



PROGRAM ON
HEALTH OUTCOMES
UNC - CHAPEL HILL

HPAA 265
Policy Issues in Health Outcomes and Quality of Care

Sue Tolleson-Rinehart, Ph.D.

suetr@unc.edu

843-9477

(readily available by appointment)

Kathleen N. Lohr, Ph.D.

Klohr@rti.org and klohr@unc.edu

541-6512 or 966-7374

(available Wednesdays and Fridays by appointment)

Fall 2003

F 2:00 – 4:50 p.m.

McGavran – Greenberg 1305

Including the Program on Health Outcomes 2003 Fall Seminar Series

The twin purposes of this course are (1) to provide an overview of the history of quality of care in the United States, with particular attention to the evolution of quality assessment, assurance, improvement, management, and research and (2) to introduce and to trace the development of outcomes measurement and research, with particular attention to health status and quality of life (patient-reported) measurement. The course will produce an understanding of these fields as the underpinning for related courses in the Program on Health Outcomes Graduate Certificate in Health Outcomes and Quality of Care. This course supplies a common foundation of knowledge for, and is the single mandatory course required of, all Certificate aspirants.

HPAA 265 takes the perspective that quality of care is one of the three significant elements of health care delivery and policy – coequal to questions of ensuring access to care and effectively managing the costs of care. Quality of care, broadly defined, has a very long history, and the course will emphasize both the constants and the sweep of change over centuries and into the present. It is thus intended to provide you with a coherent conceptual framework for understanding the field, interpreting contemporary research and policy issues related to quality of care and outcomes as they arise in related coursework, and building broad policy analytic skills.

I. Course Objectives

Students who are successful in the course will possess background understanding and knowledge of quality of care and outcomes measurement and research. The conceptual and analytical framework that students should take from the course includes *but is not limited to*

- the origins, definitions, concepts, lexicons, theoretical foundations, and principal methods of these fields;
- the history and evolution of quality of care measurement and improvement and their influence on contemporary methods for assuring high quality care in the United States;
- approaches to and challenges of assessing patient outcomes, especially self-reported outcomes;
- the role of patient reports of satisfaction and consumer assessments of the performance of health care providers, facilities, or health plans;

- basic relationships and tensions between quality of care and bioethical principles;
- the ability to understand the application of the framework in vastly different contexts, such as those of care for children and adolescents and care at the end of life; and
- the ability to evaluate whether the evidence does or does not support contentions that quality measurement and improvement efforts actually make a difference, to whom (providers? patients? health systems? payers?) others, and in what way (with regard to access? Responsiveness? improved outcomes? better health status?).

Students should gain an appreciation of the centrality of quality-of-care issues in the contemporary health care policy, research, and delivery environment of this nation and of the present-day emphasis on outcomes as measures of care for individuals and populations.

II. Course Requirements

The acceptance of this syllabus constitutes an agreement on the part of the student to abide by the requirements described herein for participating in and completing this course.

A. Student Responsibilities and Participation

Attendance in class meetings is, of course, required. Class sessions are largely group discussions, not solely didactic presentations. Good discussions require collegiality and assume a shared conceptual base. In other words, please complete the readings on each topic before that topic's class session occurs, and please be prepared to engage in spirited but civil inquiry. We do recognize that the reading load in this course is heavy. This course is also the core course for the PHO Certificate in Health Outcomes and Quality of Care. This level of reading is necessary in order to provide Certificate aspirants with the thorough and common background in the field that the Certificate is meant to signify. The heaviness of the reading load varies somewhat from class to class; plan your time accordingly.

Essays must be submitted on the day that their subject will be discussed. Late essays will be penalized 10% of the grade they would have earned had they been submitted on time. Should emergency, one's own illness or the illness of a loved one, or some other unforeseen circumstance prevent you from completing an essay on time, we strongly encourage you to contact one of us as soon as possible and before the essay is due; we will handle these matters on a case-by-case basis as they arise.

B. Honor Code and Permissible Collaboration

The principles of academic honesty, integrity, and responsible citizenship govern the performance of all academic work and student conduct at the University as they have during the long life of this institution. Your acceptance of enrollment in the University presupposes a commitment to the principles embodied in the Code of Student Conduct and a respect for this most significant Carolina tradition. Your reward is the practice of these principles.

Your participation in this course comes with the expectation that your work will be completed in full observance of the Honor Code. Academic dishonesty in any form is unacceptable, because any breach in academic integrity, however small, strikes destructively at the University's life and work. Academic dishonesty includes even unwitting failures to cite the work and/or ideas of others, for the failure to attribute credit to the originator of a piece of work is theft of intellectual property.

If you have any questions about your responsibility or the responsibility of faculty members under the Honor Code, please consult with someone in either the Office of the Student Attorney General (966-4084) or the Office of the Dean of Students (966-4041).

