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Overview

- How did ABCD III states work to improve care coordination?
- What did states measure?
- How did they measure?
- What were their results?
- What are the key takeaways?
ABCD III states
Improvement Strategies

- Consistent forms, tools, processes
- Primary care provider incentives
- Continuous quality improvement
- Data system enhancement or development
- Community engagement
- Integration of lessons into state reform initiatives
Evaluation

- Expectations of state participation:
  - Evaluation plan
  - **Common outcome**
    - States selected “closed feedback loop”
  - State-specific measures
Closed Feedback Loop

- Each state’s project focused on affecting the following points of the care delivery process:
  - PCP referral to local community service provider after identification of patient risk via a screening;
  - Community service provider follow up (with referral feedback) to referring PCP; and
  - Documentation of referral feedback in the PCP chart or by the PCP (a “closed loop.”)
Closed Feedback Loop Measures

- Number of Medicaid/CHIP children referred for developmental services whose PCP knows the results of the referral (AR)

- Number of referrals EI responded to by using referral fax-back form sent to referring medical home (IL)

- Number of children ages 0-2 referred to EI for whom the eligibility status was known and marked in the child’s electronic medical record at the referring clinic (MN)

- Number of children ≤ 34 months of age referred for EI services whose PCP knows of the services received within 80 days (OK)

- Number of children referred to EI, whose PCP received feedback from EI that was incorporated into the chart (OR)
State-specific Measures

- Stakeholder experience
  - Parents/families
  - Medical providers
  - EI providers
  - Other community providers
- Developmental screening
- Referral rate
- Timeliness
Measurement Methods

- Closed feedback loops:
  - Chart review
  - Claims analysis
  - Data tracking tools completed by providers

- State-specific measures:
  - All of the above, plus
    - Surveys
    - Interviews
    - Community meetings
Closed Feedback Loops at Baseline

- Missing (no system in place to track feedback information) in 2 states (IL, OK)

- Moderate rates of feedback in 3 states
  - 53% (AR)
  - 64% (MN)
  - 60% (OR, mid-project)
Post-Intervention Rate of Closed Loops

- 88% (compared to 53%) in AR
- 66% in IL
- 68% (compared to 64%) in MN**
- 78% in OK

**Measure changed, which may have affected results
## Timeliness: Time Needed to Close the Loop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Follow up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Average number of days between PCP referral and EI referral feedback for children ages 0-2 (all sites)*</td>
<td>147 days</td>
<td>56 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site A</td>
<td>139 days</td>
<td>53 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site B</td>
<td>203 days</td>
<td>51 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site C</td>
<td>98 days</td>
<td>63 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK**</td>
<td>Average number of days for the feedback loop to be completed</td>
<td>85 days</td>
<td>51 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback loop completed in 80 days or less</td>
<td>43 percent of the time</td>
<td>73 percent of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback loop completed in 160 days or less</td>
<td>79 percent of the time</td>
<td>98 percent of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Of those who received a report back from EI, average number of days between PCP referral and EI referral feedback</td>
<td>133 days</td>
<td>n/a^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of those for whom the feedback loop is completed, percent completed in 80 days or less</td>
<td>61 percent</td>
<td>n/a^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of those with a referral, percent completed in 80 days or less</td>
<td>32 percent</td>
<td>n/a^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of those for whom the feedback loop is completed, percent completed in 160 days or less</td>
<td>74 percent</td>
<td>n/a^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of those with a referral, percent completed in 160 days or less</td>
<td>38 percent</td>
<td>n/a^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of those with a referral, percent with some type of information back</td>
<td>52 percent</td>
<td>n/a^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Takeaways

- Mechanism likely needs to be created to track referral feedback
- ABCD III states documented improvement in tracking and in some cases, closed loops
- Measuring multiple aspects of the care process helps prioritize QI efforts
- EHRs need capacity to track referral feedback and consent forms
- Multi-method strategies are valuable
- Incentives facilitated evaluation
Thank You

- Look for the report on www.nashp.org
  - *Improving and Measuring Care Coordination: Lessons from ABCD III*