



MBQIP Quality Measures Annual Report

Wisconsin - 2021

Key Findings

- **Patient Safety/Inpatient Measures:** The Patient Safety/Inpatient reporting rate of 100.0% for Wisconsin in 2021 was higher than the national reporting rate of 93.5%. Compared with all CAHs nationally, CAHs in Wisconsin scored significantly better on 1 measure, significantly worse on 0 measures, and did not have significantly different performance on 1 measure.
- **Outpatient Measures:** The Outpatient reporting rate of 94.8% for Wisconsin in 2021 was higher than the national reporting rate of 88.2%. Compared with all CAHs nationally, CAHs in Wisconsin scored significantly better on 1 measure, significantly worse on 2 measures, and did not have significantly different performance on 1 measure.
- **Patient Engagement Measures:** The HCAHPS reporting rate of 98.3% for Wisconsin in 2021 was higher than the national reporting rate of 91.5%. Compared with all CAHs nationally, CAHs in Wisconsin scored significantly better on 7 measures, significantly worse on 0 measures, and did not have significantly different performance on 3 measures.
- **Care Transitions Measures:** The EDTC reporting rate of 89.7% for Wisconsin in 2021 was lower than the national reporting rate of 92.6%. Compared with all CAHs nationally, CAHs in Wisconsin scored significantly better on 1 measure, significantly worse on 1 measure, and did not have significantly different performance on 7 measures.

Contents

Background	Page 2
Data & Approach	Page 2
Patient Safety/Inpatient Domain	
• Reporting	Page 3
• Performance	Page 5
Outpatient Domain	
• Reporting	Page 7
• Performance	Page 9
Patient Engagement Domain	
• Reporting	Page 11
• Performance	Page 13
Care Transitions Domain	
• Reporting	Page 15
• Performance	Page 17
Appendix	Page 19

Background

The Medicare Beneficiary Quality Improvement Program (MBQIP) focuses on quality improvement efforts in the 45 states that participate in the Medicare Rural Hospital Flexibility (Flex) Program. Through Flex, MBQIP supports more than 1,350 small hospitals certified as rural Critical Access Hospitals (CAHs) in voluntarily reporting quality measures that are aligned with those collected by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) and other Federal programs. The Flex Monitoring Team (FMT) has been producing state-level annual reports on quality measures for over a decade, and this annual report from the FMT focuses specifically on MBQIP measures using data collected under the four MBQIP domains: Patient Safety/Inpatient, Outpatient, Patient Engagement, and Care Transitions.

Data and Approach

The data used for this report are reported to CMS and extracted from QualityNet, or to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) annual survey. Emergency Department Transfer Communication (EDTC) data used for this report are from the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy (FORHP) as reported by CAHs to State Flex Programs. The data values in this report only include CAHs with a signed MBQIP Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Quality measures included in this report are limited to MBQIP measures, including: eight Patient Safety/Inpatient measures (HCP/IMM-3; Antibiotic Stewardship; CLABSI; CAUTI; SSI:C; SSI:H; MRSA; CDI), four Outpatient measures (OP-2; OP-22; OP-3b; OP-18b), ten Patient Engagement measures (from the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems, or HCAHPS survey), and the Care Transitions (EDTC) measure. The six Healthcare-Associated Infections (HAI) measures (CLABSI; CAUTI; SSI:C; SSI:H; MRSA; CDI) are part of the MBQIP program, but not in the “core” measure set, and instead are a part of the “additional” measures set which is not required. For each of the four domains, there are two sections of analyses: reporting and performance. Data are aggregated to the state and national levels. In all domains, data are not displayed for measures where the aggregated state or national data include fewer than 25 patients/cases/surveys.

