Population health management: integrating approaches

HSPN Monthly Webinar

February 28, 2023
Welcome & thank you for joining us!

Please let us know who you are by introducing yourself (name & OHT or other org)

➢ Open Chat

➢ Set response to everyone in the chat box
Land Acknowledgement

We wish to acknowledge this land on which the University of Toronto operates. For thousands of years it has been the traditional land of the Huron-Wendat, the Seneca, and the Mississaugas of the Credit. Today, this meeting place is still the home to many Indigenous people from across Turtle Island and we are grateful to have the opportunity to work on this land.
Poll 1

1. Have you joined us for an HSPN webinar previously? (Single Choice)

135/135 (100%) answered

Yes (89/135) 66%

No, this is my first event (46/135) 34%
Now available…

https://hspn.ca/evaluation/oht/reports/
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Overview

Advancing Population Health

Data to support population health management

The example of diabetes in Ontario

Approaches to improve population health
OHT transformation

- OHTs are intended to hold **fiscal and clinical accountability** for an **attributed population** (currently defined by primary care attachment and hospital referral and use patterns)
- OHTs are responsible for **Population Health Management and Integrated Care**… or possibly Managing Population Health and Integrating Care

“OHTs will continue to integrate care and use equity-based population health management approaches to deliver better health outcomes and provide better experiences for patients. “ (Ontario Health Teams: The Path Forward, MOH, Nov. 2022. p2)
How can you advance?

- **Population health management requires data about the population, but I don’t have that data.**
  - (but you do have some and could have more data)

- **Population Health Management requires a long view, but I have many pressing concerns**
  - OHTs are expected to deliver on digital health initiatives
  - OHTs are expected to report on measures for cQIP (Cancer screening, Mental Health visits, ALC days) and other TPAA measures
  - OHTs are expected to deliver care pathways for specific conditions (CHF, COPD, Stroke, Diabetes)
OHT Integrated Accountable Local Care Systems: A Definition

- Primary care providers, specialists, hospitals, home care and other healthcare providers that come together to deliver **coordinated high quality, equitable, value-based care** to an attributed population

- Build mechanisms to **proactively** coordinate & facilitate timely, efficient & **person-centered care**

- Together, groups agree to be **held accountable** for “**Quadruple Aim**” outcomes for an **attributed population** - population health, patient and provider experience & cost-effective care

Adapted from McClellan M et al. Health Aff (Millwood), 29(5), 982-990.
RISE & HSPN use a five component approach to population-health management

**Start Here**

**Population Identification**

This will need to be done on an on-going basis as your population changes and can include two levels of identification:
1. Understanding your attributed population (MoH data)
2. Identifying a priority population with which to start/to prioritize next (HSPN reports)

**An iterative process!**

Throughout each component:
- Co-design with lived experience
- Apply an equity lens
- Leverage QI processes and complete tests of change
- Adapt based on learnings and as population changes

**Segmentation for Needs, Risks & Barriers**

- Segmenting your priority populations
- Choosing a segment with which to start/to prioritize next

**Monitor & Evaluate**

Using a quadruple aim approach

**Implementation & Reach**

Creating sustainable spread

**Co-designing Person-Centred Care Models & Service Mix**

Adapting and testing evidence-based care delivery

Source: Adapted from Population Health Alliance, 2012

Resource: Overview of Population-Health Management (mcmasterforum.org)
Population Segmentation: think about the priority population, needs, risks and barriers and connect them to care model design using the Kaiser risk pyramid.

Source: Adapted from Kaiser Permanente

OHT Long Term Goal: Integrating Care for Full Attributed Population
Population Health Management: Care Pathways and Care Models

Care pathways are the steps taken to deliver a care process (including social care) along the entire patient journey for the duration of their condition/chronic care for a specific disease. They are undergirded by clinical practice guidelines/quality standards.

