


# Health Outcomes for Better Information and Care (HOVIC)

**Acute Care in Ontario 2012**

September 2013





# Health Outcomes for Better Information and Care (HOBIC)

Acute Care in Ontario 2012

## ICES INVESTIGATIVE REPORT

---

### Authors

Walter P. Wodchis  
Xiaomu Ma  
Dorina Simeonov  
Melissa Stamplecoski  
Peggy White  
Ian Purdy  
Lianne Jeffs  
Karey Iron  
Penny de Nobrega  
Linda McGillis Hall

---

**September 2013**

---

## Publication Information

---

Published by the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences (ICES)

© 2013 Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any format or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the proper written permission of the publisher.

The opinions, results and conclusions included in this report are those of the authors and are independent from the funding sources. No endorsement by the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences (ICES) or the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC) is intended or should be inferred.

### **INSTITUTE FOR CLINICAL EVALUATIVE SCIENCES**

G1 06, 2075 Bayview Avenue  
Toronto, ON M4N 3M5  
Telephone: 416-480-4055  
Email: [info@ices.on.ca](mailto:info@ices.on.ca)

---

## Canadian cataloguing in publication data

Health Outcomes for Better Information and Care (HOBIC): Acute Care in Ontario 2012. ICES Investigative Report.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN: 978-1-926850-44-3 (Online)

---

## How to cite this publication

Wodchis WP, Ma X, Simeonov D, Stamplecoski M, White P, Purdy I, Jeffs L, Iron K, de Nobrega P, McGillis Hall L. Health Outcomes for Better Information and Care (HOBIC): Acute Care in Ontario 2012. ICES Investigative Report. Toronto: Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences; 2013.

This document is available at [www.ices.on.ca](http://www.ices.on.ca).

---

## Authors' Affiliations

---

**Walter P. Wodchis, PhD**

*Associate Professor, Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto / Research Scientist, Toronto Rehabilitation Institute / Adjunct Scientist, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences*

**Xiaomu Ma, MSc**

*Analyst, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences*

**Dorina Simeonov, MSc**

*Project Manager, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences*

**Melissa Stamplecoski, BSc**

*Project Manager, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences*

**Peggy White, MN**

*Project Lead, HOBIC, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences*

**Ian Purdy, MA, RN**

*HOBIC Site Coordinator, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences*

**Lianne Jeffs, RN, PhD**

*Director, Nursing Research / Scientist, Keenan Research Centre of the Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital / Assistant Director, Nursing Health Services Research Unit, University of Toronto / Assistant Professor, Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing and Institute of Health, Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto*

**Karey Iron, MHSc**

*Director, Data Partnerships and Development, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences*

**Penny de Nobrega, BHA, RN**

*Project Manager, HOBIC, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences*

**Linda McGillis Hall, RN, PhD, FAAN, FCAHS**

*Professor, Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing, University of Toronto / Adjunct Scientist, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences*

---

## Acknowledgements

---

### Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences:

**Raluca Blidaru**

Security Lead

**Mahmoud Azimae**

Health Data Lead

**Nicholas Gnidziejko**

Data Quality Analyst

**David Henry**

President and CEO

**Minnie Ho**

Epidemiologist/Research Coordination Lead

The authors also acknowledge  
Dr. Souraya Sidani and Dr. Diane Doran,  
developers of the Therapeutic Self-Care Tool.

HOBIC assessment forms use copyrighted items  
related to functional and clinical status derived  
from the interRAI assessment systems for nursing  
homes and home care settings. These items are  
used in HOBIC forms in Ontario with permission  
from interRAI.

# Contents

<b>i</b>	Publication Information	<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>TECHNICAL APPENDIX</b>
<b>ii</b>	Authors' Affiliations	<b>2</b>	<b>FINDINGS</b>	<b>17</b>	Peer Hospitals
<b>iii</b>	Acknowledgements	<b>2</b>	Hospital Coverage	<b>19</b>	Hospital Coverage
<b>v</b>	About ICES	<b>6</b>	Assessment Completeness	<b>19</b>	25 CMG Groups
<b>vi</b>	List of Exhibits	<b>8</b>	Score Changes	<b>21</b>	Assessment Completeness
<b>vii</b>	Health Outcomes for Better Information and Care (HOBIC)	<b>10</b>	Decline in Activities of Daily Living	<b>21</b>	Average Percentage Improvement
		<b>12</b>	Therapeutic Self-Care		
		<b>15</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>		
		<b>16</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b>		

---

## About ICES

---

The Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences (ICES) is an independent, non-profit organization that produces knowledge to enhance the effectiveness of health care for Ontarians. Internationally recognized for its innovative use of population-based health information, ICES evidence supports health policy development and guides changes to the organization and delivery of health care services.

