

PUBH 763

Policy Issues in Health Outcomes and Quality of Care

Spring 2008
W 2:00 - 4:50 p.m.

McGavran-Greenberg 1305

Professor:
Sue Tolleson-Rinehart, Ph.D.
suetr@unc.edu
office: 224 Wing E
843-9477
(readily available by appointment)

The twin purposes of this course are (1) to provide an overview of the history of quality of care in the United States, with particular attention to the evolution of quality assessment, assurance, improvement, management, and research, and (2) to introduce and to trace the development of outcomes measurement and research, with particular attention to health status and quality of life (patient-reported) measurement. This is not a methodology course, and we will not be dealing with specific statistical or measurement applications. Rather, we are interested in understanding the foundations, enduring questions, and surrounding political and policy environments of outcomes and quality.

PUBH 763 takes the perspective that quality of care is one of the three significant elements of health care delivery and policy – coequal to questions of ensuring access to care and effectively managing the costs of care. In this course, quality of care subsumes questions of outcomes and safety, in the sense that the achievement of both good outcomes and safety on a consistent basis occurs only in systems that aspire to high quality of care. Quality of care, broadly defined, has a very long history, and the course will emphasize both the constants and the sweep of change over centuries and into the present. The course is, thus, intended to provide you with a coherent conceptual framework for understanding the field, interpreting contemporary research and policy issues related to quality of care and outcomes as they arise in related coursework, and building broad policy analytic skills.

I. Course Objectives

Students who are successful in the course will possess background understanding and knowledge of quality of care and outcomes measurement and research. The conceptual and analytical framework that students may take from the course includes *but is not limited to*

- the origins, definitions, concepts, lexicons, theoretical foundations, and principal methods of these fields;
- the history and evolution of quality of care measurement and improvement and their influence on contemporary methods for assuring high quality care in the United States;
- approaches to and challenges of assessing patient outcomes, especially self-reported outcomes;
- the role of patient reports of satisfaction and consumer assessments of the performance of health care providers, facilities, or health plans;
- basic relationships and tensions between quality of care and bioethical principles;
- the ability to understand the application of the framework in vastly different contexts, such as those of care for children and adolescents and care at the end of life; and
- the ability to evaluate whether the evidence does or does not support contentions that quality measurement and improvement efforts actually make a difference, and to whom (Providers? Patients? Health systems? Payers? Others?) and in what way (With regard to access? Responsiveness? Improved outcomes? Better health status for individuals and populations?).

Students can gain an appreciation of the centrality of quality-of-care issues in the contemporary health care policy, research, and delivery environment of this nation and of the present-day emphasis on outcomes as measures of care for individuals and populations.

II. Course Requirements

Her or his acceptance of this syllabus constitutes an agreement on the part of the student to abide by the requirements described herein for participating in and completing this course.

A. Student Responsibilities and Participation

Attendance in class meetings is expected, of course. Class sessions are largely group discussions, not solely didactic presentations. Good discussions require collegiality, active contribution to the creation of an environment of respectful, constructive conversations, a shared conceptual foundation. In other words, please complete the readings on each topic before that topic's class session occurs, and please be prepared to engage in spirited but civil inquiry. I do recognize that the reading and writing load in this course is heavy, but believe it is necessary to provide you with the thorough and common background in the field that you require in order to participate at the highest levels of system policy development. The heaviness of the reading varies; plan your time accordingly.

I will ask you to give me the dates on which you plan to submit your essays, and you should submit your essays on those dates, and your essays should reflect the topics to be discussed in class on the days you submit them. You may change a date/topic well BEFOREHAND – but not on the date you had originally said you'd submit an essay. I penalize late essays 10% of the grade they would have earned had they been submitted on time. Should emergency, one's own illness or the illness of a loved one, or some other unforeseen circumstance prevent you from completing an essay on time, I strongly encourage you to reach me as soon as possible, preferably before the class during which the essay is due. I handle these matters on a case-by-case basis as they arise.

B. Honor Code and Permissible Collaboration

The principles of academic honesty, integrity, and responsible citizenship govern the performance of all academic work and student conduct at the University as they have during the long life of this institution. Your acceptance of enrollment in the University presupposes a commitment to the principles embodied in the Code of Student Conduct and a respect for this most significant Carolina tradition. Your reward is the practice of these principles.

Your participation in this course comes with the expectation that your work will be completed in full observance of the Honor Code. Academic dishonesty in any form is unacceptable, because any breach in academic integrity, however small, strikes destructively at the University's life and work. Academic dishonesty includes even unwitting failures to cite the work and/or ideas of others, for the failure to attribute credit to the originator of a piece of work is theft of intellectual property.

