Federal Actions Needed to Improve Targeting and Evaluation of Assistance by Quality Improvement Organizations

What GAO Found

Although more homes volunteered to work with the QIOs than CMS expected them to assist intensively, QIOs typically did not target their assistance to the low-performing homes that volunteered. Most QIOs’ primary consideration in selecting homes was their commitment to working with the QIO. CMS did not specify selection criteria for intensive participants but contracted with a QIO that developed guidelines encouraging QIOs to select committed homes and exclude those with many survey deficiencies or QM scores that were too good to improve significantly. Consistent with the guidelines, few QIOs targeted homes with a high level of survey deficiencies, and eight QIOs explicitly excluded these homes. GAO’s analysis of state survey data confirmed that selected homes were less likely than other homes to be low-performing in terms of identified deficiencies. Most state survey and nursing home trade association officials interviewed by GAO believed QIO resources should be targeted to low-performing homes.

QIOs were provided flexibility both in the QMs on which they focused their work with nursing homes and in the interventions they used. Most QIOs chose to work on chronic pain and pressure ulcers, and most used the same interventions—conferences and distribution of educational materials—to assist homes statewide. The interventions used to assist individual homes varied and included on-site visits, conferences, and small group meetings. Just over half the QIOs reported that they relied most on on-site visits to assist intensive participants. Sixty-three percent said such visits were their most effective intervention. Of the 15 QIOs that would have changed the interventions used, most would make on-site visits their primary intervention. Homes indicated that they were less satisfied with the program when their QIO experienced high staff turnover or when their QIO contact possessed insufficient expertise.

Shortcomings in the QMs as measures of nursing home quality and other factors make it difficult to measure the overall impact of the QIOs on nursing home quality, although staff at most of the nursing homes GAO contacted attributed some improvements in the quality of resident care to their work with the QIOs. The extent to which changes in homes’ QM scores reflect improvements in the quality of care is questionable, given the concerns raised by GAO and others about the validity of the QMs and the reliability of the resident assessment data used to calculate them. In addition, quality improvements cannot be attributed solely to the QIOs, in part because the homes that volunteered and were selected for intensive assistance may have differed from other homes in ways that would affect their scores; these homes may also have participated in other quality improvement initiatives. Ongoing CMS evaluation of QIO activities for the contract that began in August 2005 is being hampered by a 2005 Department of Health and Human Services decision that QIO program regulations prohibit QIOs from providing to CMS the identities of homes being assisted intensively.

What GAO Recommends

GAO recommends that the CMS Administrator (1) further increase the number of low-performing homes that QIOs work with intensively, (2) improve monitoring and evaluation of QIO activities, and (3) require QIOs to share with CMS the identity of homes assisted intensively in order to facilitate evaluation. CMS agreed with the first two recommendations, but did not specifically indicate if it agreed with the third.

To view the full product, including the scope and methodology, click on the link above. For more information, contact Kathryn G. Allen, (202) 512-7118, allenk@gao.gov.