Care models are systems of care with multiple care pathways and processes inside. They are person-centered and include other components to enable care pathways (e.g., decision support, patient self-management support) to occur for whole person care (e.g., multiple diseases).
Poll 2:

1. How confident are you with implementing population health management inclusive of care pathways and care models (Single Choice) *

138/138 (100%) answered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count (of 138)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all Confident</td>
<td>(9/138)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>(11/138)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>(10/138)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>(15/138)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Somewhat confident</td>
<td>(40/138)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>(16/138)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>(17/138)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>(11/138)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Very Confident</td>
<td>(9/138)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion Questions:
What would you like to learn more about?
Where can we provide more clarity?

Respond in the chat
What could we talk about

• There is a whole population over ages, episodic and chronic care, between sexes and genders, and types of clinical conditions. We need some simplification.

• It would be good to have data on the entire population and advanced analytics to identify clusters of individuals with common needs and gaps in supports.

• We have some data for Ontario (and some that you have for your OHT)
We can segment the population using groupings like CIHI Pop Grouper or BC Health System Matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>$ PMPM</th>
<th>Premature Mortality</th>
<th>% Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palliative</td>
<td>$ 7,590</td>
<td>51,051</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Mental Health</td>
<td>$ 1,775</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cancer</td>
<td>$ 1,670</td>
<td>4,807</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Chronic</td>
<td>$ 1,484</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Acute</td>
<td>$ 1,127</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Chronic</td>
<td>$ 390</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cancer</td>
<td>$ 388</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Acute</td>
<td>$ 302</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health</td>
<td>$ 164</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Chronic</td>
<td>$ 138</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetrics</td>
<td>$ 230</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Newborn</td>
<td>$ 121</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Health Conditions</td>
<td>$ 77</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Acute</td>
<td>$ 76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Newborn</td>
<td>$ 54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-users</td>
<td>$ 36</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data for 2020/21 based on 2019 Attributed Population
$PMPM = Provincial attributed government cost per member per month
Premature mortality per 100,000 population (Missing if fewer than 5 events)
People are not Static: Changes Over Time In CIHI Pop Group: OHT Population

e.g. people with diabetes will have acute episodes and may have other conditions that need to be addressed
Think about your **opportunities for improvement**

Now let’s take it down a level.

• Move from entire OHT attributable populations to sub-populations. Use population-segmentation to identify patient populations with (crudely) similar health and social care needs.

• i.e. Identify some population groups and see what the needs are!
How to choose areas for focus

1. High burden population
2. Gaps in care
3. Evidence-based interventions and targets
4. Willing providers
5. Implementation supports available (e.g. funding)
What are your priorities? (e.g. Cohort 1 OHTs)
Think about your opportunities for improvement

Smaller is better ... specific indicator results and areas of focus may differ. Choose populations where ranking is worse (depicted as closer to the outside of the diagram) ... and the indicator has some variability in provincial results (...some are doing much better). Combine with cost results from MOH reports and HSPN results to assess impact.

Mental Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Contact in ED for MHA</th>
<th>Days Spent at Home</th>
<th>Death in Hospital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100th (4th centile)</td>
<td>100th (4th centile)</td>
<td>100th (4th centile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>75th</td>
<td>75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>25th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frail / Older Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caregiver Distress</th>
<th>Change in MDS-HSI</th>
<th>Change in ADL Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100th (4th centile)</td>
<td>100th (4th centile)</td>
<td>100th (4th centile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>75th</td>
<td>75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>25th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End-of-Life / Palliative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palliative Home Visit (in last 90 days)</th>
<th>Palliative Home-Care (in last 90 days)</th>
<th>ED Visits (in last 60 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100th (4th centile)</td>
<td>100th (4th centile)</td>
<td>100th (4th centile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>75th</td>
<td>75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>25th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example data shown here: See your own OHT-specific reports
Let’s walk through an example (Diabetes):

1. High burden population
2. Gaps in care
3. Evidence-based interventions and targets
4. Willing providers
5. Implementation supports available
1. Burden: Average health system cost by condition

