

Hosted by the California Area Indian Health Service and the California Rural Indian Health Board, Inc.



# ALIFORNIA PROVIDERS' BEST PRACTICES & GPRA MEASURES CONFERENCE with DIABETES DAY

# **Understanding Variation**

Key to More Effective Decision Making By Clifford L. Norman Associates in Process Improvement (API) May 22, 2018

### Becoming a More Effective Health Care Leader Using the Theory of Variation Learning Objectives (p. 15)

- 1. Identify the difference between special and common cause variation when viewing data on control charts.
- 2. Understand how the theory of variation minimizes the total cost of making mistakes 1 and 2; over reacting and under reacting.
- 3. Selecting an appropriate path as a health care leader to avoid making one or both mistakes results in waste, frustration, and the blame game (attribution theory) most of us have no time for these wasteful activities our day is already full.
- 4. Employing the theory of variation to ask good questions before reacting to data.



A SYSTEMS GUIDE TO Improve Patient Care, Decrease Costs, and Improve Population Health

MICHAEL MACCOBY CLIFFORD L. NORMAN C. JANE NORMAN RICHARD MARGOLIES

Reference: Chapter 7

# Use of Data in Health Care

Focus	Judgment & Accountability	Clinical Research	Improvement
Aim	Comparisons with others; Decide on certification	New knowledge	Improvement of Care



Scenario B: Could be Percentage of New Hires to Onboard by Goal Vs. Avg. Days to Onboard New Providers

### Why Understand Variation? *Data – Information – Knowledge for Action*

### Scarce Resource: Time DJ Vanas

# The Data...Drug and Alcohol Incidents at the School – 9/2004 to 2015 – How are we doing?

DRUG AND ALCOHOL 2003-2016													
YEAR	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
SEPTEMBER	141	59	24	7	18	22	10	12	6	1 (2)	4(7)	2 (6)	3(6)
OCTOBER	129	30	21	17	7	26	26	21	13(21)	7 (14)	2(4)	4(4)	9(13)
NOVEMBER	73	41	18	21	28	44	32	14	15(17)	16 (32)	4(4)	22(34)	5(9)
DECEMBER	27	3	14	1	4	18	9	20	11(20)	5 (7)	4(5)	2 (3)	1(3)
JANUARY	7	19	27	15	9	13	15	10	4(5)	2	13(16)	2 (2)	11(14)
FEBRUARY	8	5	33	26	3	23	36	38	3(5)	4	1(1)	4 (7)	1(1)
MARCH	12	4	11	25	7	22	22	20	4(5)	10 (27)	8(12)	14(24)	
APRIL	21	29	19	7	15	30	9	6	4	11(25)	1 (1)	0	
ΜΑΥ	5	4	6	5	0	2	5	10	2	0	0	0	
TOTAL	423	194	173	124	91	200	164	151	62(85)	56(113)	36(83)	50(80)	30(46)

### Drug and Alcohol Incidents – 2003 to 2016



### Deming: "What I am getting ready to show you will haunt you for the rest of your life..."

Prior to our 1st Ami training in 2016, I was uncomfortable using charts vs tables. To me, charts were just dots and lines, and tables had data that I could more easily understand. However, when you created run charts using Micah's data, it was as if a light bulb went off. I already had seen his data , but seeing it in a run chart or control chart with explanations for the peaks and dips suddenly made sense. And, when you teased out portions of the chart so the data points weren't so compressed, it was even more powerful. I have learned that charts can be very useful tools and they are easy to create.

> Beth Finnson, MPH Chemawa Indian Health Center

![](_page_6_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Dr. Ackoff's Hierarchy of Intelligence Data – Information – Knowledge for Action F Deming U The problem is prediction! Т IJ Wisdom Length of Stay - Days P3 Wave 12 Dave 16 Data **Knowledge** Data Data Information Data Data Da Gende Data (1: male Data Patien Date of admissior dishcarge 82 numbei female date date stav (davs) start date 1/2/2011 1/12/2011 1/2/2011 30 5/29/2007 Data 1/17/2011 1/21/2011 1/18/2011 2/14/2011 2/11/2011 25 8/21/2009 2/10/2011 2/18/2011 2/17/2011 2/28/2011

га

ta

## Knowledge for Improvement Data Mining without Subject Matter Knowledge...

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Vodka + Tonic = Drunk
- Gin + Tonic = Drunk
- Whiskey + Tonic = Drunk

### **Sources of Variation**

- **Common Causes (expected)**—those causes inherent in the process over time, affect everyone working in the process, and affect all outcomes of the process
  - Common cause of variation
  - Chance cause
  - Stable process
  - Process in statistical control
- Special Causes (unexpected)—those causes *not* part of the process all the time or not affecting everyone, but arising because of specific circumstances
  - Special cause of variation
  - Assignable cause
  - Unstable process
  - Process not in statistical control

HCDG -108 Ami p. 112

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

Profound Knowledge Partners, Inc. <u>www.pkpinc.com</u> Woman-Owned Small Business Texas Certified HUB ##1743014097409

![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

Purpose:

Rapid change in global markets is driving the need for organizations to accelerate learning and adapt to changes quickly to be successful. PKP Inc. assists Leaders by engaging stakeholders effectively to transform their organization into a collaborative, learning, results-oriented system.

