Logether 2 Goal AMGA Foundation National Diabetes Campaign

Monthly Campaign Webinar

May 18, 2017

TODAY'S WEBINAR

• Together 2 Goal® Updates

- Webinar Reminders
- June 2017 Monthly Webinar
- Save the Date! September 12-13
- Million Hearts[®] Hypertension Control Champions
- Goal Post May Newsletter Highlights
- Population Management Strategies
 - AMGA Analytics
- Q&A

Together 2 Goal

- Use Q&A or chat feature





WEBINAR REMINDERS

- Webinar will be recorded today and available the week of May 22nd
 - Together2Goal.org Website (Improve Patient Outcomes → Webinars)
 - Email distribution
- Participants are encouraged to ask questions using the "Chat" and "Q&A" functions on the right side of your screen





JUNE 2017 MONTHLY WEBINAR

- Date/Time: Thursday, June 15, 2-3pm Eastern
- Topic: Integrating the Patient Voice into Diabetes Management
- **Presenters:** Kelly Close, M.B.A. and Dominick Frosch, Ph.D.





SAVE THE DATE! TOGETHER 2 GOAL[®] DIABETES SYMPOSIUM

September 12-13 Indianapolis, IN

- Audience: Together 2 Goal[®] Primary and Quality Contacts, Quality Department members, Chief Medical Officers, diabetes leaders, and others
- In conjunction with:
 - AMGA Joint Council Meeting: Quality Directors/Officers, Chief Medical Officers/Medical Directors, Chief Nursing Officers)
 - AMGA Analytics for Improvement (A4i) Meeting



in collaboration with:





MILLION HEARTS® HYPERTENSION CONTROL CHAMPIONS



To learn more or apply, visit <u>MillionHearts.HHS.gov</u>



GOAL POST NEWSLETTER: APRIL UPCOMING DATES



Upcoming Dates

- June 1: Q1 2017 data due
- June 15: Monthly campaign webinar on Integrating the Patient Voice into Diabetes Management
- June 23: Blinded, comparative reports sent to participating groups



GOAL POST NEWSLETTER: APRIL CAMPAIGN SPOTLIGHT





May 2017 Edition

Velcome to Goal Post, our monthly newsletter highlighting Together 2 $\mathrm{Goal}^{\mathrm{ID}}$ and the latest campaign news and updates.

We encourage all of our Together 2 Goal[®] medical proups and health systems to save the date for Beglermber 12 and 13 for our Together 2 Goal[®] sympositium in indianapolit. The in-person meeting will focus on how campaign participants can advance the management of people with Type 2 dispets by implementing evidence-based care processes. Peerto-peer learning and networking oppositients will be highlins of the symposium.

The Togetter 2 Goal[®] Databets grapodum is open to at AVIAA members, including jour organization's adsembla and quarky improvement professionas. The Databets Bymodum occur in conjunction with the Chinonic Care Roundtable, MMAA Ana/MCI Ana/MCI and improvement's (MAI Leasing) Collocation meeting, and MAGA subtic Leasenshi Courr Meeting with Chief Medical Officers/Medical Directors, Chief Nursing Officers, and Quark Leasenshi Courring Immediation and the subtice of the State of Sta

Mark your calendar and please stay tuned for information about the symposium a speakers, registration, and accommodations! Questions about Together 2 Goal[®]? Please reach out to your Regional Liaison

Execution and a supervision of the product of the pool megorial class Execution and the pool of the p

-The Together 2 Goal⁽¹⁾ Team

comparative reports sent to participating groups



Campaign Spotlight





Premier Medical

Premier Medicial Associatios (PMA) is the largest multispectality physician practice in the greater Pflistudy max. consisting of 100 providers and offering 23 specialities, including endocrinology and cardiology. An artificiant of the Adaptory Havinh Theorem, PMA entors more than 100,000 proglems through 10 poculons. The organization provides care to approximately 4.500 people living with Type 2 databetes.



Challenge As a participant in AMGA Foundation's Diabetes: Together 2 Goal® campaign, PMA submitted heading. data in the campaign on the measures: HhA1c control: Nondin

submitted baseline data to the campaign on flve measures: HbA1c control, blood pressur control; lipid management; medical attention for nephropathy; and a diabetes bundle measure consisting of all four of these measures.