Reporting identifies the number of CAHs reporting in each domain, and CAHs were considered reporting for any domain if they reported data in any quarter for any one measure with a denominator of one or more for that domain (indicating they had at least one patient, case, or survey for the applicable measure). Beginning in Q4 2020, population and sampling data (indicating if CAHs did not have an applicable population for a given measure) were included for measures OP-2, OP-3b, and OP-18b which may affect the number of CAHs reporting for those measures and/or Outpatient reporting totals after that time. Analysis for the HAI measures also included data reported for these 6 measures where CAHs indicated they had a 0 denominator (0 patients in 2021 that would fall under any of these HAI categories). The reporting denominator of all CAHs in the U.S. for 2021 is 1,359 CAHs (the total number of CAHs designated on December 31, 2021), and the reporting numerator includes all CAHs with a signed MBQIP MOU reporting for the specific domain or measure. Please see the Appendix for additional information about the calculation for performance score values and statistical testing in each domain.

Missing or excluded data are indicated in trend figures by a missing data point, and a missing line indicates data are not available for any of the previous three years or the current year. Trend figures are not included for OP-22 (due to low annual variation), HAI measures (due to concerns with SIR calculation for CAHs), or the EDTC measure (due to a lack of multiple years’ data for this measure). For measures OP-2, OP-3b, and OP-18b, in instances where states do not have any hospitals reporting data values greater than 0 (shown by an * in the tables), the trend figures will also have a missing data point for that year.

Benchmarks are included for all measures in this report except the six HAI measures. Benchmarks for HCP/IMM-3, Antibiotic Stewardship, and the EDTC measure are set at 100% to align with the benchmarks used in FORHP’s MBQIP Performance Score (<https://www.ruralcenter.org/resource-library/mbqip-performance-score>). Benchmarks for OP-2, OP-22, OP-3b, and OP-18b are set at the national 90th percentiles of CAHs with MOUs during 2021. Benchmarks used for the HCAHPS measures come from the benchmarks selected for CMS’ Hospital Value-Based Purchasing Program in 2021. HCAHPS Question 19 (patient recommendation) does not have a benchmark as part of these standards, and HCAHPS questions 8 and 9 (quietness and cleanliness) receive a joint benchmark.


Patient Safety/Inpatient Domain

Patient Safety/Inpatient CAH Reporting

Results

The percent of CAHs reporting Patient Safety/Inpatient quality data varied considerably across states. In Wisconsin, 100.0% of 58 CAHs reported data on at least one Patient Safety/Inpatient quality measure in 2021, and Figure 1 displays data for 2018-2021 among CAHs in four groups: those in Wisconsin, all CAHs nationally, other states with a similar number of CAHs as Wisconsin, and other states located in the same Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) geographic region as Wisconsin. Table 1 compares the Patient Safety/Inpatient reporting rates of CAHs in Wisconsin to those located in the other 44 states participating in the Flex Program as well as the rate for all CAHs nationally. The Wisconsin CAH Patient Safety/Inpatient reporting rate of 100.0% ranks #1 nationally. The number of CAHs reporting individual quality measures may differ by measure for several reasons. Some measures only apply to a portion of patients; others exclude patients with contraindications, or only apply to conditions not treated or procedures not performed in some CAHs.

Figure 1: Percentage of CAHs Reporting at Least One Patient Safety/Inpatient Measure



Footnotes:

{1} Listed n values refer to most recent data (2021) only

{2} Group includes states with 40 or more CAHs: IA(82), IL(51), KS(82), MN(77), MT(49), NE(63), OK(40), TX(88)

{3} HRSA Region C includes: IA(82), IL(51), IN(35), KS(82), MI(37), MN(77), MO(35), NE(63), OH(33)

Table 1: State Ranking of CAH Reporting Rates for Patient Safety/Inpatient Quality Measures, 2021

