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What is National Core Indicators™?

1997: NASDDDS, HSRI and State DD Agencies shared a common goal

• View system performance related to outcomes

• Beyond counting units, State Agencies want to know the impact of services in people’s lives and quality of life ➔ customer outcomes and experience

• NCI looks at performance in several areas, including: employment, community inclusion, choice, rights, satisfaction and health and safety
How Does NCI Collect Data?

3 Types of Data Collection

In-Person Survey

- Background Information Section
  - Data collected from existing systems data.
    - Age, gender, employment, preventive care
  - Section I: Subjective, perception based questions answered by person receiving services in face-to-face conversation
  - Section II: Fact-based questions. How many times...? Proxy can participate.

Adult Family, Child Family, and Family/Guardian Surveys

- Mail surveys – separate sample

Staff Stability Survey

- Sent directly to providers; information about turnover rates, wages, benefits.
By the Numbers: 2018-19 Data Cycle

- 44 states collected data
- 37 States Collected in-person data
- 14 states collected Adult – Family Survey data
- 14 states collected Child – Family Survey data
- 10 states collected Guardian- Family Survey data
- 27 states collected Staff Stability Workforce data
National Core Indicators offers a unique view

- Individual characteristics of people receiving services
- Outcomes sorted by where people live (residence type)
- Activities people engage in during the day including work outcomes
- The nature of their experiences with the supports received (with case managers, ability to make choices, self-direction)
- The context of their lives – friends, community involvement, safety
- Health and well-being, access to healthcare
NCI – Implications for States
Two Key Components of All Quality Systems:

- Quality by Perception
- Quality by Fact
Quality by Fact / Quality by Perception

- Quality by Fact--- evidentiary, indisputable, tend to be binary, can be “proven”
- Quality by Perception--- opinion, impression, influenced by senses or emotions, but nonetheless present

Effective Quality Management Systems take a Both/And approach, rather than either/or approach to these measure types.
And the Voice of the Workforce

- 27 States
- Residential, In Home, and Non Residential Agencies
- Size of Agency reporting
- Tenure
- Turnover and Vacancy Rates
- Voluntary and Involuntary Turnover
- Wages – Starting and Overall
- Benefits
- Comparison to Minimum Wage
How States Use NCI Data

States Identify Initiatives, Transformation, New Program Design

- Initiatives and transitioning programs
- Demonstrate areas for improvement
- Identify progress across years
- Compare segments of data for policy development and program design
- Inform legislators and stakeholders of the need and the purpose
Example from a state-report: Initiatives and transitioning programs

Case Management - Conflict Free Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Coordination</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has met case manager/service coordinator</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>13,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case manager/service coordinator asks person what s/he wants</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>13,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to contact case manager/service coordinator when wants</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>12,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took part in last service planning meeting, or had the opportunity but chose not to</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>11,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood what was talked about at last service planning meeting</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last service planning meeting included people respondent wanted to be there</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>11,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was able to choose services they get as part of service plan</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>11,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff come and leave when they are supposed to</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>12,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life decisions scale
Includes choice of: residence, roommates, work, day activity, and staff

84%

Inform policy development or program improvement
State A
59%
47%

Results of this scale are risk adjusted. Variables used as risk adjusters are: level of mobility, support needed for behavior problems, level of ID, and age.
Everyday Choices Scale
Includes choice of: daily schedule, how to spend money, and free time activities

Results of this scale are risk adjusted. Variables used as risk adjusters are: level of mobility, support needed for behavior problems, level of ID, and age.
Innovation and Approaches to Using Data

3 STATE INITIATIVES
Indiana Experiences: National Core Indicators and Employment

Derek Nord, PhD
Indiana Context
State Direction Setting

Four overarching goals:

1. Prioritize community settings and individualized approaches.
2. Advance and maximize community/state resources.
3. Respond to individual and family needs.
4. Include a wide array of supports…
Systems Changes

1. Waiver redesign
2. Quality assurance
3. LifeCourse integration
4. Living Well grantee state
Policy and Other Initiatives

1. Supported decision making policy
2. Employment First policy and work group
3. Gov Council funded employment town halls
4. Expansion of pre-ets.
NCI in Indiana
Guiding our uses of NCI

1. Evaluate how we’re doing.
2. Test new ideas and answer new questions.
3. Compare to other states.
Indiana data
Job in the Community
N = 614

![Pie chart showing that 22.0% have a job in the community and 78.0% do not.]