In reviewing the campaign's blinded comparative baseline data report for all Together 2 Good" participants, PMA discoursed the organization comparisonme the group-weighted compared near the comparative structure of the structure of the structure of the properties of the comparative structure of the structure of the structure of the focused on advanced to like structure participants and structure the comparative data compared that discourse and structure of the structure of the structure of the structure of the structure participants and structure of the structure of the structure of the structure participants and structure of the compared to the group-weighted average of 66.3%

www.Together2Goal.org/ GoalGetters

Together 2 Goal

GOAL POST NEWSLETTER: APRIL RESOURCE OF THE MONTH





May 2017 Edition

Velcome to Goal Post, our monthly newsletter highlighting Together 2 Goal[®] and the latest campaign news and updates.

We encourage all of our Together 2 Goal[®] medical groups and health systems to save the date for Berglember 12 and 18 for our Together 2 Goal[®] gympolum in Indianapolit The In-person meeting will found in how campoing natificants can advance the management of people with Type 2 diabetes by implementing evidence-based care processes. Reento-peer learning and networking opportunities will be highlights of the gympolum.

The Together 2 Gas¹⁰ Dalactes dynposition is soon to all ANGA memores, including your organisation is adversible and quality improvement professionals. The Dalactes dynamics was occur in conjunction with the Chronic Gare Roundtable, ANGA Analida Analytics for improvement (Aul Leaning Colaboration meeting), and ANGAs aloni Leadership Council Meeting with Cherl Medical Officers/Medical Directors, Chief Nursing Officers, and Quality Leadership Council memores.

Mark your calendar and please stay buned for information about the symposium agenda, speakers, registration, and accommodations!

Guestions about Together 2 Goal⁶? Rease reach out to your Regional Liason or email together2goal@amga.org.

-The Together 2 Goal® Team

participating groups



Resource of the Month

National

Foundation



Transforming Diabetes Care

Diabetic Kidney Disease: Prevention, Detection and Treatment

Alexis Chettiar, ACNP-BC, PhD(c)





Together 2 Goal.



AMGA Analytics



©2017 AMGA FOUNDATION



Advancing High Performance Health

The Leaky Bucket: Insights into Management of Type 2 Diabetes

May 18, 2017

Presentation Summary



- Overview Together 2 Goal [®] Campaign
- Background: Type 2 Diabetes Data Trends
- Research Study: Diabetes' Control Transitions
 - Predictive Model
 - Model Validation
 - Intervention Model

Together 2 Goal®



- AMGA Foundation's national campaign to reduce the burden of type 2 diabetes
- 150 participating AMGA members—medical groups and health systems
- Three-year initiative
- Goal: Improve care for 1 million people with type 2 diabetes
 - Screening \rightarrow increased detection and diagnosis
- Measures
 - A1c measurement and control (< 8%)
 - Blood pressure measurement and control (< 140/90 mm Hg)
 - Lipid management: Statin prescribed
 - Medical attention for nephropathy
 - Bundle measure

A1c Control by Year: Entire Population with Type 2 Diabetes

- Patients aged 18–75 with type 2 diabetes who had at least one E&M visit from 2013 to 2015
- Top: Number of patients. Bottom: A1c control by year, including patients without an A1c measured in that year
- Left: All organizations combined. Right: Each set of bars represents one organization



A1c Control by Year: A1c Measured in the Respective Year

- Patients aged 18–75 with type 2 diabetes who had an A1c measured in the respective year
- Top: Number of patients. Bottom: A1c control by year, excluding patients without an A1c measured in that year
- Left: All organizations combined. Right: Each set of bars represents one organization





A1c Control by Year: A1c Measured in Each Year

- Patients aged 18–75 with type 2 diabetes who had A1c measured in each of 3 consecutive years
- Top: Number of patients. Bottom: A1c control by year
- Left: All organizations combined. Right: Each set of bars represents one organization





