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Overview

• Need for Outcome Measures for Community-Based Services

• Study Methodology

• Implementing Quality Measures
Need for Outcome Measures for Community-Based Services

• Current measures: process, medical, consumer survey

• Need reliable and **objective outcome measures** community services
  - Help improve program services
  - Support alternative payment models
Need for Outcome Measures, con’t

• Measures based on MDS-HC
  - Outcome-based
  - Validated
  - Existing data
  - Used in Ontario, Manitoba and Michigan
  - Population-level analysis

• Research question
  Can State use its assessment data to implement interRAI’s outcome measures?
Set up analysis

- Map MDS-HC to assessment questions
  - Identify any textual differences between questions (e.g., “last 30 days” vs. “last 2 weeks”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>MDS-HC Question</th>
<th>Corresponding State Assessment Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of unintended weight loss</td>
<td>W24. Unintended weight loss of 5% or more in last 30 days (or 10% or more in last 180 days)</td>
<td>Q.1243 Unintended weight loss of 5% or more in last 30 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Prevalence of delirium        | C3.1. Sudden or new onset/change in mental function  
-OR-  
Client has become agitated or disoriented | Q.1148 Sudden or new onset/change in mental function  
-OR-  
Q.1149 Client has become agitated or disoriented |
Set up analysis, con’t

• Create study protocols
  – Link client assessments to program enrollment date
  – Develop filters (*age*, *target programs*, etc.)

• Gain in-depth understanding of how assessments are given

• Utilize iterative process
Analyze results

• **Response Rates per question (%)**
  – Overall response rates
  – Longitudinal questions
  – Response rates overall vs. by program

• **Response Patterns per question (answer options)**
  – Examined face validity of patterns
  – Compared patterns for low vs. high LOC programs
Response pattern for entire population

**Ability to use the toilet**

- **Independent** – 55%
- **Supervision** – 4%
- **Limited assistance** – 7%
- **Extensive assistance** – 3%
- **Activity did not occur** – 0%
- **Unwilling to perform** – 1%
- **Total dependence** – 1%
- **Dependence**
  - **Extensive assistance** – 3%
  - **Limited assistance** – 7%
  - **Supervision** – 4%
  - **Intermittent supervision or minimal physical assistance** – 4%
  - **Independent – but experiences difficulty** – 24%

Figures drawn from feasibility study
Response pattern by program

Ability to use the toilet

1. Independent
2. INDEPENDENT - but experiences difficulty
3. Intermittent supervision or minimal physical assistance
4. Supervision
5. Limited Assistance
6. Extensive Assistance
7. Total Dependence
8. Unwilling to perform
9. Activity did not occur

Figures drawn from feasibility study

Programs based on level of Care (LOC) – Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF) vs. lower level
Implementing Quality Measures

• Complete additional data work
  – Apply interRAI’s member-level screens (e.g., filter out cancer patients from measure on weight loss)
  – Re-analyze questions overall and by program

• Implement measures
  – 5 ready for use

• Resolve data issues
  – Additional 8 - 11 measures may be ready after data issues resolved
Potential application: Using quality measures to compare providers

Prevalence of unintended weight loss (rate of negative outcomes)
(mock data for illustrative purposes)

Boxes show average score per provider; horizontal lines show range of scores with confidence intervals. Green boxes show 75th %ile achievability level. Successful providers can share best practices.
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