### Ontario Population (pre-OHT): Average incremental cost by condition (per person per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Physician</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Drug/Device</th>
<th>Long Term Care</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renal</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPD</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mental health</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrhythmia</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary syndrome</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoporosis</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Burden: Total health system cost by condition

Ontario Population (pre-OHT): Total incremental system cost by condition per year
1. Burden: Total health system cost by condition

Ontario Population (pre-OHT) Individual incremental vs Total incremental system cost
1. Burden: Total health system cost by condition

Ontario Population (pre-OHT) Individual incremental vs Total incremental system cost
Sidebar: Person-centred care for people with Diabetes

People with diabetes also have other related and un-related conditions:

• What about co-morbidities amongst people with diabetes?

• What about cancer screening for people with diabetes?

• What about hospitalizations for CHF, COPD, Stroke & lower-limb amputations?
At least 90% of people with Diabetes have other conditions

Koné et al., 2015
Mammogram uptake is low amongst people with diabetes (particularly those in areas of high deprivation)

Horizontal axis shows the number of women 52-69 years:

- Q5 is neighbourhood with highest level of deprivation.
- Bright green indicates number of women not screened;
- Dark blue represents number of women screened;
- Percentage to the right is the proportion of each segment screened.
- Ontario average indicated in figure footnote.

Notes:
*Proportion of deprivation quintile screened is shown at end of bar.
*Overall proportion with diabetes screened in Ontario=51.4%.
Cancer screening is lower amongst women with diabetes
Hospitalizations for other conditions is much higher amongst individuals with diabetes.

People with Diabetes have a much higher likelihood of hospitalizations for ‘other’ conditions as compared to Ontarians without Diabetes!
2. Gaps in Care: Selected Diabetes Indicators

- Proportion of patients with up-to-date HbA1c testing
  *Proportion of patients that are regularly following-up on diabetes care*

- Proportion of patients with up-to-date retinal examinations
  *Allows timely treatment of diabetes eye complications through early detection*

- Proportion of patients with a statin dispensed
  *Prevents vascular complications among older diabetes patients*

- Hospitalizations for long-term diabetes related complications
  *Indicative of long-term poor management of disease resulting in blindness, kidney failure, loss of nerve function, amputation etc.*

- Proportion of patients with HbA1c >7
  *Provides information on long-term glycemic status and reliably predicts risk for diabetes-related complications*
Equity: Material deprivation varies across OHTs

Quintile data:
A score of 5 means it is in the most deprived 20% of Ontario

The population living in the most deprived neighbourhoods varies from nearly 40% to less than 10% across OHTs

For information on ON-Marg, see:
Matheson FI & van Ingen T.
2016 Ontario Marginalization Index User Guide.
Toronto, ON. St. Michael’s Hospital;
Prevalence of Diabetes across OHTs

Mean: 13.1%
Range: 9.7% - 16.8%
Moderate correlation with deprivation
High variability across and within OHTs
Diabetes Management by Socio Economic Status

Diabetes HbA1c, Retinal Screening & Statin Filled Prescriptions 2019/20, 2020/21 & 2021/22 for Ontario by Material Deprivation Quintile (Q5 is High Deprivation/Low SES)
Diabetes Outcomes vary by Socio Economic Status

Diabetes HbA1c Control 2019/20, 2020/21 & 2021/22 for Ontario by Material Deprivation Quintile (Q5 is High Deprivation/Low SES)
(missing is included in total %)
Correlation with Deprivation: 0.33

Diabetes-Related Hospitalizations in 2019/20, 2020/21 & 2021/22 for Ontario by Material Deprivation Quintile (Q5 is High Deprivation/Low SES)
Correlation with Deprivation: 0.28
HbA1c Screening

Proportion with up-to-date HbA1c testing, distribution by OHT

Mean: 47.3%
Range: 30.3% - 56.7%
Weak correlation with deprivation
High variability across the OHTs
Outcome is similar in Q1 and Q5 in almost all OHTs