Those with NO job in community (78% of total)

Want a job in community
N = 432

- No: 6.0%
- Yes: 54.2%
- In between: 39.8%
What does this mean for systems?

1. **Demand is high**: Approximately 50% of total have or want a job.

2. **Outcomes are low**: Community employment is LOW!

3. **Limited Access**: About 46% of those with no community job would like one or are uncertain.
Pushing data further…

Service Planning

Of those with:
• No employment; but,
• Wanting employment

• The vast majority do not have employment as a goal.
As we navigate systems changes

1. We might prioritize a sub-population (no employed, want a job, no goal);

2. We might investigate case manager practices and policies related to goal setting, person-centered practices, and choice making;

3. We might consider exploration/education opportunities for the 54% that state they have no job and don't want one;

4. Guardians matter too. We must look to improving in the new policy context.
National data
• Indiana HCBS investment is low, as a pct.
• System investment matters;
• Younger people have different experiences;
Where we’re headed
Integrating data into decisions

1. Analyzing and presenting internally and to advisors.
2. Informing the public.
3. Supporting rationale for system changes.
4. Future linking to ask new questions.
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Integrating Complex Datasets to Provide Outcome Insights for HCBS Users with IDD
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Contexts for the Study in Virginia
Initial Findings
Predicted Medicaid Expenditures Compared to Least Support Needs Group ($; fy2014)

- $11,000: Modest or Moderate
- $18,000: Moderate to High
- $20,000: High to Maximum
- $33,000: Extensive Medical
- $25,000: Extensive Behavioral
Predicted Medicaid Expenditures Compared to Congregate settings with 4 or more beds ($;fy2014)

- Group home 3 or fewer beds: -$7,680.00
- Independent: -$39,400.00
- Parent/relative: -$52,800.00
- Sponsored/host home: -$10,900.00
Personal Outcomes

• Support needs (SIS) predicted
  • Social participation and relationships
  • Everyday choices
  • Social determination
  • Rights

• Living arrangements
  • Social participation
  • Everyday choices
Revisiting Personal Outcome Measures (Virginia NCI, fy2018)

Personal Opportunity
• Social participation
• Choice
• Rights

Wellness
• Heart health
• Mental health
• Behavioral health
Measuring Progress

• 2014 compared with 2018 & 2019
• The possibilities!
Using NCI Data to Inform Priority Areas of Quality Improvement

Laney Bruner-Canhoto, PhD, MSW, MPH
Assistant Commissioner of Quality Management
MA Department of Developmental Services

Courtney Dutra, MPA
Project Manager
Center for Developmental Disabilities Evaluation and Research (CDDER)
University of Massachusetts Medical School
Context from Massachusetts

• DDS has built a sophisticated community-based service system.
  o From serving >10,000 individuals in nine large institutional settings
  o To serving >35,000 individuals supported in a variety of community settings.

• **Mission**: The Department is dedicated to creating, in partnership with others, innovative and genuine opportunities for individuals with intellectual disabilities to participate fully and meaningfully in, and contribute to, their communities as valued members.
Quality Council

• Began in 2007
• DDS recognized the need to establish one group that could advise the Department about how to measure quality and where to improve services and supports.
• Membership is comprised of self-advocates, family members, providers and DDS staff.
Use of Data in the Quality Improvement Cycle

Data Collection
- Identifies area for attention
- Aids understanding of depth of issue, and targets for action

Develop & Implement Intervention

Monitor impact

Confirm/Explore in other info sources or broader review

Quality Improvement Cycle
How is NCI data used?

