The CEOs Role in Reducing Variation & Improving Quality

Becker's Annual Meeting Jeremy Fotheringham, RN, MHSA, JD Twitter @jmfother



Disclosures:

• None (sadly)

MU Health Care Overview



www.MUHealth.org • Facebook/MUHealthCare • Twitter.com/MUHealth • Instagram.com/MUHealth

MISSION To save and improve lives.

VISION We will be Missouri's premier academic health system.

MU Health Care By The Numbers





1,645,121

680,624 clinic visits (all sites)

26,847 patient discharges

25,800 M A J O R surgical operations







- Ellis Fischel Cancer Center
- Missouri Orthopaedic Institute
- Missouri Psychiatric Center
- University Hospital
- Women's and Children's Hospital



¹⁰⁰⁰¹ *lab tests* **7,422,083**

pharmacy doses

6,936 total staff

6,216 OTHER STAFF



*Based on FY 2018 statistics (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018).

Designations



MU Women's and Children's Hospital Baby-Friendly Designation



Level I STEMI Center Stroke Center Trauma Center





Health Network of Missouri and MPact



Where I Am From:



A Little Inspiration From Chicago:



5 Principles for Success

- 1. Define the "Why" & Awareness of Need
- Identify Greatest Areas of Impact-Short
 & Long-Term
- 3. Resource & Build Infrastructure to Change Performance
- 4. Build Transparency & Trust
- 5. Lead & De-Centralize Ownership

A Pioneer In His Field



 <u>https://static.healthcare.siemens.com/siemens_hwemhwem_ssxa_websites-context-</u> <u>root/wcm/idc/groups/public/@global/documents/download/mda4/od</u> <u>ay/~edisp/insights-series-issue1_wp-james_reduce-unwarranted-</u> <u>variations-05983449.pdf</u>

Defining the "Why" & Awareness of Need

MISSION To save and improve lives.

Reducing Variation=Improves Quality and Reduces Cost Lower Cost & Improved Quality=More Opportunity to Achieve Our Mission

The Problem: We Cost Too Much



The Problem: Rising Costs of Health Care Coverage



Source: Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research & Education Trust

Bloomberg

Wide Variation: Increased Costs # Increased Quality

Cost of heart failure treatment in U.S. hospitals, ordered by mortality



When More is Less

Relationship Between Quality And Medicare Spending, As Expressed By Overall Quality Ranking, 2000–2001



SOURCES: Medicare claims data; and S.F. Jencks et al., "Change in the Quality of Care Delivered to Medicare Beneficiaries, 1998–1999 to 2000–2001," *Journal of the American Medical Association* 289, no. 3 (2003): 305–312. **NOTE:** For quality ranking, smaller values equal higher quality.

\$450B in Non-Value Added Care, \$1295/person in waste



The bill is due: In the last 18 months...

- •MD Anderson Cancer Center Lost \$266M
- Prestigious Partners (Boston) lost \$108M
- •Cleveland Clinic lost 71% in operating income from previous year (non-investment related)
- CHI (Pacific Coast) \$512M in lost operating income
- Sutter, NorthWell Health, UnityPoint Health all reported significant losses
- •Hospitals Closing (rural and suburban)

Rural Hospitals Closing: Could They Have Been Saved?

2005-17 rural hospital closures:

Where were they?



80 rural hospitals have closed since January 2010 122 rural hospitals have closed since January 2005

Source; https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27500663

Disproportionate Impact on Rural Hospitals in Non-Medicaid Expansion States

Closed hospitals since the beginning of 2013

Hospitals are shuttering or converting to clinics at a faster pace and most often in states that have not expanded Medicaid

PEOPLE PER SQ MILE



- Closed hospital
- States that opted out of medicaid expansion
- States with continued open debate on Medicaid expansion

SHOW/HIDE medicaid states



Higher Costs=Fewer Hospitals?