C. Assignments and Methods of Evaluation

The minimum course requirement for a grade of **PASS** is the **completion of 3 (three)** short critical essays on three different topics of your choice (short is considered to be 5 to 10 pages double-spaced, excluding bibliography in 10-12 point font). In addition, **attendance at the six 2003 Fall Series Program on Health Outcomes Seminars is required**, as these seminars are a part of the required contact hours for 3 course credits. Finally, this course includes **an oral final examination (on Friday, 12 December at 4:00pm), in the form of team debates (see below).**

A word about the essays:

First, **good writing is always important, but never more so than when one is attempting to convey new knowledge to others.** Good writing is not always highly valued, or perhaps even understood for the craft that it is, in the health sciences, so our unusually strong emphasis on it may be novel in your course experience. Each of us, on her own, has always been passionate about good writing, and has always been an instinctive copy editor. We reinforce one another's natural tendencies in this class!

We care greatly about the clear, correct and concise exposition of ideas and findings. We believe that poor writing hampers the entry of new ideas into the living stream of human knowledge. We also understand, though, that no one is born writing well. She becomes a fine writer the same way she gets to Carnegie Hall: practice, practice, practice! Or to put it in the words of one of our legendary Supreme Court Justices, Louis D. Brandeis: there is no good writing, only good rewriting. (Justice Brandeis is also renowned for having said "The right to be left alone is the most comprehensive of rights." [Olmstead v U.S. (1928)]).

One needs to keep the rules of good writing fresh in one's mind, and one needs to cultivate one's ability to be one's own first and best editor. We invite you to join us in this most valuable enterprise by using your essays as opportunities to enhance your own writing skills. To that end, on the first day of class we will distribute our "handy writing tips," an anonymous, humorous, and apt list of writing dos and don'ts, and a guide to writing resources; these are also available on the Program on Health Outcomes website at <http://www.sph.unc.edu/health-outcomes/news/certificate/corecourse/resources.htm>. We cannot urge you strongly enough to pay close attention to them.

Second, although we appreciate the human tendency to procrastinate, we strongly urge you to choose an early date for the submission of your first essay. We have found that students who pace themselves well through the essays do better and learn more. Students who get a first essay in early, and then see our comments, can expect improvement in the ease with which they learn to tackle thorny analytical problems in an elegantly small space.

Please choose early and well-spaced dates for your essays! Students must **declare all of their essay topics by Friday, 5 September 2003**, but we encourage students to make this decision at the earliest possible date. Each paper will be due at the beginning of the class meeting DURING WHICH its topic will be discussed; papers on a debate topic will be due on **12/5/03**. We strongly advise you to have a copy of your essay, or **notes on the topic**, on the day of the topic in question, because you will be considered a discussion leader on the day the topic will be discussed. We will accept electronic submissions of essays provided that we receive them before the beginning of the class period during which they are due; please submit them simultaneously to both of us at our e-mail addresses, provided on the first page.

The oral final examination in this class consists of preparation for and participation in team debates on two or three contentious issues. **You may opt to write one of your three essays on your debate topic.** We will make assignments to teams and topics on **9/19/03, the end of the fourth class meeting.** These debates are intended to draw on readings and discussion throughout the course, and students may opt to devote one of their required three essays to the debate topic. Students will work in teams, and teams have full freedom to decide how best to organize their efforts. *The final exam grade for this exercise will be a team grade, apart from and in addition to the individual grade assigned to essays on these topics. Please note that exam period for this class is from 4:00pm to 7:00pm on Friday 12 December -- this is a departure from our normal meeting time, because it is during the final exam period.*

Simple completion of the essays is not, alone, sufficient to guarantee a grade of “Pass.” Each essay must also be of high enough quality to merit a good evaluation. Good essays are well-written expositions, with sophisticated and yet intelligible theoretical frameworks, strong analytical foci, a firm grounding in the literature, and an evident understanding of the context of the problem. Students must also make a constructive contribution to class discussion, defined as coming to class prepared by having read that day's material and being capable of discussing and analyzing the material in a collegial spirit. **Students seeking a grade of “High Pass” must complete each course requirement at a marked level of excellence.**

Required Readings

Journal articles, book chapters, and other materials as cited for specific classes and topics are available in the **HPAA 265 Course Pack at the Student Stores**; the instructors will distribute additional material (see next paragraph). The required readings are presented in chronological order to show the historical growth and development of different facets of these fields. Students are strongly encouraged to read them in that order, and to consider how later work builds on, or departs from, foundational pieces.

