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Announcements

• This webinar will be recorded and available on the AHRQ QI website - [http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/](http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/).
• All participant lines will remain in listen-only mode.
• You may submit webinar questions via the question feature at any time; however, questions will be answered only during the Q&A sessions. Your questions will only be visible to the moderators.
• If multiple people from your organization are dialing in from the same location, please use only one line.
• For technical difficulties, please contact Lee Thompson at lthompson@air.org.
Objectives

• Share case studies about the impact of the AHRQ QIs on two health systems

• Create a peer-to-peer learning opportunity for organizations to share how they are using the AHRQ QIs to improve the quality of care

• Identify resources to support use of the AHRQ QIs for performance improvement
Today’s Moderators

Cheryl Fahlman, PhD, BSP  
Principal Research Scientist,  
American Institutes for Research

Diane Stollenwerk, MPP  
President,  
StollenWerks, Inc.
1. Overview of the AHRQ Quality Indicators (QIs)

2. Case Studies
   - Stephen Allegretto, Vice President, Analytic Strategy & Financial Planning, Yale New Haven Health System
   - Verna Alverson, RN, BSN, Inpatient Clinical Quality Analyst, Essentia Health

3. Q&A/Discussion
OVERVIEW OF THE AHRQ QUALITY INDICATORS
What Are the AHRQ QIs?

# The AHRQ QI Modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module:</th>
<th>What the module reflects:</th>
<th>Examples:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient Safety Indicators (PSIs)</strong></td>
<td>Quality of hospital care for adults</td>
<td>Pressure ulcers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on potentially avoidable complications and errors that occur during a hospital</td>
<td>Postoperative sepsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inpatient stay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient Quality Indicators (IQIs)</strong></td>
<td>Quality of hospital care for adults</td>
<td>Pneumonia mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inpatient mortality for medical conditions</td>
<td>Bilateral cardiac catheterization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inpatient mortality for surgical procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilization of procedures for which there are questions of overuse, underuse, or misuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Volume of procedures with evidence that higher hospital volume of procedures may be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associated with lower mortality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention Quality Indicators (PQIs)</strong></td>
<td>Hospitalization for ambulatory care sensitive conditions that reflect access to and</td>
<td>Asthma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality of outpatient care</td>
<td>Low birth weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pediatric Quality Indicators (PDIs)</strong></td>
<td>Quality of hospital care for children 18 years and younger and neonates (NQIs)</td>
<td>Neonatal mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes neonatal development</td>
<td>• Potential complications and errors resulting from a hospital admission for children</td>
<td>Postop. sepsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicators, NQIs</td>
<td>and adolescents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potentially avoidable hospitalizations among children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Initiatives Using AHRQ QIs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Indicator Module</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inpatient (IQI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAC Reduction Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital VBP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Savings Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Patients</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Innovation Awards (CMMI)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Compare</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACO: Accelerated Development Learning Sessions (CMMI)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and Community Based Services</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A sample of CMS and CMMI initiatives that use the AHRQ QIs
CASE STUDIES: LESSONS LEARNED IN USING THE AHRQ QIs
Yale New Haven Health System Uses AHRQ’s Patient Safety Indicators (PSIs) as Critical Tool in Reducing Quality Variation While Lowering Costs

Steve Allegretto, CPA, MPH
Vice President, Analytic Strategy & Financial Planning
About Yale New Haven Health System

Largest, most integrated healthcare system in Connecticut including:
- Yale-New Haven Hospital, Bridgeport Hospital, Greenwich Hospital and Smilow Cancer Hospital
- Physician practice organizations; ancillary primary, urgent and emergent care facilities
- Common electronic health record system on a single database instituted in hospitals, community health facilities, physician offices and FQHCs

- 89,998 patient discharges and 1,255,283 outpatient encounters with $3.5 billion in revenue
Enhancing the Lives of Those We Serve:

The YNHHS Revenue Challenge

Revenue/Case
Up 21.1%

Revenue/Case
Down .1%

Revenue per Equivalent Discharge

Yale New Haven Health
Cases with a PSI/Complication/Quality Variation Indicator (QVI)

What is inefficiency in this group?