Rank	State	CAHs reporting	% of CAHs	Rank	State	CAHs reporting	% of CAHs
1	Kansas	82	100.0	24	Washington	37	94.9
1	Wisconsin	58	100.0	25	Missouri	33	94.3
1	Illinois	51	100.0	26	Mississippi	30	93.8
1	Indiana	35	100.0	26	Wyoming	15	93.8
1	Colorado	32	100.0		National	1,270	93.5
1	Georgia	30	100.0	28	Kentucky	26	92.9
1	Arkansas	28	100.0	29	Nevada	12	92.3
1	Oregon	25	100.0	29	New Hampshire	12	92.3
1	Maine	16	100.0	31	Michigan	34	91.9
1	Pennsylvania	16	100.0	32	Montana	44	89.8
1	Alaska	13	100.0	33	Hawaii	8	88.9
1	Utah	13	100.0	34	Ohio	29	87.9
1	Vermont	8	100.0	35	Oklahoma	35	87.5
1	South Carolina	4	100.0	35	Arizona	14	87.5
1	Massachusetts	3	100.0	35	Virginia	7	87.5
16	South Dakota	38	97.4	38	New Mexico	9	81.8
17	North Dakota	36	97.3	39	Tennessee	13	81.3
18	California	35	97.2	40	North Carolina	16	80.0
19	Idaho	26	96.3	40	Florida	8	80.0
20	Minnesota	74	96.1	40	Alabama	4	80.0
21	Nebraska	60	95.2	43	Texas	70	79.5
21	West Virginia	20	95.2	44	Louisiana	20	74.1
23	Iowa	78	95.1	45	New York	13	72.2

Patient Safety/Inpatient CAH Performance

Results

Table 2 displays the results for performance of CAHs on core Patient Safety/Inpatient measures for Wisconsin and all CAHs nationally. Compared with all CAHs nationally, CAHs in Wisconsin scored significantly better on 1 measure, significantly worse on 0 measures, and did not have significantly different performance on 1 measure. Figures 2 and 3 show the performance trends for HCP/IMM-3 and Antibiotic Stewardship for Wisconsin and all CAHs nationally between 2018 and 2021.

Table 2: Patient Safety/Inpatient Quality Measure Results in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally, 2021

■ Significantly better than all CAHs nationally
 ■ Significantly worse than all CAHs nationally

Measure	Description	WI CAHs (n=58)		All CAHs (n=1,359)		Benchmark (%)
		CAHs reporting	Performance (%) {1}{2}	CAHs reporting	Performance (%) {2}	
HCP/IMM-3	Healthcare workers given influenza vaccination	50	82.8	984	79.4	100.0
Antibiotic Stewardship	Fulfill antibiotic stewardship core elements	58	94.8	1,157	88.9	100.0

Footnotes:

{1} Rates without highlights were not significantly different from comparable rates in all CAHs nationally.

{2} HCP/IMM-3 is expressed as the percentage of health care workers immunized, and Antibiotic Stewardship is the percentage of CAHs fulfilling all antibiotic stewardship core elements.

† Indicates insufficient data to calculate rate (<25 patients)

Figure 2: HCP/IMM-3 Trends in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally

Healthcare workers given influenza vaccination




Figure 3: Antibiotic Stewardship Trends in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally

CAHs fulfilling the seven antibiotic stewardship core elements




Table 3 displays HAI measures, including SIR performance results. Comparisons to other states are not provided for HAI measures because the majority of states did not meet the conditions for statistical comparisons. Performance trends for HAI measures are also not tracked due to concerns with SIR calculation for CAHs.

Table 3: Healthcare-Associated Infection Measures Results in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally, 2021

Measure	Description	WI CAHs (n=58)		All CAHs (n=1,359)	
		CAHs reporting	SIR {1}	CAHs reporting	SIR
HAI-1	Central-line-associated bloodstream infections (CLABSI)	53	0.7	1,102	0.8
HAI-2	Catheter-associated urinary tract infections (CAUTI)	54	0.7	1,156	0.7
HAI-3	Surgical site infections from colon surgery (SSI:C)	41	0.5	469	0.9
HAI-4	Surgical site infections from abdominal hysterectomy (SSI:H)	41	0.7	434	1.4
HAI-5	Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus Aureus (MRSA) infections	53	1.1	872	0.8
HAI-6	Clostridium difficile (C.diff) intestinal infections	53	0.7	912	0.7

Footnotes:

{1} SIRs are a ratio of the total number of infections observed in 2021 divided by the predicted number of annual infections.