Note: Dashed line reflects total population (crude) average in year

Note: Dashed line reflects null value (no difference between Q5 and Q1). OHTs with small Ns (numerator or denominator) are suppressed.
Retinal Examination

Mean: 61.3%
Range: 55.6% to 71.1%
Weak correlation with deprivation
High variability across the OHTs
Outcome is similar in Q1 and Q5 in almost all OHTs

Proportion with up-to-date retinal exam, distribution by OHT

Ratio of OHTs attributable population residing in most vs least deprived areas (quintile):
- Q1 (high % in least deprived areas)
- Q2
- Q3
- Q4
- Q5 (high % in most deprived areas)

Note: Dashed line reflects total population (crude) average in year

Ratio of Proportion with up-to-date retinal exam in deprivation Q5 v Q1, according to OHT

Note: Dashed line reflects null value (no difference between Q5 and Q1). OHTs with small Ns (numerator or denominator) are suppressed.
Statins Dispensed

Mean: 72.7%
Range: 61.2% - 76.3%
Very weak correlation with deprivation
High variability across the OHTs
Outcome is similar in Q1 and Q5 in almost all OHTs
Patients with HbA1c levels ≥7

- **Mean**: 38.31
- **Range**: 31.5% - 57.5%
- **Weak to moderate correlation** with deprivation
- **High variability** across the OHTs

Outcomes are higher in Q5 compared to Q1 in almost all OHTs
Summary

• Overall Diabetes management is moderate:
  • 47% up to date on 2 HbA1c tests in past year
  • 61% up to date on retinal screening
  • 72% receiving recommended statin therapy

• There is high degree of equity (equally moderate achievement) in accessing the above diabetes management services.

• There are *inequities* in the health outcomes associated with diabetes:
  • patients from more-deprived neighbourhoods have higher hospitalization rates for diabetes related complications and higher proportions of HbA1c >7 (uncontrolled diabetes)
OHT Population Level Management ≠ Outcomes

HSPN has sent each OHT individual OHT-level indicator data. HSPN Spider Diagrams – Being “On Target” (Near Centre) indicates best performance in Ontario.

OHT A: Top Performer on outcomes; Weaker on management

OHT B: Poor outcomes; Ok on management

Outcome Measures

Process Measures

Outcomes

Process

Measures

Measures

HbA1c levels >7

Had statins dispensed

Up-to-date with HbA1c tests

Hosp for diabetes complications

Up-to-date with a retinal exam

Hosp for diabetes complications

Up-to-date with HbA1c tests

Hosp for diabetes complications

Up-to-date with a retinal exam

Hosp for diabetes complications

Up-to-date with HbA1c tests

Hosp for diabetes complications

Up-to-date with a retinal exam

Hosp for diabetes complications

Up-to-date with HbA1c tests

Hosp for diabetes complications

Up-to-date with a retinal exam

Hosp for diabetes complications

Up-to-date with HbA1c tests

Hosp for diabetes complications

Up-to-date with a retinal exam
Although OHTs with good management indicators do not always have good outcomes, this does *not* mean that diabetes screening/management is not related to diabetes outcomes.

Patients up-to-date on HbA1c screening are *significantly less likely* to be hospitalized for long-term diabetes related complications in the very next year! (*and long-term complications can take years to accumulate*)

Disparities in screening and outcomes at the population-level are likely driven by subset of population that are not up-to-date on screening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Hospitalized</th>
<th>Hospitalized</th>
<th>Hospitalization Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not up-to-date with HbA1c screening</td>
<td>738,869</td>
<td>15,783</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date with HbA1c Screening</td>
<td>663,891</td>
<td>12,039</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways

- Achieving diabetes management will require new strategies to reach those individuals who are not keeping up to date with diabetes management.

- While it is vital that patients access care, simply accessing care is not enough. We must also ensure that care accessed is effective.

- There may be more to reducing complications than merely diabetes management. Social determinants may play a role. Diabetes management at the population level requires coordination across different healthcare sectors.