If you have any questions about your responsibility or the responsibility of faculty members under the Honor Code, please consult with someone in either the Office of the Student Attorney General (966-4084) or the Office of the Dean of Students (966-4041).

C. Assignments and Methods of Evaluation

The minimum course requirement for a grade of **PASS** is the **completion of 3 (three)** short critical essays on three different topics of your choice (short is considered to be 5 to 10 pages double-spaced, excluding bibliography, in 11-12 point font; references not included in text page limits). In addition, this course includes a **“Point – Counterpoint Debate” on the last day of class, April 23, 2008. I will be providing the debate topic and assigning each member of the class to one of two debate teams, “Team Codman” or “Team Nightingale.”**

PLEASE review the resources I've provided on the course's Blackboard site in "Assignments" and in "Writing Resources." I expect you to use the guidance in both places as you develop your own essays.

Now, a few words about the essays, and more about the debate below. Please choose early and well-spaced dates for your essays! Students must **declare all of their essay topics by Wednesday, January 30, 2008**. Each paper will be due at the beginning of the class meeting DURING WHICH its topic will be discussed; papers on a debate topic will be due on **April 18, 2007**. I strongly advise you to have a copy of your essay, or **notes on the topic**, on the day of the topic in question, because you will be considered a discussion leader on the day the topic will be discussed. I will accept electronic submissions of essays provided that we receive them before the beginning of the class period during which they are due.

The "point-counterpoint debate" assignment consists of preparation for and participation in team debates on a challenging question. **You may opt to write one of your three essays on the debate topic, should you wish.** I will distribute assignments to teams and topics in class on **January 30, 2008 (the end of the fourth class meeting)**. I reserve the right to assign class members to teams according to my own best judgment of how to create comparable teams. These debates are intended to draw on readings and discussion throughout the course, and students may opt to devote one of their required three essays to the debate topic. Students will work in teams, and teams have full freedom to decide how best to organize their efforts. *The grade for this final assignment will be a team grade, apart from and in addition to the individual grade earned by anyone who might also choose to write one of her/his essays on the debate topic.*

Simple completion of the essays is not, alone, sufficient to guarantee a grade of "Pass." Each essay must also be of high enough quality to merit a good evaluation. Good essays are well-written expositions, with sophisticated and yet intelligible theoretical frameworks, strong analytical foci, a firm grounding in the literature, and an evident understanding of the context of the problem. Students must also make a constructive contribution to class discussion, defined as coming to class prepared by having read that day's material and being capable of discussing and analyzing the material in a collegial, respectful spirit. **Students seeking a grade of "High Pass" must complete each course requirement at a marked level of excellence.**

Required Readings

Journal articles, book chapters, convention papers, and other materials as cited for specific classes and topics are available on Blackboard (in the "Class Meetings" site, where each meeting's required readings is listed under its date; all electronic reserves are also listed in "Assignments"), and I may distribute additional materials. I invite you to consider how newer work builds on, or departs from, foundational pieces.

You will find suggested additional readings and other resources for most topics; these are not required, but they may be of interest, and they may also help you with your essay topics.

Grading System

You may earn a possible total of 100 points in this course. These are the course elements and their weights:

Each essay:	0-25 points, depending on quality of substance and exposition
Class participation:	0-10 points, depending on strength of constructive and civil contribution to discussion
Point-Final Exam: Debate participation	0-15 points, depending on strength of contribution to preparation or presentation; note that all members receive the team's grade

Each of these elements will be summed to provide a final grade according to the following scale:

- H: 90-100
- P: 80-89
- L: 70-79
- F: ≤ 69

IV. Schedule of Class Meetings and Readings

1/09/08 First Day of Class: History, Origins, and Definitions of Quality of Care, and Essay Writing

Required Readings

- Nightingale, F [1863] 1989. *Notes on Hospitals*, Preface and Chapter 1. In Rosenberg Charles E. *Florence Nightingale on Hospital Reform*, New York: Garland Publishing.
- Codman EA. [1917] 1996. *A Study in Hospital Efficiency*, privately printed, Boston MA, reprinted by Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, Oakbrook Terrace IL, 1996; pp 53-60.
- Codman EA. [1914] 1990. The Product of a Hospital, *Surgery Gynecology and Obstetrics* 18: 491-496, reproduction published in *Archives of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine* 114: 1106-1111.
- Donabedian A. 1966. Evaluating the quality of medical care. *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 44 (July supplement, Part 2): 166-206.
- Lohr KN and Schroeder SA. 1990. A strategy for quality assurance in Medicare. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 322:707-712.

