

# Measuring improvement to improve measurement: Action research to validate a composite measure of quality

Carol Mulder, on behalf of and with thanks to the members of the Association of Family Health Teams of Ontario, Canada

Action research: a group of people identify a problem, do something to resolve it, see how successful their efforts were, and if not satisfied, try again\*

## Objective

Measure performance to improve quality and demonstrate the value of primary care teams in Ontario, Canada.

# Action research cycles so far

#### Cycle 1: Start Measuring

Action: Get started on the journey to quality thru voluntary reporting on <12 indicators covering as many of Starfield's 4C's as possible (October 2014).

**Learning:** High participation showed that getting started small works but 1<sup>st</sup> iteration not very "patient-centered."

#### Cycle 2: Composite Measure of Quality

Action: Add a composite measure of quality using the limited data available in attempt to better reflect what matters to patients (see poster 55284).

Learning: Composite measure was useful for membership-level analyses (see poster 55280) but not well understood or useful at team level. Also, reliability was hard to establish, given the limited data used to build it.

# Current cycle: Action

Take advantage of extensive UK primary care data to address gaps in the process of building a composite measure.

- Extract UK practice level data from the following sources:
  - > All indicators: <a href="https://indicators.hscic.gov.uk/webview/">https://indicators.hscic.gov.uk/webview/</a>
  - Quality Outcomes Framework: http://www.content.digital.nhs.uk/catalogue/PUB22266
  - > Patient survey: <a href="https://gp-patient.co.uk/surveys-and-reports">https://gp-patient.co.uk/surveys-and-reports</a>
- Include data from components of existing composite and as many indicators as possible from Ontario's Primary Care Performance Measurement Framework.\*\*
- Factor and scale analyses to revise composite structure.
- Compare scores of existing and revised composites.

Ontario	UK
patients involved in decisions about their care as much as they want	Rating of GP involving you in decisions about your care
patients who had opportunity to ask questions	Rating of GP listening to you
patients who felt providers spent enough time with them	Rating of GP giving you enough time - total responses
patients who can book an appointment within a reasonable time	Convenience of appointment
patients with readmission within 30 days after hospitalization	Emergency readmissions within 30 days of discharge from hospital
visits made to patients' regular primary care provider team	See their preferred GP always, almost always or a lot of the time (total)
Emergency department visits per patient	Accident and Emergency Referrals per 1,000 population
Ambulatory care sensitive hospitalizations per 1000 patients	
eligible patients screened for colorectal cancer	Bowel screening
eligible patients screened for cervical cancer	Patients whose notes record that a cervical smear has been performed in the last five years
eligible patients screened for Breast cancer	Hospital data
eligible patients with Diabetic management & assessment	The practice can produce a register of all patients aged 17 years and over with diabetes mellitus, which specifies whether the patient has Type 1 or Type 2 diabetes (plus individual Diabetes processes such as blood pressure/sugar monitoring)
eligible children immunized according to guidelines	
patients able to get an appointment on the same or next day	How long until actually saw or spoke to GP / nurse - total responses

# Current cycle: Expected learning and potential actions

- Change in the components of the composite could refocus data capture for Ontario primary care teams
- 2) Comparison of existing and revised composite scores could inform usefulness of existing composite if Ontario teams can't align with structure of revised composite
- 3) Comparison of Ontario and UK scores could start conversation about potential value of the composite for international comparisons of a more patient-centered view of quality

## What do you think?

- How would you adjust the proposed actions?
- What else do you think we might learn from the proposed actions?

\*O'Brien, R. (2001) 'An Overview of the Methodological Approach of Action Research'

http://www.web.ca/~robrien/papers/arfinal.html

\*\* Health Quality Ontario

http://www.hqontario.ca/portals/0/Documents/pr/pc-performance-measurement-report-en.pdf



