



THE LEAPFROG GROUP

Informing Choices. Rewarding Excellence.

Getting Health Care Right.

Leapfrog Hospital Rewards Program™ Selecting Clinical Areas and Performance Measures

Barbara Rudolph, Ph.D.

Director, Leaps and Measures

February 6, 2006

LFHRP Pre-Conference Sessions

- Clinical areas & performance measures (9:00 am)
- Data collection & scoring methodology (9:30 am)
- Program Implementation: Data and Program Licensing (10:15 am)
- Rewards Principles and Efficiency Process (10:30 am)
- LFHRP Implementation (11:00-Noon)
 - Case Study I: Memphis Business Group on Health
 - Case Study II: Capital District (General Electric Verizon and Hannaford Bros.)

Selecting Clinical Areas and Performance Measures

Selecting Clinical Areas: Criteria

- Relevance to commercial population
- Opportunity for quality improvement
- Potential dollar savings as quality improves
- Availability of nationally endorsed and collected performance measures

Actuarial Analysis

Top 10 Clinical Focus Groups Ranked by Potential Opportunity for Savings	Total Potential Opportunity ¹	Total Payments ²	NQF-approved measures?
CORONARY ARTERY BYPASS GRAFT	\$62,666,869	\$691,772,784	Yes
PERCUTANEOUS CORONARY INTERVENTION	\$58,157,873	\$717,954,275	Yes
ACUTE MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION	\$53,616,015	\$607,227,166	Yes
COLON SURGERY	\$38,389,673	\$396,004,245	
HEART FAILURE	\$34,983,226	\$224,919,006	
COMMUNITY ACQUIRED PNEUMONIA	\$29,536,322	\$355,686,956	Yes
OTHER CARDIAC SURGERY	\$25,767,191	\$211,578,764	
PREGNANCY AND NEWBORNS	\$23,368,721	\$1,781,273,763	Yes
VASCULAR SURGERY	\$16,412,194	\$133,287,531	
SPINE - OTHER	\$12,925,843	\$422,595,301	

¹ Total Payments x Readmission Rate

² Premier Commercial Payment data (10/2001 - 9/2002)

Measure selection criteria

- Capacity for rapid adoption
- Nationally endorsed
- Leverages actuarial/clinical research
 - Actuarial impact for commercial market sufficient to exceed cost of implementation
 - Consistent with clinical research findings
- Available data collection mechanism
- Consistent with current Leapfrog patient safety measures
- Meaningful to purchasers



Quality measures consistent with current Leapfrog hospital measures

- Leapfrog Hospital Quality and Safety Survey data must contribute to the program
- When available, use Leapfrog process measures versus JCAHO measures
 - Some LF measures had a higher standard; and,
 - Ongoing process of alignment between Leapfrog measures and the NQF endorsed measure sets, CMS and JCAHO measures

CABG measures by source

<i>Metric</i>	<i>Source</i>
Prophylactic antibiotic received within 1 hour prior to surgical incision	JCAHO (3Q04 SIP)
Prophylactic antibiotics discontinued within 24 hours after surgery end time	JCAHO (3Q04 SIP)
CABG mortality	Leapfrog Survey
CABG volume	Leapfrog Survey
Prophylactic antibiotic selection for surgical patients	JCAHO (3Q04)
Computer Physician Order Entry	Leapfrog Survey
ICU Physician Staffing (IPS)	Leapfrog Survey
Leapfrog Safety Index (NQF Safe Practices)	Leapfrog Survey
CABG using internal mammary artery	Leapfrog Survey
Use of beta-blockers within 24 hours after surgery	Leapfrog Survey
Beta-blockers prescribed at discharge	Leapfrog Survey
Lipid lowering therapy at discharge	Leapfrog Survey
Aspirin prescribed at discharge	Leapfrog Survey
Early extubation for certain populations	Leapfrog Survey

AMI measures by source

Metric	Source
Aspirin at arrival for AMI	JCAHO
Aspirin prescribed at discharge for AMI	JCAHO
Beta Blocker at arrival for AMI	JCAHO
Beta Blocker prescribed at discharge for AMI	JCAHO
AMI Inpatient Mortality	JCAHO
Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor (ACEI) for left ventricular systolic dysfunction	JCAHO
Time to Thombolysis	JCAHO
First balloon inflation within 90 minutes of hospital arrival	Leapfrog Survey
Smoking Cessation Counseling	JCAHO
Computerized Physician Order Entry	Leapfrog Survey
ICU Physician Staffing (IPS)	Leapfrog Survey
Leapfrog Safety Index (NQF Safe Practices)	Leapfrog Survey

PCI measures by source

Metric	Source
PCI mortality	Leapfrog Survey
PCI volume	Leapfrog Survey
Aspirin for PCI patients	Leapfrog Survey
First balloon inflation within 90 minutes of hospital arrival	Leapfrog Survey
Computer Physician Order Entry	Leapfrog Survey
ICU Physician Staffing (IPS)	Leapfrog Survey
Leapfrog Safety Index (NQF Safe Practices)	Leapfrog Survey

