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Presentation Overview

Background
- Initial observations presented by Press Ganey Associates at ESRI National GIS Healthcare Conference 2014 resulted in collaboration with similar study developed at Kaiser.

National Study (Press Ganey)
- A broad look at the impact of proximity on patient experience scores in hospitals across the United States. Analysis of survey data from Press Ganey may help hospital leaders understand the perceived relationship between survey response locations and scores.

Case Study (Kaiser Permanente)
- Kaiser Permanente will share insights, findings and implications from a regional health system’s experiences using patient satisfaction scores and location information.
US Hospitals and Drive Time: Does the Commute Matter?
Performance Scores and Drive Time

- **HCAHPS Composite Scores**
  - 71% • 72% • 73% • 74% • 74% • 75% • 76%
  - Drive Time Category (Minutes):
    - 0 to 5
    - 5 to 10
    - 10 to 15
    - 15 to 30
    - 30 to 60
    - 60 to 120
    - 120 to 240

- **Hospital Overall Rating Scores**
  - 67% • 69% • 70% • 71% • 72% • 75% • 77%
  - Drive Time Category (Minutes):
    - 0 to 5
    - 5 to 10
    - 10 to 15
    - 15 to 30
    - 30 to 60
    - 60 to 120
    - 120 to 240

- **Likelihood to Recommend Scores**
  - 71% • 73% • 75% • 76% • 78% • 86% • 82%
  - Drive Time Category (Minutes):
    - 0 to 5
    - 5 to 10
    - 10 to 15
    - 15 to 30
    - 30 to 60
    - 60 to 120
    - 120 to 240

Variation by Score Category

Neighbors
Very High = 32%
Very Low = 29%

Commuters
Very High = 38%
Very Low = 23%
Observations

- Top performing hospitals are more likely to be recommended by patients who commute longer distances.
- Patients with longer drive times appear to be less likely to return very low performance scores and more likely to return very high performance scores.

Hypothesis

Recommendations and higher performance scores returned by patients traveling greater distances are due to brand loyalty.
Variation in Recommendation
Recommendation Scores Show Considerable Variation

• Top Hospitals receive the highest recommendation from over 90% of their patients, providing an advantage in loyalty, branding, and other organizational outcomes.

Mean = 70.95%
Standard Deviation = 9.12
N = 2,869

Hospital Compare® data for facilities having 300 or more responses - year ending September 2013.
The Sources of Recommendation (4W’s)

- **What**
  - Types of Care Delivered

- **Well**
  - The Quality of Care Delivered

- **Who**
  - Receives and Delivers Care

- **Where**
  - Care is Delivered

What “W” is Most Important to Recommendation?

Based on regression analytics, quality of care (how well) is the most important source of recommendation.

Quality of Care is also the most easily controlled factor by the organization.
### Hospital Recommendation Rates by Performance and Local Alternatives

**Observation:** Top performing hospitals are more likely to be recommended when the patient has more alternatives from which to choose.

#### Would Definitely Recommend Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCAHPS Composite</th>
<th>How many other hospitals are available within a 10 mile radius of the reference hospital?</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2 or 3</th>
<th>4 to 6</th>
<th>7 or more</th>
<th>mean range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>mean range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile</td>
<td>Score Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.9 to 65.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.9 to 67.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.0 to 69.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>67.0 to 70.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>70.5 to 71.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>71.5 to 72.3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>72.4 to 73.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>73.5 to 74.6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>74.8 to 76.6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.8 to 88.9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications

- Large medical facilities appear to receive **higher performance scores from commuters**, who travel longer distances seeking premier medical services despite the pain, expense, danger and disruption of medical travel.
- Providers are extending the geographic boundaries of service areas, enabling commuters through **telemedicine** and **satellite facilities**.
- As providers seek to mitigate the burden of medical travel, care must be taken not to **dilute the brand** through actual or perceived negative impact to the quality of remotely delivered care.
- Locational analysis of commute patterns and associated **Patient Experience** and **Patient Reported Outcome** measures can be used to monitor quality and perception of geographically extended service areas.
Case Study: Medical Office Visit Patient Satisfaction Survey and Distance

Dru G. Metz, MHPA
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Kaiser Permanente Northwest Region

- Portland, OR and SW Washington
- 12,000+ Employees, MDs, Dentists
- 520,000+ Medical Plan Members
- 230,000+ Dental Plan Members
- 2 Kaiser Permanente Hospitals
- 33 Medical Offices
- 17 Dental Offices
Exploring Driving Distance and Medical Office Visit (MOV) Survey Results

Purpose and Objective

- The Press Ganey Medical Office Visit Medical Practice Survey provides patient satisfaction results and feedback to Kaiser Permanente Northwest in order to ensure we are meeting our patient expectations and support regional planning efforts.

- Explore the potential for a relationship between existing MOV Survey questions and the distance a patient resides from their medical office visit site.

- Limitations:
  - Current MOV Survey questions don’t specifically address the perceived convenience of a facilities location or access to care.
  - Confounding variables may impact any perceived correlation.
  - Survey is only KPNW patients who visited a Kaiser Permanente specialty care location, so response and results only representative of the Kaiser Permanente patient population.
Specialty Care MOV Scores by Distance

% Very Good (Rated 5 on 5 point scale)

Inconsistent Trend
- Ability to Get Desired Appointment
- Convenience of Office Hours
- *Not good proxy questions for convenience of location?*

Consistent Trend
- Likelihood to Recommend the Practice
- Likelihood to Recommend your Care Provider
- *Selection bias for patients willing to drive for Kaiser Permanente care?*
Patient Expectation for Routine vs Specialized Care?

- Key questions we hoped to address with this research is does certain visit types have different patient expectations for convenience and access?

- Optometry and Ophthalmology are examples of routine versus specialized eye care where we might expect to see a difference in patient expectations.
Potential Implications and Next Steps

Potential Applications and Implications

- Eventually help understand the patient satisfaction impact of service location changes.
- Patient satisfaction with convenience of care is becoming more critical.
  - Narrow Networks
  - Accountable Care Organizations
  - Healthcare mergers and acquisitions
  - Outcomes based reimbursement

Next Steps for Kaiser Permanente

- Explore impact of brand perception on results.
- Test impact of service delivery site location changes.
- **Future**: Is there potential for predictive modeling? Developing a projected “return on patient satisfaction”? 