Key to our work is our ability to link population based health information, at the patient level, in a way that ensures the privacy and confidentiality of personal health information. Linked databases reflecting 13 million of 34 million Canadians allow us to follow patient populations through diagnosis and treatment and to evaluate outcomes.

ICES brings together the best and the brightest talent across Ontario. Many of our scientists are not only internationally recognized leaders in their fields but are also practicing clinicians who understand the grassroots of health care delivery, making the knowledge produced at ICES clinically focused and useful in changing practice. Other team members have statistical training, epidemiological backgrounds, project management or communications expertise. The variety of skill sets and educational backgrounds ensures a multi-disciplinary approach to issues and creates a real-world mosaic of perspectives that is vital to shaping Ontario's future health care system.

ICES receives core funding from the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. In addition, our faculty and staff compete for peer-reviewed grants from federal funding agencies, such as the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, and receive project-specific funds from provincial and national organizations. These combined sources enable ICES to have a large number of projects underway, covering a broad range of topics. The knowledge that arises from these efforts is always produced independent of our funding bodies, which is critical to our success as Ontario's objective, credible source of evidence guiding health care.



## List of Exhibits

**EXHIBIT 1.1** Hospital coverage (percentage of site-specific acute care discharges with an associated HOBIC assessment), for large and small hospitals, December 2006 to March 2012, Ontario

**EXHIBIT 1.2** Hospital coverage (percentage of site-specific acute care discharges with an associated HOBIC assessment) for participating sites, by type of hospitalization, December 2006 to March 2012, Ontario

**EXHIBIT 2.1** Completeness of HOBIC assessments (at admission and/or discharge) performed at participating sites for 10 HOBIC scales, January 1 to March 31, 2012, Ontario

**EXHIBIT 3.1** Percentage change in HOBIC assessment scores on selected measures from admission to discharge, by small and large hospitals, January 1 and March 31, 2012, Ontario

**EXHIBIT 4.1** Percentage of patients with a decline in ADL across participating sites, by age and length of stay, December 1, 2006 to March 31, 2012, Ontario

**EXHIBIT 5.1** Percentage change in TSC-revised item score from admission to discharge, by response, April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012, Ontario

**EXHIBIT 5.2** Proportion of response options for TSC-revised items on admission and discharge, April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012, Ontario

**EXHIBIT 6.1** HOBIC sites grouped by hospital size, Ontario, 2012

**EXHIBIT 6.2** Case Mix Groups in the “25 CMG” group used to classify the type of hospitalization for HOBIC assessments

## Health Outcomes for Better Information and Care (HOBIC)

The Health Outcomes for Better Information and Care (HOBIC) initiative is funded by the Information Management and Investment Division of the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC) and managed by the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences (ICES). HOBIC introduces the collection of standardized clinical information (HOBIC measures) reflective of patient care in the following settings across Ontario:

- Acute care
- Complex continuing care
- Long-term care
- Home care

This information provides feedback to health care providers and health care leaders to support quality improvement in health care delivery.

**HOBIC measures** include assessments of:

- Functional status/activities of daily living (e.g., eating, bathing, personal hygiene, walking, transfer to toilet, toilet use, bed mobility, bladder continence)
- Symptom status (e.g., pain, fatigue, dyspnea, nausea)
- Safety outcomes (e.g., falls, pressure ulcers)
- Therapeutic self-care/readiness for discharge (e.g., ability to manage medications, understanding of their symptoms and how to treat them, general ability for self-care, knowing who to contact for help, ability to handle or adjust activities of daily living)

These data are a unique source of information that can be used to answer important questions about health system and provider effectiveness, as well as nursing practice.