† Indicates insufficient data to calculate SIR

- Indicates no data available for this measure

Note: Significance tests for HAI Measures are not included as statistical tests are not able to be performed on these data.


Outpatient Domain

Outpatient CAH Reporting

Results

The percent of CAHs reporting Outpatient quality data varied considerably across states. In Wisconsin, 94.8% of the 58 CAHs reported data on at least one Outpatient quality measure in 2021, and Figure 4 displays data for 2018-2021 among CAHs in four groups: those in Wisconsin, all CAHs nationally, other states with a similar number of CAHs as Wisconsin, and other states located in the same HRSA geographic region as Wisconsin. Table 4 compares the Outpatient reporting rates of CAHs in Wisconsin to those located in the other 44 states participating in the Flex Program as well as the rate for all CAHs nationally. The Wisconsin CAH Outpatient reporting rate of 94.8% ranks #15 nationally. The number of CAHs reporting individual quality measures may differ by measure for several reasons, other than missing data. Some measures may only apply to a portion of patients; others exclude patients with contraindications, or only apply to conditions not treated or procedures not performed in some CAHs.

Figure 4: Percentage of CAHs Reporting at Least One Outpatient Measure



Footnotes:

{1} Listed n values refer to most recent data (2021) only

{2} Group includes states with 40 or more CAHs: IA(82), IL(51), KS(82), MN(77), MT(49), NE(63), OK(40), TX(88)

{3} HRSA Region C includes: IA(82), IL(51), IN(35), KS(82), MI(37), MN(77), MO(35), NE(63), OH(33)

Table 4: State Ranking of CAH Reporting Rates for Outpatient Quality Measures, 2021

Rank	State	CAHs reporting	% of CAHs	Rank	State	CAHs reporting	% of CAHs
1	Kansas	82	100.0	24	Colorado	29	90.6
1	Michigan	37	100.0		National	1,198	88.2
1	Georgia	30	100.0	25	Oregon	22	88.0
1	New York	18	100.0	26	Tennessee	14	87.5
1	Nevada	13	100.0	26	Virginia	7	87.5
1	New Hampshire	13	100.0	28	South Dakota	34	87.2
1	New Mexico	11	100.0	29	Kentucky	24	85.7
1	Hawaii	9	100.0	30	North Carolina	17	85.0
1	Massachusetts	3	100.0	31	Alaska	11	84.6
10	Minnesota	76	98.7	32	Iowa	68	82.9
11	Arkansas	27	96.4	33	Montana	40	81.6
12	Idaho	26	96.3	34	Arizona	13	81.3
13	Nebraska	60	95.2	35	Florida	8	80.0
13	West Virginia	20	95.2	35	Alabama	4	80.0
15	Wisconsin	55	94.8	37	Washington	31	79.5
16	North Dakota	35	94.6	38	California	28	77.8
17	Maine	15	93.8	39	Illinois	39	76.5
17	Pennsylvania	15	93.8	40	Wyoming	12	75.0
19	Oklahoma	37	92.5	41	Texas	65	73.9
20	Utah	12	92.3	42	Louisiana	18	66.7
21	Indiana	32	91.4	43	Mississippi	20	62.5
21	Missouri	32	91.4	44	Vermont	4	50.0
23	Ohio	30	90.9	44	South Carolina	2	50.0



Outpatient CAH Performance

Results

Tables 5 and 6 display the results for performance of CAHs on Outpatient measures for Wisconsin and all CAHs nationally. Table 6 displays results for median time measures (lower scores, indicating shorter median times, are better). Compared with all CAHs nationally, CAHs in Wisconsin scored significantly better on 1 measure, significantly worse on 2 measures, and did not have significantly different performance on 1 measure.