PLEASE NOTE: At the beginning of the semester, we will distribute approved reproductions of **Quality of Health Care in the United States: A Chartbook** by Sheila Leatherman and Douglas McCarthy (2002; The Commonwealth Fund, hereafter *Chartbook*) free of charge to all students. We are permitted to download and copy courtesy of the Commonwealth Fund, and the UNC Program on Health Outcomes has subsidized the cost of the photocopying. Please review any specified chapter of the *Chartbook* before discussion of course topics. We will also be distributing a copy **Pharmacoepidemiology & Drug Safety 10(5)** devoted to health care databases; and **Leatherman et al., “The Business Case for Quality”** (see required readings for 9/12 below). Our ability to distribute these materials to you, as with the *Chartbook*, is made possible by the UNC Program on Health Outcomes.

We provide supplemental/additional readings below the required list for all topics. Although we encourage students to examine them in preparation for class discussion, they are not required. They may be of assistance in guiding you to relevant literature on your essay topics.

Grading System

A total of 100 points is possible in this course. These are the course elements and their weights:

Each essay:	0-25 points, depending on quality of substance and exposition
Class participation	0-10 points, depending on strength of constructive contribution to discussion
Final Exam: Debate participation	0-15 points, depending on strength of contribution to preparation or presentation; note that all members receive the team's grade

Each of these elements will be summed to provide a final grade according to the following scale:

H: 96-100	P-: 80-82
H-: 90-95	L: 76-79
P+: 87-89	L-: 70-75
P: 83-86	F: ≤ 69

IV. Schedule of Class Meetings and Readings

8/29/03 First Day of Class: History, Origins, and Definitions of Quality of Care, and Essay Writing

Required Readings

- Nightingale, Florence. *Notes on Hospitals*, Preface and Chapter 1. In Rosenberg Charles E. *Florence Nightingale on Hospital Reform*, New York: Garland Publishing 1989.
- Codman EA. *A Study in Hospital Efficiency*, privately printed, Boston MA, 1917; reprinted by Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, Oakbrook Terrace IL, 1996; pp 53-60.
- Codman EA. The Product of a Hospital, *Surgery Gynecology and Obstetrics* 1914; 18: 491-496, reproduction published in *Archives of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine* 114: 1106-1111, 1990.
- Donabedian A. 1966. Evaluating the quality of medical care. *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 44 (July supplement, Part 2): 166-206.
- Lohr KN and Schroeder SA. 1990. A strategy for quality assurance in Medicare. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 322:707-712.

Useful Websites for Background on National Groups Involved in Quality of Care

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality:

- Quality of care activities: <http://www.ahrq.gov/qual/qualix.htm> (accessed for this syllabus on 23 April 2003).
- Quality Interagency Coordination Task Force (QUIC): <http://www.quic.gov/> (accessed for this syllabus on 23 April 2003).
- National Quality Measures Clearinghouse (NQMC): <http://www.qualitymeasures.ahrq.gov> (accessed for this syllabus on 23 April 2003).

Leapfrog Group website and see Fact Sheets at <http://www.leapfroggroup.org/> (accessed for this syllabus on 23 April 2003. This is the business group behind quality improvement; their patient safety standards have been controversial).

National Quality Forum website at <http://www.qualityforum.org> (accessed for this syllabus on 23 April 2003).

Multiagency "Talking Quality" web site designed to help managers and providers measure and report on their own quality improvement efforts at <http://www.talkingquality.gov/> (accessed for this syllabus on 23 May 2003).

See also <http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/> for AHRQ's latest attempt to offer three sets of "universal" indicators – hospital, "preventive," and safety – by which health care systems might begin standardizing their approach to certain facets of quality accessed for this syllabus on 23 April 2003).

Journals devoted entirely to Quality of Care and Outcomes:

International Journal for Quality in Health Care
The Joint Commission Journal of Quality Improvement
Quality of Life Research

Important Issues of Other Journals devoted to Quality of Care

Inquiry 25 (1), Spring 1988
Health Affairs 7(1), Spring 1988
Health Affairs 16(3), May/June 1997
Health Affairs 22(2), March/April 2003

Suggested/Additional Readings for 8/29/03 through 9/12/03 Quality of Care Classes

- Brook RH, Williams KN, Avery AD. 1976. Quality assurance today and tomorrow: Forecast for the future. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 85:809-817.
- Williamson JW. 1988. Future policy directions for quality assurance: Lessons from the Health Accounting experience. *Inquiry* 25(1): 67-77.
- Palmer RH. 1988. The challenges and prospects for quality assessment and assurance in ambulatory care. *Inquiry* 25(1):119-131.
- Wyszewianski L. 1988. Quality of care: Past achievements and future challenges. *Inquiry* 25(1): 3-24.
- McGlynn EA. 1997. Six challenges in measuring the quality of health care. *Health Affairs* 16(3):7-21.
- Lohr KN. 1997. How do we measure quality? *Health Affairs* 16(3):22-25.
- Chassin MR. 1998. Is health care ready for six sigma quality? *The Milbank Quarterly* 76(4): 565-591.
- Becher, Elise C. and Mark R. Chassin. 2001. Improving the quality of care: who will lead? *Health Affairs* 20(5): 164-179.
- Business Case for Quality: Individual Case Studies. Companion to Leatherman et al., required reading for 9/12/03. Go to <http://www.cmwf.org/publist/publist2.asp?CategoryID=3> and look for specific pdf files called "A Business Case for ...[Topic]" following the Leatherman et al. article.

