20/20 Cayman Islands National Healthcare Conference Healthcare Economics: The Search for Quality and Affordability The Ritz-Carlton, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands Saturday, 19 November 2011 -- 9:30a - 10:30a

The Quality Imperative: The Best Clinical Result at the Lowest Necessary Cost

Brent C. James, M.D., M.Stat. Executive Director, Institute for Health Care Delivery Research Intermountain Healthcare Salt Lake City, Utah, USA



Neither I, Brent C. James, nor any family members, have any relevant financial relationships to be discussed, directly or indirectly, referred to or illustrated with or without recognition within the presentation.

I have no financial relationships beyond my employment at Intermountain Healthcare.

Dr. Alan Morris, LDS Hospital, 1991

- NIH-funded randomized controlled trial assessing an "artifical lung" vs. standard ventilator management for acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS)
- discovered large variations in ventilator settings across and within expert pulmonologists
- created a protocol for ventilator settings in the control arm of the trial
- Implemented the protocol using Lean principles Womack et al., 1990 - The Machine That Changed the World

Dr. Alan Morris, LDS Hospital, 1991

• Results:

survival (for ECMO entry criteria patients) improved from 9.5% to 44% costs fell by ~25% (from \$160k to \$120k) physician time fell by ~50%

we generalized the concept: Shared Baseline protocols to standardize care while

encouraging clinicians to vary based on individual patient needs; and feeding back variation data in a "learning system"

Shared Baseline protocols (a form of Lean Production)

A multidisciplinary team of health professionals:

- **1.** Select a high priority care process
- **2.** Generate an evidence-based "best practice" guideline
- **3**. Blend the guideline into the flow of clinical work
 - staffing
 - training
 - supplies
 - physical layout
 - educational materials
 - measurement / information flow
- 4. Use the guideline as a shared baseline, with clinicians free to vary based on individual patient needs

5. Measure, learn from, and (over time) eliminate variation arising from professionals; retain variation arising from patients ("mass customization") When abstract guidelines hit real patient care, experience clearly shows that (with very rare exception)

No protocol fits <u>every</u> patient;

more important,

No protocol (perfectly) fits <u>any</u> patient.

Sepsis bundle compliance

— ER bundle —— ICU bundle —— All components



Sepsis mortality - ER-ICU transfers



~116 fewer inpatient deaths per year Month

Diabetes Patient Follow-Up Worksheet: All Patients Report Period April-01-2008 to March-31-2009



Patients that need follow-up are those whose average Blood Pressure > 130/80, last A1c value was > 8.0, last LDL > 100, and/or Triglycerides >= 400, or any of the aforementioned tests were not performed during the reporting period. Please remember "credit" can be given to improve individual scores if patients are contacted by your office but are not compliant or lab information is incorrect.

Provider Name (P								14 Patie	nts Th	at Need F	-ollow-up				
SelectHealth Incentive Benchmark Goals:					50%	to 90%			76% to 8	1%		85% to	90%	54%	to 59%
Total SelectHealth Patients	- 21	SelectHealth C	urrent Diabetes	Performance:		100%			77%			92%	5		62%
SelectHealth				Last Office	Blood	Press	ure	Lipid N	lanager	nent		HGA1c		MicroAlb	ouminuria
Patient Name	IDX MRN	Birthdate	Phone	Visit	Date	BP	<=130/80	Date	LDL †	HDL	Trig	Date H	GA1c	Date M	/licroAlb ‡
				12/18/2006	12/18/2006	130/80	Yes	2/26/2007	105	50	227	Not	Tested	No	t Tested
Corrections	A											6			
				5/31/2007	5/31/2007	131/79	No	1/13/2007	99	30	230	5/31/2007	4.9	Na	t Tested
Corrections															
				5/11/2007	6/18/2007	108/59	Yes		74		236	1/16/2007	6.9	No	t Tested
Corrections					e mercerne onnen.		n								
				5/3/2007	5/3/2007	131/73	No	12/13/2006	99	39	232	3/8/2007	NA	Να	t Tested
Corrections															
				3/15/2007	3/15/2007	131/83	No	Nc	t Tested			12/14/2006	6.2	No	t Tested
Corrections												8			
				10/2/2006	10/23/2006	131/80	No	10/2/2006	92	53	282	11/13/2006	6.8	10/2/2006	NEG
Corrections							-1999-1996-197			CHEEP.		3	Pre- a r- su		
	· · · · · ·			6/4/2007	6/4/2007	111/63	Yes		23		115	6/4/2007	10.8	Nephro	pathy Tx
Corrections				PORC 4/10/10/00		G- 90112942777	044/750/		1007-		1 1 1 2010-0		0000000		
				2/16/2007	2/16/2007	144/74	No	8/23/2006	92	29	339	2/16/2007	5.9	8/23/2006	POS
Corrections				And receiver of Tala			a (gran)	n - ann an ann an Tarllo.	1.07	9235	ann an				in without
					4			2						2	