Table 5: Outpatient Quality Measure Results in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally, 2021

 Significantly better than all CAHs nationally  Significantly worse than all CAHs nationally

Measure	Description	WI CAHs (n=58)		All CAHs (n=1,359)		Benchmark (%)
		CAHs reporting	% of patients {1}	CAHs reporting	% of patients	
OP-2	Fibrinolytic therapy received within 30 minutes	55	 28.8	1,121	48.3	100.0
OP-22	Patients left without being seen (lower is better)	45	 0.8	834	1.3	0.1

Footnotes:


{1} Rates without highlights were not significantly different from comparable rates in all CAHs nationally.

† Indicates insufficient data to calculate rate (<25 patients)

* Indicates that no CAHs in the state submitted data values for eligible patients, but that one or more CAHs in the state either reported a population of 0 or submitted eligible cases to CMS that were excluded for the measure.

Table 6: Outpatient Median Quality Measure Results in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally, 2021

 Significantly better than all CAHs nationally  Significantly worse than all CAHs nationally

Measure	Description	WI CAHs (n=58)		All CAHs (n=1,359)		Benchmark (minutes)
		CAHs reporting	Minutes {1}	CAHs reporting	Minutes	
OP-3b	Median time to transfer to another facility - acute coronary intervention	55	64.0	1,121	70.0	36.0
OP-18b	Median time from ED arrival to ED departure for discharged patients	55	 124.0	1,134	116.0	84.0

Footnotes:

{1} Median minutes to receiving care. Lower is better for all measures. Rates without highlights were not significantly different from comparable rates in all CAHs nationally.

† Indicates insufficient data to calculate rate (<25 patients)

* Indicates that no CAHs in the state submitted data values for eligible patients, but that one or more CAHs in the state either reported a population of 0 or submitted eligible cases to CMS that were excluded for the measure.

Figures 5-7 show the performance trends for the Outpatient measures for Wisconsin and all CAHs nationally between 2018 and 2021. The OP-22 trend is not displayed due to the measure's low annual variation.

Figure 5: OP-2 Trends in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally

Fibrinolytic therapy received within 30 minutes




Figure 6: OP-3b Trends in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally

Median time to transfer to another facility - acute coronary intervention (lower is better)





Figure 7: OP-18b Trends in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally

Median time from ED arrival to ED departure for discharged patients (lower is better)



Patient Engagement Domain

HCAHPS CAH Reporting


Results

The HCAHPS reporting rate for Wisconsin was 98.3% in 2021. Figure 8 compares reporting rates from 2018-2021 in the Patient Engagement domain (HCAHPS) over time among four groups of CAHs: those in Wisconsin, all CAHs nationally, those located in other states with a similar number of CAHs, and those located in the same HRSA geographic region as Wisconsin.

The number of completed HCAHPS surveys per CAH in Wisconsin and nationally in the five survey completion and three survey response rate categories reported by CMS are shown in Table 7. Hospitals with 100 or more completed HCAHPS surveys over a four-quarter period receive HCAHPS Star Ratings from CMS. CMS recommends that each hospital obtain 300 completed HCAHPS surveys annually, in order to be more confident that the survey results are reliable for assessing the hospital's performance. However, some smaller hospitals may sample all of their HCAHPS-eligible discharges and still have fewer than 300 completed surveys. Caution should be exercised in comparing HCAHPS results for states that have few CAHs reporting results and/or CAHs whose results are based on fewer than 100 completed surveys. In 2020, HCAHPS data only included two rolling quarters (Q3 2020 and Q4 2020) instead of the typical four, and as a result CAHs submitted fewer completed surveys that year.

Table 8 compares the HCAHPS reporting rates of CAHs in Wisconsin to those located in the other 44 states participating in the Flex Program as well as the rate for all CAHs nationally. The Wisconsin HCAHPS reporting rate of 98.3% ranks #14 nationally.

