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- Everyone signs a confidentiality agreement for entry to the meeting
- Every meeting
- No photos
- Reports distributed at the end of the meeting
Confidentiality Agreement

The following examples are to be considered privileged and confidential information and should be discussed only within the confines of the MTQIP Quality Collaborative meetings.

- Any and all patient information.
- Any and all patient identifiers which are considered privileged and protected health information as defined by current HIPPA laws.
- Any specific Michigan trauma case information.
- Any information discussed regarding a specific MTQIP site outcome.
- Any reference to a specific MTQIP site result or analysis.
- All trauma data presented including but not limited to Composite Metrics.
Confidentiality Agreement

By signing this document, I agree to protect the confidentiality of all information discussed at this meeting and take steps to safeguard against any disclosure of privileged information that may have been discussed. I understand that any violation of confidentiality may result in my personal removal from participation in the project as well as the removal of the hospital site I represent.
How Decisions Are Made, Navigating Your Health System

Paul A. Taheri, MD MBA
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Who am I?

• Trauma Surgeon

• University of Michigan 1994-2007
  – Trauma Director
  – Associate Dean of Academic Business Development

• University of Vermont 2007-2013
  – President/CEO of University of Vermont Medical Group

• Yale University March 2013 - Current
Goal for today

• Provide some framework

• Provide a bit of perspective

• Have real dialogue
So how are decisions made inside our organizations

• Significant variation in actual process, but information and common themes are evident

• So what are the key issues/considerations and what is the optimal process for decision making?

• Who really are the decision makers?

• What happens when you leave the room – what is the Sr. Leadership discussion?

• Let’s start with the important considerations you need to be aware of
You need to be mindful of two issues

• Money

• Governance
Understand your environment

- What is the role of your organization in the larger landscape of the State’s health care
  - Academic, regional or local focus?
  - Is your hospital part of a larger system? If so where does it fit?
  - Are you “integrated” clinically, organizationally, financially...

- What is the current status of your organization vis a vis your local environment
  - Is it making money? Is the leadership stable? Is the press chasing some story down?

- This is very important to understand. So take a moment to “inventory” your institution. Assess where it is and what is has going for it.
  - Be brutally honest in this assessment.
Understand the basic vision for the organization

- Of course the mission is quality compassionate care....but what is the direction of the enterprise?
  - Locally focused on primary/secondary, OP care?
  - Quaternary care driven (University /teaching institutions?)
  - Are you moving toward true capitation/population health or are you going to “milk the current fee for service environment for a while longer?”
  - Understanding these types of considerations is very important in where your proposal “fits in” and how you are viewed by Sr. Leadership.
Governance a few basic ground rules - triage

- Decisions must be triaged just like clinical decisions are:
  
  – Operative decisions are determined by surgeon (of course), but smaller decisions are made all along the way....registration, which pre-op room does the patient go to....
  
  – So what you present to whom matters. For example, do not ask the CEO for a printer, new furniture, or to cover a lease for $500/month. I have been asked for each of these mentioned...
  
  – So, truly think about what you are asking to whom.
Governance – more ground rules - information

- Come when you are fully prepared = have the financial, operational, timeframes, and the like all clarified.
  - Executives value their time just like you do.

- Write it all down in a document.

- Provide lots of background information about your service, the relevance of your service, volumes, number of faculty/employees....
  - This can all be in an appendix of your presentation
  - You would be stunned how little the Sr. Leadership knows about individual programs/MD’s
Governance – what do we really want to see

- Your presentation should focus on the operational impact, how/why you can actually get this done, how you will measure success/failure, who is accountable for what.

- Financial impact/ROI – you do not need to do this! Have the hospital do it for you.
  - If you use their people, data, and processes, there is nothing to debate about the validity of the numbers.
Institutional considerations - Money

- Volume of patients and hospital capacity
  - Will this grow volume? Is the hospital full of the right patients?

- Access to capital – What truly is the financial status of the organization?
  - Metrics of success – days cash on hand, bond ratings, debt/capital ratio...there are many others
  - Operating Margin
  - Capital expenditures

  - Collectively these tell a financial story – you do not need to know them, but you should have a sense of how things are going financially?
    - If you are asking for $10M and the hospital is losing $50M, likely a tough ask...
The numbers

• We know most initiatives lose money, but some have to make money.

