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HCAHPS Survey Topics

- Communication with doctors and nurses
- Responsiveness of hospital staff
- Cleanliness and quietness of hospital environment
- Pain Management
- Communication about medications
- Discharge information
- Overall rating of the hospital
- Rating of willingness to recommend hospital
Who’s Reporting?

• Nationally, 38% of CAHs reported HCAHPS data for 2010 discharges (2008 it was 34%)
• Most CAHs report HCAHPS data in addition to inpatient measures; some also reported outpatient measures
• One-third of the 505 CAHs with HCAHPS data for 2010 discharges had response rates of 40% or more
• The average rate for all hospitals (CAHs and non-CAHs) reporting HCAHPs data for 2010 was 33%
How much is being reported?

- CMS recommends that each hospital obtain 300 completed HCAHPS surveys annually*
  - 27% of reporting CAHs had 300 or more completed surveys
  - 54% had between 100 and 299 completed surveys
  - 19% had less than 100 completed surveys

Many small rural hospitals will not meet this expectation due to low volumes

*“Critical Access Hospitals and HCAHPS”
Michelle Casey, MS University of Minnesota Rural Health Research Center
June 12, 1012
Partnership = Success

• BMH partnered with the Rural Wisconsin Health Cooperative in 2010
• RWHC contracted to send out the surveys and tabulate the results. Prior to that it was handled in-house
• Our partner******

Mary Jon Hauge  
Assistant Director Programs & Services  
Rural Wisconsin Health Cooperative  
880 Independence Lane, Sauk City, WI 53583  
(v) 800-225-2531 (f) 800-896-4233  
mjhauge@rwhc.com  
www.rwhc.com
Rural Wisconsin Health Cooperative
HCAHPS Program

• Practical
• Web based
• Real time reports
• Data and trending slides
• Other areas of surveys:
  • Outpatient
  • Emergency Department
  • Ambulatory Surgery
  • Hospital Departments, i.e.: Lab, Radiology, Therapy
## Communication with Nurses

### 2012

**Communication with nurses.**
Combines responses from three questions regarding how often nurses communicated well with patients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=54)</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Access (n=7564)</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Facilities (n=19873)</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011

**Communication with nurses.**
Combines responses from three questions regarding how often nurses communicated well with patients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=122)</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Access (n=10568)</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Facilities (n=27250)</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication with Doctors

2012

Communication with doctors.
Combines responses from three questions regarding how often doctors communicated well with patients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=54)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Access (n=7513)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Facilities (n=19743)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011

Communication with doctors.
Combines responses from three questions regarding how often doctors communicated well with patients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=123)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Access (n=10488)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Facilities (n=26998)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responsiveness of Staff

2012

Responsiveness of hospital staff
Combines responses from two questions regarding how responsive hospital staff were with patients.

- (n=27) 3.7% 18.5% Usually 77.8% Always
- Critical Access (n=3779) 8.1% 4.1% 23.2% Usually 71.9% Always
- All Facilities (n=9742) 1.2% 4.3% 19% Usually 75.5% Always

2011

Responsiveness of hospital staff
Combines responses from two questions regarding how responsive hospital staff were with patients.

- (n=65) 1.5% 21.5% Usually 76.9% Always
- Critical Access (n=5302) 1.2% 4.4% 23.7% Usually 70.7% Always
- All Facilities (n=13455) 1.3% 4.5% 20.1% Usually 74.1% Always

RWHC
Affordable and effective services to healthcare organizations since 1979.
Pain Control

2012

Pain Control
Combines responses from two questions regarding how often pain was controlled.

- (n=22)
  - 4.5% Never
  - 50% Sometimes
  - 45.5% Usually

- Critical Access (n=3579)
  - 1% Never
  - 3.7% Sometimes
  - 25.2% Usually
  - 70.1% Always

- All Facilities (n=10688)
  - 8% Never
  - 3.9% Sometimes
  - 20.8% Usually
  - 74.4% Always

2011

Pain Control
Combines responses from two questions regarding how often pain was controlled.

- (n=54)
  - 1.9% Never
  - 1.9% Sometimes
  - 29.6% Usually
  - 66.7% Always

- Critical Access (n=5050)
  - 9% Never
  - 3.6% Sometimes
  - 25.1% Usually
  - 70.4% Always

- All Facilities (n=14810)
  - 8% Never
  - 3.8% Sometimes
  - 20.8% Usually
  - 74.6% Always
Communication about Medicines

2012

Communication About Medicines
Combines responses from two questions regarding how often hospital staff communicated well with patients about medications.