Figure 8: Percentage of CAHs Reporting at Least One Patient Engagement Measure (HCAHPS)



Footnotes:

{1} Listed n values refer to most recent data (2021) only

{2} Group includes states with 40 or more CAHs: IA(82), IL(51), KS(82), MN(77), MT(49), NE(63), OK(40), TX(88)

{3} HRSA Region C includes: IA(82), IL(51), IN(35), KS(82), MI(37), MN(77), MO(35), NE(63), OH(33)

Table 7: Number of Completed HCAHPS Surveys and Response Rates in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally, 2021

	Total CAHs reporting	Number of Completed HCAHPS Surveys					HCAHPS Survey Response Rates		
		<25	25-49	50-99	100-299	300+	<25%	25-50%	>50%
National	1,243	282	275	344	320	22	559	666	18
Wisconsin	57	1	7	17	25	7	5	51	1

Table 8: State Ranking of CAH Reporting Rates for HCAHPS Quality Measures, 2021

Rank	State	CAHs reporting	% of CAHs	Rank	State	CAHs reporting	% of CAHs
1	Illinois	51	100.0	24	Arkansas	26	92.9
1	Georgia	30	100.0	24	Kentucky	26	92.9
1	Idaho	27	100.0	26	Oklahoma	37	92.5
1	West Virginia	21	100.0	27	Nevada	12	92.3
1	New York	18	100.0	27	Utah	12	92.3
1	Maine	16	100.0		National	1,243	91.5
1	New Hampshire	13	100.0	29	Mississippi	29	90.6
1	New Mexico	11	100.0	30	North Carolina	18	90.0
1	Vermont	8	100.0	31	Missouri	31	88.6
1	Alabama	5	100.0	32	Montana	43	87.8
1	South Carolina	4	100.0	33	Wyoming	14	87.5
1	Massachusetts	3	100.0	33	Virginia	7	87.5
13	Nebraska	62	98.4	35	Michigan	32	86.5
14	Wisconsin	57	98.3	36	California	31	86.1
15	Iowa	80	97.6	37	Washington	33	84.6
16	South Dakota	38	97.4	38	Texas	71	80.7
17	Colorado	31	96.9	39	Arizona	12	75.0
18	Kansas	79	96.3	39	Tennessee	12	75.0
19	Minnesota	74	96.1	41	Indiana	26	74.3
20	Oregon	24	96.0	42	Louisiana	20	74.1
21	North Dakota	35	94.6	43	Alaska	8	61.5
22	Ohio	31	93.9	44	Florida	6	60.0
23	Pennsylvania	15	93.8	45	Hawaii	4	44.4

HCHAPS CAH Performance

Results

Table 9 displays the results for performance on Patient Engagement (HCAHPS) measures for Wisconsin and all CAHs nationally. Compared with all CAHs nationally, CAHs in Wisconsin scored significantly better on 7 measures, significantly worse on 0 measures, and did not have significantly different performance on 3 measures.

Table 9: HCAHPS Results for CAHs in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally, 2021

 Significantly better than all CAHs nationally  Significantly worse than all CAHs nationally

HCAHPS Measure	Percentage of patients that gave the highest level of response (e.g., “always”)		
	WI CAHs (n=58)	All CAHs (n=1,359)	Benchmark (%)
CAHs Reporting	n=57	n=1,243	
Nurses always communicated well	85.3	83.6	87.7
Doctors always communicated well	84.5	83.8	88.0
Patients always received help as soon as wanted	75.3	74.0	81.2
Staff always explained medications before giving them to patients	68.4	66.4	74.1
Staff always provided information about what to do during recovery at home	90.8	88.4	92.2
Patients strongly understood their care when they left the hospital	57.2	55.2	63.6
Patient’s room and bathroom were always clean	81.2	78.7	79.6
Area around patient’s room was always quiet at night	70.4	66.9	79.6
Patient gave a rating 9 or 10 [high] on a 1-10 scale	78.9	77.0	85.7
Patient would definitely recommend the hospital to friends and family	76.5	74.8	NA


Footnotes:

† Indicates insufficient data to calculate rate (<25 surveys)

Figure 10 shows the trends for each HCAHPS measure for Wisconsin and all CAHs nationally between 2018 and 2021.