Administrative (HEDIS) criteria for diabetes (at least 2 face-to-face contacts in an outpatient facility and an ICD-9-CM code 250.xx; or at least 1 inpatient stay and an ICD-9-CM code 250.xx; or at least 1 prescription for insulin or an oral hypoglycemic agent) in the current measurement period or prior measurement periods.

* Indicates a new patient on the list from last reporting period.

** Avg B/P measure is an average of the last three EMR recorded blood pressure results from home or clinic. Blood pressure data only available for physicians with access to Intermountain EMR.

Indicates a patient that has been noted in the EMR as having an in-control blood pressure within the last six months.

† Indicates a SelectHealth patient who has a pharmacy benefit, is over 40 years old with an LDL test above 100, and is not on a lipid lowering medication.

‡ Indicates a SelectHealth patient who has a pharmacy benefit, a positive microalbuminuria test and is not on ACEI or ARB medication.

CONFIDENTIAL: This material is prepared pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 26-25-1 et. Seq., Idaho Code Ann. 39-1392 et seq., for improvement of the quality of hospital and medical care rendered by hospitals or physicians.

General patient status information

11 July 2003			ΩΡ:	atient \	Nork	sheet			v1.
PATIENT NAME TEST, A A			SE F	X DOB 09/01	/1964	/MI# 545073664		MRN# 545073664	
Problems			I						
Hype thyroidism s of the p ist appende L abete s malling two Active Medications			s an	d ch	Hypertensi Dipler deo Coloni ov a	on o ny ir ery d sé as	con	ditio	n
1 Digitoxin, 0.1 2 Entex LA (Gu	mg, Tab Jaifenes	olet; 3 TJ BLF in/PPA IOU,			B	pro	file		
Preventive Care									
CV Risk	P p Sm	near	ntin		orc		\sim		
5%*(1.4x)**	No Dat	eve		ve c	ale	; Su		aly	
Clinical Laboratory	Data								
HgbA1c (<=7.0)		UA Protein		uAlb/Cr (<30)		24 Urine Albun	nin (<30)		
No Data	-	06/01/2001 12/18/2000 11/06/2000	Negative Positive Negative	No Data	-	No Data	-		
Serum Cr		Serum K	Ďo	Lipid Pr	ofile LDL	. (< 100)	-200) HDL	(>35) CHOL (<2	200)
04/26/2003 10/25/2002 02/27/2002 10/03/2001	1.1 2.0 1.6 2.3	04/26/200 02/05/200 10/25/200 01/29/200	03 C 03 02 02	.2 0./24/200 6.0 04/06/200 4.5 02/24/200 6.1 02/06/200)3)3)3)3	10 C O 1 154 8 149 1! 168 18	3 5 5 4 51 4 39 3	0 176 1 212 1 220 13 239	
TC/HDL Ratio		НСТ		hsCRP		Homocystein	е	Fasting Glucose	•
04/26/2003 04/06/2003 02/24/2003 02/06/2003	3.5 5.2 5.4 7.2	02/05/2003 10/02/2002 08/23/2002 07/19/2002	35.9 % 37.7 % 45.0 % 29.9 %	04/06/2003 02/24/2003	0.6 mg/l 1.2 mg/l	04/06/2003	6 mcmol/l	02/25/2003 12/19/2002 01/02/2002 12/20/2001	1 1 1
Clinic Data									
Date W	eight	BMI (<25)	Weight Class	Blood Pressu	ure (<130/80) Hea	rt Rate		
No Data Last foot exam: Last dilated retinal Reminders	- exam:	- No Dat No Data	Pert	1/25/2001 INE	ht ^{145/74}		5/2001 NS	86	
Preventive									
* Predicted % Risk of ** Relative Risk over Pap and pelvic sugg For Patients with knn Blood Pressure mea Suggested follow-up Pneumovax suggest Diabetes	over 10 yea r 10 yea jested ev own Car asureme o for miss ted for a	- years of a cardiov very 3 yea s rdioval cular 8 nt is suggeste sing data: - Pa Il patients age	diovascular even vascular event (mor time com of states target a for adults even ap Smear e 65 and above	ant (MI, revascula compared to lowe at vertice ap ten DV for ary two years. and all patients	rization, CVA est risk categ	A, death). Inory. Indiana and a state of the system of the		5	
Suggest repeat Urin Last ALT = 28 on 4/2 Suggested follow-up	e Album 26/2003 o for miss	- hin Test more & AST = 66 c sing data: - H	than (>) 1 year on 4/26/2003 gbA1c - Dialate	since last test. d Retinal Exam -	Foot Exam ·	- Weight		-	
nvperiension									
ACE Inhibitors (ACE	EI) or if A	_ CEI intoleran	t, Angiotensin I	Receptor Blocke	ers (ARBs) o	r the combinatior	of ACEI or AR	BS and Diuretics are	e the
ACE Inhibitors (ACE recommended initial	El) or if A drug th	CEI intolerant erapy for patie	t, Angiotensin I ents who are di	I Receptor Blocke agnosed with hyp	ers (ARBs) o ertension in	r the combinatior conjunction with	of ACEI or AR Diabetes.	BS and Diuretics are	e the

