

Attachment 6A.1 Description of the Chicago Pediatric Quality and Safety Consortium Hospitals

CPQSC: Institution Characteristics

	Advocate – Oak Lawn	Advocate – Park Ridge	Lurie Children’s	Prentice	Mount Sinai	Stroger
Type of Institution	Children’s Hospital with pediatric residency program and fellowships in Pediatric Critical Care and Pediatric Cardiology	Children’s Hospital with pediatric residency program and fellowships in Pediatric Critical Care and Neonatology	Children’s Hospital with pediatric residency programs and fellowships in Allergy/Immunology, Academic Pediatrics & Primary Care, Anesthesia, Cardiology, Child Abuse Pediatrics, Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, Child Neurology, Dentistry, Congenital Cardiac Surgery, Dermatology, Critical Care Medicine, Emergency Medicine, Endocrinology, Heart Transplant, Gastroenterology, Medical Imaging, Neonatology, Ophthalmology, Hematology/Oncology, Neurooncology, Neurosurgery, Infectious Diseases, Kidney Diseases, Pathology, Neurocritical Care,	Birth hospital	Children’s hospital within a hospital with a pediatric residency training program. A safety net hospital.	Public Safety Net

Attachment 6A.1 Description of the Chicago Pediatric Quality and Safety Consortium Hospitals

			Otolaryngology, Pediatric Surgery, Rheumatology, Sports Medicine, Pulmonary Medicine, Regional Anesthesia, Surgical Critical Care, Transplant Hepatology, Urology			
Number of pediatric beds	89 (including 44 normal newborn beds)	160 (including 51 normal newborn beds)	288	0	29	40
Number of NICU beds	32	54	42	90	39	52
Number of PICU beds	24	17	40	0	8	10
Pediatric ED	Combined Pediatric/Adult ED; Pediatric ED MD always available	Separate Pediatric ED attached to Adult ED. Pediatric ED MD available 24/7.	Free standing separate Pediatric ED, Pediatric ED MD available 24/7	None	There's a place for children to be seen as part of the adult ED.	20,000 visits annually; separate from adult ED, staffed by pediatric emergency medicine specialists and pediatricians
Annual number of pediatric admissions	6,502 (including 2,862 normal newborn admissions)	7,296 (including 3,796 normal newborn admissions)	11,291	0	4,800 including 2,500 newborn admissions	2,500
Annual number of out-patient visits	40,107	50,930	426,429	0	19,500	25,000
Subspecialties include Neonatology	Yes	Yes	Yes	No pediatric	Yes	Yes

Age at time of developmental screen (must be between 6 and 36 months) - same value as column K	Evidence that a developmental screen was administered during a well-child visit* (yes - 1/ no - 2)	Evidence of developmental screening using a validated tool* (yes - 1/ no - 2)	Date of developmental screen	Documentation in the chart of a discussion of the developmental screen by a primary care clinician on the same day as the screening visit*(yes - 1/ no - 2)
12 mos	1	1	8/4/2012	1
9 mos	1	1	12/1/2013	1
24 mos	1	1	1/15/2014	1
7 mos	1	1	5/23/2014	2
0				
0				
0				
0				
0				
0				
0				

IF MULTIPLE REFERRALS: Date that referral for follow-up care was provided to patient (not date of actual appointment)*	IF MULTIPLE REFERRALS: Type of referral:	IF MULTIPLE REFERRALS: Type of referral: Other, please specify	IF MULTIPLE REFERRALS: Date that referral for follow-up care was provided to patient (not date of actual appointment)*	IF MULTIPLE REFERRALS: Type of referral:	IF MULTIPLE REFERRALS: Type of referral: Other, please specify
-	None		-	None	
-	None		-	None	
-	None		-	None	
-	None		-	None	

Evidence in the chart that the patient was referred for follow-up services but did not continue care in the medical home where diagnosed* (yes - 1/ no - 2)	Evidence in the chart that the patient did not attend any visit(s) for follow-up services* (yes - 1/ no - 2)	Evidence in the chart that patient has already received or is receiving therapy, intervention, or education that would also be applicable for developmental delay follow-up care* (yes - 1/ no - 2)	Comments?
2	2	2	
2	2	2	
2	2	2	
2	2	1	