• We look at the portfolio of investments to have an Net Present Value (NPV) \( \geq 0 \).

• One of the key issues is RISK – who bears it where and when in the length of the initiative.
  – So outline where, when the risks occur and who owns them and how you will work to mitigate these and other risks throughout the initiative.
Capital Budget process – Timing matters

- When is the budget cycle? How does it work at your hospital
  - Harder to ask for money if the budget was just approved last month.

- The capital budget process is complicated and time consuming, but relevant...you’ll likely need to deal with this.

- Remember others are requesting $$$ - there is competition for money
Capital budget decision making (template)

Capital budget Committee (sr. Leadership)

Clinical program development (COO, MD’s, RN’s, others)

Infrastructure - IT, real estate, facilities management (COO, CFO, others)

Special projects – EMR, new hospital...Sr. clinical and institutional leadership
The requesting individual

- The “subjective” component of decision making

- Is the requester credible?

- Have they done it before and succeeded?
  - The best predictor of the future is the past.

- Is this truly benefiting the organization, or is this just a “pet project” of the individual?
The individual requestor (you)

• You have to be honest with yourself
  – What is your track record?
  – Best to start with small projects, then to bigger ones....graded responsibility, just like residency (your first case is not a transplant!)
  – Be transparent

• Vet your presentation with some colleagues and folks with whom you will be impacting.
  – So if you are proposing expanding your program (code word “turf”) executives will want to understand where all of the constituents are on your proposal.
What are your strengths

• Providers bring a lot to the table:

  – Patients = volume = money

  – Information – your information is much better that the executives

  – Ability to implement – you are the only ones who can implement a clinically based initiative

  – Collectively these actions will help build the hospitals brand.
When you leave the room

• Here are the basic questions we ask:
  
  – Does this project/initiative make strategic sense?
  – Was the presentation legitimate/credible or BS?
  – Can we actually execute on this initiative?
  – Are you the right person/team to get it done?
  – What are the other initiatives we have that are similar can they be combined?
  – Are the finances as presented reliable/credible?
  – What are the politics of this decision?
    • What happens if we say No or Yes – both answers have implications
Summary

– Be prepared

– Be forthright

– Be persistent

– Write it down and plan on following through
QI Projects

Covenant HealthCare
Sujal Patel, Deb Falkenberg
MTQIP Hospital Specific Indicator:
ED-ICU LOS
The Problem

- We identified that our ED-ICU LOS was higher than expected
- We reviewed our 2009-2011 data to identify the baseline
- We set our goal to decrease it by 30 minutes
**Intervention (s)**

- Added to monthly Trauma Scorecard
- Keystone ICU Meetings
- Critical Care Director
- NTICU Manager
- ED Managers
- ED/Trauma Director
- CNO
- TPOPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED-ICU LOS (goal decrease by 15min)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome (Results)
ED-ICU by Year

ED to ICU in Hours:Minutes
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Outcome (Results)  
ED-ICU by Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6North opened, 5 CC beds added</td>
<td>Very high, up to 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SICU Renovation, Down 7 CC beds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ED-ICU LOS: Activation Level by Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>3:35</td>
<td>3:06</td>
<td>3:41</td>
<td>4:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>4:46</td>
<td>3:42</td>
<td>3:38</td>
<td>4:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing ED-ICU LOS: Activation Level by Quarter]
Sustaining The Change

What Worked
- Adding to Scorecard
- Reporting out at TPOPP
- Distributing to CC Director/NTICU Manager
- Distributing to ECC Manager
- Adding CC Surge Beds for throughput

What Didn’t
- High CC/Hospital Census
- Renovating SICU, eliminating surge capacity for CC
- Holding transfer for testing
- Holding transfer for orders
- Holding transfer for transport (bed not ready)
Future Directions

- Break data into smaller elements
  - ED-ICU LOS for Level 1 Activations
  - ED-ICU LOS for Level II Activations
  - As well as overall ED-ICU LOS
  - Break data into smaller elements and analyze
    - Look for opportunities in ED throughput
    - Look for opportunities in CC throughput
      - Time of DC out of ICU to TTA in stepdown
      - Evaluate need for NT progressive unit
QI Projects