Useful Websites for Background on National Groups Involved in Quality of Care

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ; the federal agency charged with promoting quality and safety):

- Quality of care activities: <http://www.ahrq.gov/qual/qualix.htm> (last visited on 1 December 2004).
- National Quality Measures Clearinghouse (NQMC): <http://www.qualitymeasures.ahrq.gov> (last visited on 1 December 2004).

Leapfrog Group website and see Fact Sheets at <http://www.leapfroggroup.org/> (last visited on 1 December 2004.) This is the business group behind quality improvement; their patient safety standards have been controversial).

National Quality Forum website at <http://www.qualityforum.org> (last visited on 1 December 2004).

Multiagency "Talking Quality" web site designed to help managers and providers measure and report on their own quality improvement efforts at <http://www.talkingquality.gov/> (last visited on 1 December 2004).

See also <http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/> for AHRQ's latest attempt to offer three sets of "universal" indicators – "Prevention QIs," "Inpatient QIs," and "Patient Safety QIs," – by which health care systems might begin standardizing their approach to certain facets of quality (last visited on 1 December 2004).

Selected journals devoted entirely to Quality of Care and Outcomes:

International Journal for Quality in Health Care
The Joint Commission Journal of Quality Improvement
Quality of Life Research

Important Issues of Other Journals devoted to Quality of Care

Inquiry 25 (1), Spring 1988
Health Affairs 7(1), Spring 1988
Health Affairs 16(3), May/June 1997
Health Affairs 22(2), March/April 2003

Suggested/Additional Readings for first two classes

Brook RH, Williams KN, Avery AD. 1976. Quality assurance today and tomorrow: Forecast for the future. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 85:809-817.

- Williamson JW. 1988. Future policy directions for quality assurance: Lessons from the Health Accounting experience. *Inquiry* 25(1): 67-77.
- Palmer RH. 1988. The challenges and prospects for quality assessment and assurance in ambulatory care. *Inquiry* 25(1):119-131.
- Wyszewianski L. 1988. Quality of care: Past achievements and future challenges. *Inquiry* 25(1): 3-24.
- McGlynn EA. 1997. Six challenges in measuring the quality of health care. *Health Affairs* 16(3):7-21.
- Lohr KN. 1997. How do we measure quality? *Health Affairs* 16(3):22-25.
- Chassin MR. 1998. Is health care ready for six sigma quality? *The Milbank Quarterly* 76(4): 565-591.
- Becher EC and Chassin MR. 2001. Improving the quality of care: who will lead? *Health Affairs* 20(5): 164-179.
- Blumenthal D and Ferris TG. 2004. The Business Case for Quality: Ending Business as Usual in American Health Care. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, Report # 715, available on line at http://www.cmwf.org/publications/publications_show.htm?doc_id=245589 (last visited on 22 November 2004).

1/16/08 The One You've Heard About: Patient Safety and Data

Required Readings

- Berwick DM and Leape LI. 1999. Reducing errors in medicine. *British Medical Journal (BMJ)* 319:136-7.
- Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS, editors. Institute of Medicine. 1999. *To Err is Human*. Washington: National Academy Press. Summary only.
- Leape LL and Berwick DM. 2005. Five years after *To Err is Human*: What have we learned? *JAMA* 293(19): 2384-2390.
- Baciu, A, Stratton, K and Burke SP, Editors. Institute of Medicine. 2006. *The Future of Drug Safety: Promoting and Protecting the Health of the Public*. Washington: National Academy Press. Executive Summary Only.

Suggested/Additional Readings

- Roper WL. and Tolleson-Rinehart S. 2001. Health Care Data and Health. *Pharmacoepidemiology & Drug Safety* 10(5): 363-366.
- Flores G, Laws MB, Mayo SJ et al. 2003. Errors in medical interpretation and their potential clinical consequences in pediatric encounters. *Pediatrics* 111(1): 6-14.
- Wachter RM. The End Of The Beginning: Patient Safety Five Years After 'To Err Is Human' Amid signs of progress, there is still a long way to go. *Health Affairs Web Exclusive* 30 November 2004 W4-534 --W4-545. Electronic version available at <http://content.healthaffairs.org/cgi/reprint/hlthaff.w4.534v1> (Last visited on 30 November 2004).
- President's Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry*. 1998. Executive Summary. Electronic version at <http://www.hcqualitycommission.gov/final/execsum.html>; entire report available at <http://www.hcqualitycommission.gov/final/>. (Last visited on 22 November 2004).
- AHRQ's Patient Safety web pages include <http://www.ahrq.gov/qual/errorsix.htm> for a general directory of patient safety material (last visited on 22 November 2004), and AHRQ Web M&M, the online journal and forum on patient safety, at <http://webmm.ahrq.gov/> (last visited on 30 November 2004). AHRQ Web M&M is a fascinating read!