• Compliments DDS system indicators
  • To describe the experience of individuals in service settings
• To benchmark performance against other states and the national averages.
Informing the QC Perspective

- NCI Benchmarking
- DDS Systems
- Outcome Data

NCI DDS Systems
EXAMPLES
Health

Data are from licensing and certification processes, health care record analysis and NCI.

Percentages of people receiving annual physical and dental exams has always been an important indicator.

Generally these percentages are fairly consistent across the data sources.
Healthy Lifestyle 2010-2011

85% received an annual physical.

83% received an annual dental exam.

67% received flu vaccine

1Analysis of DDS Health Care Records for adults aged 18+ eligible for DDS community-based residential services.

Below NCI state and national averages
Health Promotion and Coordination Initiative

Goal: enhance the quality of health care by focusing on the important role that direct support professionals play in health care advocacy, including:

• The preventive health screening recommendations

• A health review checklist which is completed by direct support professionals and taken to every primary care appointment to aid in communication and follow up.

• Easy to use informational sheets for observing and reporting signs and symptoms of illness.

• Training for direct support professionals
Preventive Screening Guidelines for Adults with Intellectual Disability

- **Target:** Improve emphasis on & decrease variation of preventive health at annual physical, the main source of health-related information in ISP development.
93% received an annual physical exam.

88% received an annual dental exam.

69% received flu vaccine
[NCI: 77%; MA BRFSS 91%]

Healthy Lifestyle 2018

Above NCI state and national averages

1Analysis of DDS Health Care Records for adults aged 18+ eligible for DDS community-based residential services.
## Preventive Screenings 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screenings</th>
<th>Adults with I/DD¹</th>
<th>MA General Population²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye exam or vision screening in the past year</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing test in the past 5 years</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Pap test in the past 3 years, ages 21-65</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Mammogram in the past 2 years, ages 50-74</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal cancer screening in the past 10 years, ages 50-74</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Analysis of DDS Health Care Records updated 1/1/18 or later for adults aged 18+ who area currently eligible for DDS community-based residential services.

² Massachusetts Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) 2016 survey.

NCI data are consistent. Some differences in screening time frames.
However, adults served by DDS are much more likely to die from female breast and colorectal cancers – both of which have early detection screenings.

Cancer deaths compared with Healthy People 2020

Mortality Objectives
Rates per 100,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number</th>
<th>Healthy People 2020 Objective</th>
<th>Target 2020</th>
<th>MA DDS Avg. Crude Adult Rate</th>
<th>Target Status</th>
<th>General Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>Lung Cancer</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>Female Breast Cancer (per 100,000 females)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>Uterine cervix (per 100,000 females)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>Colorectal Cancer</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-6</td>
<td>Oropharyngeal Cancer</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7</td>
<td>Prostate Cancer (per 100,000 males)</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-8</td>
<td>Malignant Melanoma</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Adult Cause-specific Mortality Rates Between MA DDS and MA General Population (rates per thousand people)
Given the cancer mortality rates, are adults served by DDS getting screenings?

- Adults served by DDS in residential supports obtain annual physicals at a higher rate than other adults living in MA.
- However, adults served by DDS in residential supports have lower rates of receiving cancer screenings than other adults living in MA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adults with I/DD in DDS residential supports</th>
<th>MA General population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Physical Exams</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pap test in past 3 years (ages 21-65)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammogram in the past 2 years (ages 50-74)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal cancer screening in past 10 years (ages 50-74)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes/Source: Analysis of DDS Health Care Records for adults 18+ years eligible for DDS community-based residential services. General population data from MA BRFSS 2016 survey data. Analysis completed with the assistance of CDDER/UMass Medical School.
Barriers to Mammography among women with ID

• Retrospective chart review of 89 women over age 40 in a residential support setting.