9/5/03 Quality and Quality Improvement

NOTE WELL: PHO Keynote Seminar today (see distributed schedule of dates and speakers)

ESSAY TOPICS AND DATES DUE TODAY

Required Readings

- Walton, Mary. 1986. *The Deming Management Method*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company "The Deming Management Method," [title and verso pp] and pp. 89-118.
- Berwick DM. 1989. Continuous improvement as an ideal in health care. *New England Journal of Medicine* 320:53-56.
- Batalden PB, Stoltz PK. 1993. A framework for the continual improvement of health care: building and applying professional and improvement knowledge to test changes in daily work. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality Improvement* 19:424-47.

9/12/03 Quality and Contemporary Thinking

Required Readings

- Chassin MR and Galvin RW. 1998. The urgent need to improve health care. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 280:1000-1005.
- McNeil, Barbara J. 2001. The Shattuck Lecture – hidden barriers to improvement in the quality of care. *New England Journal of Medicine* 345: 1612-1620.
- Grol, Richard. 2001. Improving the quality of medical care: building bridges among professional pride, payer profit and patient satisfaction. *JAMA* 286: 2578-2585.
- Leatherman S, Berwick DM, Iles D et al. 2003. The Business Case for Quality: Case Studies and an Analysis. *Health Affairs* 22(2): 17-30. (Handed out to students at beginning of semester).
- Millstein A and Adler NE. 2003. Out of sight, out of mind: why doesn't widespread clinical quality failure command our attention? *Health Affairs* 22(2): 119-127.

9/19/03 The Politics of the Delivery of Health Care

NOTE WELL: PHO Seminar today

DEBATE TOPICS AND TEAMS ASSIGNED TODAY!

Required Readings:

- Jencks S and Wilensky G. 1992. The Health Care Quality Improvement Initiative: A new approach to quality assurance in Medicare. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 268:900-903. [HCFA's response to the IOM study on Medicare QA. {Lohr and Schroeder, 1991}.]
- Institute of Medicine. 2001. *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*. Committee on the Quality of Health Care in America. Washington: National Academy Press. Reading: Executive Summary available as html document at <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309072808/html/1.html> and available as .pdf document at http://books.nap.edu/html/quality_chasm/exec_summ.pdf ; at these sites you may find and download the entire report, from front matter to appendices. Last access for this syllabus on 23 April 2003.
- McGlynn E and Brook RH. 2001. Keeping quality on the policy agenda: How many more people have to die before we accept that quality is everyone's problem? *Health Affairs* 20 (May/June): 82-90.
- Chartbook*: Chapter 3, Access and Timeliness; Chapter 5, Disparities in Health Care; Chapter 6, Capacity to Improve
- Visit PHO Seminar Series [webcast] Mark Smith, MD, MBA. "Quality Measurement in Health Care: The Role of Public Reporting" at <http://www.sph.unc.edu/health-outcomes/news/seminars/spring2002.htm>

9/26/03 Effectiveness, Appropriateness, and Variations in Use

Required Readings

- Wennberg JE, Gittelsohn A. 1982. Variations in medical care among small areas. *Scientific American* 246:120-134.
- Wennberg JE. 1984. Dealing with medical practice variations: A proposal for action. *Health Affairs* 3:6-32.
- Brook RH, Lohr KN. 1985. Efficacy, effectiveness, variations, and quality: Boundary-crossing research. *Medical Care* 23:710-722.
- Chassin MR, Kosecoff J, Park RE, et al. 1987. Does inappropriate use explain geographic variations in the use of health care services? A study of three procedures. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 258:2533-2537.
- Roper WL, Winkenwerder W, Hackbarth GH, Krakauer H. 1988. Effectiveness in health care. An initiative to evaluate and improve medical practice. *New England Journal of Medicine* 319:1197-1202.
- Lohr KN and Steinwachs DM. 2002. Health Services Research: An Evolving Definition of the Field. *Health Services Research* 37(1):7-10.
- Chartbook*: Chapter 1, Effectiveness

Suggested/Additional Readings

- Wennberg JE, Barnes BA, Zubkoff, M. 1982. Professional uncertainty and the problem of supplier-induced demand. *Social Science and Medicine* 16:811-824.
- McPherson K, Strong PM, Epstein A. et al. 1981. Regional variations in the use of common surgical procedures: within and between England and Wales, Canada and the United States of America. *Social Science and Medicine* 15A:273-288.
- Leape LL, Park RE, Solomon DH, Chassin MR, Kosecoff J, Brook RH. 1990. Does inappropriate use explain small-area variations in the use of health care services? *Journal of the American Medical Association* 263:669-672.