Detroit Receiving Hospital
Anna Ledgerwood, Markyta Armstrong-Goldman
Emergency Department LOS for Trauma ICU throughput

Dr. A. Ledgerwood, M.D., TPM & M. Armstrong-Goldman, RN, TPC
Detroit Receiving Hospital
The Problem

- Trending of prolonged ED LOS – over 6hrs to 12 hrs - noticed in the weekly PIPS Trauma Rounds meeting while reviewing all the trauma cases in 2012.
- Issue became a standing topic for monitoring and reporting in the monthly PIPS Trauma Systems Meetings in 2012.
- 2013 - ED LOS was discussed in weekly trauma rounds, with a focus on ICU cases with ED LOS times greater than 4hrs - time of arrival to time of departure from ED.
Intervention(s)

- ED LOS discussed in detail at weekly trauma rounds to identify issues/barriers for resolution/loop closure.
- Issues with prolonged ED or hospital LOS with trauma cases are reported to the attending physician on record and/or department head, and VPMA by the Trauma Program Medical Director.
- Trauma Program Coordinator was added to daily am “huddle meetings” and bi-monthly hospital administration Patient Throughput meetings to report issues discussed in trauma rounds regarding ED LOS of ICU trauma cases.
Outcome (Results)

2012 & 2013 Year-End-Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Year-end Average</th>
<th>2013 Year-end-Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICU w/in 2hrs</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU w/in 4hrs</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn w/in ICU 2hrs</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn w/in ICU 4hrs</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a confidential professional/peer review and quality improvement document of the DMC. It is protected from disclosure pursuant to one or more of the provisions of MCL 331.531, MCL 331.533, MCL 330.1143a and other state and federal laws. Unauthorized disclosure or duplication is absolutely prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, immediately contact the sender and destroy the copy format.
Sustaining The Change

**Changes**
- Increases awareness of the issue and its impact on care and bed availability throughout the hospital
- Quicker movement to move patients from ICU to acute care or discharge
- Streamlining processes to improve efficiency and communication

**Barriers/Challenges**
- Construction renovations that decreased the number of physical beds available
- Physician Decision making and changing of decisions.
- Institution of new processes and limited resources – changes and staffing cuts
Future Directions

- Multiple variables and barriers/challenges exist that must be addressed on a global issue within the hospital system.
- Most of these global variances have been determined to be outside the scope and authority of the trauma program.
- The Trauma Program Coordinator and Trauma Program Medical Director will continue current efforts to assist hospital administration in improving patient throughput of the trauma and surgical patients.
QI Projects

Henry Ford Hospital
Jerry Stassinopoulos, Beth Fasbinder
MTQIP LOS QI Project

Henry Ford Hospital
MTQIP LOS Data 2010
Discharge Rounds

- Daily on general practice unit
- Multidisciplinary
  - Nursing
  - Acute Care Surgeon
  - Trauma Services
  - PT/OT
  - Case Management
# Data Collection Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRN:</th>
<th>INSURED: Y / N</th>
<th>DATE READY FOR DISCHARGE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INITIALS:</td>
<td>ROOM#</td>
<td>ADMIT DATE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT/OT REC's:</td>
<td>PT/OT REC's:</td>
<td>PT/OT REC's:</td>
<td>PT/OT REC's:</td>
<td>PT/OT REC's:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELAY</th>
<th>DELAY</th>
<th>DELAY</th>
<th>DELAY</th>
<th>DELAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT/OT</td>
<td>PT/OT</td>
<td>PT/OT</td>
<td>PT/OT</td>
<td>PT/OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Mgmt</td>
<td>Case Mgmt</td>
<td>Case Mgmt</td>
<td>Case Mgmt</td>
<td>Case Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed Placement</td>
<td>Bed Placement</td>
<td>Bed Placement</td>
<td>Bed Placement</td>
<td>Bed Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NOTES | NOTES | NOTES | NOTES | NOTES |
Reasons for Delay

- Case Mgmt
- PT/OT
- Placement
- Insurance
- Family
- Patient

- Failure
  - Team
  - Process
  - Other
    - Ambulance
    - Consult

- Rehab Coordinator
MTQIP LOS Data 2012
QI Projects

McLaren Macomb Hospital
Douglas Paulk, Sue Schafer
ED to ICU LOS

PI Initiative MTQIP
McLaren Macomb
Douglas Paulk, DO, TMD
Susan Schafer, RN, MSN, TPM
The Problem

ED to ICU / Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ED LOS</th>
<th>AVG ISS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process Change

FLOW CHART:

PRE-HOSPITAL INJURY

ER

TRAUMA TEAM ACTIVATION

NO Trauma team activation

ADMIT TO ICU

- Call to ICU charge nurse by surgery attending or resident for bed assignment
- Provide report, and communicate expectations upon arrival to ICU re: lines, vent., meds, etc.