• 59.6% of women had a mammogram in previous year (in 2008 MA: 84.9% ; US:76%)

• Women needing special positioning 25 times less likely to have screening.

• If able to give consent: 20 times more likely
ADDITIONAL EXAMPLE - FALLS
Massachusetts DDS Falls

• Incident Management System
  • 1,500 reported serious injuries from falls
  • Estimate 10,000 falls occur without injury

• Emergency Room Visits (2011-2012)
  31% of ER visits were from physical injuries
  49% of physical injuries were from falls
Falls Prevention Initiative

- Training to all providers
- Developed falls risk screening tools
- Developed post-fall assessments
## STOP Falls Pilot Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STOP Falls Pilot</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>910 Individuals for 6 months</td>
<td>• 33% reduction in monthly rate of falls and reduction in # of people who fell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff tracked all falls and completed post-fall assessments</td>
<td>• <strong>Factors that increased falls risk:</strong> Recent falls history (5x), unsteady balance (5x), 4 or more prescription drugs (2.5x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloted tool use</td>
<td>• Loss of Balance and Trip/Slip (53%) were the most common ‘why’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify falls patterns to reduce risk</td>
<td>• 46% of falls occur while the person was “walking around”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Is No Accident

Preventive Screenings
Promoting Health for All

DID YOU KNOW?
85% of adults in DDS-funded residential supports had an annual exam in either 2010 or 2011; 37% of adults living in their own home or with their family had one.

67% of adults in DDS-funded residential supports and 20% of adults living in their own home or with family received a flu shot in 2010 or 2011.

At least 30% of adults with ID

Screening Recommendations
DDS developed guidelines to assure that people with ID receive the same consideration for preventive health care screenings as the general population. Too often, health care screening is the first thing that is neglected.

Strategies to Ensure Access to Screenings

Advocate for Screenings
- Staff or family members can be effective advocates for preventive screenings.
- Staff who accompany a person to the annual physical should be familiar with the person’s preferences for support, communication styles, and needed accommodations.
- Advocates should be knowledgeable about which screenings would be appropriate to discuss with the physician or health care provider at the annual visit. The DDS Preventive Health Screening checklist can assist with this process.

Reduce Fear and Confusion
- Many adults feel more comfortable at a medical visit if they feel adequately prepared for the event. It can be helpful to talk about the details of what to expect and why it’s important.
- Listen to the person’s concerns and address them.
- Prepare for exam procedures by tailoring information to the person’s level of understanding; show, don’t tell. For example, show what may happen during a screening on a staff person or doll, or introduce unfamiliar items such as a stethoscope or a blood pressure cuff at home to allow the instrument to become more familiar.
- If the person is particularly anxious, talk with the health care provider about the possibility of booking multiple appointments to allow time for the person to become comfortable.
- Be clear about why consent is given or refused. If a guardian refuses to consent to a screening, ask whether the guardian has concerns or questions they want addressed. Where appropriate, offer additional information about the screening’s benefits.

Understand and accommodate the person’s needs
- People with mobility challenges may need accessible screening facilities, such as those listed.
Dissemination – QA Briefs

Massachusetts Department of Developmental Services (DDS)

Quality Assurance Brief

Preventive Care

2017-2018 National Core Indicator Data: All adults served by DDS

- 50% had an eye exam in the past year
- 63% had a hearing test in the past 5 years
- 77% had a flu vaccine in the past year

Adults in community-based residential supports:

Physical Exams:
- 96% of providers adequately supported people to receive annual physical exams.
- 93% of people had a complete physical exam in the past year. This is higher than the Massachusetts general population (79%).

Dental Exams:
Thank you!

Courtney Dutra, MPA  
Courtney.Dutra@umassmed.edu  
774-455-6563

https://shriver.umassmed.edu/programs/cdder/dds-quality-assurance-reports

https://shriver.umassmed.edu/programs/cdder/dds-preventive-health-screenings-adults-intellectual-disabilities