![](_page_10_Picture_5.jpeg)

### 2/3 THOR (Special Cause Patterns)

	Name	Pattern	# Consecutive Data Points	Description
2/3	Two of Three	CL. Outer one-third of chart	2 out of 3	Two out of three consecutive points near (in the outer third) of the control limit
т	Trend		6	Six consecutive points increasing (trend up) or decreasing (trend down).
н	Hugging the Centerline	UCL	15	Fifteen consecutive points close (in the inner one- third) to the centerline.
0	Outside	UCL.	1	A single point outside the control limits.
R	Run		8	A run of eight or more points in a row above (or below) the centerline.

# Using Data without Theory Allowed us to make which mistake? 1 or 2

Doctor	Num	Total	Percent
Α	20	40	0.50
В	20	55	0.36
С	20	50	0.40
D	45	75	0.60
Е	15	40	0.38
F	35	70	0.50
G	25	60	0.42
Н	55	105	0.52
I	45	90	0.50
J	45	80	0.56
К	20	55	0.36
L	10	20	0.50
Μ	15	45	0.33
Total	370	785	0.47

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

ACTUAL	SITUATION	OF SYSTEM

ACTION	NO CHANGE	CHANGE
Take action on individual outcome; Treat as a <b>special cause variation.</b>	- \$ Mistake 1	+ \$ Correct Decision (A)
Treat outcome as part of system; work on changing the system-Treat as <i>common cause variation</i>	+ \$ Correct Decision (B)	- \$ Mistake 2

Transforming Healthcare Leadership – A Systems Guide to Improve Care, Reduce Costs & Improve Population Health, Maccoby, Norman, Norman, Margolies (2013); Ch. 7, p. 108-111

# Judgment and Learning

Legend for Status of Goals (Based on Annual Goal)		FY 2009 Hospital System-Level Measures								
Goal Met (GREEN)										
Goal 75% Met (YELLOW)	-	Goa	ls	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009 Q1	FY 2009 Q2	FY 2009 Q3		
Goal Not Met (RED)		FY 09	Long							
		Guai	Goat							
Patient Perspective										
1.Overall Satisfaction Rating: Percent Who Would Recommend (Includes inpatient, outpatient, ED, and Home Health)		□ 60%	80%	37.98%	48.98%	57.19%	56.25%	51.69%		
2.Wait for 3rd Next Available Appointment: Percent of Areas with appointment available in less than or equal to 7 business days (n=43)		□ 65%	100%	53.5%	51.2%	54.3%	61.20%	65.1%		
Patient Safety										
1.Safety Events per 10,000 Adjusted Patient Days		<b>□ 0.28</b>	0.20	0.35	0.31	0.31	0.30	0.28		
1.Percent Mortality		□ 3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.48	3.50	3.42		
5. Total Infections per 1000 Patient Days		□ <b>2</b>	0	3.37	4.33	4.39	2.56	1.95		
Clinical										
6.Percent Unplanned Readmissions		□ 3.5%	1.5%	6.1%	4.8%	4.6%	4.1%	3.5%		
1.Percent of Eligible Patients Receiving Perfect CareEvidence Based Care (Inpatient and ED)		□ 95%	100%	46%	74.1%	88.0%	91.7%	88.7%		
Employee Perspective										
1.Percent Voluntary Employee Turnover		□ 5.80%	5.20%	5.20%	6.38%	6.10%	6.33%	6.30%		
1.Employee Satisfaction: Average Rating Using 1-5 Scale (5 Best Possible)		□ 4.00	4.25	3.90	3.80	3.96	3.95	3.95		
Operational Performance										
1.Percent Occupancy		□ 88.0%	90.0%	81.3%	84.0%	91.3%	85.6%	87.2%		
1.Average Length of Stay		□ 4.30	3.80	5.20	4.90	4.60	4.70	4.30		
1.Physician Satisfaction: Average Rating Using 1-5 Scale (5 Best Possible)		□ 4.00	4.25	3.80	3.84	3.96	3.80	3.87		
Community Perspective										
1.Percent of Budget Allocated to Non-recompensed Care		7.00%	7.00%	5.91	7.00%	6.90%	6.93%	7.00%		
1. Percent of Budget Spent on Community Health Promotion Programs		0.30%	0.30%	0.32%	0.29%	0.28%	0.31%	0.29%		
Financial Perspective										
1.Operating Margin-Percent		□ <b>1.2%</b>	1.5%	-0.5%	0.7%	0.9%	0.4%	0.7%		
1. Monthly Revenue (Million)-change so shows red-but sp cause good related to occupancy		□ 20.0	20.6	17.6	16.9	17.5	18.3	19.2		

### **Goodhart's Law** Unintended Consequences of Targets

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

"When a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure."