Recent studies conducted by ICES scientists provide examples of how HOBIC data are currently being used, from a research perspective, to understand how better information can improve health outcomes.<sup>1,2</sup> One study examined the relationship between HOBIC acute care discharge measures and the likelihood of acute care readmission within 3, 30, 60 and 90 days from discharge and found that early readmissions were related to nausea while those occurring later were more strongly related to dyspnea.<sup>1</sup> In addition, a higher patient score on the therapeutic self-care discharge assessment was negatively related to readmission for all time periods.<sup>1</sup> Another study examined changes in clinical health outcomes between admission and discharge in acute care HOBIC sites and found significant improvements in all of the outcomes studied, with the exception of pressure ulcers.<sup>2</sup> This suggests that nursing care interventions are having the desired effect on clinical outcomes, leading to an improvement in the outcomes by the time of discharge.<sup>2</sup>

# Introduction

This is the second provincial report produced by ICES that examines HOBIC data.. It focuses exclusively on HOBIC measures in the acute care setting collected from December 1, 2006 to March 31, 2012. The report's findings are divided into five sections as follows:

1. **Hospital coverage** – sheds light on improvements in the uptake and representativeness of site-specific HOBIC data since the start of data collection.
2. **Assessment completeness** – presents information about the proportion of patients with complete and incomplete assessments at admission and/or discharge for each measure.
3. **Score changes** – reports mean admission and discharge assessment scores, along with the average percentage improvement observed for each of the HOBIC scales, using the most recent quarter of data available (January to March 2012).
4. **Decline in activities of daily living** – shows the percentage of patients who experienced a decline in activities of daily living during the course of their hospital stay, by age and length of stay.
5. **Therapeutic self-care** – reports the changes in each TSC item score from admission to discharge and the percentage of all respondents by type of response to each item.

Comparisons are also provided, where possible, between small and large hospital sites. While individual hospitals are able to view and use their own HOBIC data, this report adds value through linkages with other databases, such as the Canadian Institute for Health Information's Discharge Abstract Database (CIHI-DAD), and by creating aggregate benchmarking across participating HOBIC sites.

# Findings

## Hospital Coverage

Hospital coverage is defined as the proportion of site-specific acute care discharges—recorded in the CIHI-DAD—that had an associated HOBIC assessment. Thus, it refers to the proportion of patients where data were available, or “covered,” in both datasets. The total number of hospital discharges between December 1, 2006 and March 31, 2012 was calculated from the CIHI-DAD (denominator). Any CIHI-DAD record with an admission and/or discharge assessment for any of the HOBIC measures was included in the numerator.

Therefore, the coverage estimate measures the proportion of acute care admissions that had any HOBIC assessment (either admission or discharge). Coverage rates for each hospital site were calculated on a bimonthly basis to ensure that at least 30 observations in each measurement period were obtained.

**Exhibit 1.1** presents the mean and interquartile range (between the 25th and 75th percentiles) for bimonthly hospital coverage for participating small and large hospitals. (See the **Technical Appendix** for a full list of hospital sites.) It is important to consider factors which could contribute to lower coverage rates (e.g., a higher number of casual or float nursing staff on a unit who may not have been trained in

HOBIC assessments, unit preparedness for HOBIC data collection) in order to develop strategies aimed at improving these rates in the future.

With input from local nursing staff, HOBIC has set specific achievable targets for each site that take their unique settings into account (e.g., the target may differ for surgical and medical units). HOBIC science and operations leads have been working with hospitals to help them achieve the ultimate goal of 80% coverage. In recent years, small hospitals on average have been meeting this target while coverage for large hospitals remains below target.

In **Exhibit 1.2**, bimonthly hospital coverage for participating hospitals is presented by the type of hospitalization: medical, surgical and “25 CMG”


(Case Mix Group). Hospitalizations were broadly categorized as medical and surgical, respectively, based on the CMG partition methodology developed by CIHI.

Case Mix Groups+ (CMG+) is a methodology designed to aggregate acute care inpatients with similar clinical and resource utilization characteristics using ICD-10-CA (International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, Tenth Revision, Canada) and CCI (Canadian Classification of Health Interventions).<sup>3</sup> The “25 CMG” group represents all patients hospitalized for one of the 25 CMGs included in the Local Health Integration Network (LHIN) accountability agreements and identified by the MOHLTC Health Analytics Branch as being associated with preventable readmissions. These CMGs fall more broadly under the following disease groups: stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, pneumonia, congestive heart failure, diabetes, cardiac and gastrointestinal. (See the **Technical Appendix** for a list of the 25 CMGs.)