10/3/03 Patient Safety and Data: Current Preoccupations

NOTE WELL: PHO Seminar today

Required Readings

Berwick DM and Leape LI. 1999. Reducing errors in medicine. *British Medical Journal (BMJ)* 319:136-7.
Institute of Medicine. 1999. *To Err is Human*. LT Kohn, JM Corrigan, MS Donaldson, eds. Washington: National Academy Press. Summary only.
Roper WL. and Tolleson-Rinehart S. 2001. Health Care Data and Health. *Pharmacoepidemiology & Drug Safety* 10(5): 363-366.
Chartbook: Chapter 2, Patient Safety

Suggested/Additional Readings

President's Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry. 1998. Executive Summary. Electronic version at <http://www.hcqualitycommission.gov/final/execsum.html>; entire report available at <http://www.hcqualitycommission.gov/final/>. Last access on 4/24/2003.

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality web pages: Patient Safety: <http://www.ahrq.gov/qual/errorsix.htm>
To witness the intersection of cultural and language barriers, literacy and health literacy, patient-provider communication and patient safety, see Flores G, Laws MB, Mayo SJ et al. 2003. Errors in medical interpretation and their potential clinical consequences in pediatric encounters. *Pediatrics* 111(1): 6-14.

10/10 Outcomes: Patient-reported Health Status and Quality of Life Measures

Required Readings

Patrick DL, Deyo RA. 1989. Generic and disease-specific measures in assessing health status and quality of life. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S217-S232.
Wilson IB, Cleary PD. 1995. Linking clinical variables with health-related quality of life. A conceptual model of patient outcomes. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 273:59-65.
Testa MA, Simonson DC. 1996. Current Concepts. Assessment of quality-of-life outcomes. *New England Journal of Medicine* 334(13): 835-840.
Mishoe SC, Maclean JR. 2001. Assessment of health-related quality of life. *Respiratory Care* 46(11): 1236-1255.

Chartbook: Chapter 4, Focus on the Patient

Visit QualityMetric website at <http://www.qualitymetric.com/> (last accessed for this syllabus on 23 April 2003)
Visit PHO Seminar Series [PowerPoint] for John E. Ware, Jr., PhD, seminar: "New Tools for Monitoring Health Status Outcomes: From Short Forms to the Internet, April 28, 2000 at <http://www.sph.unc.edu/health-outcomes/presentations/index.htm>

Suggested/Additional Readings for 10/10 and 10/17 Classes on HRQOL

Conceptual and methods articles

Brook RH, Davies-Avery A, Greenfield S, Harris, LJ, Lelah T, Solomon NE, Ware JE, Jr. 1977. Assessing the quality of medical care using outcome measures: an overview of the method. *Medical Care* 15(Supplement 9): iii-165. Summary and Chapter 1, pp. iv-vi, 1-15.

- Elwood PM. 1988. The Shattuck Lecture--outcomes management. A technology of patient experience. *New England Journal of Medicine* 318:1549-1556
- Stewart AL, Hays RD, Ware JE, Jr. 1988. The MOS Short-form General Health Survey. Reliability and validity in a patient population. *Medical Care* 26:724-735.
- Steinwachs DM. 1989. Application of health status assessment measures in policy research. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S12-S26. (Note the case study of use of outcomes measures in elderly.)
- Deyo RA and Patrick DL. 1989. Barriers to the use of health status measures in clinical investigation, patient care, and policy research. 1989. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S254-S268.
- Nelson EC and Berwick DM. 1989. The measurement of health status in clinical practice. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S77-S90.
- Bergner M. 1989. Quality of life, health status, and clinical research. *Medical Care* 27 (3, supplement): S148-S156.
- Patrick DL and Bergner M. 1990. Measurement of health status in the 1990s. *Annual Review of Public Health* 11:165-83.
- Ware JE and Sherbourne CD. 1992. The MOS 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36). *Medical Care* 30:473-483.
- Greenfield S and Nelson EC. 1992. Recent developments and future issues in the use of health status assessment measures in clinical settings. *Medical Care* 30(5, Supplement): MS23-MS41.
- Clancy C and Eisenberg JW. 1998. Outcomes research: measuring the end results of health care. *Science* 282: 245-246.
- Mullin, P., K. Lohr, B. Bresnahan, and P. McNulty. 2000. Applying Cognitive Design Principles to Formatting HRQOL Instruments. *Quality of Life Research* 9: 13-27.
- Scientific Advisory Committee of the Medical Outcomes Trust (Lohr KN, Aaronson N, Alonso J, Burnam A, Patrick D, Perrin E, Stein R). 2002. Assessing Health Status and Quality-of-Life Instruments: Attributes and Review Criteria *Quality of Life Research*. 11:193-205.

