



Learning how to get lucky: enablers of high performing primary care teams

Carol Mulder, Provincial Lead, Quality Improvement Decision Support

On behalf of and with thanks to the members of the Association of Family Health Teams of Ontario

Nov 12, 2018

*Luck affects everything;
let your hook always be cast;*

*in the stream
where you least expect it,
there will be a fish.*

Ovid

Overview

- Objective
- Study Design
- Results
- Limitations (aka learnings for next time)
- Conclusions

Objective

- Identify characteristics that primary care teams could address to help achieve better quality and/or reduce overall healthcare system costs for their patients.

Study Design

- Setting and participants:
 - Primary care sector in Ontario, population of approximately 13 Million
 - Members of the Association of Family Health Teams of Ontario (virtually all of the 184 Family Health Teams, some Nurse-Practitioner Led Clinics)
 - Serve approximately 25% of Ontario's population
- Observational study

Data

- Team-level performance data
- Voluntarily contributed to Data to Decisions (D2D)
- Data elements:
 - 4 Patient experience measures (patient surveys)
 - 4 Preventive measures (EMR)
 - 3 Healthcare system utilization measures (administrative data)
 - 25 Team and patients characteristics (online survey - 11 minutes)

Analysis

- Mixed Models analysis with repeated measures (SPSS)
 - Multiple teams: random effects
 - Repeated measures: multiple iterations
- Model structure
 - Outcomes were per capita healthcare system cost and overall quality
 - Independent variables (“factors”) were
 - Team characteristics: Patient panel size, electronic connection between hospital and primary care EMR, single-site design or not, governance type,
 - Patient characteristics: complexity, age (ie senior or not), low income
 - Clinical outcomes: quality
 - Structure informed by multivariate linear regression with single record per team
- Separate (not stratified) analysis of 25 rural and 35 urban teams

Results: significant associations with outcomes

setting	outcome	EMR-HIS integration	SAMI (complexity)	Single site	Physician board	Panel size	Seniors	Low income	Quality (overall)
Rural (25 teams)	Costs: services		857				35	4	
	Costs: settings						16	6	
	Costs: total (no institution care)						51	11	
Urban (35 teams)	Costs: services		672		- 144		10		
	Costs: settings				- 83				
	Costs: total (no institution care)		1051		- 212		18		
rural	Quality (overall)		- 36			0.0003			
urban	Quality (overall)								

X = p<0.10 for Type III Test of Fixed Effect

-X = negative relationship of parameter estimate with outcome

Results: summary

- Patient characteristics
 - Socioeconomics: Proportion of seniors more strongly related to costs than proportion of patients with low income. Both measured at COMMUNITY level.
 - Patient complexity: equivocal evidence of the impact of patient complexity on cost
- Overall quality:
 - Not related to cost, once seniors and income are considered by the model
- Team characteristics
 - Setting: Rural and urban teams are different
 - Governance: The governance structure of teams is related to cost.
 - QI activities: Engagement in QI, clinical champions, EMR maturity etc do NOT appear to be related to cost (possibly due to lack of power/measurement error)

Limitations

- Representative sample
 - missing data is not likely due to random causes
- Data standardization
 - Locally-derived data more meaningful and timely resources for improvement
 - BUT: Definitions might not be clear or consistent
- Ecologic fallacy in administrative data:
 - Administrative data are standardized, consistent and VERY easy to access
 - BUT: Population data at community level might not describe patients of the team
 - NEVERTHELESS: the data start conversations about equity

High performance: Learning, not luck

- Fertile learning environment: Solid measurement culture of 4 years, 8 iterations, 100+ teams
- Things we know but need to do more with quality matters! And healthcare system cost is related to characteristics of primary care patients, even more than quality
- Socioeconomic status: Cost appears to be related more strongly to senior than with in-home. This is an easier place to start addressing equity than other aspects of socioeconomic status.
- Governance: How teams are governed may be important in healthcare system cost – even more so than QI activities and clinical champions

THANKS!!!

Thanks!

- For more information: Carol.mulder@afhto.ca