Disease specific information



CONFIDENTIAL: This material is prepared pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 26-25-1 et. Seq. or Idaho Code Ann. 39-1392 et seq. for improvement of the quality of hospital and medical care rendered by hospitals or physicians.

Steven Towner - Intermountain Salt Lake Clinic - Intermountain Medical Group

Intermountain Primary Care Clinical Programs: Adult Diabetes Medical Director Summary Report Reporting Period: 01-Jul-08 To 30-Jun-09 Medical Director: **Intermountain**[™]

Family Medicine		Hemo	Hemoglobin A1c Summary: 12 Months						LDL Summary: 12 Months				MA:
Clinic Location	Diabetes Patient Count	Tested	Tested, result NA	Percentages with availabl A1c<7.0	based on on e A1c results 7.0<=A1c<=8	ly those 3.0 A1c>8.0	Tested r	Tested, esult NA	Percentages with availab LDL<100 1	s based on only those ble LDL results 00 <ldl<=130 ldl="">130</ldl<=130>	BP Results If Availabl	; BP In le Control	MA Tested
Provider Name													
SelectH	ealth 98	88 (90%) 1 (1%)	40 (46%)	26 (30%)	21 (24%)	92 (94%)	0 (0%)	60 (65%)	17 (18%) 14 (15%)	97 (99%)	44 (45%)	67 (68%)
All Other Pa	yers 209	184 (88%) 4 (2%)	94 (52%)	29 (16%)	57 (32%)	178 (85%)	0 (0%)	86 (48%)	50 (28%) 31 (17%)	201 (96%)	74 (37%)	110 (53%)
Comb	ned 307	272 (89%) 5 (2%)	134 (50%)	55 (21%)	78 (29%)	270 (88%)	0 (0%)	146 (54%)	67 (25%) 45 (17%)	298 (97%)	118 (40%)	177 (58%)
Family Medicine Su SelectHea All Other Pay Combin	mmary: Ilth 98 ers 209 ned 307	88 (90% - 272(89%) 1 (1%)) 5 (2%)	40 (46%) 134 (50%)	26 (30%) 55 (21%)	21 (24%) 78 (29%)	92 (94%) 270 (88%)	0 (0%) 0 (0%)	60 (65%) 86 (48%) 146 (54%)	17 (18%) 14 (15%) 50 (28%) 31 (17%) 67 (25%) 45 (17%)	97 (99%) 298 (97%)	44 (45%) 74 (37%) 118 (40%)	67 (68%) 177(58%)
13											Interm	ountain Med	lical Group