- More research (LR’s thesis) will look more carefully at the drivers of good (and poor) diabetes-related health and hospital outcomes.
Population health management

• Opportunities for Improvement: e.g. Diabetes or other conditions

3. Evidence-based interventions and targets/measures

4. Willing providers

5. Implementation supports available
Poll 3:

1. What do you think about your opportunity to improve care for people with diabetes in the next year (multiple responses are ok) (Multiple Choice)

82/82 (100%) answered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our team is not going to focus on people with diabetes in the next year</td>
<td>16/82</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our team is not ready to improve care for people with diabetes</td>
<td>9/82</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our team has an opportunity to improve care for people with diabetes and we should/are/will be ...</td>
<td>35/82</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our team aims to improve care for people with diabetes but we face considerable challenges to ac...</td>
<td>22/82</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our team is highly likely to improve care for people with diabetes</td>
<td>21/82</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poll 4:

1. What other population groups are you aiming to make improvements for? (multiple responses are ok) (Multiple Choice) *

89/89 (100%) answered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Votes (Total)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congestive Heart Failure (CHF)</td>
<td>(23/89)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)</td>
<td>(28/89)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>(11/89)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td>(54/89)</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Life/Palliative Care</td>
<td>(26/89)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with depression/anxiety</td>
<td>(41/89)</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with serious mental health disorders</td>
<td>(47/89)</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion Question:

What are your challenges and opportunities to advance care based on your knowledge of population burden and gaps in care? For what populations?

Respond in the chat
Building a Care Model to manage Prevention and Chronic Care

- **Current system** built on short, episodic care needs –REACTIVE
- **Need system** that anticipates patient needs and PROACTIVELY delivers care.
- **Need to build care model** that accommodates 80% of care needs.
- **Start with** a chronic condition that has high prevalence, increasing (over time) system utilization that is not integrated and substantial preventive care.
- **Diabetes is often chosen for integration efforts**
- **Once the integrated infrastructure is built** to manage DM, the system can now accommodate new conditions by adding the clinical guidelines and disease specific care pathways.
What we know about the diabetes population
summary of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comorbidities</th>
<th>% of total attributed population: ~13%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 hypertension (~82%),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 overweight or obesity (~78%),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 hyperlipidemia (~77%),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 chronic kidney disease (~24%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 cardiovascular disease (~21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 depression (~15-30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Statistics for Segmentation
- 30% of patients will have 3 or more co-morbidities at diagnosis increasing to 60% ten years later
- People with five or more comorbidities at diagnosis had higher prevalence of (in order of prevalence) hypertension, back pain, depression, asthma and osteoarthritis.
- People with obesity at diagnosis had substantially different comorbidity profiles to those without, and the five commonest comorbidities were 50% more common in this group.

Common subpopulations
- (e.g., Type 1, Type 2, rural, most deprived, low self confidence, etc.)
Ideas for Segmenting the Diabetes Population

Best to start with primary care data.
- **HbA1c**: <7, 7-8.9, 9>
- **Multiple indicators**: HbA1c, LDL, BP, presence of neuropathy, kidney disease, heart disease.
- **Age and number of high-risk chronic condition**
- **Confidence managing health** (needs data collection)
- **Place them in the risk pyramid**

Regardless of segmentation approach, consider the impact of Social Determinants: poverty, racism/marginalization, health literacy, housing. More determinants, more impact on outcomes across all segments.
Population Segmentation: An example of using HbA1c to segment those with diabetes

- **End stage complications** (LEAs, ESRD, blindness, advanced heart disease, stroke)

- **High risk** (HbA1c > 9 %, multiple co-morbidities)

- **Rising Risk** (HbA1c 7.6-9%)

- **Healthy Patients** (HbA1c 6-7.5%)

Source: Adapted from Kaiser Permanente
Population Segmentation: An example of using ABCs (A1c, Blood pressure, Cholesterol-ABCs) to segment those with diabetes