What is potentially avoidable?
Enhancing the Lives of Those We Serve:

Better Quality Generating Better Margins

Revenue per case up 21.1%
Expense per case up 20.3%

Revenue per case down .1%
Expense per case up 1.4%

Clinical Redesign
EMR Implemented

Advanced Cost Accounting
Quality Definition

Center for Healthcare Solutions
Yale New Haven Health
AHRQ Adverse Event/Complication Example

Problem:
Higher than expected incidence of VAP in SICU (BH)

Analysis:
VAP is considered a generally avoidable adverse event associated with ventilator management. VAP is one of YNHHS’s complications/QVIs reported on monthly.

Intervention:
- Medical and surgical critical care at BH, later YNHHS all agreed on single vent weaning protocol
- Enhanced compliance with Ventilator Bundle
Case Study Quality Outcomes

**FY 2012: 13 VAPS**

- *NHSN Benchmark: 3.5*
- **FY2012 RATE:** 9.8 (13/1327)
- Decreased VAP rate from FY’12 to FY’13

**FY2013: 1 VAP**

- *NHSN Benchmark: 2.4*
- **FY2013 RATE:** 1.2 (1/838)
- **NHSN Benchmark decreased from 3.5 in FY12 to 2.4 in FY13**
Case Study Financial Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Cases (all critical care units)</th>
<th>Cost Average for all cases*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Bridgeport Hospital, cost per case of patients with VAP ranges from $60,897 to $95,980 per case each year (FY’11-FY’14)

*Calculated using $75,000 per case (FY’14 cost/case = $77,862)

**Year to date----And over the last 3 years avoided/saved over_____M?


Over 31,000 VAP cases annually are estimated to occur in US Acute Care Hospitals with over 75% of this HAI identified as being preventable resulting in $3.1 Billion of potential cost reductions relating to improved quality ***
Looking Ahead…..

• Reduction of:
  • Iatrogenic Pneumothoraces (PSI 06)
  • Deep Vein Thrombosis (PSI 12)

• Participant in Bundled Payments (orthopedic bundles)—better utilization and adverse event reduction to decrease cost, readmissions—the ultimate Clinical Redesign

• Vendor RFP and Internal Cost Savings Gain Sharing
Cost Savings and Gain Sharing Model for DVT/PE

Surgeons participate in both elements of model

Element 1: Cost Savings
Successful RFP negotiation to decrease implant costs

Element 2: Gain Sharing

Follow Blood Clot Protocol
(DVT/PE PSI 12 and QVI 9)

- Compliant
  - No Blood Clot: Gain Sharing $$
  - Blood Clot*: Blood Clot*

- Non-Compliant
  - No $$

* Approx. 1% on Index Admission Only
Surgical Site Infection (SSI) Patient Story
68-year-old Medicare-Insured YNHH Primary Service Area Patient
(Bundled Payment Episode)

Jun 2014: Left total hip arthroplasty (THA) due to osteoarthritis

- Physically active preoperatively: despite hip pain patient mows lawn & walks his dogs
- Uneventful surgery & 6-day hospital stay with discharge to Grimes

Jul 2014: Infection discovered; -wo readmissions including prosthesis head change

Jul 2014-Jan 2015: 9 outpatient visits; 2-six week rounds of IV antibiotics; central venous line placement; extended long term care stay; 6 months of adapted/abbreviated joint rehab due to pain & limited mobility caused by infection

Feb 2015: Infection resolved (7 months post-op)

Feb-Jun 2015: 3 Infectious disease follow-up visits for infection monitoring; 2 outpatient visits with wound infection as principal diagnosis; now on long-term/lifetime suppression oral antibiotic

- Golf ball-size hip incision swelling persists
QUESTIONS?