1/23/08 Quality, Quality Improvement, and Contemporary Thinking

Required Readings

- Anderson JC., Rangtusanatham Manus and Schroeder Roger G. 1994. A Theory of Quality Management Underlying the Deming Management Method. *Academy of Management Review* 19(3): 472-509.

Sprague L. 2001. Quality in the Making: Perspectives on Programs and Progress. A Background Paper. Washington: national Health Policy Forum.

Berwick DM. 1989. Continuous improvement as an ideal in health care. *New England Journal of Medicine* 320:53-56.

Chassin MR and Galvin RW and the National Roundtable on Health Care Quality. 1998. The urgent need to improve health care. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 280:1000-1005.

McNeil, BJ. 2001. The Shattuck Lecture – hidden barriers to improvement in the quality of care. *New England Journal of Medicine* 345: 1612-1620.

Additional/Suggested Readings

Batalden PB. Stoltz PK. 1993. A framework for the continual improvement of health care: building and applying professional and improvement knowledge to test changes in daily work. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality Improvement* 19:424-47.

Grol, R. 2001. Improving the quality of medical care: building bridges among professional pride, payer profit and patient satisfaction. *JAMA* 286: 2578-2585.

1/30/08 The Politics of the Delivery of Health Care I

ESSAY DATES DUE TODAY! DEBATE TEAMS, TOPIC, AND GROUND RULES UNVEILED TODAY!

Required Readings:

(Please also see the PowerPoint handout posted on Blackboard)

Hacker, JS. 2002. *The Divided Welfare State: The Battle Over Public and Private Social Benefits in the United States*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press. Readings: Chapter 4, 191-220; Chapter 5, pp 221-269

Oberlander, J. 2003. *The Political Life of Medicare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Readings: Chapter 7, The New Politics of Medicare

Suggested Readings for both 2/4 and 2/11:

You may wish to read ALL of the books from which chapters are drawn for these two classes on the politics of health care, and you may also wish to explore another classic work:

Jacobs, LR. 1993. *The Health of Nations: Public Opinion and the Making of American and British Health Policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

2/06/08 The Politics of the Delivery of Health Care II: recent US-UK reforms

Required Readings:

Skocpol, T. 1997. *Boomerang: Health Care Reform and The Turn Against Government (with a new Afterword)*. New York: W.W. Norton. Readings: Chapter Six and Afterword

- Oberlander, J. 2003. The Politics of Health Reform: Why Do Bad Things Happen to Good Plans? *Health Affairs Web Exclusives* 27 August 2003, W3-391 – W3-404. Available on line at <http://content.healthaffairs.org/cgi/reprint/hlthaff.w3.391v1>
- Schlesinger, Mark and Jacob Hacker. 2005. Window of opportunity: How Medicare's hybrid of public and private insurance could deliver universal coverage. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington DC, September 1-4. Copyright, American Political Science Association.
- Klein, Rudolf. 2006. The Troubled Transformation of Britain's National Health Service. *New England Journal of Medicine* 355(4): 409-415.

Additional resource:

For an example of attempts to aid states in improving the health status of their residents, see AHRQ's *Improving the Quality of Diabetes Care. New Tools for States*. September 2004. Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, Rockville, MD. <http://www.ahrq.gov/qual/diabqualoc.htm> (site last visited for this syllabus on 8 January 2008). At that site, you will find both a resource guide and a workbook for state stakeholders.

2/13/08 Effectiveness, Appropriateness, and Variations in Use

Required Readings

- Wennberg JE, Gittelsohn A. 1982. Variations in medical care among small areas. *Scientific American* 246:120-134.
- Wennberg JE. 1984. Dealing with medical practice variations: A proposal for action. *Health Affairs* 3:6-32.
- Chassin MR, Koseoff J, Park RE, et al. 1987. Does inappropriate use explain geographic variations in the use of health care services? A study of three procedures. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 258:2533-2537.
- Roper WL, Winkenwerder W, Hackbarth GH, Krakauer H. 1988. Effectiveness in health care. An initiative to evaluate and improve medical practice. *New England Journal of Medicine* 319:1197-1202.
- Jencks SF, Huff ED, Cuerdon T. 2003. Change in the quality of care delivered to Medicare Beneficiaries, 1998-1999 to 2000-2001. *JAMA* 289(3): 305-312.