Changes in A1c Control by Year, Accounting for Prior Status



Changes in A1c Control Rates Over Time: With A1c in Each Year



- 414,000 patients aged 18-75 with type 2 diabetes who had an A1c measured in each of the 3 consecutive years
- The 3 bars to the left show the control rates for each of the 3 consecutive years
- The right most bar shows control status for all three years (brown, A1c levels ≥ 8% for all three years; green, < 8% for all years; light orange, transitioning in and out of A1c control throughout the time period





Focus on Patients who Transition



- Identify a population that allows us to answer specific questions
 - Who's transitioning?
 - What's the pattern of Δ A1c?
 - Who's most likely to slip out of control?
 - What interventions work to keep patients in control?
- Study population of 245,000 patients
 - Age 18–75 with type 2 diabetes, and plurality of care (24 months) with primary care, endocrinology, cardiology, or nephrology
 - Both an index A1c in 2015 and a baseline A1c measured 12–15 months earlier

Study Schema





A1c Control Over Time: Study Cohort

AMGA

- 245,000 patients aged 18–75 with type 2 diabetes, plurality of care (24 months) with primary care, endocrinology, cardiology, or nephrology
- Index A1c in 2015, baseline A1c measured 12–15 months earlier
- We see little movement in control over time, not what we expect



A1c Control Over Time: Accounting for Prior Status



- 12–15 months after baseline, 40% of the out of control population have moved into control (A1c has fallen to <8%)
- 60% of those out of control at baseline remain out of control
- We are making progress



A1c Control Over Time: Accounting for Prior Status



- But, 12–15 months after baseline, 11% of the in control population have moved out of control (A1c has risen to ≥8%)
- Only 89% of those in control at baseline remain in control



A1c Control Over Time: Accounting for Prior Status



• So, it's not really 22% of patients that we simply are unable to bring into control over time



Study Cohort: A1c Control Baseline to Follow-up



- So, it's not really 22% of patients that we simply are unable to bring into control over time
- Only 13.6% remained out of control for both years
- In addition, only 68% remained in control



Study Cohort: A1c Control Baseline to Follow-up



- So, it's not really 22% of patients that we simply are unable to bring into control over time
- Only 13.6% remained out of control for both years
- In addition, only 68% remained in control
- 18% of the population is transitioning from one state of control to another





Study Cohort: A1c Control Baseline to Follow-up



- So, it's not really 22% of patients that we simply are unable to bring into control over time
- Only 13.6% remained out of control for both years
- In addition, only 68% remained in control
- 18% of the population is transitioning from one state of control to another
 - Moving out of control at the same rate they are moving into control
 - No overall progress is being made





Move In Stay Out Stay In Move Out

Changes (Δ) in A1c Control (< 8%)

- 245,000 patients aged 18–75 with type 2 diabetes, plurality of care (24 months) with primary care, endocrinology, cardiology, or nephrology, and both index A1c in 2015 and baseline A1c measured 12–15 months earlier
- 18% move into (yellow = 9.6%) or out of (orange = 8.5%) A1c control. Ranges from 14–20% by group (yellow + orange).







Distribution of Δ A1c over 12–15 Months

• Mean Δ A1c for the population was 0.8% and median Δ A1c was 0.5%



ÁMGA

Distribution of $\Delta A1c$ over 12–15 Months and Transitions in Control



- Mean Δ A1c for the population was 0.8% and median Δ A1c was 0.5%
- 10% of patients (yellow) move into control, but 9% (orange) move out of control



Distribution of Δ A1c over 12–15 Months and Transitions in Control

AMGA.

- Mean Δ A1c for the population was 0.8% and median Δ A1c was 0.5%
- 10% of patients (yellow) move into control, but 9% (orange) move out of control
- ΔA1c is much larger for those transitioning...transitions are not happening at the margins



Distribution of Baseline A1c and Transitions in Control

AMGA

• Transitions by baseline A1c (include patients with 5.0 to 11.0 at baseline)



Changes (Δ) in A1c Control (< 8%) by Baseline A1c

- 245,000 patients aged 18–75 with type 2 diabetes, plurality of care (24 months) with primary care, endocrinology, cardiology, or nephrology, and both index A1c in 2015 and baseline A1c measured 12–15 months earlier
- Each column in the right-hand graphs below represents patients with the respective baseline A1c





Changes (Δ) in A1c Control (< 8%) by Baseline A1c

- 245,000 patients aged 18–75 with type 2 diabetes, plurality of care (24 months) with primary care, endocrinology, cardiology, or nephrology, and both index A1c in 2015 and baseline A1c measured 12–15 months earlier
- Each column in the right-hand graphs below represents patients with the respective baseline A1c





Why Predictive Model?