- ICU charge nurse at pager # 1304 will assign bed, unless circumstances prevent admission, which will be communicated to the physician
- Charge nurse notifies bed coordinator of bed assignment and alerts ICU resident on pager # 0300
  ***Night shift / weekends – ICU charge will inform admitting of bed assignment
- Bed coordinator or admitting will inform the ED of bed placement
- Triage per ICU triage protocol as needed for admission. May include attending to attending communication

ALGORITHM FOR TRAUMA PATIENTS Admitted to ICU

- Surgery Resident / Attending accompanies patient to ICU
- Orders written, appropriate care rendered

03/18/2011
Interventions

- Education RE: TTA criteria

- “WHY” critical patients to ICU quickly:
  - Better for patient care
  - Off load the ED staff
  - Maintain “ready” perception in ED for EMS

- Future - Review Trauma Activation Criteria
  - Include geriatric population
    - Fall From Standing
    - Age > 65
    - Anticoagulation therapy
Outcome (Results)

MTQIP ED to ICU Time Oct / Jan 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ED LOS &lt; 3</th>
<th>ED LOS &gt; 3</th>
<th>Total to ICU</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Not Activated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED LOS &lt; 3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED LOS &gt; 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ED LOS &lt; 3hrs</th>
<th>ED LOS &gt; 3 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total to ICU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activated</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Act.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome (Results)

MTQIP ED to ICU Time Feb / May 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ED LOS &lt; 3</th>
<th>ED LOS &gt; 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total to ICU</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activated</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evals / Consults</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outcome (Results)

### MTQIP ED to ICU Time June / Sept 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ED LOS &lt; 3</th>
<th>ED LOS &gt; 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total to ICU</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activated</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evals / Consults</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total to ICU**: 81
- **Activated**: 57
- **Evals / Consults**: 24

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ED LOS &lt; 3</th>
<th>ED LOS &gt; 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total to ICU</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activated</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evals / Consults</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustaining The Change

What Worked:

- ED to ICU algorithm
- Education:
  - Attendings
  - Residents
  - Nursing

Obstacles:

- CPOE – June ‘13
- June / July – new residents
- ICU nurses:
  - New ICU manager
  - Need to educate
- Better documentation for evals / consults
Future Directions

- Measure Trauma Activations ED – ICU
- Revise H & P:
  - Include time of notification when consulted
  - Include time of arrival when consulted
- Review Trauma Activation Criteria
  - Include geriatric population
    - Fall From Standing
    - Age > 65
    - Anticoagulation therapy
Questions??
QI Projects

Oakwood Dearborn Hospital
James Wagner, Barb Ferrari
ED to ICU Placement

James Wagner, MD
Barb Ferrari, RN, MBA

Oakwood Dearborn
The Problem

• ED boarding is associated with higher mortality and hospital length of stay
• On-going resuscitation is more appropriate in the ICU setting
• Our goal is to have the highest level activations placed within 2 hours of arrival
Intervention (s)

- Collaborated with ICU to develop a process for rapid placement of trauma patients
- ICU on the activation pager
- Review of all cases going to the ICU for delays
- ICU comes to ED to coordinate care/communication on highest level activations
- Placement dependent on bed availability:
  - Open Bed-Priority to trauma patient
  - ICU Full- Every 12hrs potential transfers out are identified.
Outcome (Results)

**Time to ICU-Overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Report</th>
<th>2nd Report</th>
<th>3rd Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time to ICU-Highest Activation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustaining The Change

• Having an empty bed available allowed placement quickly.

• We were able to get the patient from CT to the bed with no delays.

• Not having a bed available created delays.