**EXHIBIT 1.1** Hospital coverage (percentage of site-specific acute care discharges with an associated HOBIC assessment), for large and small hospitals, December 2006 to March 2012, Ontario


## Key Findings

- Median coverage for small hospitals remained relatively stable from 2006 to 2012, ranging from 60% in June 2007 to 95% in June 2009.
- Median coverage for large hospitals ranged from 50% to 60% over the study period.



IQR = interquartile range (between 25th and 75th percentile)

**EXHIBIT 1.2** Hospital coverage (percentage of site-specific acute care discharges with an associated HOBIC assessment) for participating sites, by type of hospitalization, December 2006 to March 2012, Ontario



---

## Assessment Completeness

---

In addition to knowing how many eligible patients are receiving a HOBIC assessment, it is also important to look at how complete these assessments are. Assessment completeness is reported in **Exhibit 2.1**, as the number and proportion of patients who had complete, partially complete, and incomplete assessments for each of the ten HOBIC scales. Data is presented for the most recent quarter (January 1 to March 31, 2012).

Sites should aim to have complete data for all eligible patients with both an admission and discharge assessment for all scales. A patient's HOBIC record was deemed complete if all required items for a given scale were assessed at both admission and discharge. An assessment was considered partially complete for a given scale if one assessment was completed, at either admission or discharge, for that scale.

For the therapeutic self-care (TSC) scale, patients with a recorded TSC version 2 score were interpreted as having a completed TSC assessment. The overall patient score indicates overall completeness across all scales, excluding TSC. If a single measure was missing, then an overall score could not be calculated for the patient; hence the measure for that patient record was marked as incomplete. (See the **Technical Appendix** for more details.)

Several practices have been shown to be effective in improving assessment completeness:

- Including a HOBIC information session in hospital orientations.
- Embedding HOBIC within existing patient care assessments to avoid duplication.
- Working with nurses to reinforce the value and importance of the discharge assessment.
- Presenting HOBIC coverage and completion rate information at team meetings to reinforce the importance of these assessments.
- Presenting HOBIC reports to nursing advisory groups and including them in the pursuit of higher completion rates.
- Demonstrating commitment to and use of HOBIC reports by senior nurse executives.



**EXHIBIT 2.1** Completeness of HOBIC assessments (at admission and/or discharge) performed at participating sites for 10 HOBIC scales, January 1 to March 31, 2012, Ontario

## Key Findings

- Rates of completion for discharge assessments were lower than for admission assessments, which may lead to gaps in discharge planning (e.g., patient education and post-discharge care).
- The ADL composite measure and the concomitant overall patient score had the greatest numbers of incomplete assessments.
- Therapeutic self-care assessments are only required for patients being discharged home. Approximately 20% of patients were legitimately missing a therapeutic self-care discharge assessment because they were discharged to long-term care, complex continuing care or other inpatient care.

HOBIC Scales	Complete	Partially Complete		Incomplete
	Completed Admission and Discharge Assessment	Missing Admission Assessment	Missing Discharge Assessment	Missing Admission and Discharge Assessment
	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)
ADL composite	107 (21.2)	158 (31.3)	121 (24.0)	119 (23.6)
Bladder continence	151 (29.9)	144 (28.5)	166 (32.9)	44 (8.7)
Pain composite	134 (26.5)	131 (25.9)	166 (32.9)	74 (14.7)
Fatigue	162 (32.1)	135 (26.7)	174 (34.5)	34 (6.7)
Dyspnea	155 (30.6)	142 (28.1)	171 (33.8)	38 (7.5)
Nausea	155 (30.7)	141 (27.9)	171 (33.9)	38 (7.5)
Falls	157 (31.0)	135 (26.7)	174 (34.4)	40 (7.9)
Pressure ulcers	152 (30.1)	140 (27.7)	169 (33.5)	44 (8.7)
Therapeutic self-care, version 2	144 (28.5)	138 (27.3)	163 (32.3)	60 (11.9)
Overall patient score	69 (13.7)	137 (27.2)	95 (18.8)	203 (40.3)

ADL = activities of daily living

**Note:**

Excludes patients who died, patients who were transferred from or to another hospital or intensive care unit, mental health admissions, and patients with a length of stay of less than 48 hours.

---

## Score Changes

---

For patients with both an admission and discharge assessment, the average percentage score change for each measure was calculated (the mean score at discharge minus the mean score at admission, divided by the mean score at admission) and reported in **Exhibit 3.1**. In order to present the percentage change as a positive improvement, all changes (incidence of declines) are measured on a positive scale (to measure incidence of improvement). Data is presented for the most recent quarter (January 1 to March 31, 2012).