Charles Goodhart London School of Economics

# Judgment and Learning

Legend for Status of Goals (Based on Annual Goal)		FY 2009 Hospital System-Level Measures								
Goal Met (GREEN)										
Goal 75% Met (YELLOW)	-	Goa	ls	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009 Q1	FY 2009 Q2	FY 2009 Q3		
Goal Not Met (RED)		FY 09	Long							
		Guai	Goat							
Patient Perspective										
1.Overall Satisfaction Rating: Percent Who Would Recommend (Includes inpatient, outpatient, ED, and Home Health)		□ 60%	80%	37.98%	48.98%	57.19%	56.25%	51.69%		
2.Wait for 3rd Next Available Appointment: Percent of Areas with appointment available in less than or equal to 7 business days (n=43)		□ 65%	100%	53.5%	51.2%	54.3%	61.20%	65.1%		
Patient Safety										
1.Safety Events per 10,000 Adjusted Patient Days		<b>□ 0.28</b>	0.20	0.35	0.31	0.31	0.30	0.28		
1.Percent Mortality		□ 3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.48	3.50	3.42		
5. Total Infections per 1000 Patient Days		□ <b>2</b>	0	3.37	4.33	4.39	2.56	1.95		
Clinical										
6.Percent Unplanned Readmissions		□ 3.5%	1.5%	6.1%	4.8%	4.6%	4.1%	3.5%		
1.Percent of Eligible Patients Receiving Perfect CareEvidence Based Care (Inpatient and ED)		□ 95%	100%	46%	74.1%	88.0%	91.7%	88.7%		
Employee Perspective										
1.Percent Voluntary Employee Turnover		□ 5.80%	5.20%	5.20%	6.38%	6.10%	6.33%	6.30%		
1.Employee Satisfaction: Average Rating Using 1-5 Scale (5 Best Possible)		□ 4.00	4.25	3.90	3.80	3.96	3.95	3.95		
Operational Performance										
1.Percent Occupancy		□ 88.0%	90.0%	81.3%	84.0%	91.3%	85.6%	87.2%		
1.Average Length of Stay		□ 4.30	3.80	5.20	4.90	4.60	4.70	4.30		
1.Physician Satisfaction: Average Rating Using 1-5 Scale (5 Best Possible)		□ 4.00	4.25	3.80	3.84	3.96	3.80	3.87		
Community Perspective										
1.Percent of Budget Allocated to Non-recompensed Care		7.00%	7.00%	5.91	7.00%	6.90%	6.93%	7.00%		
1. Percent of Budget Spent on Community Health Promotion Programs		0.30%	0.30%	0.32%	0.29%	0.28%	0.31%	0.29%		
Financial Perspective										
1.Operating Margin-Percent		□ <b>1.2%</b>	1.5%	-0.5%	0.7%	0.9%	0.4%	0.7%		
1. Monthly Revenue (Million)-change so shows red-but sp cause good related to occupancy		□ 20.0	20.6	17.6	16.9	17.5	18.3	19.2		

# What color is the light?

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Stable or Unstable?

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Minimizing the Two Mistakes

**MISTAKE 1**: React to an outcome as if it came from a special cause, when actually it came from common causes of variation.

**MISTAKE 2**: Treat an outcome as if it came from common causes of variation, when actually it came from a special cause.

![](_page_18_Figure_3.jpeg)

Transforming Healthcare Leadership – A Systems Guide to Improve Care, Decrease Costs & Improve Population Health. Maccoby, Norman, Norman, Margolies (2013); Ch. 7

![](_page_19_Figure_0.jpeg)

### **Goodhart's Law** Unintended Consequences of Targets

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

"When a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure."

Charles Goodhart London School of Economics

# Becoming a More Effective Health Care Leader Using the Theory of Variation

### Summary

- 1. Identify the difference between special and common cause variation when viewing data on control charts.
- 2. Understand how the theory of variation minimizes the total cost of making mistakes 1 and 2; over reacting and under reacting.
- 3. Selecting an appropriate path as a health care leader to avoid making one or both mistakes results in waste, frustration, and the blame game (attribution theory) most of us have no time for these wasteful activities our day is already full.
- 4. Employing the theory of variation to ask good questions before reacting to data.

![](_page_21_Picture_6.jpeg)

MICHAEL MACCOBY CLIFFORD L. NORMAN C. JANE NORMAN RICHARD MARGOLIES

Reference: Chapter 7

## **Breakout Session for this Afternoon**

- Moving data from data bases to information and knowledge for action.
  - Introduction to Software owned by IHS to produce useful displays of data –QI Charts.
- Explore the use and application of run charts and control charts in the health care setting.
- Appreciate the power and usefulness of using analytic methods for decision making and improvement.

# What to do if the data does not give you the answer you want...

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)