• Open unit design fragments the ability to move pts. out quickly.
Future Directions

• Currently doing an analysis regarding high level activation timing. Possibly “holding” a bed during peak need.
• Moving towards a closed ICU
• Suggestions?
Break
Diving Into MTQIP Data

Mercy Health Saint Mary’s – Grand Rapids
Wayne Vander Kolk, MD
Failure to Rescue

• Do WE really suck?
• Do the statistics suck?

Wayne Vander Kolk MD FACS
St Mary's Medical Center
Grand Rapids
November 1, 2011 – October 31, 2012

- **Mercy Health Saint Mary’s**
- **All MTQIP**
Time Period: 11/1/2011 to 10/31/2012

Failure to Rescue

% versus Trauma Center

Year Range: 2011-2014
Outcomes Overview - Failure to Rescue
Complications by Severity - Grade II

Provider: Saint Mary’s Health Care, Period: 11/01/2011 - 10/31/2012, Peer Group: MTQIP - All,
Report Date: 12/20/2013
Complications by Severity - Any Complications

[Graph showing complication rates with a focus on Saint Mary's Health Care compared to the peer group.]
Failure to Rescue

• Definitions:
  – FTR In the setting of Grade II or III complication the patient expires
  – Failure The lack of success or the omission of an expected or required action
  – Rescue the act of saving from distress
The statistics

- St Mary's
  - Off the caterpillar graph
  - We were the one on the bad side
Initial Reaction

• Unbelief
• Hemmila screwed up the math
• We need a new registrar
• Must be the program managers fault
• Is it the trauma directors patients?
  – Probably my partners!
  – Probably my partners covering my patients!
Patient One

- 19 y.o male involved in mvc
- Arrival GCS of 3
- Some free fluid seen on the initial CT scan
- Expected mortality of .52
- Probability of survival 22%
Patient One

• Taken for emergent craniotomy
• Later in the morning within the first 8 hours not improving acidosis
• Repeat CT shows more fluid abdomen and tiny amount of free air
• Emergent laparotomy shows jejunal injury
Patient One

- Spent 15 days in hospital without significant neurological improvement and family withdrew support
- MTQIP Complications
  - Unplanned return to OR
  - UTI
    - No evidence of UTI
    - an intern’s note bringing up the possibility
Patient Two

- 24 y.o female hit by car
- Arrival GCS of 3
- Taken to operating room for emergent craniotomy
- Initiation of massive transfusion during surgery
Patient Two

• During craniotomy
  – She had basically divided her brain in two hemispheres traumatically with a corresponding injury to central sinus
  – Massive blood loss during surgery
  – Initiation of massive transfusion
  – Period of asystole responded to brief period of CPR
Patient Two

- Expected mortality of 0.11
- Probability of survival 48%
- Patient with massive brain swelling and family withdrew support less than 24 hours later
- MTQIP complication
  - CPR
Patient 3

- 30 year old pedestrian struck by car
- ISS of 33
- Severe closed head injury
- Placement of ICP monitor
Patient 3

- Patient had aggressive support.
- Patient failed to progress and with the assistance of palliative care family withdrew support.
- Expected mortality of 15%.
- Expected survival of 96%.
Patient 4

- Patient a pedestrian hit by car
- Patient sustained a tib/fib fracture.
- Patient had repair of fracture and POD #1 on trip to bathroom had a fatal PE and died
- Patient on anticoagulation from arrival
Patient 4

- Expected mortality of 0%
- Expected survival of 100%
What did I learn?

• I love the program
  – It is easy to play with
  – The graphs are helpful
  – It is easy to narrow the focus on your searches.
What did I learn?

• My initial reactions
  – I have to clear all complications before they go in
  – The definitions need reworking
  – This is not accurate reflection of our practice
Mortality November 2011 – October 2012
ISS 5-15
Mortality November 2011 – October 2012
ISS 16-25
Mortality November 2011 – October 2012
ISS 26-35
Mortality November 2011 – October 2012
ISS > 35
Mortality November 2011 – October 2012
All ISS
Complications Grade 2
ISS 5-15

Complications by Severity - Grade II
Provider: Saint Mary’s Health Care, Age: ALL, No Signs of Life: Include DOAs, ALL, Cohort: Cohort 1 (All), ISS: 5 to 15, Period: 11/01/2011 - 10/31/2012, Peer Group: MTQIP - All, Report Date: 01/29/2014
Complications Grade 3
ISS 5-15
Complications Grade 2
ISS 16-24