HOBIC measures for pressure ulcers and falls are not included in **Exhibit 3.1**. The incidence of new falls and pressure ulcers was examined for patients at participating sites between January 1 and March 31, 2012. On average, 4% of patients with both admission and discharge assessments for falls experienced a fall during the course of their hospitalization and 3% of patients developed a pressure ulcer during their hospital stay. These are patients with an admission score of zero and a discharge score of greater than zero on these two measures.

Several practices have been shown to be effective in improving score changes:

- Using HOBIC measures in clinical care huddles to target areas of focus for the interdisciplinary team (e.g., improving ambulation and continence).
- Using the therapeutic self-care scale on admission and 24-48 hours before discharge to give nurses more information about the needs of their patients, thus making them better able to target patient-specific education requirements at discharge.

**EXHIBIT 3.1** Percentage change in HOBIC assessment scores for select measures from admission to discharge, by small and large hospitals, January 1 and March 31, 2012, Ontario

## Key Findings

- For each of the HOBIC scales presented above, patients improved, on average, from admission to discharge. The magnitude of improvement was similar across small and large hospitals.
- The median percentage improvement for the health outcomes of bladder continence, pain assessment and management, and management of nausea and dyspnea symptoms was substantial from admission to discharge (reflected by a lower score at discharge). This is consistent with initial research, which suggests that care interventions are leading to improvements in outcomes.<sup>2</sup>

HOBIC Scales	Mean Score at Admission	Mean Score at Discharge	Percentage Change in Scores						Average Percentage Improvement
			Small Hospitals			Large Hospitals			
			25th Percentile	50th Percentile (Median)	75th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile (Median)	75th Percentile	
ADL composite	6.8	4.0	31	41	45	20	25	41	37
Bladder continence	0.6	0.4	11	34	43	4	13	40	25
Pain composite	1.1	0.5	38	53	65	30	51	55	55
Fatigue	1.2	0.8	29	37	47	35	47	50	39
Dyspnea	0.6	0.3	34	52	59	45	53	67	49
Nausea	0.4	0.1	65	75	86	64	75	80	71
Therapeutic self-care, version 2	1.7	1.7	-6	-3	-1	-4	-2	-1	-3
Overall patient score	10.6	6.3	25	42	47	35	37	46	36

ADL = activities of daily living

IQR = interquartile range (25th to 75th percentile).

---

## Decline in Activities of Daily Living

---

The decline in activities of daily living (ADL) functioning associated with long lengths of stay in acute care settings is problematic, particularly for older adults who may decompensate during hospital stay. **Exhibit 4.1** shows the percentage of patients who experienced a decline in their ADL score over the course of their acute care hospital stay. Patients with a discharge score for ADL that was greater than their admission score were defined as having a decline. The measure includes only patients who had both admission and discharge assessments for ADL between December 1, 2006 and March 31, 2012. In order to better characterize patients with a functional decline in ADL, the percentage of patients with a decline in ADL was calculated for different lengths of stay (1–7, 8–14, 15–30, 31–90, more than 90 days) and age groups (18–40, 41–65, 66–79, 80–89, more than 89 years).


Several practices have been shown to be effective in preventing decline in activities of daily living:

- Posting HOBIC information on unit-based quality boards so that the team can use this information to focus practice.
- Incorporating HOBIC information into senior-friendly care programs, restorative care units and acute geriatric units—information that can add value in focusing on specific areas for these populations (e.g., function, fatigue, falls and continence).

**EXHIBIT 4.1** Percentage of patients with a decline in ADL across participating sites, by age group and length of stay, December 1, 2006 to March 31, 2012, Ontario

### Key Findings

- Within each length of stay grouping, the percentage of patients experiencing a decline in ADL functioning increased with age.
- Within a given age category, the percentage of patients experiencing a decline in ADL functioning increased with length of stay.
- These trends were not observed consistently across all sites (data not shown). It would be quite valuable for health care leaders to understand the reasons for these differences across sites.



ADL = activities of daily living

**Note:** Across all age categories, percentages for patients with a length of stay of greater than 90 days were based on less than 20 patients.

## Therapeutic Self-Care

Therapeutic self-care is critical for successful transition to and management of conditions in the community. Self-care refers to patients' ability to perform activities that are aimed at maintaining health and managing their health conditions at home, after discharge from hospital.