- Identify risk factors associated with patients who appear "safe" but are at risk of slipping out of control
 - Differentiate patients that are considered "well-controlled" vs "moderately-controlled"
 - Model 1: With baseline A1c in the range of 5.5 to 6.9
 - Model 2: With baseline A1c in the range of 7.0 to 7.9, and at least 0.5% absolute increase in A1c
 - Stratify patients by risk factors for optimal use of scarce clinical resources
- 245,000 patients with index A1c in 2015 and baseline A1c measured 12–15 months earlier
 - Restrict to population with 455 days of activity prior to baseline A1c measure (n=179,000)
 - Remove outliers (n=175,000)
 - Remove observations with missing data (n=150,000)

Candidate Predictor and Control Variables











Socio-Demographic Indicators

Age
Gender
Race/Ethnicity
Income
Education
Rural/Urban (RUCA)
Insurance Status

Health Status Indicators

Severity/Comorbidity Scores or indexes
Utilization – IP, ED & Office Visit counts
Related Diagnosis –e.g. Depression, Neuropathy
Related Cohorts - e.g. CHF Cohort
BMI, LDL, Systolic Blood Pressure

Baseline Medications

InsulinSecond Line DM AgentsMetformin Only

Behavioral and Lifestyle Indicators

Smoking Status
Exercise
Diabetes Management Education

Variable Selection

0

Ē

Ð

 \bigcirc

Socio-



Race/Ethnicity phic Age **Insurance Status** gra Gender

Obesity Class Lipoprotein Control Systolic Blood Pressure Hypoglycemia Dx Congestive Heart Failure Dx Microvascular Condition Score

Score

Indicators Status Health Cardiovascular Complexity

Insulin Medications Second Line Agents **Metformin Only** seline Ba

Variable selection was determined by:

- Data Availability: Variables with large number of missing observations were not used in the model
- Univariate Analysis: Those not found to be statistically significant at univariate level were dropped
- Clinical Relevance and Data **Diagnostics:** Of those variables measuring similar clinical constructs and to avoid correlation or collinearity, only those more clinically relevant were retained
- Model Fit Procedure: The final model was selected using a stepwise procedure with backward elimination

Predictive Model Key Findings



Factors with Largest Effects

- Age For "well-controlled" population
- Male (A1c 5.5 to 6.9%)
- Hispanic non-white
- Low-income insurance
- BMI/Obesity
- Smoker at baseline
- Depression
- A1C at baseline
- Systolic blood pressure

- Low-density lipoprotein For moderately-controlled"
- congestilation (Allar 2.0 to 7.9%)
- Hypoglycemia
 - Microvascular Score
 - Metformin only
 - Insulin
 - Second line agents

Model Validation and Application



- Risk stratification can allow for more efficient use of resources and proactive care
- Using the model results, we can rank patients in descending order by predicted probability of moving out of control (A1c ≥ 8%), then divide into percentile bands

- How well does the model identify patients that are more (or less) at risk to move out of control relative to the average patient with A1c < 8?
- To validate the model we look at the actual experience of the patients in each ten-percentile band, over 12-15 months to see the actual proportion that transitioned out of control

Patients with Baseline A1c 5.5% to 6.9%

All Patients (Deciles: Ranked by Predicted Risk) 77,400 100% 10% 10% 80% 10% 10% 60% 10% 10% 40% 10% 10% 20% 10% 10% 0%

Increasing Predicted Risk

Patients with Baseline A1c 5.5% to 6.9%



Increasing Predicted Risk

Patients with Baseline A1c 5.5% to 6.9%



Increasing Predicted Risk

Patients with Baseline A1c 5.5% to 6.9%



Patients with Baseline A1c 7.0% to 7.9%



So, How Does this Help?