Pneumonia measures by source

Metric	Source
Oxygenation assessment	JCAHO
Antibiotic timing	JCAHO
Blood culture collected prior to first antibiotic administration	JCAHO
Influenza screen or vaccination	JCAHO (3Q04)
Pneumonia screen or pneumococcal vaccination	JCAHO
Adult smoking cessation advice/counseling	JCAHO
Computer Physician Order Entry	Leapfrog Survey
ICU Physician Staffing (IPS)	Leapfrog Survey
Leapfrog Safety Index (NQF Safe Practices)	Leapfrog Survey

Deliveries/Complicated Newborns measures by source

<i>Metric</i>	<i>Source</i>
Third or fourth degree laceration	JCAHO
Neonatal mortality	JCAHO
Antenatal steroids for certain high-risk deliveries	Leapfrog Survey
NICU daily census	Leapfrog Survey
Computer Physician Order Entry	Leapfrog Survey
Leapfrog Safety Index (NQF Safe Practices)	Leapfrog Survey

Effectiveness Measure Assignment and Weighting within Condition

- First stage of weighting*—outcomes within a condition assigned as follows:
 - 46% for mortality**
 - 29% for serious morbidity**
 - 25% for complications**
- Second stage—measures within an outcome weighted according to impact (when evidence available)

*Pauly, M.V., Brailer, D.J., Kroch, E., and O. Even-Shoshan. "Measuring Hospital Outcomes from a Buyer's Perspective." *American Journal of Medical Quality*, Vol. 11(8):112-122, Fall 1996.

Efficiency Measure

- Average severity-adjusted LOS, by clinical area
 - Average actual LOS / case
 - Commercial health plan enrollees only
 - Latest 6 months experience, updated semi-annually
 - Specify different bed-types (e.g. ICU)
 - Adjustments applied by aggregator:
 - Severity based on risk-adjustment data from vendor
 - Re-admission
 - » For each clinical area: readmission rate within 14 days to same hospital,
- Efficiency measure for this program meets guidelines established by “Measuring Provider Longitudinal Efficiency” white paper
- Program Licensees will be required to marry this LFHRP resource-based measure of efficiency with their own financial-based measure of efficiency for their entire book of business

Efficiency and Quality Statistics

- Hospitals will be relatively ranked within condition based on their final weighted score for that condition
- The “bottom performer” in the top 25% on quality and efficiency will be used to determine placement in each of the remaining three cohorts.
- Hospitals in the top cohort are in the top quartile on both quality and efficiency (results in < than 25%)
- Hospitals in the bottom cohort will have efficiency and quality scores that are significantly worse by $p=.05$ than the bottom performer in the “top performing” cohort



Statistical Method

- Suggested by Tom Cook, Northwestern University
- Uses the bottom performer in the relatively ranked top quartile to serve as the benchmark for the remaining three cohorts
- Provides greater variation than is found in typical hospital public reporting; assures that cost savings will result in order for purchasers to recoup costs
- Assures that payments are made to top performers
 - Method results in 5% to 8% of hospitals in Top Performance cohort (Cohort 1) (see next slide)
 - **average payments 25% to 35% lower than average**
 - 25% to 30% of hospitals fall into **Cohort 4**
 - **average payments 20% to 25% above average**

Model savings across conditions

	AMI				CABG				CAP			
	# hospitals	% of Total Hospitals	Avg Payment	% of Grand Mean	# hospitals	% of Total Hospitals	Avg Payment	% of Grand Mean	# hospitals	% of Total Hospitals	Avg Payment	% of Grand Mean
Cohort 1	9	8.2%	\$13,631	65%	8	7.5%	\$24,685	71%	9	4.4%	\$4,851	76%
Cohort 2	56	50.9%	\$18,699	90%	55	51.9%	\$31,626	91%	115	56.1%	\$5,809	90%
Cohort 3	14	12.7%	\$23,372	112%	10	9.4%	\$39,145	113%	31	15.1%	\$6,723	105%
Cohort 4	31	28.2%	\$25,700	123%	33	31.1%	\$41,025	118%	50	24.4%	\$7,918	123%
Grand Mean	110	100.0%	\$20,852	100%	106	100.0%	\$34,737	100%	205	100.0%	\$6,420	100%

Based on Premier data for AMI, CABG and CAP:

- 5% to 8% of hospitals fall into Top Performance cohort (Cohort 1)
 - average payments 25% to 35% lower than average
- 25% to 30% of hospitals fall into **Cohort 4**
 - Efficiency AND Effectiveness scores statistically worse than Cohort 1 bottom performer at p = .05
 - average payments 20% to 25% above average

Summary

- Cost savings related to both conditions selected and statistical approach
- Measures selected and weighted based on evidence of reductions in mortality and morbidity
- Effectiveness and Efficiency measured and contribute equally to performance incentive
- Methods vetted with many stakeholders