The therapeutic self-care assessment is designed to determine a patient's perceived ability to engage in four aspects of self-care:

- Taking medications
- Managing symptoms
- Performing activities of daily living
- Managing changes in condition

The therapeutic self-care (TSC) scale, which has displayed adequate reliability and validity, was originally designed as a self-reporting measure. However, nurses also administer the TSC scale, ideally within 24 hours of admission and upon discharge from hospital. In 2010, refinements to version 1 of the TSC scale were made in response to feedback from nurses and researchers. Questions were modified to make them easier to use, understand and respond to, resulting in version 2 of the

TSC scale.<sup>4</sup> All results shown in this report use the revised TSC scale and may not be comparable to results presented in the HOBIC report published in 2012.

In order to provide a full perspective on the outcomes of this measure, it is presented in two ways. **Exhibit 5.1** shows the changes in each TSC item score between admission and discharge, and **Exhibit 5.2** shows the percentage of all respondents by type of response to each item on admission and discharge.

Several practices have been shown to be effective in improving therapeutic self-care:

- Teaching back the four aspects of self-care through clinician and patient interaction, clarification and comprehension.
- Sharing the discharge assessment, including the therapeutic self-care scores, with Community Care Access Centres, physicians and others involved in the patient's care post-discharge.
- Using the therapeutic self-care scale on admission and 24–48 hours before discharge makes nurses better informed about the needs of their patients on discharge and allows them to target education specific to the patient.

**EXHIBIT 5.1** Percentage change in TSC-revised item scores from admission to discharge, by response, April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012, Ontario**Knowledge of Medications**

% of total frequency		Discharge		
		0	1	2
Admission	0	2.5	2.0	2.0
	1	1.4	7.0	11.0
	2	0.9	8.0	65.2

**Reason for Medications**

% of total frequency		Discharge		
		0	1	2
Admission	0	2.4	1.9	1.5
	1	1.3	7.0	10.4
	2	0.8	8.4	66.2

**Taking Medications**

% of total frequency		Discharge		
		0	1	2
Admission	0	1.6	0.9	1.8
	1	0.8	2.9	8.0
	2	1.2	6.7	76.2

**Symptoms**

% of total frequency		Discharge		
		0	1	2
Admission	0	1.9	1.4	1.5
	1	1.2	5.4	10.3
	2	1.7	7.8	68.8

**Carrying Out Treatments for Symptoms**

% of total frequency		Discharge		
		0	1	2
Admission	0	2.6	2.2	2.4
	1	1.8	7.5	13.8
	2	1.8	8.4	59.5

**Ability to Do Everyday Things**


% of total frequency		Discharge		
		0	1	2
Admission	0	2.9	2.9	2.6
	1	2.2	9.3	13.4
	2	1.3	11.2	54.3

**Available Contact to Help with Everyday Things**

% of total frequency		Discharge		
		0	1	2
Admission	0	1.3	0.7	2.5
	1	0.7	2.4	8.4
	2	1.5	5.8	76.7

**Available Contact in Case of Emergency**

% of total frequency		Discharge		
		0	1	2
Admission	0	1.0	0.5	1.1
	1	0.5	1.5	5.4
	2	0.8	4.3	85.0

**EXHIBIT 5.2** Proportion of response options for TSC-revised items on admission and discharge, April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012, Ontario



# Conclusion

This report provides information about the coverage and completion rates of HOBIC measures for participating acute care sites across the province. There have been improvements in coverage and completion rates over time; however, larger hospitals have not achieved their target completion rates.

The examination of changes in HOBIC scores from admission to discharge provides health care organizations with evidence to use for improving patient care and local nursing practice. There have been improvements over time in score changes from admission to discharge. These improvements may reflect strategies that were implemented after preliminary studies highlighted some of the

challenges involved in collecting and using HOBIC data,<sup>5,6</sup> and demonstrate the commitment to and value placed on HOBIC by health care leaders in the province.<sup>6</sup>

Given Ontario's aging population and increased focus on acute care length of stay, the HOBIC data that are focused on ADL decline provide health care organizations with valuable information to implement and evaluate interventions to mobilize patients, particularly older adults, early in their stay.

Throughout this report, effective strategies for improving assessment completeness, score changes, declines in ADL, and therapeutic self-care are highlighted. Health care leaders are encouraged to

incorporate these strategies to enable better data quality, facilitate better decision making and, ultimately, improve patient care.