- Use readily available predictors to identify and stratify patients and target resources towards those most at risk of moving out of control
- In red, we identified an at-risk population (*relative to a goal of < 8%*):

Baseline A1c 5.5 to 6.9	AND	Baseline A1c 7.0 to 7.5
Males Baseline Insulin or 2 nd line R Class 2 or 3 obesity	Х	Baseline Insulin or 2 nd line Rx Class 2 or 3 obesity

- This at-risk group represents 12% of with baseline A1c ≤ 8 (that is patients that are at least 0.5% below the control threshold), and 26% of those who subsequently moved out of control (≥ 8%)
- Using this "rule of thumb" method to stratify your population you are able to concentrate patients who move out of control by a factor of > 2
- Once you identify those at the highest risk of slipping out of control... now what?



Once We Identify those Most at Risk...Now What?



- Examine the effect of specific interventions:
 - After accounting for differences in patient factors, identify which interventions have the largest impact on diabetes management and for which patients.
 - Examine differential impact of these interventions between those in-control and out-of-control at baseline.





Weight Control and Exercise

Access to Regular or Improved Care







Medication Regimens and Adherence

BMI Distribution by Medical Group

• 245,000 patients aged 18–75 with type 2 diabetes, plurality of care (24 months) with primary care, endocrinology, cardiology, or nephrology, and both index A1c in 2015 and baseline A1c measured 12–15 months earlier



• Left: Baseline BMI distribution for all organizations combined Right: BMI distribution for individual groups



BMI Distribution by Medical Group

• 245,000 patients aged 18–75 with type 2 diabetes, plurality of care (24 months) with primary care, endocrinology, cardiology, or nephrology, and both index A1c in 2015 and baseline A1c measured 12–15 months earlier



• Left: Baseline BMI distribution for all organizations combined Right: BMI distribution for individual groups



Transition Status by Baseline A1c and ΔWeight

Move In	Stay Out
📃 Stay In	Move Out

- On the top is A1c at baseline by decile, within each decile the different columns represent varying degrees of weight loss/gain between baseline and follow-up
- Moving from left to right within a decile signifies less weight loss or more weight gain (good to bad)



Modeling the Effect of Interventions on A1C Control



- To estimate the effect of an intervention on patients we felt it was important to differentiate the patients moving into control from those moving out
- Three different model specifications predicted odds of A1c control at follow-up based on baseline A1c status



Model A: All patients, controlling for baseline A1c status

Model B: A1c ≥ 8% at baseline

Model C: A1c < 8% at baseline

Modeling the Effect of Weight Loss on A1c Transitions



	Model A	Model B	Model C
Outcome Variable	A1C at Followup In-Control <8%		
Baseline A1C	All patients	A1C ≥8	A1C<8
Weight Loss 2 to 4%	19.2%	27.4%	15.7%
Weight Loss 5 to 7%	51.3%	69.5%	40.4%
Weight Loss Greater Than or Equal to 8%	144.6%	195.4%	99.9%
Number of Patients	150,395	33,877	116,518
Note: (i) Reference Category is Weight Neutral (+/- 2%) (ii) Controlling for socio-demographic factors, health sta (iii) Controlling for baseline A1C in Model A	atus indicators and l	baseline medicatio	ons

- Weight loss is associated with better A1c control
- We see incremental increase in the percentage probability of moving into-control with increase in weight loss.
- The effect is most pronounced for those out of control at baseline (A1c ≥ 8%), nearly 2x more likely to move into control
 with a weight loss of 8% or more
- But most important, the effect of weight loss is significant for even small changes in weight and for maintaining control (or for those with baseline A1c < 8%)

Further Investigation



- Refine predictive model for glycemic control state transitions
 - Check ages 18–89 (only 18–75 thus far)
 - Explore individualized threshold (6.5 to 8.5% based on ADA Guidelines)
 - Refine rules of thumb for "safe" patients at greatest risk of slipping out of control
 - Create calculator to incorporate into EHRs
- Explore interventions
 - Weight Control 🗸
 - Medication Regimens and Adherence
 - Nutrition Counseling & Diabetes Education
 - Access to Regular or Improved Care









amga.org

Thank you

Anupama Arora, MS, MPH Aarora@amga.org

Cori Rattelman, MS crattelman@amga.org