Complications by Severity - Grade II
Provider: Saint Mary’s Health Care, Age: All, No Signs of Life: Include DOAs, All, Cohort: Cohort 1 (All), ISS: 16 to 24, Period: 11/01/2011 - 10/31/2012, Peer Group: MTQIP - All, Report Date: 01/29/2014
Complications Grade 3
ISS 16-24
Complications Grade 2
ISS 25-35

Complications by Severity - Grade II
Complications Grade 3
ISS 25-35
Complications Grade 2
ISS > 35
Complications Grade 3
ISS > 35
What did I learn?

• Final reaction
  – I like the complications (obviously not for patients)
  – I can see this tool very helpful in tracking tendencies
    – i.e. are we missing injuries with craniotomies
    – Are we late with massive transfusions
    – Are we withdrawing support too often
      » Age related
      » Outcomes related
Conclusion

• Will have to figure out a way in the program to track that which is important for me
• Grade II complications seem to be the area that we in Michigan should attack with the most vigor
• Will we be able to customize our views to provide report cards.
  – Can I look at partners with care subdivided by injury patterns, ISS, and etc.
MTQIP Data

Mark Hemmila
Outcomes Overview - Dead
Provider: University of Michigan Health System, Age: ALL, ISS: ALL, ALL, Cohort: Cohort 2 (Admit to Trauma Service), No Signs of Life: Exclude DOAs, Period: Program To Date, Peer Group: MTQIP - All, Report Date: 01/27/2014

- U 6.2%
- A 5.1%
- U 4.8%
- A 4.6%
Outcomes Overview - Serious Complications

Provider: University of Michigan Health System, Age: ALL, ISS: ALL, ALL, Cohort: Cohort 2 (Admit to Trauma Service), No Signs of Life: Exclude DOAs, Period: Program To Date, Peer Group: MTQIP - All, Report Date: 01/27/2014

- U 16.5%
- A 14.0%
- U 11.6%
- A 11.0%

Graph showing trends from 2008 to 2013 with data points for University of Michigan Health System and MTQIP - All.
Failure to Rescue

- Failure to Rescue
  - Severity Grade 2 or 3 Complication
  - FTR = Dead with Severity Grade 2 or 3 Complication / N with Severity Grade 2 or 3 Complication
  - 5/1/2011 to 4/30/2013
VAP

- 5/1/11 to 4/30/13
- Cohort 2 (Admit to Trauma)
- Exclude patients with no signs of life
- Exclude patients with Vent Day < 1
Brain Injury

- 5/1/11 to 4/30/13
- Cohort 1
- Mechanism = Blunt
- AIS Head ≥ 1
- Exclude if ED GCS>8 and TBI GCS>8
- Exclude patients with no signs of life
- Exclude patients transferred late (Direct admit)
- Procedure Data – (ICD-9)
  - Ventriculostomy (2.20, 1.26, 1.28)
  - Intraparenchymal pressure monitor (1.10)
  - Brain tissue oxygen monitor (1.16)
  - Brain operation (1.18, 1.24, 1.25, 1.31, 1.39, 1.51, 1.53, 1.59, 2.11, 2.13, 2.92)
Intervention for Head Injury

- Eligible = N - Alive w/o intervention - Dead and monitor withheld for reason
- Eligible and no intervention = N - Alive w/o intervention - Alive with intervention - Dead with intervention - Dead and monitor withheld for reason
- Timely = Intervention within 8 hrs of arrival to ED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trauma Center</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dead</th>
<th>Alive w/o Intervent</th>
<th>Alive with Intervent</th>
<th>Dead w/o Intervent</th>
<th>Dead with Intervent</th>
<th>Dead and Monitor Withheld</th>
<th>Eligible &amp; no Intervent</th>
<th>Eligible w/o Intervent</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>% Dead / N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>718</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blood Product Ratio in first 4 hrs if ≥ 4 uPRBCs