# References

1. Wodchis W, McGillis Hall L, Quigley L. Increasing patient self-care to avoid acute readmissions. Unpublished data presented at HOBIC Symposium: Demonstrating Value with HOBIC Data, Toronto, ON, February 8, 2012.
2. McGillis Hall L, Wodchis WP, Ma X, Johnson S. Changes in patient health outcomes from admission to discharge in acute care. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 2012; 28(1):8-16.
3. Canadian Institute for Health Information. CMG+. Accessed July 18, 2013 at [http://www.cihi.ca/CIHI-ext-portal/internet/en/document/standards+and+data+submission/standards/case+mix/casemix\\_cmg](http://www.cihi.ca/CIHI-ext-portal/internet/en/document/standards+and+data+submission/standards/case+mix/casemix_cmg)
4. Sidani S, Doran D, Tracey P, Persaud M. Refinement of the Therapeutic Self-Care Scale. Phase 1 Report [2009]. Accessed July 18, 2013 at [http://community.hobic-outcomes.ca/file.php/1/Research/TSC\\_refinement\\_report\\_-\\_phase\\_1\\_short\\_form.pdf](http://community.hobic-outcomes.ca/file.php/1/Research/TSC_refinement_report_-_phase_1_short_form.pdf)
5. Jeffs L, Wilson G, Ferris E, Cardiff B, Ng S, Lanceta M, White P, Pringle D. Exploring nurses' perceptions of collecting and using HOBIC measures to guide clinical practice and improve care. *Nurs Leadersh (Tor Ont).* 2012; 25(1):14-28.
6. Hall LM, Johnson S, Hemingway A, Pringle D, White P, Wodchis WP. "The potential is unlimited!" Nurse leader perspectives on the integration of HOBIC in Ontario. *Nurs Leadersh (Tor Ont).* 2012; 25(1):29-42.

# Technical Appendix

---

## Peer Hospitals

---

Participating HOBIC sites in Ontario were categorized as either small or large hospitals. In total, there were 35 small hospitals and 17 large hospitals, the latter comprised of two academic/teaching hospitals and 15 community hospitals. The small hospitals had from four to 104 acute care beds (excluding mental health, chronic care, general and special rehabilitation beds). The large hospitals had from 92 to 458 acute care beds. **Exhibit 6.1** lists the hospitals that comprise each category.

**EXHIBIT 6.1** HOBIC sites grouped by hospital size, Ontario, 2012

Small Hospitals	Large Hospitals
<p>Alexandra Hospital            Campbellford Memorial Hospital            Collingwood General and Marine Hospital            Deep River and District Hospital            Englehart and District Hospital            Georgian Bay General Hospital – Midland Site            Grey Bruce Health Services – Lions Head Site            Grey Bruce Health Services – Markdale Site            Grey Bruce Health Services – Meaford Site            Grey Bruce Health Services – Southampton Site            Grey Bruce Health Services – Wiarton Site            Groves Memorial Community Hospital            Haldimand War Memorial Hospital            Haliburton Highlands Health Services Corporation – Haliburton Site            Hanover and District Hospital            Headwaters Health Care Centre – Dufferin Site            Kirkland and District Hospital            Lakeridge Health Corporation – Bowmanville Site            Lakeridge Health Corporation – Port Perry Site            Niagara Health System – Fort Erie Douglas Site            Niagara Health System – Niagara-on-the-Lake Site            Norfolk General Hospital            North Wellington Health Care – Mount Forest Site            North Wellington Health Care – Palmerston Site            Northumberland Hills Hospital            Quinte Healthcare Corporation – Bancroft Site            Quinte Healthcare Corporation – Picton Site            Quinte Healthcare Corporation – Trenton Site            Smooth Falls Hospital            South Bruce Grey Health Centre – Chesley Site            South Bruce Grey Health Centre – Durham Site            South Bruce Grey Health Centre – Walkerton Site            South Bruce Grey Health Centre – Kincardine Site            St. Francis Memorial Hospital            Stevenson Memorial Hospital, Alliston</p>	<p>Brant Community Healthcare System – Brantford Site            Chatham-Kent Health Alliance            Grand River Hospital Corporation – Waterloo Site            Hamilton Health Sciences Corporation – McMaster Site            Joseph Brant Memorial Hospital            Lakeridge Health Corporation – Oshawa Site            Peterborough Regional Health Centre            Quinte Healthcare Corporation – Belleville Site            Ross Memorial Hospital            Royal Victoria Hospital of Barrie            Scarborough Hospital – Grace Site            Scarborough Hospital – Scarborough General Site            Southlake Regional Health Centre            St. Mary’s General Hospital            St. Michael’s Hospital            Timmins and District General Hospital            Trillium Health Centre – Mississauga Site</p>

