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Monthly Campaign Webinar
August 20, 2020
Today’s Webinar

• Together 2 Goal® Updates
  – Webinar Reminders
  – AMGA’s 2020 IQL Virtual Conference
  – Obesity Care Model Collaborative Case Studies

• T2G Diabetes Bundle Best Practices
  Learning Collaborative Results
  – AMGA

• Q&A
  – Use Q&A or chat feature
Webinar Reminders

• Webinar will be recorded today and available the week of August 24th
  – www.Together2Goal.org

• Participants are encouraged to ask questions using the “Chat” and “Q&A” functions on the right side of your screen
IQL20 Virtual
Transformation and Innovation
Post COVID-19
September 17-18, 2020

Register today at amga.org/IQL20
Obesity Care Model Collaborative Case Studies

OCMC Case Studies are available at AMGA.org
Today’s Featured Presenters

Danielle Casanova, M.B.A.
Senior Director, Population Health Initiatives
AMGA

Earlean Chambers, R.N., M.S., CPHQ
Director of Clinical and Quality, Population Health Initiatives
AMGA

Cori Rattelman
Senior Research Analyst
AMGA Analytics
T2G Diabetes Best Practices Learning Collaborative

Improve performance on the T2G Core Track bundle measure:

- HbA1c control (< 8.0)
- Blood pressure control (< 140/90)
- Lipid management (statin Rx)
- Medical attention for nephropathy
National Advisors

Francis Colangelo, MD, MS-HQS, FACP  
Chief Quality Officer, Premier Medical Associates

Megan Dornell, PharmD, BCACP  
Clinical Director, Ambulatory Pharmacy Services, Community Health Network

Tony Hampton, MD, MBA, ABOM, CPE  
Regional Medical Director, Advocate Trinity Service Area, Advocate Aurora Healthcare

Jamie L. Reedy, MD, MPH  
Chief of Population Health, Summit Health Management

Gretchen Shull, MD  
Endocrinologist, Vice President of Diabetes Care, Mercy
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DM Bundle Collaborative Participants

Sutter Health
Palo Alto Medical Foundation

Mercy Health System

Michigan Medicine
University of Michigan

AMGA

Geisinger

Excella Health

SUMMIT MEDICAL GROUP

Ochsner Health System

Norton Healthcare

PRIVIA Health
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Diabetes Bundle Collaborative Process

Development Phase
- Program planning
- National Advisors
- Measure development
- Organization recruitment
- Application vetting & selection
- On-boarding Organizations

Implementation Phase
- Quality improvement & data reporting
- Site visits/Clinical outreach
- Regular education webinars
- In-person/Virtual meetings

Final Analysis & Dissemination Phase
- Compile findings
- Data analysis
- Qualitative analysis
- Publication

©2019 AMGA Foundation. All rights reserved.
Summary Data Report: T2G Bundle Measure
Why a Bundle Measure?

- Reflects the patient’s perspective—holistic view
  - Address multiple key risk factors or care needs

- Encourages system perspective—no dropped balls
  - Are all contributors to the care process working together?

- More sensitive scale for assessing improvement
  - Amplifies variation in care process
  - Also amplifies errors in measurement

All-or-None Measurement Raises the Bar on Performance

Thomas Nolan, PhD
Donald M. Berwick, MD, MPP

The pursuit of evidence-based medicine is now at the core of the agenda for improving health care in the United States. All major quality measurement systems use science-based indicators of proper processes of care, such as the ORYX measures of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations,1 the Health Employer Data and Information Set measures of the National Committee on Quality Assurance,2 the measures used by the Quality Improvement Organizations under contract with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services,3 and at least 70 of the 179 measures in the 2009 National Health Care Quality Report from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.1

Often, several individual performance measures are used to assess care of the same condition. For example, a recent...
Bundle Measure → Frustration!

Maximum performance on bundle, given individual measures

- A1c: 66.1%
- BP: 72.0%
- Neph: 86.0%
- Lipid: 65.9%
- Bundle: 31.4%

+ 34.5%
Bundle Measure Arithmetic

Neph 86.0%
BP 72.0%
A1c 66.1%
Lipid 65.9%

Entire population 100%
Bundle Measure Arithmetic

Neph  86.0%
BP    72.0%
A1c   66.1%
Lipid 65.9%

Bundle 31.4%
T2G Bundle: Distribution of Patients by Number of Measures in Control
T2G Patients by Number of Measures in Control

All Patients (2017 Q1)

37.5% of Patients with 3 Bundle Measures in Control

- A1c non-compliant: 37.4%
- BP non-compliant: 25.9%
- Nephropathy non-compliant: 7.2%
- Lipid non-compliant: 32.3%

6.5% w/out an A1c measured

+ 39.5% non-compliant
46.0% process improvement
T2G Patients by Number of Measures in Control