Suggested/Additional Readings

- Brook RH, Lohr KN. 1985. Efficacy, effectiveness, variations, and quality: Boundary-crossing research. *Medical Care* 23:710-722.
- Wennberg JE, Barnes BA, Zubkoff, M. 1982. Professional uncertainty and the problem of supplier-induced demand. *Social Science and Medicine* 16:811-824.
- McPherson K, Strong PM, Epstein A. et al. 1981. Regional variations in the use of common surgical procedures: within and between England and Wales, Canada and the United States of America. *Social Science and Medicine* 15A:273-288.
- Leape LL, Park RE, Solomon DH, Chassin MR, Koseoff J, Brook RH. 1990. Does inappropriate use explain small-area variations in the use of health care services? *Journal of the American Medical Association* 263:669-672.

Required Readings

- Patrick DL, Deyo RA. 1989. Generic and disease-specific measures in assessing health status and quality of life. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S217-S232.
- Wilson IB, Cleary PD. 1995. Linking clinical variables with health-related quality of life. A conceptual model of patient outcomes. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 273:59-65.
- Testa MA, Simonson DC. 1996. Current Concepts. Assessment of quality-of-life outcomes. *New England Journal of Medicine* 334(13): 835-840.
- Wild D, Grove A, Martin M, Eremenco S, McElroy S, Verjee-Lorenz A, Erikson P. 2005. Principles of good practice for the translation and cultural adaptation process for patient-reported outcomes (PRO) measures: report of the ISPOR Task Force for Translation and Cultural Adaptation. *Value in Health* 8(2): 94-104.
- Clancy C and Eisenberg JW. 1998. Outcomes research: measuring the end results of health care. *Science* 282: 245-246.

Suggested/Additional Readings

Conceptual and methods articles

- Elwood PM. 1988. The Shattuck Lecture--outcomes management. A technology of patient experience. *New England Journal of Medicine* 318:1549-1556
- Stewart AL, Hays, RD, Ware JE, Jr. 1988. The MOS Short-form General Health Survey. Reliability and validity in a patient population. *Medical Care* 26:724-735.
- Steinwachs DM. 1989. Application of health status assessment measures in policy research. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S12-S26. (Note the case study of use of outcomes measures in elderly.)
- Deyo RA and Patrick DL. 1989. Barriers to the use of health status measures in clinical investigation, patient care, and policy research. 1989. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S254-S268.
- Nelson EC and Berwick DM. 1989. The measurement of health status in clinical practice. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S77-S90.
- Bergner M. 1989. Quality of life, health status, and clinical research. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S148-S156.
- Patrick DL and Bergner M. 1990. Measurement of health status in the 1990s. *Annual Review of Public Health* 11:165-83.
- Ware JE and Sherbourne CD. 1992. The MOS 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36). *Medical Care* 30:473-483.
- Greenfield S and Nelson EC. 1992. Recent developments and future issues in the use of health status assessment measures in clinical settings. *Medical Care* 30(5, Supplement): MS23-MS41.
- Mullin, P., K. Lohr, B. Bresnahan, and P. McNulty. 2000. Applying Cognitive Design Principles to Formatting HRQOL Instruments. *Quality of Life Research* 9: 13-27.
- Scientific Advisory Committee of the Medical Outcomes Trust (Lohr KN, Aaronson N, Alonso J, Burnam A, Patrick D, Perrin E, Stein R). 2002. Assessing Health Status and Quality-of-Life Instruments: Attributes and Review Criteria. *Quality of Life Research*. 11:193-205.

2/27/08 Outcomes: Patient-reported Health Status and Quality of Life, con't.

Required Readings

- Coons SJ, Rao S, Keininger DL, Hays RD. 2000. A comparative review of generic quality-of-life instruments. Review article. *Pharmacoeconomics* 17(1):13-35.
- Lohr KN. 2000. Health Outcomes Methodology Symposium: Summary and recommendations. *Medical Care* 38(9): Suppl II-194-208.

Visit the PROMIS Web Site at <http://www.nihpromis.org/> (site last visited for this syllabus on 8 January 2008).