Figure 10: HCAHPS Trends for CAHs in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally

Percentage of respondents that gave the highest level of response (e.g. "always")




Care Transitions Domain

EDTC CAH Reporting

Results

Figure 11 compares reporting in the Care Transitions domain (EDTC) for Wisconsin and all CAHs nationally for 2021. 89.7% of Wisconsin CAHs reported the EDTC measure. Collection and reporting procedures for the EDTC measure changed beginning in 2020. This and future reports only include data for the new measure. Table 10 compares the EDTC reporting rates of CAHs in Wisconsin to those located in the other 44 states participating in the Flex Program as well as the rate for all CAHs nationally. The Wisconsin EDTC reporting rate of 89.7% ranks #33 nationally.

Figure 11: Percentage of CAHs Reporting Care Transitions Measure (EDTC)



Footnotes:

{1} Listed n values refer to most recent data (2021) only

{2} Group includes states with 40 or more CAHs: IA(82), IL(51), KS(82), MN(77), MT(49), NE(63), OK(40), TX(88)

{3} HRSA Region C includes: IA(82), IL(51), IN(35), KS(82), MI(37), MN(77), MO(35), NE(63), OH(33)

Table 10: State Ranking of CAH Reporting Rates for EDTC Quality Measure, 2021

Rank	State	CAHs reporting	% of CAHs	Rank	State	CAHs reporting	% of CAHs
1	Kansas	82	100.0	24	Mississippi	30	93.8
1	Minnesota	77	100.0	24	Maine	15	93.8
1	Oklahoma	40	100.0	24	Tennessee	15	93.8
1	California	36	100.0	24	Wyoming	15	93.8
1	Georgia	30	100.0		National	1,259	92.6
1	Arkansas	28	100.0	28	Louisiana	25	92.6
1	Idaho	27	100.0	29	Washington	36	92.3
1	West Virginia	21	100.0	29	Alaska	12	92.3
1	New York	18	100.0	29	New Hampshire	12	92.3
1	Pennsylvania	16	100.0	32	Illinois	46	90.2
1	Nevada	13	100.0	33	Wisconsin	52	89.7
1	Utah	13	100.0	34	Missouri	31	88.6
1	New Mexico	11	100.0	35	Iowa	72	87.8
1	Florida	10	100.0	36	Arizona	14	87.5
1	Hawaii	9	100.0	36	Virginia	7	87.5
1	Alabama	5	100.0	38	Montana	42	85.7
1	South Carolina	4	100.0	38	Kentucky	24	85.7
1	Massachusetts	3	100.0	40	North Carolina	17	85.0
19	Nebraska	62	98.4	41	Colorado	27	84.4
20	South Dakota	38	97.4	42	Texas	71	80.7
21	Michigan	36	97.3	43	Oregon	20	80.0
21	North Dakota	36	97.3	44	Ohio	24	72.7
23	Indiana	34	97.1	45	Vermont	3	37.5

EDTC CAH Performance

Results

Table 11 displays the results for performance on the Care Transitions (EDTC) measure for Wisconsin and all CAHs nationally. Compared with all CAHs nationally, CAHs in Wisconsin scored significantly better on 1 measure, significantly worse on 1 measure, and did not have significantly different performance on 7 measures. Figure 12 shows performance data for EDTC over time, though data on this measure are only available for 2020 and 2021.