- **(n=23)**
  - Never: 13%
  - Sometimes: 4.3%
  - Usually: 13%
  - Always: 69.6%

- **Critical Access (n=3148)**
  - Never: 5.9%
  - Sometimes: 8.3%
  - Usually: 20.4%
  - Always: 65.4%

- **All Facilities (n=8079)**
  - Never: 7.4%
  - Sometimes: 7.1%
  - Usually: 17.3%
  - Always: 68.3%

2011

Communication About Medicines
Combines responses from two questions regarding how often hospital staff communicated well with patients about medications.

- **(n=55)**
  - Never: 12.7%
  - Sometimes: 12.7%
  - Usually: 14.5%
  - Always: 60%

- **Critical Access (n=4238)**
  - Never: 7.5%
  - Sometimes: 8.4%
  - Usually: 19.8%
  - Always: 64.3%

- **All Facilities (n=10932)**
  - Never: 8.3%
  - Sometimes: 7%
  - Usually: 17.1%
  - Always: 67.6%
Cleanliness of Hospital

2012

Cleanliness of Hospital Environment
Displays responses from one question regarding cleanliness information.

(n=18) - 11.1% Always, 88.9% Never
Critical Access (n=2494) - 6.6% 3% 15% Always, 81.4% Never
All Facilities (n=6554) - 1.3% 3.4% 13.9% 81.7% Always

2011

Cleanliness of Hospital Environment
Displays responses from one question regarding cleanliness information.

(n=40) - 15% Always, 85% Never
Critical Access (n=3482) - 6.6% 2.3% 14.8% Always, 82.2% Never
All Facilities (n=8999) - 1.3% 3.4% 14.2% 81% Always
Quiet of Hospital Environment

2012

Quiet of Hospital Environment
Displays responses from one question regarding quietness information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=18)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Access (n=2504)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Facilities (n=6598)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011

Quiet of Hospital Environment
Displays responses from one question regarding quietness information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=41)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Access (n=3501)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Facilities (n=9046)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discharge Information

2012

Discharge Information
Combines responses from two questions regarding discharge information.

(n=29)  
- Not available (29) - 34.5%
- Available (29) - 65.5%

Critical Access (n=4369) -
- Not available - 13%
- Available - 87%

All Facilities (n=11872) -
- Not available - 11.4%
- Available - 88.6%

2011

Discharge Information
Combines responses from two questions regarding discharge information.

(n=64)  
- Not available (64) - 23.4%
- Available (64) - 76.6%

Critical Access (n=6011) -
- Not available - 14.1%
- Available - 85.9%

All Facilities (n=16066) -
- Not available - 12.5%
- Available - 87.5%
Using any number from 0 to 10 where 0 is the worst hospital possible and 10 is the best hospital possible, what number would you use to rate this hospital during your stay?

### 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating 0-6</th>
<th>Rating 7-8</th>
<th>Rating 9-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Facilities (n=6519)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Access (n=2486)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating 0-6</th>
<th>Rating 7-8</th>
<th>Rating 9-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Facilities (n=8884)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Access (n=3452)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RWHC
Your partner. Your source.
Affordable and effective services to healthcare organizations since 1979.
Would You Recommend?

2012

Would you recommend this hospital to your friends and family?

- (n=18) -
  - Definitely No: 5.6%
  - Probably No: 5.6%
  - Probably Yes: 33.3%
  - Definitely Yes: 55.6%

- Critical Access (n=2474) -
  - Definitely No: 5.5%
  - Probably No: 1.5%
  - Probably Yes: 26.2%
  - Definitely Yes: 71.4%

- All Facilities (n=6510) -
  - Definitely No: 1.1%
  - Probably No: 1.9%
  - Probably Yes: 20.4%
  - Definitely Yes: 76.6%

2011

Would you recommend this hospital to your friends and family?

- (n=36) -
  - Definitely No: 27.8%
  - Probably No: 43.9%
  - Probably Yes: 21.1%
  - Definitely Yes: 72.2%

- Critical Access (n=3409) -
  - Definitely No: 11.1%
  - Probably No: 17.1%
  - Probably Yes: 26.1%
  - Definitely Yes: 71%

- All Facilities (n=8843) -
  - Definitely No: 1.1%
  - Probably No: 1.9%
  - Probably Yes: 19.3%
  - Definitely Yes: 77.7%
Percentage - Always

2012

- Communication with nurses: 84.7%
- Communication with doctors: 87.5%
- Responsiveness of hospital staff: 72.6%
- Pain control: 55%
- Communication about medicines: 71.9%
- Cleanliness of hospital environment: 87.5%
- Quiet of hospital environment: 54.2%