Intermountain Medical Group

Internal Medicine		Hemoglobin A1c Summary: 12 Months				LDL Summary: 12 Months					Blood Pr	MA:		
Diabet Patier Clinic Location Court	tes nt nt	Tested	Tested, result NA	Percentages with available A1c<7.0	based on on e A1c results 7.0<=A1c<=8	ly those 3.0 A1c>8.0	Tested	Tested, result NA	Percentage with availa LDL<100	es based on c ble LDL resul 100 <ldl<=13< th=""><th>only those ts 0 LDL>130</th><th>BP Results If Availabl</th><th>BP In e Control</th><th>MA Tested</th></ldl<=13<>	only those ts 0 LDL>130	BP Results If Availabl	BP In e Control	MA Tested
Clinic Name tain Holladay Clin	ic _													
Provider Name			6 0.000.00000000000	BARAN CONSUMPTIONS	out Successingment	0300 80008000 D	N	to et metrocomen	C.107 040704541000345		50.00 - 150.050.050.050.050			
SelectHealth 4	8	48 (100%)	0 (0%)	31 (65%)	6 (13%)	11 (23%)	47 (98%)) 1 (2%)	26 (57%)	13 (28%)	6 (13%)	48 (100%)	31 (65%)	31 (65%)
All Other Payers 24	7	240 (97%)	0 (0%)	161 (67%)	49 (20%)	30 (13%)	237 (96%)) 0 (0%)	162 (68%)	50 (21%)	21 (9%)	247 (100%)	163 (66%)	165 (67%)
Combined 29	5	288 (98%)	0 (0%)	192 (67%)	55 (19%)	41 (14%)	284 (96%)) 1 (0%)	188 (66%)	63 (22%)	27 (10%)	295 (100%)	194 (66%)	196 (66%)
Internal Medicine Summary	:													
SelectHealth	48	48 (100%)	0 (0%)	31 (65%)	6 (13%)	11 (23%)	47 (98%)) 1 (2%)	26 (57%)	13 (28%)	6 (13%)	48 (100%)	31 (65%)	31 (65%)
All Other Payers 24	47			(-		162 (68%)	50 (21%)	21 (9%)	1000 Notes	163 (66%)	
Combined 29	95	288(98%)	0 (0%)	192 (67%)	55 (19%)	41 (14%)	284 (96%)) 1 (0%)	188 (66%)	63 (22%)	27 (10%)	295 (100%)	194 (66%)	196(66%)
Medical Director Summary:														
SelectHealth 14	46	136(93%)	1 (1%)	71 (53%)	32 (24%)	32 (24%)	139 (95%)	1 (1%)	86 (62%)	30 (22%)	20 (14%)	145 (99%)	75 (52%)	98(67%)
All Other Payers 45	56	424(93%)	4 (1%)	255 (61%)	78 (19%)	87 (21%)	415 (91%)	4 (1%)	248 (60%)	100 (24%)	52 (13%)	448 (98%)	237 (53%)	275(60%)
Combined 60	02	560(93%)	5 (1%)	326 (59%)	110 (20%)	119 (21%)	554 (92%)) 1 (0%)	334 (60%)	130 (24%)	72 (13%)	593 (99%)	237 (53%)	373(62%)

IHC Primary Care System Goals and Managed Care Incentive Achievement Summary: Internal Medicine