Table 11: EDTC Results for CAHs in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally, 2021

 Significantly better than all CAHs nationally  Significantly worse than all CAHs nationally


EDTC Measure	Average Percentage		
	Wisconsin CAHs (n=58)	All CAHs (n=1,359)	Benchmark (%)
CAHs Reporting	n=52	n=1,259	
EDTC-All: Composite	90.7	90.2	100.0
Home Medications	95.3	94.4	100.0
Allergies and/or Reactions	96.1	96.1	100.0
Medications Administered in ED	96.4	96.4	100.0
ED Provider Note	93.5	94.7	100.0
Mental Status/Orientation Assessment	95.9	95.5	100.0
Reason for Transfer and/or Plan of Care	97.0	96.8	100.0
Tests and/or Procedures Performed	96.6	96.5	100.0
Tests and/or Procedures Results	95.7	96.0	100.0

Footnotes:

† Indicates insufficient data to calculate rate (<25 patients)

Figure 12: EDTC Trends for CAHs in Wisconsin and All CAHs Nationally

Percentage of patients that met this element



Appendix

This appendix includes additional detailed information regarding the methods and data used in this report. Performance for each measure is shown in a variety of ways depending on the measure.

Percentages were calculated using the number of patients (or healthcare workers for the measure HCP/IMM-3) who met the measure criteria, divided by the number of patients or workers in the measure population, which are specifically defined for each measure. For antibiotic stewardship measures, this report showed the percentage of CAHs in your state that met the seven elements individually, as well as the percentage that met all elements. Values were rounded to the nearest decimal place. State performance was compared to the performance for all CAHs nationally using Chi-square tests ($p < 0.05$). The results of the state performance comparisons were classified as: 1) insufficient data (less than 25 total patients); 2) not significantly different than all CAHs nationally; 3) significantly better than all CAHs nationally; or 4) significantly worse than all CAHs nationally.

Median time includes the median number of minutes until the specified event occurs among patients who meet certain criteria, which are specifically defined for each measure. For median time measures, lower scores, indicating shorter median times, are better. Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney tests were used to compare the median times for CAHs in each state to all CAHs nationally.

Antibiotic stewardship performance were measured as the percentage of CAHs that fulfilled all seven core elements of an antibiotic stewardship program. The questions in the NHSN address different activities CAHs can participate in to fulfill the core elements. For all years, antibiotic stewardship values only include data submitted by the March 31 NHSN deadline. The state-level performance on antibiotic stewardship was compared to the performance of all other CAHs nationally using Fisher's exact test.

Performance for each HAI measure was calculated using Standardized Infection Ratios (SIRs). SIRs are a ratio of the total number of infections observed in 2021 divided by the predicted number of annual infections. Predicted number of infections data were calculated and made available by the CDC. SIRs could only be calculated when there were one or more predicted infections for the time period. A lower SIR indicates better performance. Significance tests comparing state HAI performance to the performance all CAHs nationally were not performed because the majority of states did not meet the conditions for statistical comparisons: at least one predicted infection and the state's predicted number of infections multiplied by the SIR of all other CAHs must be equal to or greater than one.

For each HCAHPS measure, the percentage of patients reporting the highest response (e.g., "always") on each measure were summed and averaged across all reporting CAHs within a state and all CAHs nationally. HCAHPS data for 2020 only include two rolling quarters (Q3 2020 and Q4 2020) instead of the typical four quarters, as a result of CMS reporting changes due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Two-sample t-tests were used to compare whether the mean scores on each measure are significantly different between CAHs in each state and all CAHs nationally.

Performance for the EDTC measure was calculated as the percentage of patients that met all of the seven data elements. State performance was compared to the performance for all CAHs nationally using Chi-square tests ($p < 0.05$). Changes to the EDTC measure in 2020 focused on adjustments to help streamline and modernize the measure, including a reduction in the total number of data elements from 27 to 8 and clarifications to specific definitions of individual data elements.

All statistical analysis was carried out using R 4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020) and the Tidyverse (Wickham et al., 2019), rmarkdown (Allaire et al., 2020), kableExtra (Zhu, 2020), and knitr (Xie, 2020) packages.

For more information on this report, please contact Megan Lahr at lahrx074@umn.edu.

This report was completed by the Flex Monitoring Team with funding from the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy (FORHP), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), under PHS Grant No. U27RH01080. The information, conclusions, and opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and no endorsement by FORHP, HRSA, or HHS is intended or should be inferred.