Empirical articles reporting data on HRQOL

- Brook RH, Ware JE, Jr, Rogers WH, Keeler EB, Davies AR, Donald CA, Goldberg GA, Lohr KN, Masthay PC, Newhouse JP. 1983. Does free care improve adults' health? Results from a randomized controlled trial. *New England Journal of Medicine* 309:1426-1434.
- Tarlov AR, Ware JE, Jr., Greenfield S, Nelson EC, Perrin E, Zubkoff M. 1989. The Medical Outcomes Study: an application of methods for monitoring the results of medical care. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 262:925-30.
- Stewart AL, Greenfield S, Hays RD, Wells K, Rogers WH, Berry SD, McGlynn EA, Ware JE, Jr. 1989. Functional status and well-being of patients with chronic conditions. Results from the Medical Outcomes Study. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 262:907-913.

10/17/03 Outcomes: Patient-reported Health Status and Quality of Life, con't.

NOTE WELL: PHO Seminar today

Required Readings

- Coons SJ, Rao S, Keininger DL, Hays RD. 2000. A comparative review of generic quality-of-life instruments. Review article. *Pharmacoeconomics* 17(1):13-35.
- Lohr KN. 2000. Health Outcomes Methodology Symposium: Summary and recommendations. *Medical Care* 38(9): Suppl II-194-208.

10/24/03: NO CLASS: FALL BREAK

10/31/03 Patient Satisfaction and Consumer Assessments

NOTE WELL: PHO Seminar today

Required Readings:

- Cleary PD and McNeil, BJ. 1988. Patient satisfaction as an indicator of quality care. *Inquiry* 25(1): 25-36.
- Davies AR and Ware JE, Jr. 1988. Involving consumers in quality assessment. *Health Affairs* 7(1, Spring): 33-48.
- Cleary PD and Edgman-Levitan S. 1997. Health care quality: Incorporating consumer perspectives. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 278:1608-1612.
- View PHO Seminar Series for [webcast] Stephen Garfinkel, PhD, "The Consumer Perspective on Health Care: CAHPS II" at <http://www.sph.unc.edu/health-outcomes/webcasts/garfinkel.htm>
- Review Stephen Garfinkel PowerPoint file at http://www.sph.unc.edu/health-outcomes/presentations/garfinkel/110802_files/v3_document.htm

Suggested/Additional Readings

- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality: Topics related to the Consumer Assessment of Health Plans Survey (CAHPS): <http://www.ahrq.gov/qual/cahpsix.htm> (last visited for this syllabus on 22 April 2003).
- Harris-Kojetin LD, FJ Fowler, JA Brown, JA Schnaier, and SF Sweeny. 1999. The use of cognitive testing to develop and evaluate CAHPS™ 1.0 Core Survey Items. *Medical Care* 37:3 Suppl: MS10-MS21.
- Hays RD, JA Shaul, VSL Williams, JS Lubalin, LD Harris-Kojetin, SF Sweeny and PD Cleary. 1999. Psychometric properties of the CAHPS™ 1.0 Survey Measures. *Medical Care* 37:3 Suppl: MS22-MS31.
- MCGee J, Kanouse DE, Sofaer S, Hargraves JL, Hoy E, Kleimann S. 1999. Making survey results easy to report to consumers: How reporting needs guided survey design in CAHPS. *Medical Care* 37:3 Suppl: MS32-MS40.
- The remainder of the CAHPS™ articles in *Medical Care* 37:3 Suppl.

11/7/03 Evidence-based Practice and Clinical Practice Guidelines

Required Readings

- Institute of Medicine. 1992. *Guidelines for Clinical Practice: From Development to Use*. MJ Field, KN Lohr, editors. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Summary only.
- Woolf SH. 1992. Practice guidelines: a new reality in medicine. I. Recent developments. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 150:1811-1818.
- Evidence-based Working Group. 1992. Evidence-based medicine. A new approach to teaching the practice of medicine. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 268:2420-2425.
- Editorial. 1992. Evidence-based medicine, in its place. *The Lancet* 346(8978):785.
- Sackett DL, Rosenberg WM, Muir-Gray JA, Haynes RB, Ricahrdson WG. 1996. Evidence-based medicine: what it is and what it isn't. *British Medical Journal* 312(7023):71-72.
- Lohr KN, Eleazer K, Mauskopf J. 1998. Health policy issues and applications for evidence-based medicine and clinical practice guidelines. *Health Policy* 46: 1-19.
- Mulrow C.W. and Lohr K.N. 2001. Proof and policy from medical research evidence. *Journal of Health Policy, Politics, and Law* 26 (2):249-266.