100%

1.) Diabetes, HbA1c Testing	2.) Diabetes, LDL Testing					
The percent of patients with diabetes wh a HbA1c test within the last 12 months.	The percent of patients with diabetes who had a LDL test within the last 24 months.					
Your Achievement:	78%	Your Achievement:	94%			
System Goal:	80%	System Goal:	80%			
Managed Care Incentive Goal:	85%	Managed Care Incentive Goa	al: 85%			
Your Score in this area is:	0%	Your Score in this area is	s: 100%			
3.) Urine Microalbuminuria Scr	een					
Number of patients with diagnosis of dia	abetes who had appro	opnate urine screen in last 12 mo	nths.			
Your Achievement:	12%					
Goal: Managed Care Incentive Goal:	40% 55%	Your Score in this area is	s: 100%			
<u>4.) Asthma Care</u> Percent of patients in your Internal Medi prescription for a controller in the last ye Your Group Achievement Goal: Managed Care Incentive Goal:	cine Group with "high ar. 94% 82% 87%	er risk asthma" who filled at leas Your Score in this area is	tone :: 100%			
5.) Clinical Learning Day		Your Score in this area is	100%			
Attended a Clinical Learning Day Progra	am in 2003 or 2004					
Your Score for each -100% if you ex -0% -50%-100% sliding s	of the above measures ceed the Managed Care if you are below the Sys cale if you are between	is computed as follows: Incentive (MCI) goal stem Goal the System and MCI goals				
Ma	naged Care Ince	ntive Summary				
, Your total s	score is computed usi	ing the following weighting:				
25%	6 from Item 1 Diabete	es (HbA1c Testing)				
259	% from Item 2 Diabete	es (LDL Testing)				
109	% from Item 3 Urine N	licroalbuminuria Screen				
159	% from Item 4 Asthma	Care				
25%	% from Item 5 Attend	Clinical Learning Day				
Your Total	Managed Care Inc	entive Score is: 75%				

CPM with clinic care managers

Complex diabetes patients - mortality rates



CPM with clinic care managers

Complex diabetes patients - hospitalization rates



Physician productivity (WRVUs - work relative value units)



Physicians with embedded care management support were significantly (8%) more productive than controls

Of the 4 measurement tools shown,

which was most effective in driving change?

- 1. Action lists (tools to move from episodic to continuous care)
- 2. Patient worksheets (targets of opportunity embedded, evidence based reminders at every point of contact)
- **3. Comparative outcomes** (what is possible, who to ask)
- 4. Financial incentives (see: Drive by Daniel Pink; intrinsic vs extrinsic motivators)

Only one pertinent question:

Assume that front-line clinicians are

- as smart you are
- as dedicated to patients as you are
- as hard-working as you are
- as motivated as you are
- are the only ones with fundamental knowledge of how the front-line process actually works;

But they usually don't control the systems that set the context within which they work ...

How will your proposed intervention

make it easier for them to do it right?

NICU admits by weeks gestation

Deliveries w/o Complications, 2002 - 2003



Weeks gestation

Elective inductions < 39 weeks



Unplanned c-section rates

Electively induced patients by Bishop score, Jan 2002 - Aug 2003



Average hours in labor & delivery

Electively induced patients by Bishop score, Jan 2002 - Aug 2003



Primiparous elective inductions



Elective induction: length of labor



Overall c-section rate



Quality-based cost improvement

Combined maternal and neonatal variable cost

Deliveries without complications resulting in normal newborns Actual - expected cost, based on year-end 2000 with PPI inflation



Deming: Quality controls costs



50+% of all resource expenditures in hospitals is quality-associated waste:

- recovering from preventable foul-ups
- building unusable products
- providing unnecessary treatments

simple inefficiency

Andersen, C. 1991 James BC *et al.*, 2006

Rough estimate: more than 80% of all cost saving opportunities lie on the clinical side of the line

Nested waste analysis

1. Population Level	
(a) Supply-induced overuse - no benefit to patient; should never have been done	14%
(b) Preference-induced overuse - if given a fair choice, patients opt out	(left out)
2. Episode / Microsystem (process) Level	
(a) Preventable patient safety events	(left out)
(b) Evidence-based best process implementation	(left out)
3. Patient Level	
(a) Non-value adding front-line work	35%
(b) Administrative efficiencies - including regulatory mandates	(left out)
Effective, efficient care - everything that works, but only what works; - at the lowest necessary cost; with - no unnecessary delays; - no unnecessary risk or pain; - under the patient's full understanding and control; - to all in need; - good this time, but better next time.	