Trauma Center

Ratio of PRBC/FFP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>recordno</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>ed_arrdate</th>
<th>mech</th>
<th>ed_bp</th>
<th>iss</th>
<th>prbc4</th>
<th>ffp4</th>
<th>plt4</th>
<th>cryo4</th>
<th>ratio4</th>
<th>prbc24</th>
<th>ffp24</th>
<th>plt24</th>
<th>cryo24</th>
<th>ratio24</th>
<th>txa</th>
<th>dead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47934</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4-Jul-11</td>
<td>Penetrating</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48029</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16-Jul-11</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48050</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19-Jul-11</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48054</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19-Jul-11</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48214</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15-Aug-11</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48387</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11-Sep-11</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48628</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1-Nov-11</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48679</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9-Nov-11</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48701</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12-Nov-11</td>
<td>Penetrating</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48847</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19-Dec-11</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49085</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8-Feb-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49131</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17-Feb-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49263</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20-Mar-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49264</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20-Mar-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49319</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2-Apr-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49335</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4-Apr-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49402</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21-Apr-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49462</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3-May-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49530</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17-May-12</td>
<td>Penetrating</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49531</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18-May-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49532</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19-May-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49820</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5-Jul-12</td>
<td>Penetrating</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49841</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6-Jul-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49878</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14-Jul-12</td>
<td>Penetrating</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49932</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22-Jul-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49977</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29-Jul-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50046</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12-Aug-12</td>
<td>Penetrating</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50160</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3-Sep-12</td>
<td>Penetrating</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50187</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9-Sep-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50431</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25-Oct-12</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VTE

- **Type Prophylaxis**
  - None
  - Heparin SQ
  - LMWH SQ

- **Timing**
  - Timely (< 48 hrs after admission)
## VTE Prophylaxis Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTE Prophylaxis Type</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4354</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤48 Hours</td>
<td>3505</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heparin</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMWH</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;48 Hours</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heparin</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMWH</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 9057 100.0 487 100.0

## VTE Prophylaxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTE Prophylaxis Type</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤48 Hours</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heparin</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMWH</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 154 1.7 12 2.5 129 1.4 9 1.8 34 0.4 5 1.0
New Data Elements for 2014 (MTQIP)

- Responding/Admitting Surgeon
- Crystalloid
  - Only patients receiving blood in first 4 hrs
  - Total IVF in 0-4hrs
  - Total IVF in 0-24hrs
  - Conversion table for colloids
  - Nearest liter
- Complication
  - Renal Insufficiency
Future Directions

- Data Transfer
- Need to run faster
- Currently lags 6-9 months
- Solution
  - DI xml
  - iSend
  - Completed cases, modified
- Target completion Summer 2014
  - DI (NTRACS, V5)
  - CDM ?
  - Lancet ?
Future Directions

Product Suite: NTRACS, MTQIP Module, DI TQIP Module

Copyright © 2013 Digital Innovation Inc. All rights reserved.
Future Directions

- ICD-9 to ICD-10
  - January 1, 2015
  - AIS 2005

- TQIP State Report
  - Michigan as a Center
  - May Meeting
CME Clarification

• Physician CME
  – Todays meeting 3.75 AMA PRA Category 1 Credits
• Nurse CME
  – CME credit may be used by nurses for re-licensure
• Registrars
  – Certificate of participation with hours listed
MTQIP Site Visits

• Dr. Hemmila & J. Mikhail
• Purpose
  – Customer Service Visit
  – Face to face
  – Identify concerns
  – Answer questions
  – Discuss MTQIP reports
  – How can MTQIP improve?

13 Completed to Date:
Beaumont
Borgess
Botsford
Bronson
Detroit Receiving
Genesys
Henry Ford
Hurley
Munson
McL Oakland
Sinai Grace
Sparrow
St Joseph Ann Arbor
2014 Site Specific QI Reports

- Meaningful QI issue to you
- Complements
  - ACS Verification
  - Hospital QI efforts
- Everyone should be involved:
  - Surgeons, TPM’s, Registrars
- Ongoing data collection
- Submit data 3 times a year
  April 1, September 1, January 1
- Periodically present at MTQIP

Past Projects
1. Anticoagulant reversal
2. Complications
3. Length of stay
4. Clinical management
   ➢ New project for 2014?
Best Practices

Learning From Others

Identifying Positive Deviants...
Abbreviated Abstract
for ISS<5

THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX
The 38% ....
Abbreviated Abstract