: Cecil G. Sheps Center for Health Services Research, University of North Carolina • Created with Datawrapper

Source: https://www.shepscenter.unc.edu/programsprojects/rural-health/infographics/

Rapid Expansion of Medicare

Providers must closely manage costs as more of the U.S. population ages into Medicare eligibility

Projected Change in Medicare Enrollment, 2000 - 2050

- Government will absorb a significant portion of healthcare costs as **more of** the population ages into Medicare and utilization continues to rise
- Rise in Medicare population and utilization will **increase margin pressures** requiring providers to improve efficiency and reduce cost of care delivery

The CEO Dilemma-Why So Much Waste?

The collision of two forces with underlying perverse incentives

Continued Reliance on the Craft of Medicine

Clinical Uncertainty

Payment System that Encourages Utilization

Identifying Greatest Areas of Impact

The Risks of Bad Data

Reducing Care Variation at University Hospital

Top 20 Primary Diagnoses – UH Inpatients

- Focus conditions selected from top discharge diagnoses from UH inpatient discharges
- Five identified with highest cost variability

		Discharge Date
	Discharge DX 1 Code Description	FY 2017
→ /	A41.9 - Sepsis, unspecified organism-A41.9	782
→ I	N17.9 - Acute kidney failure, unspecified-N17.9	316
I	E66.01 - Morbid (severe) obesity due to excess calories-E66.01	315
→ I	163.9 - Cerebral infarction, unspecified-163.9	287
	J44.1 - Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease w (acute) exacerbation-J44.1	237
→ I	I21.4 - Non-ST elevation (NSTEMI) myocardial infarction-I21.4	227
I	F10.239 - Alcohol dependence with withdrawal, unspecified-F10.239	211
I	E10.10 - Type 1 diabetes mellitus with ketoacidosis w/out coma-E10.10	182
→	J18.9 - Pneumonia, unspecified organism-J18.9	167
-	T81.4XXA - Infection following a procedure, initial encounter-T81.4XXA	156
I	I11.0 - Hypertensive heart disease with heart failure-I11.0	136
1	N39.0 - Urinary tract infection, site not specified-N39.0	128
	J96.01 - Acute respiratory failure with hypoxia-J96.01	120
	J96.21 - Acute and chronic respiratory failure with hypoxia-J96.21	120
I	113.0 - Hyp hrt & chr kdny dis w hrt fail and stg 1-4/unsp chr kdny-113.0	119
1	I26.99 - Other pulmonary embolism w/out acute cor pulmonale-I26.99	108
I	K85.90 - Acute pancreatitis w/out necrosis or infection, unspecified-K85.90	108
1	I25.110 - Athscl heart disease of native cor art w unstable ang pctrs-I25.110	103
I	K92.1 - Melena-K92.1	102
1	148.91 - Unspecified atrial fibrillation-148.91	99

Variability by Condition

Hea	alth of Missouri	VISIT FINANCIAL MEASURE DISTRIBUTIONS	Payer (All) ▼ Age Group (All) ▼
	-	Select Visit Level Financial Measure	
Total Direct Cost			
FY 2017	FY 2018		
Visit Financi	al Measu	re by DX Distribution	
A41.9 - Sepsis, unspecified organism-A41.9	FY 2017	\$7.2K	• •
	FY 2018	\$7.0K	
I21.4 - Non-ST elevation (NSTEMI) myocardial	FY 2017	\$7.1K	
infarction-121.4	FY 2018	\$7.3K	
J96.01 - Acute respiratory failure with hypoxia-J96.01	FY 2017	\$6.4K	
	FY 2018	\$5.9K	
N17.9 - Acute kidney failure, unspecified-N17.9	FY 2017	\$3.0K	
	FY 2018	\$3.1K	
T81.4XXA - Infection following a procedure, initial encounter-T81	FY 2017	\$6.1K	•
4XXA	FT 2018	\$7.0K	
		\$0K \$10K \$20K \$30K \$40K \$50K \$60K \$70K \$80K \$90K \$100K \$110	к \$120К \$130К \$140К