2011

- Communication with nurses: 77.9%
- Communication with doctors: 80.9%
- Responsiveness of hospital staff: 78.8%
- Pain control: 68.2%
- Communication about medicines: 58.8%
- Cleanliness of hospital environment: 86.6%
- Quiet of hospital environment: 70.5%
Percentage - Usually

2012

- Communication with nurses: 15.3%
- Communication with doctors: 9.7%
- Responsiveness of hospital staff: 18.9%
- Pain Control: 42.5%
- Communication about medicines: 7.5%
- Cleanliness of hospital environment: 12.5%
- Quiet of hospital environment: 37.5%

2011

- Communication with nurses: 22.1%
- Communication with doctors: 14.4%
- Responsiveness of hospital staff: 20%
- Pain Control: 28.9%
- Communication about medicines: 14.2%
- Cleanliness of hospital environment: 13.4%
- Quiet of hospital environment: 24.8%
## Top Box 2012

### 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2012-Q4</th>
<th>2012-Q3</th>
<th>2012-Q2</th>
<th>2012-Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2011-Q4</th>
<th>2011-Q3</th>
<th>2011-Q2</th>
<th>2011-Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why should CAHs report HCAHPS?

• MBQIP
  • Phase 1: Hospital Compare pneumonia and heart failure measures (2011-2012)
  • Phase 2: Hospital Compare outpatient AMI/chest pain measures, outpatient surgical measures (if applicable) and HCAHPS (2012-2013)
  • Phase 3: Pharmacist CPOE/24 hour verification of medication orders and outpatient transfer communication measures (2013-2014)

** As of June 2012, over 1000 of the 1328 CAHs had signed MOUs for MBQIP!!

• Value Based Purchasing
  • 30% HCAHPS
Why should CAHs report HCAHPS? (Cont.)

• On average, CAHs have significantly higher ratings on HCAHPS measures than all US hospitals*
• For all ten HCAHPS measures, CAHs had higher average scores than non-CAHs*
• Value Based Purchasing demonstrations will continue to evolve to include rural providers

*Policy Brief #30
Critical Access Hospital Year 7 Hospital Compare Participation and Quality Measure Results
Michelle Casey, MS Bridget Barton, MPP, Peiyin Hung, MSPH, and Ira Moscovice, PhD
University of Minnesota Rural Health Research Center
Why did BMH report?

I. It is the right thing to do!
II. It improves quality of care
III. It engages the staff and physicians on patient care issues
IV. It encourages the hospital to focus on quality patient care
V. It involves the board of directors
VI. It reveals patient’s perceptions of the hospital environment and quality of care provided
Lessons Learned

1) Process: Data collection from admission to discharge is compared monthly using HCAHPS.

2) Data Reality: Seeing data on paper is often different than the image we have of it.

3) The staff have used the data as a teaching tool with all providers.

4) Results are reviewed and in-service programs are developed to address specific patient care issues. The goal is to improve care.
Lessons Learned (Cont.)

5) Suggestion boxes were created to encourage feedback from patients as well as staff.

6) Early wins included provider involvement with quality care in the hospital and letting the patients know that the staff was listening to them.

7) Scores have improved and community members now request the hospital for Swing bed and other services.

8) HCAHPS will keep the staff on their toes and keep them engaged with the patients in the future to meet their needs.
Staff Comments about HCAHPS

• “Patients thought more about the attitude of those taking care of them than they did about the care they were receiving.”

• “Some of our early wins I think were getting the providers involved with quality and making patients feel like they are listened to.”

• “I personally believe that HCAHPS will keep us on our toes and keep us in touch with the consumer in the future; and their wants and needs and how they perceive things.”
“High Performer” Characteristics

- **Quality:** Not just a department...the highest organizational priority including; board of directors, hospital staff and medical staff
- **Data:** Real time collection, fix problems as they occur, not just for inspections or surveys
- **Culture:** The norm is 100% success, failures trigger investigations

- It is no longer “good enough” to just report statistics, we MUST make the reports meaningful, useful and practical!
Conclusion

- As an industry, we must stop looking for reasons not to report
- We must work together (partner) and share our experiences; good and bad
- We must realize that we all have limitations
- We must get past a “reporting” mentality
- We must strive to be “high performers”!
Conclusion (Cont.)

- CAH quality reporting requirements will continue to increase
- Quality reporting will be market/payer driven (even in small rural hospitals)
- Payment reform on a national level will impact CAHs
- CAHs should be proud of the care we deliver
- We should always strive to improve patient care
QUESTIONS???

Thank you!
Lance W. Keilers, MBA, CAPPM
lwkeilers@gmail.com
(325)212-2143