



UNC
GILLINGS SCHOOL OF
GLOBAL PUBLIC HEALTH

Accreditation Outcomes: Choosing the Right Indicators

Mary V. Davis, DrPH, MSPH

THE NORTH CAROLINA
Institute for Public Health

April 21, 2010

Acknowledgments

CoAuthors

- J Michael Bowling, PhD
- Margaret Cannon, MPH
- Dorothy Cilenti, DrPH, MPH, MSW

Funding

- HCFO Robert Wood Johnson Foundation



Research Objectives

- Performance differences on LHD indicators by accreditation status
- Association between LHD performance on indicators and leadership, community engagement, and policy development domains
- Likelihood of receiving services in accredited vs. non-accredited agencies.



NC Local Health Dept Accreditation

- 48 of 85 accredited through final rules, 2 through pilot standards
- This study used 07/08 as cutoff date
 - 40 Accredited
 - 45 Non accredited
- Best match with available survey and indicator data



Case Management Indicators

- Percent of Medicaid deliveries where maternity care coordination services were received
- Percent of Medicaid-eligible children birth to 21 receiving Health Check/Health Choice services
- Percent of Medicaid-eligible children ages birth to 2 receiving direct blood lead screening test(s)
- Percent of breast and cervical cancer prevention age-specific targets achieved for mammograms
- Percent health department clients age 2 who have received age-appropriate immunizations



Service Indicators

- Percent of Medicaid deliveries where prenatal WIC assistance was received
- Ratio of family planning caseload relative to previous three-year average
- Adolescent pregnancy rate among females ages 10 to 17
- Outlier--Percent compliance with food and lodging inspection requirements



Domains

- Community engagement, leadership, and policy development
- Identified as accreditation performance domains through literature review
- Tested through previous research (Cilenti):
 - Association between accreditation
 - Community engagement
 - Policy development



Analyses: Influence of Accreditation on Indicators

Created composite performance outcome measure using 9 indicators

- Greater than median improvement in measure
- Greater than median rate or proportion of indicator

Conducted t-tests or independent means with p-values to test for differences in composite measure by accreditation status



Analyses: Indicators

Calculated Logistic Regressions of Likelihood of Receiving Services by LHD Accreditation Status

- Health Check
- Maternal Care Coordination
- Teenage Pregnancy
- WIC
- Lead Screening

Controlled for median income and percent African American in population served by LHD



Analyses: Domains

Computed single year means of each indicator for 2008 data

Conducted logistic regression to examine association between indicators and domains

Controlled for median income and percent African American in population served by LHD



Results

- Performance outcome measure: No statistically significant differences between accredited and non accredited LHDs
- Likelihood of receiving specific services:
 - No consistent relationship
 - Significant differences not meaningful on population level
- Domains: No consistent relationship between domains and indicators



So What Does this Mean??

Performance indicators and accreditation

- Indicators may not be appropriate measures
- Indicator data of questionable quality
- Insufficient time for accreditation to affect indicators
- Non-accredited agencies exposed to accreditation standards
- Accredited and non-accredited agencies conducting quality improvement initiatives



Limitations

- Data Quality
 - Missing variables and data
 - Different measurement timeframes (calendar, fiscal years, years of data available)
- Too much power in data?
 - Large number of observations resulting in statistically significant differences that are not meaningful



Project 2nd Phase

- Case study of 6 high performing LHDs on indicators
- 4 accredited and 2 non-accredited
- Explore what drives performance on these indicators
- Stay tuned for results





QUESTIONS??