All Patients (2017 Q1)

- 6.8%
- 19.4%
- 34.2%
- 51.5%
- 38%
Data Timing
## Data Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Type</th>
<th>Measurement Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline period</td>
<td>2018 Jan 1 - 2018 Dec 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-intervention period 1</td>
<td>2018 Feb 1 - 2019 Jan 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-intervention period 2</td>
<td>2018 Mar 1 - 2019 Feb 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-intervention period 3</td>
<td>2018 Apr 1 - 2019 Mar 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Phase:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 1</td>
<td>2018 May 1 - 2019 Apr 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 2</td>
<td>2018 Jun 1 - 2019 May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 3</td>
<td>2018 Jul 1 - 2019 Jun 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 4</td>
<td>2018 Aug 1 - 2019 Jul 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 5</td>
<td>2018 Sep 1 - 2019 Aug 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 6</td>
<td>2018 Oct 1 - 2019 Sep 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 7</td>
<td>2018 Nov 1 - 2019 Oct 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 8</td>
<td>2018 Dec 1 - 2019 Nov 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 9</td>
<td>2019 Jan 1 - 2019 Dec 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 10</td>
<td>2019 Feb 1 - 2020 Jan 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 11</td>
<td>2019 Mar 1 - 2020 Feb 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention period 12</td>
<td>2019 Apr 1 - 2020 Mar 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2018 Q4 (BL)**
- **1st in-person meeting**
- **Final MP for comparison to campaign (2019 Q4)**
- **Final MP for collaborative improvements (Jan ’20)**
The Collaborative Cohort
Bundle Collaborative Participants
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Patient population:

- Active Patient population increased by 4.6% (1.8M to 1.9M)

*Includes 4 geographic regions: Georgia, Gulf Coast, Mid-Atlantic, N Texas*
Patient population:

- Active Patient population increased by 4.6% (1.8M to 1.9M)
- T2G cohort (active patients w/ T2DM) increased by 9.4% (271K to 296K)
Prevalence: Type 2 diabetes (T2DM)

- Active Patient population increased by 4.6% (1.8M to 1.9M)
- T2G cohort (active patients w/ T2DM) increased by 9.4% (271K to 296K)
- Patient weighted average prevalence increased from 14.7% to 15.4%
Collaborative Performance
Collaborative Performance: Group Weighted Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Collaborative Average Group Outcomes¹</th>
<th>Baseline (Dec 2018)</th>
<th>Jan 2020</th>
<th>Absolute Δ</th>
<th>Relative Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1c &lt; 8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP &lt; 140/90</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention for Nephropathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipid Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2G Bundle</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Collaborative touched more than 296,000 patients with type 2 diabetes
- Improvements across all measures

¹ Columns may not add due to rounding.
Collaborative Performance: Group Weighted Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Collaborative Average Group Outcomes&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (Dec 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1c &lt; 8.0</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP &lt; 140/90</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention for Nephropathy</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipid Management</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2G Bundle</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Columns may not add due to rounding.

- Collaborative touched more than 296,000 patients with type 2 diabetes
- Improvements across all measures
- Highest gains in T2G Bundle control
T2G Measures (adjusted)

- Seasonally adjusted A1c, BP, and bundle measures
Patients with A1c control (A1c < 8.0)
Adjusted for seasonality

- 1.8% relative improvement among all patients
- Over 2x improvement seen by campaign (as of 2019Q4)
- **3,100 additional patients** with A1c measured and < 8.0
  - 2.0% relative improvement → 363 patients
  - 2.4% relative improvement → 449 patients
  - 3.7% relative improvement → 1007 patients
  - 6.9% relative improvement → 450 patients
Patients with BP control (BP < 140/90) 
Adjusted for seasonality

+ 2.0% absolute
+ 2.7% relative

OR

If you think of available improvement:

100 – 76.5 = 23.5%
without BP control

Cohort captured 8.6% of the available improvement

- 3 organizations above 80% control (MUPD)

- **5,900 additional patients** with BP measured and < 140/90
  - 2.8% relative improvement → 435 patients
  - 2.9% relative improvement → 752 patients
  - 3.2% relative improvement → 642 patients
  - 3.4% relative improvement → 2,186 patients
  - 5.7% relative improvement → 371 patients
Patients with BP control (BP < 140/90) Adjusted for seasonality

+ 2.0% absolute
+ 2.7% relative

OR

If you think of available improvement:

100 – 76.5 = 23.5% without BP control

Cohort captured 8.6% of the available improvement

- 3 organizations above 80% control (MUPD)
- **5,900 additional patients** with BP measured and < 140/90
  - 2.8% relative improvement → 435 patients
  - 2.9% relative improvement → 752 patients
  - 3.2% relative improvement → 642 patients
  - 3.4% relative improvement → 2,186 patients
  - 5.7% relative improvement → 371 patients