Costs by Charge Grouping

	le versit	alt	h ssouri			F	IN	ANG		LIV	IEA	\SU	RE	S E	BY (СН	AR	GE	GR	OU	Р			Pa Age	ayer Grouj	AII • AII		
07/01/2016 to	o 06/:	Disch 30/2018	arge D	ate				т	otal (Selec Direct (t Fina Cost	ancial	Metri	ic for C	harg	e Grou	ιp		20	Se	lect N	l for To	op N C)ischa	rges l	oy Volu	ıme	
FY 2017		F	Y 2018																						Roo	m co	osts	maio
Bundle F	ina	ancia	I Me	as	ure	s by	v Cł	narg	le G	irou	p														con	tribu	utor	in all
			Bla	ink	С	ard	c	linic		ER	Imp	lants	L	.ab	(DR	Ot	ther	Ph	narm	F	Rad	R	pom	Sup	plies	seş	uma
A41.9 - Sepsis,	lue	\$80K \$60K																	•									
organism- A41.9	Va	\$20K \$20K \$0K	\$137	\$118	\$102	\$24	\$53	\$57	\$256	\$257	51 69	\$208	\$748	\$657	5268	\$236	\$549	\$442	\$1E5	\$724	\$219	\$214	\$3.513	\$3,806	\$261	\$226	\$231	
I21.4 - Non- ST elevation (NSTEMI)	alue	\$40K																										
myocardial infarction- 121.4	>	\$20K \$0K	\$137	\$118	\$2,676	\$1,483	\$65	\$108	\$256	\$257	\$1,066	\$866	8	\$282	\$512 \$5	\$377	511	\$496	R R R	\$468	÷.	\$73	\$1.869	\$2,077	3	\$499	\$231	_
J96.01 - Acute respiratory failure with bypoxia-196	Value	\$100K \$50K																						×				8
01		\$0K	\$137	\$118	685	\$115	\$55	\$55	\$380	\$257	5 69	\$376	\$607	\$600	\$245	\$522	89 <u>7</u> 3	\$845	2 8	\$358	\$18	\$152	8	\$3,43	6/ TS	\$215	\$900	\$1,19
N17.9 - Acute kidney failure	lue	\$20K																										
unspecified- N17.9	Va	\$10К \$ОК	\$137	\$118	\$12	\$24	\$58	\$38	\$256	\$257	\$196	\$314	315	\$334	₹₽	\$18	5	\$182	\$221	\$209	\$104	\$124	51 603 51	\$1,656	ŝ	\$36	\$231	\$429
T81.4XXA - Infection following a	alue	\$40K																					•					
procedure, initial encounter	V.	\$20K \$0K	\$137	\$118	\$12	\$12	\$34	\$38	\$256	\$257	\$249	\$245	\$324	\$284	818 18	\$2,176	\$115	\$115	\$665	\$846	\$131	6/1\$	\$2.755	\$2,957	\$497	\$417		

Variability vs. LOS by Condition

· LOS and Room Costs are significant component of the variability

Sepsis Variability vs LOS

LOS variability is highly case dependent

Regardless of transfer/nontransfer or Sepsis type, not meeting fluids compliance results in significantly higher mortality

Sepsis	Mortalit	y Index	Median Co	Direct ost	СМІ			
Class	No*	Yes*	No*	Yes*	No*	Yes*		
Sepsis	0.65	0.58	\$5,530	\$4,666	2.00	1.92		
Severe	1.22	0.55	\$6,688	\$7,392	2.28	2.56		
Shock	0.94	0.81	\$16,883	\$17,925	3.75	3.85		

*Compliant with 3 Hr Bundles

Data combined from Vizient, IDX, ADS, and Sepsis HealtheIntent Bundle Model sources Encounters with a primary Vizient Adult Sepsis Diagnosis codes as POA and associated Bundle Model Data from Jan-Nov 2017 Further Exclusions Include Encounters with a Disposition of Left AMA, Non-Transfers, and an Observed LOS of < 2 Days to minimize impact of Early Deaths Additionally Median Direct Costs Exclude Expired Patients

Order Sets Used and Outcomes: Bariatric Surgery Results

Volum	e		Direct Cost Distribution
GSTR RSTCV PX W/BYP Y LIMB <150 CM	Before Meeting	61	8.8% Median Cost Reduction
0143644 - LAPS (ROUX-EN-	After Meeting	62	

Readmissions – All vs SNF Discharges

Readmissions from SNFs comparable or greater than all discharges overall

All Discharges

SNF Discharges

Care Across the Continuum:

CJR Physician Scorecard Analytics – Discharge Disposition by Encounter (FY17)

Resource & Build Infrastructure to Change Performance

Unhealthy Disconnect

Willing) www ALC NO

"I am truly concerned about the quality of care and health of the patients. The executives are only concerned about profit maximization and cutting costs."