-- and we'll have class discussion of potential of tools like CAT and IRT

3/05/08 Patient Satisfaction and Consumer Assessments

Required Readings:

- Cleary PD and McNeil, BJ. 1988. Patient satisfaction as an indicator of quality care. *Inquiry* 25(1): 25-36.
- Davies AR and Ware JE, Jr. 1988. Involving consumers in quality assessment. *Health Affairs* 7(1, Spring): 33-48.
- Cleary PD and Edgman-Levitan S. 1997. Health care quality: Incorporating consumer perspectives. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 278:1608-1612.

Visit the CAHPS Web Site at <https://www.cahps.ahrq.gov/default.asp> (site last visited for this syllabus on 8 January 2008)

-- and we'll have a discussion of the use of consumer surveys to measure effective delivery of care.

Suggested/Additional Readings

- Harris-Kojetin LD, FJ Fowler, JA Brown, JA Schnaier, and SF Sweeny. 1999. The use of cognitive testing to develop and evaluate CAHPS™ 1.0 Core Survey Items. *Medical Care* 37:3 Suppl: MS10-MS21.
- Hays RD, JA Shaul, VSL Williams, JS Lubalin, LD Harris-Kojetin, SF Sweeny and PD Cleary. 1999. Psychometric properties of the CAHPS™ 1.0 Survey Measures. *Medical Care* 37:3 Suppl: MS22-MS31.
- MCGee J, Kanouse DE, Sofaer S, Hargraves JL, Hoy E, Kleimann S. 1999. Making survey results easy to report to consumers: How reporting needs guided survey design in CAHPS. *Medical Care* 37:3 Suppl: MS32-MS40.
- The remainder of the CAHPS™ articles in *Medical Care* 37:3 Suppl.

[No class on 3/12/08 \(Spring Break\) – Have Fun and Go Heels](#)

3/12/08 Public Disclosure, Report Cards, and Performance Measures

Required Readings:

- Hannan EL, Kilburn H, Jr, Racz M, Shields E, Chassin MR. 1994. Improving the outcomes of coronary artery bypass surgery in New York State. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 271:761-766.
- Eddy DM. 1998. Performance measurement: problems and solutions. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):7-25.

- Thier SO and Gelijns AC. 1998. Improving health: the reason performance measurement matters. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):26-28, 1998
- Galvin RS. 1998. Are performance measures relevant? *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):29-31,
- Newcomer LN. 1998. Physician, measure thyself. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):32-35
- Sennett C. 1998. Moving ahead, measure by measure. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):36-37
- O'Leary DS. 1998. Reordering performance measurement priorities. *Health Affairs*. 17(4):38-39.
- Lansky D. 1998. Measuring what matters to the public. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):40-41.
- Marsh LC. 1998. The doctor's bottom line. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):75-79
- Blendon RJ, Brodie M, Benson JM, Altman DE, Levitt L, Hoff T, Hugick L. 1998. Understanding the managed care backlash. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):80-94.
- Institute of Medicine. 2001. *Envisioning the National Health Care Quality Report*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Executive Summary only.

Suggested/Additional Readings

- Donaldson MS and Lohr KN, editors. Institute of Medicine. 1994. *Health Data in the Information Age. Use, Disclosure, and Privacy*. Washington DC: National Academy Press. Chapter 3, "Public Disclosure of Data on Health Care Providers and Practitioners" (pp. 91-123) and "Appendix 3A. Fairness and Public Disclosure of Data" (pp. 123-135). Available at <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309049954/html/index.html> (site last visited for this syllabus on 22 November 2004).
- Green DC, Koplan JP, Cutler CM. 1999. Prenatal care in the first trimester: misleading findings from HEDIS. Health Plan Employer Data and Information Set. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 11(6):465-473.
- O'Kane ME. 1999. HEDIS data integrity. *Health Affairs*. 18(4):209
- Vaiana ME and McGlynn EA. 2002. What cognitive science tells us about the design of reports for consumers. Review article. *Medical Care Research and Review* 59(1):3-35.