Cohort captured 8.6% of the available improvement
Patients with BP control (BP < 140/90) Adjusted for seasonality

- + 2.0% absolute
  + 2.7% relative

  OR

If you think of available improvement:

100 – 76.5 = 23.5% without BP control

Cohort captured 8.6% of the available improvement

- 3 organizations above 80% control (MUPD)

- 5,900 additional patients with BP measured and < 140/90
  - 2.8% relative improvement → 435 patients
  - 2.9% relative improvement → 752 patients
  - 3.2% relative improvement → 642 patients
  - 3.4% relative improvement → 2,186 patients
  - 5.7% relative improvement → 371 patients

Cohort captured 8.6% of the available improvement

23% of available improvement
Patients with medical attention for nephropathy

+ 0.6% absolute improvement
+ 0.6% relative improvement

OR

If you think of available improvement:

100 – 90.7 = 9.3% without attention for nephropathy

Cohort captured 6.4% of that available improvement

● 2 organizations started at over 93% control and still made gains

● 1,500 additional patients with attention to nephropathy
  ✓ 1.2% absolute increase, capturing 13.9% of available improvement \(\rightarrow\) 100 patients
  ✓ 1.5% absolute increase, capturing 16.4% of available improvement \(\rightarrow\) 362 patients
Patients with lipid management (with statin prescription or documented reason not to have a statin)

- **6,000 additional patients** with lipid management
- 9 of 10 groups saw improvement
  - 2.5% relative improvement $\Rightarrow$ 214 patients
  - 3.0% relative improvement $\Rightarrow$ 2,038 patients
  - 3.2% relative improvement $\Rightarrow$ 664 pts
  - 3.4% relative improvement $\Rightarrow$ 805 patients
  - 7.3% relative improvement $\Rightarrow$ 1,294 patients
- 5 groups captured > 10% of their available opportunity

If you think of available improvement:

$$100 - 77.3 = 22.7\%$$

OR

Cohort captured 8.4% of the available improvement

+ 1.9% absolute
+ 2.5% relative
Patients with lipid management (with statin prescription or documented reason not to have a statin)

- **6,000 additional patients** with lipid management
- **9 of 10 groups** saw improvement:
  - 2.5% relative improvement → 214 patients
  - 3.0% relative improvement → 2,038 patients
  - 3.2% relative improvement → 664 pts
  - 3.4% relative improvement → 805 patients
  - 7.3% relative improvement → 1,294 patients
- **5 groups captured > 10%** of their available opportunity

**Available improvement:**

If you think of available improvement:

$$100 - 77.3 = 22.7\%$$

**OR**

Cohort captured 8.4% of the available improvement

**Graph:**
- **Group weighted average (all):**
  - BL: 77.3%
  - Jan ’20: 79.2%
  - + 1.9% absolute
  - + 2.5% relative
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Patients with bundle control
Adjusted for seasonality

- All 10 groups saw improvement

+ 2.7% absolute
+ 6.7% relative
Patients with bundle control*  
Adjusted for seasonality

* Sorted by measure rate in last reporting period (descending)
Patients with bundle control*  
Adjusted for seasonality

* Sorted by measure rate in last reporting period (descending)
Patients with bundle control*  
Adjusted for seasonality

* Sorted by measure rate in last reporting period (descending)
Patients with bundle control*  
Adjusted for seasonality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Rate</th>
<th>2018 Q4</th>
<th>2019 Q1</th>
<th>2019 Q2</th>
<th>2019 Q3</th>
<th>2019 Q4</th>
<th>2020 Q1</th>
<th>2020 Q2</th>
<th>2020 Q3</th>
<th>2020 Q4</th>
<th>2021 Q1</th>
<th>2021 Q2</th>
<th>2021 Q3</th>
<th>2021 Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sorted by measure rate in last reporting period (descending)
Patients with bundle control
Adjusted for seasonality

- All 10 groups saw improvement
  - 3.4% relative improvement → 181 patients
  - 4.0% relative improvement → 531 patients
  - 4.7% relative improvement → 847 patients
  - 4.9% relative improvement → 367 patients
  - 4.9% relative improvement → 543 patients
  - 7.9% relative improvement → 243 patients
  - 8.1% relative improvement → 861 patients
  - 8.5% relative improvement → 2,961 patients
  - 9.9% relative improvement → 941 patients
  - 11.2% relative improvement → 480 patients

8,000 additional patients with bundle control

Bundle control (adj)

Group weighted average (all)

+ 2.7% absolute
+ 6.7% relative
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Comparison to Campaign Cohort
Comparison of Collaborative Improvement to Campaign: T2G Patients with bundle control