• Ad Hoc Committee
  1. Kelly Burns, Registrar, Spectrum Health
  2. Kathy Kempf, TPM, St. Joseph Mercy
  3. Donna Tommelein, Registrar, St. Joseph Mercy
  4. Cece Roiter, Registrar, Univ of Michigan
  5. Liz Sarwar, Registrar, Bronson
  6. Penny Stevens, TPM, Sparrow
  7. Judy Mikhail, Manager, MTQIP
Goal

• Determine feasibility of using an abbreviated abstract for patients with ISS<5
• **Without** sacrificing program integrity
• Still meeting the needs of stakeholders
  – ACS (NTDB, TQIP)
  – State Registry
  – Hospital Administration
  – Injury prevention, PI, Research, etc...
Surveillance
Injury Prevention
Resource Utilization
Trauma System Review

100%

38%

quality Improvement
Complications
Failure to Rescue

62%
Key National Stakeholders

- Melanie Neal
  - NTDB Manager, ACS
- Michael Nance, MD
  - Chair Quality & Data Resources Subcommittee ACS
- Clay Mann, PhD
  - Epidemiologist, Univ. of Utah
- Rob Seesholtz
  - Chair, Data Managers Council National Assoc. State EMS Officials
- Heidi Hotz, MSN
  - Immediate Past President, American Trauma Society
- Amy Koestner, MSN
  - Society of Trauma Nurses, Liaison to the ACS
ISS < 5 Examples

- Closed FX of UE and LE (except femur)
- Concussion with LOC less than 1 hour
- Brain contusions (tiny)
- Minor lacerations
- Facial fractures
- Abdominal contusions, minor lacerations
- Spinal FX without cord involvement
NTDB Validator Minimum Requirement

• All data points in data dictionary required to pass NTDS Validator
• Common sense approach
• **Step 1: Stratify by ISS**
  – No MTQIP or TQIP data points
• **Step 2: Set your net-how tight?**
• Analogous to non-surgical admits
• Must fit your program needs
• Options:
  A. Procedures na
  B. Complications na
  C. Co-Morbidities na
  - With Exemptions:
    - Deaths
    - Transfers
    - Major filter failures
      - Transfer back to ICU
      - LOS greater than X
  - Incorporate into PI Plan
  - Review annually
2014 BCBSM Hospital Performance Metrics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Points Existing Participants</th>
<th>Points New 2014 Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATION (70%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Data Submission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>On time 3 of 3 times</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On time 2 of 3 times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On time 1 of 3 times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meeting Participation – Surgeon Lead</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Participated in 3 of 3 meetings</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in 2 of 3 meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in 1 of 3 meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No participation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meeting Participation – Trauma Manager/Registrar (Avg)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Participated in 3 of 3 meetings</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in 2 of 3 meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in 1 of 3 meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No participation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Site Specific Quality Improvement Project Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project data submitted</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project data not submitted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Surgeon Lead Presents MTQIP Reports at Hospital Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Presented at 3 meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presented at 2 meetings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presented at 1 meeting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Signed attestation required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Data Accuracy</td>
<td>Visit #1</td>
<td>Visit #2 or More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 star validation</td>
<td>0-4.5%</td>
<td>0-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 star validation</td>
<td>4.6-5.5%</td>
<td>4.6-5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 star validation</td>
<td>5.6-8.0%</td>
<td>5.6-7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 star validation</td>
<td>8.1-9.0%</td>
<td>7.1-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 star validation</td>
<td>&gt; 9%</td>
<td>&gt; 8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Massive Transfusion</strong> (defined as &gt;4 u PRBC in 1st 4 hrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean PRBC to Plasma Ratio for 1st 4 hrs of admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 - 2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Timely VTE Prophylaxis</strong> (&lt; 48 hours of admission)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 50%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points Possible** | **100** | **70**
Guidelines/Protocols

- Increased significance
- Tackle variation in care
- Integrate into PI
- MTQIP can help
Future Meetings

- **Wednesday May 14, 2014**
  - Location: Petoskey

- **Tuesday June 3, 2014**
  - Location: Ann Arbor
  - Registrar’s

- **Tuesday October 14, 2014**
  - Location: Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti
Conclusion

- **CME**
  - On way out

- **MTQIP Reports**
  - On way out

- **Evaluations**
  - Fill out and turn in