- **Healthy Patients**: All three indicators in good control
- **Rising Risk**: At least one indicator out of range
- **High risk**: All three indicators out of control
- **Poor ABCs for 5 or more years**: Long Term Control Issues

Source: Adapted from Kaiser Permanente
Population Segmentation: An example of using Social Determinants and Control Issues to segment those with diabetes

- **Healthy Patients**: Good overall health, stable income, housing
- **Rising Risk**: Changing life situations, marginalized, control issues
- **High risk**: Poor health literacy, low income, low education, poor access and control
- **Familiar Faces**: Most deprived coupled with uncontrolled diabetes

Source: Adapted from Kaiser Permanente
### Population Segmentation: Segmenting based on confidence managing health and disease control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good Clinical Control</th>
<th>Poor Clinical Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Self-confidence</strong></td>
<td>Usual Care</td>
<td>Clinical care, Action Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Self-confidence</strong></td>
<td>Action Planning</td>
<td>Inter-disciplinary Care Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary Care

- Disease registries ----> All patients coded 250.XX in EMR
- All people w/o recent visit ----> Patients with high blood sugars
- Planned Visits ----> longer visit medication reconciliation, foot exam, renal screen, HbA1c, LDL, BP, self-management support (PAM scores)
- Prevention ----> pneumococcal/COVID vaccines, SDH assessment, self-management, cancer screenings
- Provincial Supports ----> Regional Ontario Self-management program to train staff in brief action planning and provide Chronic Disease Self-management Program
- National Supports ----> Leverage ECHO programs
Care Models: Generic------>Disease-specific ideas for change

Acute Care

- **Coordinated Care** ----> Joint multi-discipline assessment during IP (endo, nephron, CC specialists)
- **Discharge with follow-up visit scheduled** ----> Discharge summary for DM care attached to scheduled visit
- **Acute Exacerbations** ----> Hi/Lo sugar events managed, patient referred to DEC, all coordinated with PCP
- **Prevention** ----> DM vaccines, foot, renal, eye, cancer screens sent to PCP EMR
Care Models: Generic------>Disease-specific ideas for change

Specialist

- PHM focus in practice -----> Diabetes Registries linked to PCP
- Referral agreements with PCP -----> Guidelines for when patient returns to PCP with diabetes-specific care recommendations
- Joint Visits with PCP -----> Endocrinologist visits practice for specified patient visit: PCP team trained in evidence-based care

Primary Care – Specialty Care

- An ideal system will provide timely specialty input, when needed.
- No more and no less
Patient Education and Self-management Supports

- **Patient-driven education** ----> Shorter visits with patient-driven agenda at Diabetes Education Center (DEC) sessions
- **Community-based Referrals** ----> Refer to DM-specific programs (outside DECs), Living Well with Chronic Conditions workshops
- **Provider Capacity Building** ----> Ensure diabetes educators are training in Brief Action Planning and Motivational Interviewing

Care Models: Generic------>Disease-specific ideas for change
Home Care

- **Care coordinator Integration** -----> working with PCP (IPCT model) for those with high medical complexity including those with diabetes
Poll 5:

1. How confident are you to use these approaches to build a care model for people with diabetes or other groups? (Single Choice)

78/78 (100%) answered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not confident at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat confident</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very confident</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

What Questions Do You Have?

Respond in the chat
Poll 6:

1. How useful was today's session to inform approaches to population health management in your OHT? (Single Choice) *

79/79 (100%) answered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count/Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>37/79</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>30/79</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>11/79</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little useful</td>
<td>1/79</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not useful</td>
<td>0/79</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Up Next

HSPN Webinar Series
• 4th Tuesday of the Month: 12:00 – 1:30pm

March 2023: In collaboration with IFIC Canada
• Digital Health for Integrated Care
What’s next?

March 28, 2023

Advancing Integrated Care with Digital Health Innovation
March Webinar: Digital Health for Integrated Care

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TeOP30HcnqI
THANK YOU!
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