---

## Hospital Coverage

---

In calculating hospital coverage, CIHI-DAD records created prior to the first HOBIC assessment submitted by each site were excluded from the denominator. In accordance with HOBIC business rules, the following were also excluded:

- patients younger than 18 years at hospital admission
- maternity care admissions
- mental health admissions
- CIHI-DAD records with an ICU flag

The numerator included any site-specific acute care hospitalization identified in the CIHI-DAD (same exclusions as for the denominator) for which there was also a linkable HOBIC record. Any CIHI-DAD record with an admission and/or discharge assessment for any of the HOBIC measures was included in the numerator.

---

## 25 CMG Groups

---

This group represents all patients hospitalized for one of the 25 CMGs included in the LHIN accountability agreements and identified as being associated with preventable readmissions by the Health Analytics Branch of the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. These CMGs are available from the CIHI-DAD and fall broadly under the following disease groups: stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, pneumonia, congestive heart failure, diabetes, cardiac and gastrointestinal.

**EXHIBIT 6.2** Case Mix Groups in the “25 CMG” group used to classify the type of hospitalization for HOBIC assessments

CMG+		CMG+ Description
<b>Stroke (Age &gt; 45)</b>		
CMG 2009	25	Hemorrhagic event of central nervous system
	26	
	28	
<b>Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (Age &gt; 45)</b>		
CMG 2009	139	Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
<b>Pneumonia (All Ages)</b>		
CMG 2009	136	Bacterial pneumonia
	138	Viral/unspecified pneumonia
	143	Disease of pleura
<b>Congestive Heart Failure (Age &gt; 45)</b>		
CMG 2009	196	Heart failure without cardiac catheter
<b>Diabetes (All Ages)</b>		
CMG 2009	437	Diabetes
<b>Cardiac (Age &gt; 40)</b>		
CMG 2009	202	Arrhythmia without cardiac catheter
	204	Unstable angina/atherosclerotic heart disease without cardiac catheter
	208	Angina (except unstable)/chest pain without cardiac catheter
<b>Gastrointestinal (All Ages)</b>		
CMG 2009	231	Minor upper gastrointestinal intervention
	248	Severe enteritis
	251	Complicated ulcer
	253	Inflammatory bowel disease
	254	Gastrointestinal hemorrhage
	255	Gastrointestinal obstruction
	256	Esophagitis/gastritis/miscellaneous digestive disease
	257	Symptom/sign of digestive system
	258	Other gastrointestinal disorder
	285	Cirrhosis/alcoholic hepatitis
	286	Liver disease except cirrhosis/malignancy
	287	Disorder of pancreas except malignancy
	288	Disorder of biliary tract

---

## Assessment Completeness

---

To calculate assessment completeness, patients who were ineligible to receive a HOBIC assessment were excluded based on the following criteria: were transfers to or from another hospital or ICU, were mental health admissions, died, or had a hospital length of stay of less than 48 hours. The denominator includes only site-specific hospitalizations that were identified in the HOBIC database; these include patients who had at least one assessment either at admission or discharge for any of the HOBIC scales. Patients discharged to long-term care homes do not require a therapeutic self-care (TSC) assessment on discharge; however, they were not excluded from the TSC assessment completeness calculation. Patients discharged to long-term care, complex continuing care or other inpatient care represented 12% of patients with HOBIC assessments overall and less than 20% of patients who lacked a TSC assessment at discharge.

---

## Average Percentage Improvement

---

The average percent improvement represents the site-specific mean score difference (the discharge score minus the admission score) divided by the mean admission score. In order to present the percentage change as a positive improvement, all values (except therapeutic self-care, version 2) were converted to a positive scale (i.e., multiplied by negative one).

# Evidence Guiding Health Care

---

**Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences**

G1 06, 2075 Bayview Avenue

Toronto, Ontario M4N 3M5

[www.ices.on.ca](http://www.ices.on.ca)

---