Shared savings? (2008 data)

	<u> </u>	ase
	Cost	NO
Normal delivery:	<1.00>	303
Unplanned c-section:	<2.05>	648

Aim: reduce unplanned c-sections by 2 percentage points (6.25% to 4.25%; more than 670 fewer c-sections per year)

Reduced cost: Reduced revenue (insurance payments): Reduced NOI: Reduced contribution to margin: 1,991,860 2,216,800 224,940 1,370,222

(2008 data)

Current payment mechanisms

 Actively incent overutilization: do more, get paid more - even when there is no health benefit

 I am paid to harm my patients (paid more for complications)

 Actively disincents innovation that reduces costs through better quality (a key success factor for the rest of the U.S. economy)

 Very strong, deep, wide evidence showing exactly this effect throughout U.S. healthcare

Bending the cost curve



Capitation makes a comeback

1. ACOs, AMHs: sophisticated forms of capitation

 provider at (financial) risk: bundled payment, chronic disease capitation, etc. ... but with

- better data systems (quality measaurement) and better risk adjustment

2. Represent "managed care at the bedside"

- managed care the only method that has "bent the cost curve"

- shifts control / accountability from insurers to care delivery groups

3. More than 80% of cost saving opportunities live on the clinical side

Mortality amenable to health care

Deaths per 100,000 population



Source: World Health Organization, Nolte and McKee, Rutgers Center for State Health Policy Standardized for age (1998) Utah from 2003, normalized for general US change from 1998

The Wall Street Journal

Perverse Incentives in Health Care

April 5, 2007 John C. Goodman, President, National Center for Policy Analysis

Research at Dartmouth Medical School suggests that if everyone in America went to the Mayo Clinic, our annual health-care bill would be 25% lower (more than \$500 billion!), and the average quality of care would improve. If everyone got care at Intermountain Healthcare in Salt Lake City, our healthcare costs would be lowered by one-third. Of course, not everyone can get treatment at Mayo or Intermountain. But why are these examples of efficient, high-quality care not being replicated all across the country? The answer is that high-quality, low-cost care is not financially rewarding. Indeed, the opposite is true. Hospitals and doctors can make more money providing inefficient, mediocre care.

Wells Fargo inflation summary, 1988-2006

December 2006



COST OF LIVING INDEX

	Wasa	atch F	ront	National						
	Index <u>Mar. 1988=100</u>	% Change <u>6 Mos.*</u>	(Non-Seas. Adj.) <u>1 Mo. Prior</u>	Index <u>Mar. 1988=100</u>	% Change <u>6 Mos.*</u>	(Non-Seas. Adj.) <u>1 Mo. Prior</u>	(Seas. Adj.) <u>1 Mo. Prior</u>			
All Categories	(154.6)	-0.1%	0.2%	(173.4)	2.7%	0.1%	0.5%			
Housing	182.8	2.7	0.1	175.6	3.8	0.1	0.4			
Transportation	120.2	-11.4	-1.4	163.9	0.8	0.9	1.8			
Health Care	157.4	0.1	-0.1	(249.5)	3.9	0.0	0.1			
Food at Home	201.2	3.3	3.1	170.6	1.8	0.0	-0.3			
Clothing	113.2	-1.6	0.6	102.9	0.2	-2.5	0.6			
Food Away	162.2	0.0	0.0	168.7	3.2	0.3	0.3			
Utilities	128.7	-1.0	0.0	175.4	3.1	1.1	1.2			
Recreation	139.1**	5.8	0.0	109.8^{\dagger}	1.3	-0.4	-0.3			
Education & Comm.	124.6**	5.6	0.0	116.2^{\dagger}	2.5	-0.1	0.2			
Other Goods & Sves.	104.3**	0.0	0.0	243.3	2.6	0.7	0.8			

*Last six-month percentage change compared with same period one year ago. ***(Feb. 1998=100 base)

National Data Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics †(Dec. 1997=100 base)

"Better has no limit" (an old Yiddish proverb)

- The professions passed the tipping point roughly 9 years ago; accelerating rapidly
- Similar major change in care delivery operations
- Tightly linked to better internal data (true transparency)
- Often called "Organized Care:" Health care as an organized system focused around patient need (not built around physicians or technology; "patient-centered care")
- Financial incentives (payment) aligned to appropriate patient-centered professional goals = provider "at risk" payment (ACOs; AMH, bundled payment)

Key operational idea: Don't wait for Washington