3/26/08 Evidence-based Practice and Clinical Practice Guidelines

Required Readings

- Field MJ and KN Lohr, editors. Institute of Medicine. 1992. *Guidelines for Clinical Practice: From Development to Use*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Summary only.
- Editorial. 1992. Evidence-based medicine, in its place. *The Lancet* 346(8978):785.
- Sackett DL, Rosenberg WM, Muir-Gray JA, Haynes RB, Richardson WG. 1996. Evidence-based medicine: what it is and what it isn't. *British Medical Journal* 312(7023):71-72.
- Lohr K.N. 2004. Rating the Strength of Scientific Evidence: Relevance for Quality Improvement Programs. *International Journal of Quality in Health Care* 16 (1): 9-18
- Harris, R.P., M. Helfand, S.H. Woolf, K.N. Lohr, C.D. Mulrow, S.M. Teutsch, D. Atkins for the Methods Work Group, Third US Preventive Services Task Force. 2001. Current Methods of the US Preventive Services Task Force: A Review of the Process. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 20 (3S):21-35.

Supplemental/Additional Readings

- Evidence-based Working Group. 1992. Evidence-based medicine. A new approach to teaching the practice of medicine. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 268:2420-2425.
- Woolf SH. 1993. Practice guidelines: a new reality in medicine. III. Impact on patient care. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 153:2646-2655.
- Lomas J, Anderson G, Domnick-Pierre K, et al. 1989. Do Practice Guidelines Guide Practice? *NEJM* (321):1306-1311
- Sackett DL, Straus SE, Richardson WS, Rosenberg W, Haynes, RB. *Evidence-based Medicine. How to Practice and Teach EBM*. Second edition. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 2000. (NOTE: THIS is now the definitive EBM book, not the first edition.)

West SL, King V, Carey TS, Lohr KN, Mckoy N, Sutton SF, Lux, L. *Systems to Rate the Strength of Scientific Evidence*. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 47. AHRQ Publication No. 02-E016. Rockville, Md.: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Summary only. HTML version available at <http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/epcsums/strengthsum.htm> (last visited on 22 November 2004).
Woolf SH. 1999. The need for perspective in evidence-based medicine. *JAMA* 282:2358-2365.

Relevant AHRQ and CDC web pages:

- Evidence-based Practice Program: <http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/epcix.htm>
- Effective Health Care: <http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/aboutUs/index.cfm>
- National Guidelines Clearinghouse: <http://www.guideline.gov/index.asp>
- United States Preventive Services Task Force: <http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/uspstfix.htm>
- CDC Guide to Community Preventive Services: <http://www.thecommunityguide.org/default.htm>

4/02/08 Performance Improvement: The Latest Strategy for Building Quality into the Business Case

Required Readings

Fisher ES, Wennberg DE, Stukel TA and Gottlieb DJ. 2004. Variations in the Longitudinal Efficiency of Academic Medical Centers. *Health Affairs Web Exclusive* VAR19-32.
Rosenthal MB, Fernandopulle R, Song HyunSook R and Landon B. 2004. Paying for Quality: Providers Incentives for Quality Improvement. *Health Affairs* 23(2): 127-141.
Leatherman, S, Berwick D, Iles D, Lewin LL, Davidoff, F, Nolan T and Bisongnano M. 2003. The business case for quality: case studies and an analysis. *Health Affairs* 22(Mar-April): 17-30.
Rosenthal MB, Frank RG, Li, Zhonge, Epstein AM. 2005. Early experience with pay-for-performance: from concept to practice. *JAMA* 294(14): 1788-1793.
Dudley, RA. 2005. Pay-for-performance research: how to learn what clinicians and policy makers need to know (Editorial). *JAMA* 294(14): 1788-1793.
Committee on Redesigning Health Insurance Performance Measures, Payment, and Performance Improvement Programs. 2007. Institute of Medicine. *Rewarding Provider Performance: Aligning Incentives in Medicare* (Pathways to Quality Health Care Series). Washington: National Academies Press. Executive Summary Only.

See also the "Leapfrog Compendium" of incentive and reward programs at <http://www.leapfroggroup.org/compendium2> (site last visited for this syllabus 8 January 2008)

4/09/08 – 4/16/08 Quality, Ethics, and Issues at the Start and End of Life

Required Readings,

Ethics generally (4/09)

Povar, G. Part III. What Does "Quality" Mean? Critical Ethical Issues for Quality Assurance. In: RH Palmer, A Donabedian, and GJ Povar. *Striving for Quality in Health Care: An Inquiry into Policy and Practice*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Health Administration Press, 1991.

- Faden R, Leplege A. Assessing quality of life. Moral implications for clinical practice. 1992. *Medical Care* 30 (5, Supplement):MS166-MS175.
- Lohr KN. Quality of Health Care. In: Reich WT, ed. *Encyclopedia of Bioethics* 2nd ed, New York: Macmillan, 1995.