Steve Allegretto, CPA, MPH
Vice President, Analytic Strategy & Financial Planning
Yale New Haven Health System

Stephen.allegretto@ynnh.org
Case Study 2: Essentia Health

Essentia Health Uses AHRQ’s Patient Safety Indicators (PSIs) to Improve Patient Safety Through Education and Prevention Activities

Verna Alverson, RN, BSN
Inpatient Clinical Quality Analyst
About Essentia Health

- A private non-profit integrated health system with facilities in 4 states (Idaho, Minnesota, North Dakota, Wisconsin)
- A $1.7 billion enterprise with more than 14,000 employees including 1,500 physicians and advanced practitioners
- Includes 16 hospitals, 69 clinics, 8 long-term care facilities, 2 assisted living facilities, 4 independent living facilities, and 1 research institute

Our focus on patient safety indicators stemmed from the emphasis placed on these indicators by value-based purchasers.
Opportunities for Improvement

- Benchmark report found that select PSIs were higher than national benchmarks

Goal

- Improve patient safety and pay for performance by prioritizing improvement on a subset of 10 AHRQ PSIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHRQ PSIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSI 3: Pressure Ulcer Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 6: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 7: Central Venous Catheter-Related Blood Stream Infection Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 8: Postoperative Hip Fracture Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 9: Perioperative Hemorrhage or Hematoma Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 11: Postoperative Respiratory Failure Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 12: Perioperative Pulmonary Embolism or Deep Vein Thrombosis Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 13: Postoperative Sepsis Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 14: Postoperative Wound Dehiscence Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 15: Accidental Puncture or Laceration Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementing the PSIs

- **PSI 9** (Perioperative Hemorrhage or Hematoma Rate)
  - Examined procedures that frequently cause hematoma, hemorrhage, or bruising
  - Linked increased occurrence to use of new hemostatic wristband for angiograms
  - Convened working group of physician, nursing, and education staff to develop improved and consistent process for securing the wristband

Result = Targeted provider engagement and education efforts led to safer patient care and improvement in PSI 9 rate.
Implementing the PSIs

- **PSI 15 (Accidental Puncture or Laceration Rate)**
  - Examined the data and found that some of the cases flagged as a patient safety event by the indicator were incorrectly coded as ‘accidental’ and that these lacerations were inherent to the particular surgical procedure
  - Instituted case-by-case peer review by a physician in the relevant specialty
  - Using AHRQ’s website and other resources, created educational materials for providers about the definition of accidental puncture or laceration

Result = Essentia Health-Fargo reduced PSI 15 from a rate of 1.2 events per 1000 eligible procedures in 2013 to 0.07 in the first half of 2015—a rate that is better than the national average.
Lessons Learned

• Provider education and prevention activities are critical to improving patient safety.

• The PSIs show us where to focus – we use the technical specifications to examine each case individually, identify opportunities to improve clinical care delivery, and then go back to frontline to make the improvements.

• The AHRQ QI website includes a wealth of evidence-based information and toolkits that provide adaptable solutions, guide the provision of safe care, and reduce patient harm.
QUESTIONS?

Verna Alverson RN, BSN
Inpatient Clinical Quality Analyst
Essentia Health

Verna.Alverson@EssentiaHealth.org
DISCUSSION
IMPLEMENTING THE AHRQ QIs

Resources and Support
AHRQ QI Toolkit Includes:

- Assess readiness to change
- Apply QIs to your data
  - Detailed guidance
  - Understand your rates
  - Trends and comparisons
- Identify quality improvement priorities
- Implement improvements
- Monitor progress
- Analyze return-on-investment (ROI)

Available at:
**Additional Resources**

- **AHRQ QI website**

- **AHRQ QI technical assistance**
  - [http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/FAQs_Support/](http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/FAQs_Support/)
  - QIsupport@ahrq.hhs.gov

- **AHRQ QI software and documentation (SAS and WinQI)**
Webinars

• Upcoming (Spring 2016)
  ► SAS Version 6.0 QI Software
  ► WinQI Version 6.0 Software
  ► AHRQ QI Transition to ICD-10
Thank you to our speakers and participants!

General Questions and Comments:
AHRQ QI Support Team
QIsupport@ahrq.hhs.gov