

Avoid Built-In Blind Spots in your Performance Measurement

Paula Griswold

Executive Director

Massachusetts Coalition for the Prevention of Medical Errors

October 18, 2018



Goals for Presentation

- “ You can’t manage what you can’t measure.”
- Lessons from MA Coalition – Patient Safety:
Recognizing approaches to measurement that limit its effectiveness for overall performance assessment
- Examples
 - From healthcare/patient safety
 - From government/your experience

1. Reports \neq Events/Incidents

Relying on # Reports for Measurement

- Absolute level of reports
 - (About) 30 Serious Reportable Events in MA hospitals
1012 reported in 2017
 - **52 medication errors** – serious injury or death
 - Studies show adverse events in 3.7% to 13.5% of hospital admissions; 19% were drug complications
(includes additional categories)
 - More than 700,000 admissions → more than 25,900 events
→ nearly 5,000 drug complications

1. Reports \neq Events/Incidents

Relying on # Reports for Measurement

- Relative level of reports
 - For hospitals: different numbers may reflect different reporting “cultures”, not underlying incidence
 - Municipal government: calls from citizens may reflect reporting culture, not the number of potholes...
“Squeaky wheel gets the grease”

2. Only managing what you measure

Only seeing what you measure

- If the 30 specific Serious Reportable Events are considered “all harm”,
you are missing much patient harm

- “Deaths of despair” story

3. Limiting your perspective by “defensive” approach

Limiting scope for improvement by measures defined defensively

- “Preventable harm”

4. Missing unintended consequences

Limiting your view of consequences –
“balancing measures”

- Tracking “balancing measures” defined in advance, without ongoing review of impact that you didn’t expect

Avoid blind spots



Don't stop thinking!

Consider where your measures may be limiting your learning