Infants, children and adolescents (4/16)

- Chung PJ and Schuster MA. 2004. Access and quality in child health services: Voltage Drops. *Health Affairs* 23(5): 77-87
- Simpson L. 2004. Lost in Translation? Reflections on the role of research in improving health care for children. *Health Affairs* 23(5): 125-130.

End of life (4/16)

- Donaldson MS, Field MJ. 1998. Measuring quality at the end of life. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 158:121-128.
- Emanuel EJ, Emanuel LL. 1998. The promise of a good death. *Lancet* 351 (May):s1121-s1129.
- Patrick DL, Curtis JR, Engelberg RA, Nielsen E, McCown E. Measuring and improving the quality of dying and death. *Ann Intern Med.* 2003 Sep 2;139(5 Pt 2):410-5.

Suggested/Additional Readings

- McGlynn EA, CL Damberg, EA Kerr and MA Schuster, editors. 2000. *Quality of Care for Children and Adolescents*. Santa Monica, Calif.: The RAND Corporation, 2000. (ISBN 0-8330-2922-3). Front matter and introductory chapter (pp 1-34).
- Palmer, R. Heather and Miller, Marlene R. 2001. Methodologic Challenges in Developing and Implementing Measures of Quality for Child Health Care, *Ambulatory Pediatrics* 1:39-52.
- Palmer RH, Strain R, Maurer JV, Thompson MS. 1984. A method for evaluating performance of ambulatory pediatric tasks. *Pediatrics* 73:269-277.
- Palmer RH, Louis TA, Hsu LN, Peterson HF, Rothrock JK, Strain R, Thompson MS, Wright EA. 1985. A randomized controlled trial of quality assurance in sixteen ambulatory care practices. *Medical Care* 23:751-770.
- McGlynn EA and Halfon N. 1998. Overview of issues in improving quality of care for children. *Health Services Research* 33:977-1000.
- Mangione-Smith R, McGlynn EA. 1998. Assessing the quality of healthcare provided to children. *Health Services Research* 33:1059-1090.
- Moyer, Virginia A. 2001. Evidence Synthesis in Child Health, *Ambulatory Pediatrics* 1:53-58.
- Christakis DA, Johnston BD, Connell F A. 2001. Methodologic issues in pediatric outcomes research, *Ambulatory Pediatrics* 1:59-62.
- Kaplan SH, Greenfield S, Connolly GA, Barlow SE, Grand R. 2001. Methodologic issues in the conduct and interpretation of pediatric effectiveness research. *Ambulatory Pediatrics* 1:63-70.
- Lynn J. 1997. Measuring quality of care at the end of life: a statement of principles. *Journal of the American Geriatric Society* 45:526-527.
- The SUPPORT Principal Investigators. 1995. A controlled trial to improve care for seriously ill hospitalized patients: The Study to Understand Prognoses and Preferences for Outcomes and Risks of Treatments (SUPPORT). *Journal of the American Medical Association* 274:1591-1598
- Field MJ, Cassell CK, editors. Institute of Medicine. 1997. *Approaching Death: Improving Care at the End of Life*. Field MJ, Cassell CK, eds. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Executive Summary; go to <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309063728/html/index.html> (last accessed for this syllabus on 22 November 2004).
- Byock IR, Teno JM, Field MJ, guest editors. 1999. Special Section on Measuring Quality of Care at Life's End. Preface. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 17:73-74 and other selections from this issue, including these:
- Byock IR. 1999. Conceptual Models and the Outcomes of Caring. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 17: 83-92.

Stewart AL, Teno JM, Patrick DL, and Lynn J. 1999. The Concept of Quality of Life of Dying Persons in the Context of Health Care *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 17: 93-108.
Fowler FJ, Coppola KM, and Teno JM. 1999. Methodological Challenges for Measuring Quality of Care at the End of Life. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 17: 114-119.

AHRQ web pages:

- General issues of child health research: <http://www.ahrq.gov/child/> (last visited this syllabus on 3 January 2007).
- Measuring Performance in Child Health Programs : Access, Quality, and Health Service Delivery Concepts, tips, and tools for evaluating Medicaid, the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), Title V, and other health care service programs for children. <http://www.ahrq.gov/chttoolbx> (last visited for this syllabus on 3 January 2007).

Point-Counterpoint Essay due 4/16 if you have chosen to write one of your 3 essays on your debate topic.

4/23/08 Last Class Meeting: Point-Counterpoint Debate

Debate topics and team assignments announced on January 31, 2007