> "I am truly concerned about the quality of care provided. Physicians don't understand there are limited resources available or what it takes to run a hospital."

Most systems have failed to crack internal/governance nut

Sources: Burns, L. R., McCullough, J. S., Wholey, D. R., Kruse, G., Kralovec, P., & Muller, R. (2015). Is the system really the solution? Operating costs in hospital systems. Medical Care Research and Review, 72(3), 247-272.

Fundamentals of Infrastructure

- •Data, Data, Data,
- •Resource the Needed Teams
- •Focus on Rapid & Sustained Improvement
- •Establish or Join a Clinical Training Improvement Program
- •Performance Tie-In Back to the Bottom Line

Build Transparency & Trust

You Need A Partner (usually a Physician)

Physician Leadership is Key

Bepartment of Medicine Grand Rounds

"Say 'NO' to 'Low Value Care"

S. Hasan Naqvi, MD

Division Director, Hospital Medicine Associate Professor of Clinical Medicine Associate Chief Medical Officer, MU Health Care University of Missouri, Columbia

Introduced By: Dr. Edward TH Yeh, MD, Chairman, Dept. of Medicine

Thursday, March 21st, 2019

MA217 Acuff Auditorium, 12 pm to 1 pm

Speaker Disclosure: S. Hasan Naqvi has indicated the following conflict of interest: None

The Office of Continuing Medical Education, School of Medicine, University of Missouri (OCME SOM UM) is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) to provide continuing medical education for physicians. The OCME SOM UM designates this live educational activity for a maximum of 1 AMA PFA Category I CreditTM. Physicians should only claim credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Equal Opportunity/ADA Institution

Dyad Partners to Build Analytics to Drive Value:

Creating A Real-Time, Actionable Dashboard

Scoring Sorting by Physician

Enterprise Analytics

CJR - Internal Data (ADS, EMR, Vizient)

Patient Type Mn	nemonic	DRG	Fractu	ıre (Yes/No)	Prim Su	urgeon Name	Disc	harge DX 1 Code	e Description	Discharge	Procedure 1 Co	de and Descript	ion Di	scharge Procedu	ire 2 Code and I	Description	
(All)	•	(All) ▼	(All)	T	(All)		▼ (All)		•	(All)			▼ (All)			T	J
Prim Surgeon				July 2016	August 2016	September 2016	October 2016	November 2016	December 2016	January 2017	February 2017	March 2017	April 2017	May 2017	June 2017	Grand Tota	I

Name		July 2010	August 2010	2016	00000012010	November 2010	December 2010	Junuary 2017	10010019 2017	March 2017	Abii 2017	may 2017	June 2017	orana rotar
	Encounters	28	38	36	29	21	38	24	18	22	24	25	16	319
	% Age 75 and older	28.57%	39.47%	52.78%	65.52%	42.86%	47.37%	45.83%	50.00%	31.82%	33.33%	40.00%	43.75%	43.89%
	% SNF	21.43%	21.05%	19.44%	41.38%	23.81%	34.21%	12.50%	38.89%	13.64%	20.83%	12.00%	25.00%	23.82%
	% IRF	10.71%	10.53%	8.33%	17.24%	4.76%	7.89%	12.50%	5.56%	9.09%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
	% Home Health	64.29%	68.42%	66.67%	51.72%	57.14%	57.89%	75.00%	50.00%	72.73%	50.00%	64.00%	56.25%	61.76%
	% Readmissions (30 Day)	0.00%	2.63%	2.78%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	0.94%
Grand Total	% Readmissions (90 days)	7.14%	23.68%	13.89%	37.93%	23.81%	13.16%	20.83%	16.67%	13.64%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	15.36%
	% Fractures	14.29%	15.79%	11.11%	41.38%	19.05%	26.32%	16.67%	27.78%	9.09%	12.50%	12.00%	18.75%	18.81%
	% Diabetes	7.14%	21.05%	5.56%	3.45%	4.76%	5.26%	4.17%	11.11%	22.73%	16.67%	8.00%		9.40%
	% BMI >=40	10.71%	21.05%	11.11%	24.14%	9.52%	21.05%	12.50%	22.22%	13.64%	16.67%	12.00%		15.36%
	CMI	2.16	2.27	2.17	2.21	2.07	2.16	2.21	2.13	2.12	2.07	2.26	2.22	2.18
	SOI (AVG)	1.45	1.76	1.63	1.77	1.43	1.34	1.84	1.67	1.55	1.71	1.92	1.69	1.64
	Risk of Mortality (AVG)	1.17	1.58	1.41	1.71	1.19	1.20	1.40	1.78	1.36	1.25	1.56	1.69	1.43

