funding is not unlimited; we are stewards of a finite amount of taxpayer dollars, and it's our responsibility to only fund MES projects that we believe are realistically set up to meaningfully improve program and end user outcomes. When that is not the case, it's our responsibility to say "no" (and to support the state to adjust their approach toward a more promising one).