Seasonally adjusted group weighted average\(^1\): T2G Bundle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline (2018Q4)</th>
<th>2019Q4</th>
<th>Δ BL to 2019Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campaign(^2)</strong></td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative(^3)</strong></td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative improvement for collaborative 1.8x that seen by the campaign.
### Comparison of Collaborative Improvement to Campaign: All T2G Core Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures:</th>
<th>Relative Δ 2018 Q4 (BL) to 2019 Q4&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Rel. Improvement: collaborative vs campaign (BL to 2019Q4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Campaign&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1c &lt; 8.0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP &lt; 140/90</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention for Nephropathy</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipid Management</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T2G Bundle</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Note that these Δs are measured from the bundle baseline to December 2019, the last bundle measurement period to coincide with a T2G campaign measurement period (2019Q4) prior to when health systems began to see an impact due to COVID-19 pandemic. For the collaborative, January 2021 was considered the end of the intervention period with regard to calculating collaborative improvements.

<sup>2</sup> Campaign includes 51 health care systems that reported to the T2G campaign in both 2018Q4 (BL) and 2019Q4, excluding collaborative participants.

<sup>3</sup> Collaborative includes the 10 health care systems participating in the T2G bundle collaborative.
In 13 months...

• Cohort improved in each of the bundle components
  – A1c control: + 3,100 patients, 2.2 x campaign
  – BP control: + 5,900 patients, 1.6 x campaign
  – Nephropathy: + 1,500 patients, 1.8 x campaign
  – Lipid mngt: + 6,000 patients, 1.2 x campaign

• Cohort achieved a 6.7% relative improvement in bundle control
  – All 10 organizations improved (range: 3.4% to 11.3%)

• 8,000 additional patients with bundle control

• 1.8 x the bundle improvement achieved by campaign
Quality Improvement Activities
Together 2 Goal
National Campaign
DM Bundle Collaborative
Teamwork

Daily Huddles

Amplified Huddles

Diabetes Operations Group and Task Force

Diabetes Mellitus Care Model Program
Education

Provider

Staff

Patient
Provider Education

• Department meetings
• Insulin trouble shooting guide
• Peer to peer assistance on performance
• Collaboration with Cardiology Department
• Grand Rounds on diabetes medication
• CME seminar "Diabetes Clinical Updates"
• Treatment algorithm
• Diabetes Super BPA
• Health Maintenance updates for Diabetes Standards of Care
• Monthly Provider Diabetes transparent reports
• Gap Reports
Staff Education

- Motivational interviewing training
- Scripting
- Annual competencies
- Novo Nordisk training course
- POC A1C machine training
- Chart Review and Documentation
- Standing Orders
Patient Education

• Patient waiting area and exam room
• Virtual visits including diabetes education
• Increase referrals to Diabetes Specialist
• Statin education material mailed to patients
A1C Control - Nephropathy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC A1C machines</th>
<th>Bulk messaging to patient with missing nephropathy test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-visit lab work</td>
<td>Urine screening at POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Medicine Diabetes Program</td>
<td>Automated outreach for gaps in care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blood Pressure Control

• Outreach to patients with elevated BP
• Repeat Blood pressure checks
• Getting back to basics among staff
• Alignment of hypertension metrics across value based contracts
Lipid Management

- Pharmacy Engagement
- Grand Rounds on diabetes medication
- Statin focused education for providers and patients
- Patient engagement algorithm for statins
- Provider-talking point on the demystification of statins for patients
- 30 day prescription to 90 day prescriptions
Patient Outreach

**Measures**
- Missing, Due or Uncontrolled Measures

**Methods of Outreach**
- Patient portal
- Mail
- Phone calls (automated/manual)

**Care Coordinators/ Medical Assistants**
- Communication with patients
- Schedule a provider appointment
- Follow up for needed lab work
- Schedule Diabetes specialist appointments and programs
Quality Measures

- DB measures align with organization quality measures
- Bundle measure added to organizations quality measures
- Part of value based contracts
- 100 Day Value Goals Push for BP control, A1C Poor Control, DM Bundle to improve care and close gaps
- Provider incentives
Lessons Learned

• Improvement is a slow process
• Improvement needs to occur as a system wide approach
• Adopt standard care guidelines and address deviation
• Dedicated and trained staff to conduct patient outreach works
• Providing tools to increase efficiency does not equal immediate adoption
• Laboratory relationship and cooperation is essential
• Communication is key
• Celebrate Accomplishments
September Webinar

• **Date/Time:** September 17, 2020 from 2-3pm Eastern

• **Topic:** Addressing Social Determinants of Health: Community Partnerships and Health Equity Strategies

• **Presenter:** Kristen M. Kopski, M.D., Ph.D of HealthPartners Care Group
Questions