Supplemental/Additional Readings

- Woolf SH. 1993. Practice guidelines: a new reality in medicine. III. Impact on patient care. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 153:2646-2655.
- Lomas J, Anderson G, Domnick-Pierre K, et al. 1989. Do Practice Guidelines Guide Practice? *NEJM* (321):1306-1311

Sackett DL, Straus SE, Richardson WS, Rosenberg W, Haynes, RB. *Evidence-based Medicine. How to Practice and Teach EBM*. Second edition. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 2000. (NOTE: THIS is now the definitive EBM book, not the first edition.) Or see: <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/medicine/ebm>.

West SL, King V, Carey TS, Lohr KN, Mckoy N, Sutton SF, Lux, L. *Systems to Rate the Strength of Scientific Evidence*. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 47. AHRQ Publication No. 02-E016. Rockville, Md.: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Summary only. HTML version available at <http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/epcsums/strengthsum.htm> (last visited on 24 April 2003).

Woolf SH. 1999. The need for perspective in evidence-based medicine. *JAMA* 282:2358-2365.

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality web pages:

- Evidence-based Practice Program: <http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/epcix.htm>
- National Guidelines Clearinghouse: <http://www.guideline.gov/index.asp>

11/14/03 Public Disclosure, Report Cards, and Performance Measures

NOTE WELL: PHO Seminar today

Required Readings:

Hannan EL, Kilburn H, Jr, Racz M, Shields E, Chassin MR. 1994. Improving the outcomes of coronary artery bypass surgery in New York State. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 271:761-766.

Eddy DM. 1998. Performance measurement: problems and solutions. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):7-25.

Thier SO and Gelijns AC. 1998. Improving health: the reason performance measurement matters. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):26-28, 1998

Galvin RS. 1998. Are performance measures relevant? *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):29-31,

Newcomer LN. 1998. Physician, measure thyself. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):32-35

Sennett C. 1998. Moving ahead, measure by measure. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug):36-37

O'Leary DS. 1998. Reordering performance measurement priorities. *Health Affairs*. 17(4):38-39.

Lansky D. 1998. Measuring what matters to the public. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug):40-41.

Marsh LC. 1998. The doctor's bottom line. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug.):75-79

Blendon RJ, Brodie M, Benson JM, Altman DE, Levitt L, Hoff T, Hugick L. 1998. Understanding the managed care backlash. *Health Affairs*. 17(4 Jul-Aug):80-94.

Institute of Medicine. 2001. *Envisioning the National Health Care Quality Report*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Executive Summary only.

Suggested/Additional Readings

Institute of Medicine. 1994. *Health Data in the Information Age. Use, Disclosure, and Privacy*. MS Donaldson and KN Lohr, editors. Washington DC: National Academy Press. Chapter 3, "Public Disclosure of Data on Health Care Providers and Practitioners" (pp. 91-123) and "Appendix 3A. Fairness and Public Disclosure of Data" (pp. 123-135). Available at <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309049954/html/index.html> (site last visited for this syllabus on 25 July 2002).

Green DC, Koplan JP, Cutler CM. 1999. Prenatal care in the first trimester: misleading findings from HEDIS. Health Plan Employer Data and Information Set. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 11(6):465-473.

O'Kane ME. 1999. HEDIS data integrity. *Health Affairs*. 18(4):209

Vaiana ME and McGlynn EA. 2002. What cognitive science tells us about the design of reports for consumers. Review article. *Medical Care Research and Review* 59(1):3-35.

11/21/03 Quality of Care and Ethics

Required Readings

- Povar, G. Part III. What Does "Quality" Mean? Critical Ethical Issues for Quality Assurance. In: RH Palmer, A Donabedian, and GJ Povar. *Striving for Quality in Health Care: An Inquiry into Policy and Practice*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Health Administration Press, 1991.
- Faden R, Leplege A. Assessing quality of life. Moral implications for clinical practice. 1992. *Medical Care* 30 (5, Supplement):MS166-MS175.
- Lohr KN. Quality of Health Care. In: Reich WT, ed. *Encyclopedia of Bioethics* 2nd ed, New York: Macmillan, 1995.
- Daniels N, Kennedy BP, and Kawachi I. 1999. Why justice is good for our health: the social determinants of health inequalities. *Daedalus* 128: 215-252.

NOTE: Class on 12/5/03 will build on concepts from today's discussions

11/28 NO CLASS: Thanksgiving Break

12/5/03 Quality of Care Issues at the Start and End of Life

Point-Counterpoint Essay due today, if you have chosen to write one of your 3 essays on your debate topic.