Lead & De-Centralize Ownership

Lead & De-Centralize Ownership Principles to Build Transparency & Trust

- Reward & Recognize Success
- Consistent & Reliable Systems of Communication
- Everyone Understands What is Expected of Them
- Continuous Feedback Loop & Expectations for Continuous Improvement

Daily management huddle

- 1. Status updates 5 min Throughput and Criticality
- 2. Safety/ Improvement 5 min
- 3. Announcements/ Education - 5 min
- 4. Run the Metric Board for Zero Harm focus areas

Status	New Innovation	n Opportunities	Quality & Safety
Admitš: Disawye: L Name Alert		Expectations • Andoulahan TiDer per order • Intakes Output • Daving pamps • Daving weights • Bahing at back 940 • IPac • 20 hours • sking manual • pan • fails • Bedisde Report	Process of the Week: Rebent locked art in batmoons, pulled at class table. Use cain to unlock door Days Since Last Fall: 7 -bod Nome tas End Yos Days Since Last HAP1:13 17 -Press doubt in who oder manber in ALL vice patients induling 1980 years. Pul- -Prob to class in all ober remas
Needs/Shortages	"Just Do Its"	Escalate Up	
Implemented Recognition	Projects In Progress	And	Education & Top Topics Attinual Mandebried /STEMI due 3/34 Uncoming Transloo Phone for the States Mile Current Kings PTOB education E Semil Bring SD glassenters & date to be 800 - Chris mill Make gright them Tag has if had alorer net nerving Kurp hore porter Stated on Halle-Allyn Stateg are charteng Stateg are charteng EMPLOYEE ENGINEENT!

Cardiovascular Tier 1 Huddle Board (1/22/19)

Example of Tiered Huddle System: Intermountain Healthcare

Example at MUHC

Spinal Surgery & Implants Project

- Drive Standardization in Implants and OR Care Process
- Prior to project Intermountain had 37 spine implant suppliers.
 - Open Supplier process.
- Major operational and quality control complexity
 - Inventory management
 - Staff training
 - Contract oversight
 - Rep management

Identify Key Principles & Get Out of the Way:

- Patients are why we are here-Mission Driven
- Unnecessary variability drives increased in costs
- Affordability= Increased Patient Access
- Tracking and Transparency in quality and cost metrics is paramount
- Focus on the brutal facts-data driven decisions

Implants Savings and Case Volume

Changing Processes at Individual Hospitals

90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0% PathCityMedicalCenter Logan Regional AmericanFort PrimaryChildren's Divie Regional Cassia Regional OremCommunity Sevier Valley 705H Riverton Utah Valley Imed McKayDee Hebervalley Jalley View

% Required Vendor Change

Mortality Rates

All Hospitals

Readmission Rates:

All Hospitals

Complications:

All Hospitals

OR Minutes:

Cost Per Case:

All Hospital

5 Principles for Success

- 1. Define the "Why" & Awareness of Need
- Identify Greatest Areas of Impact-Short
 & Long-Term
- 3. Resource & Build Infrastructure to Change Performance
- 4. Build Transparency & Trust
- 5. Lead & De-Centralize Ownership

When You All Are Singing the Same Song

Thank you.