Measure 2

Discussion

Referral

Referral follow-up

Follow-up

Follow-up discussion

Developmental screen

Developmental screening result

Screening visit

Screening score

Developmental screening tool

Developmental screening instrument

Discussion with parent

Discussion with family

Developmental screening referral

Positive developmental screening result

Positive developmental screening score

Early Intervention

Follow-up testing

Physical therapy

Physical therapist

Occupational therapy

Occupational therapist

Speech pathologist

Language pathologist

Medical home clinician internal

Specialist

Specialty clinician

Attachment 6A.3 NLP Record Identification for DSF Measures 2 & 3

Early head start

Network care manager

Family-to-family support

Hearing specialist

Vision specialist

Mental health specialist

Positive screen

Positive result

Developmental delay

Healthy screen

Age appropriate

Not age appropriate

On target

Not on target

Concern

Slight concern

Follow-up appointment

Bring back

Neurology

Neurologist

Scan

Follow-up

Not doing well

For age

Discussion with patient's family

Delay

Measure 3

Discussion

Referral

Referral follow-up

Follow-up

Follow-up discussion

Developmental screen

Developmental screening result

Screening visit

Screening score

Developmental screening tool

Developmental screening instrument

Discussion with parent

Discussion with family

Referral tracking

Referral feedback

Feedback from referral

Message from

Heard from

Follow-up results

Received report

Received

Report

Early Intervention

Patient seen

Patient seen by

Follow-up testing

Patient seen by Physical therapist

Patient seen by Occupational therapist

Attachment 6A.3 NLP Record Identification for DSF Measures 2 & 3

Patient seen by Speech pathologist

Patient seen by Language pathologist

Patient seen by Medical home clinician internal

Patient seen by Specialist

Patient seen by Specialty clinician

Patient seen by Early head start

Patient seen by Network care manager

Patient seen by Family-to-family support

Patient seen by Hearing specialist

Patient seen by Vision specialist

Patient seen by Mental health specialist

Attachment 6A.4 Measure Performance Results

Table 1. Demographics-All Sites

	N	%
Female	68	48.57%
Male	72	51.42%
<u>Age at Screen</u>		
6-9 months	80	57.14%
10-18 months	32	22.86%
19-36 months	28	20.00%
<u>Race</u>		
White	45	32.14%
Black	43	30.71%
Hispanic	20	14.29%
Other	11	7.86%
Unknown	21	15.00%
<u>Insurance</u>		
Medicaid	90	64.29%
Private	45	32.14%
Missing	5	3.57%
<u>Primary Language</u>		
English	135	95.74%
Non-English	6	4.26%

Table 2. Kappa Values for Meeting the Measures

	Reviewer 2 - Met the Measure								
	<u>Used Validated tool</u>		<u>Follow-up After Screening</u>		<u>Referral After Positive Screen</u>		<u>Follow-up after Referral</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
<u>Reviewer 1 - Met the Measure</u>									
Yes	80	6	45	7	4	2	1	1	
	56.74%	4.26%	50.56%	7.87%	26.67%	13.33%	14.29%	14.29%	
No	3	52	17	20	2	7	2	3	
	2.13%	36.88%	19.10%	22.47%	13.33%	46.67%	28.57%	42.86%	
Kappa	0.8672		0.4224		0.3778		0.087		

Table 3. Overall Measure Performance

	All Sites				Site A				Site B				Site C				Site D			
	Reviewer group A		Reviewer group B		Reviewer 1		Reviewer 2		Reviewer 3		Reviewer 4		Reviewer 5		Reviewer 6		Reviewer 7		Reviewer 8	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Use Validated Tool	141	60.99%	141	58.87%	57	100.00%	57	100.00%	17	94.12%	17	94.12%	10	50.00%	10	60.00%	57	14.04%	57	7.02%
Follow-up After Screening	89	58.43%	89	69.66%	57	80.70%	57	80.70%	16	6.25%	16	43.75%	6	83.33%	6	83.33%	10	0.00%	10	40.00%
Referral After Positive Screen	15	40.00%	16	37.50%	13	30.77%	14	28.57%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	0	n/a	0	n/a
Follow-up after Referral	7	28.57%	7	42.86%	5	40.00%	5	40.00%	1	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	0.00%	1	0.00%	0	n/a	0	n/a

Attachment 6A.5 References

1. King TN, Tandon SD, Macias MM, ..., Lipkin PH. Implementing developmental screening and referrals: lessons learned from a national project. *Pediatrics*. 2010; 125(2):350-360.