Quality of Care and Children

Required Readings

- McGlynn EA, CL Damberg, EA Kerr and MA Schuster, editors. 2000. *Quality of Care for Children and Adolescents*. Santa Monica, Calif.: The RAND Corporation, 2000. (ISBN 0-8330-2922-3). Front matter and introductory chapter (pp 1-34).
- Palmer, R. Heather and Miller, Marlene R. 2001. Methodologic Challenges in Developing and Implementing Measures of Quality for Child Health Care, *Ambulatory Pediatrics* 1:39-52.

(NB: We will be handing out an unpublished "Brief Legislative/Regulatory History of Pediatric Human Subjects Research" written by STR).

Suggested/Additional Readings

- Palmer RH, Strain R, Maurer JV, Thompson MS. 1984. A method for evaluating performance of ambulatory pediatric tasks. *Pediatrics* 73:269-277.
- Palmer RH, Louis TA, Hsu LN, Peterson HF, Rothrock JK, Strain R, Thompson MS, Wright EA. 1985. A randomized controlled trial of quality assurance in sixteen ambulatory care practices. *Medical Care* 23:751-770.
- McGlynn EA and Halfon N. 1998. Overview of issues in improving quality of care for children. *Health Services Research* 33:977-1000.
- Mangione-Smith R, McGlynn EA. 1998. Assessing the quality of healthcare provided to children. *Health Services Research* 33:1059-1090.
- Moyer, Virginia A. 2001. Evidence Synthesis in Child Health, *Ambulatory Pediatrics* 1:53-58.
- Christakis DA, Johnston BD, Connell F A. 2001. Methodologic issues in pediatric outcomes research, *Ambulatory Pediatrics* 1:59-62.

Kaplan SH, Greenfield S, Connolly GA, Barlow SE, Grand R. 2001. Methodologic issues in the conduct and interpretation of pediatric effectiveness research. *Ambulatory Pediatrics* 1:63-70.

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality web pages:

- General issues of child health research: <http://www.ahrq.gov/child/> (last accessed for this syllabus on 22 April 2003).
- Measuring Performance in Child Health Programs : Access, Quality, and Health Service Delivery Concepts, tips, and tools for evaluating Medicaid, the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), Title V, and other health care service programs for children. <http://www.ahrq.gov/chttoolbx> (last accessed for this syllabus on 22 April 2003).

Quality of Care at the End of Life

Required Readings

- Lynn J. 1997. Measuring quality of care at the end of life: a statement of principles. *Journal of the American Geriatric Society* 45:526-527.
- Donaldson MS, Field MJ. 1998. Measuring quality at the end of life. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 158:121-128.
- Emanuel EJ, Emanuel LL. 1998. The promise of a good death. *Lancet* 351 (May):s1121-s1129.
- Morrison RS, Siu AL, Leipzig RM, Cassel CK, Meier DE. 2000. Commentary. The hard task of improving the quality of care at the end of life. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 160: 743-747.

Suggested/Additional Readings

- The SUPPORT Principal Investigators. 1995. A controlled trial to improve care for seriously ill hospitalized patients: The Study to Understand Prognoses and Preferences for Outcomes and Risks of Treatments (SUPPORT). *Journal of the American Medical Association* 274:1591-1598
- Institute of Medicine. 1997. *Approaching Death: Improving Care at the End of Life*. Field MJ, Cassell CK, eds. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Executive Summary; go to <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309063728/html/index.html> (last accessed for this syllabus on 22 April 2003) but be warned that you can only download one page at a time.
- Byock IR, Teno JM, Field MJ, guest editors. 1999. Special Section on Measuring Quality of Care at Life's End. Preface. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 17:73-74 and other selections from this issue, including these:
- Byock IR. 1999. Conceptual Models and the Outcomes of Caring. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 17: 83-92.
- Anita L. Stewart, Joan Teno, Donald L. Patrick, and Joanne Lynn. 1999. The Concept of Quality of Life of Dying Persons in the Context of Health Care *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 17: 93-108.
- Floyd Jackson Fowler, Jr., PhD, Kristen M. Coppola, PhD, and Joan M. Teno, MD, MS. 1999. Methodological Challenges for Measuring Quality of Care at the End of Life. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 17: 114-119.
- Patrick DL, Engelberg RA and Curtis JR. 2001. Evaluating the quality of dying and death. *Journal of Pain & Symptom Management* 22(3): 717-726.
- Visit PHO Seminar Series [webcast]: Endnote: Ezekiel J. Emanuel, MD, PhD. "Costs and Patterns of Care at the End-of-Life" <http://www.sph.unc.edu/health-outcomes/news/seminars/spring2002.htm>

12/12/03 4:00PM: Oral Final Examination: Point-Counterpoint Debates

Debate topics and team assignments announced on September 19.