Published in final edited form as:

Am J Prev Med. 2013 December ; 45(6): 782–786. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2013.08.007.

Assessing the Impact of a Quality Improvement Intervention on Diabetes Self- Management Education Services Provided by Local Health Departments

Angela T. Dearing, MD,

Department of Internal Medicine, University of Kentucky College of Medicine, Lexington, Kentucky

Richard C. Ingram, DrPH,

Department of Health Services Management, University of Kentucky College of Public Health, Lexington, KY

Robin P. Pendley, DrPH, and

Department of Health Services Management, University of Kentucky College of Public Health, Lexington, Kentucky

Sarah Wilding, MPA

Kentucky Department for Public Health, Frankfort, Kentucky

Abstract

Background—As the burden of diabetes continues to overwhelm the public health system, there is increased demand on local health departments (LHDs) to improve public health services.

Quality improvement (QI) techniques have been shown to be an effective means to improve the delivery of services by LHDs.

Purpose—To evaluate the extent to which the adoption of organizational quality improvement (QI) strategies influences the delivery and outreach of Diabetes Self- Management Education (DSME) services provided by LHDs.

Methods—A change facilitation model which included QI team development and on- site QI training and facilitation was delivered to 6 LHDs who provide DSME during 2010-2011. After training, each LHD developed and implemented a QI project to improve the outreach and delivery of DSME services. Pre- and post- intervention surveys were administered to evaluate the extent of change in DSME outreach and delivery.

Results—The number of individuals who completed an entire course of DSME increased by > 100%, and 14% more diabetics attended DSME on a monthly basis. Half of LHDs reported

Corresponding Author: Angela T. Dearing, MD, MPH, 111 Washington Avenue, Lexington, KY 40536, Telephone: 859-218-2100, Fax number: 859-257-9862, angelatackett@uky.edu.

Conflict of Interest Statement:

Angela Dearing has no financial disclosures.

Richard Ingram has no financial disclosures.

Robin Pendley has no financial disclosures.

Sarah Wilding has no financial disclosures.

receiving increased numbers of referrals per month, and 15% more healthcare providers referred diabetic patients to the LHD for DSME.

Conclusions—Participation in COACH 4 DM led to improvements in the LHD QI infrastructure, and in the outreach and delivery of services to diabetic patients. The techniques used during COACH-4 DM are applicable to a wide variety of contexts and may be an effective tool to improve the delivery of other clinical and community preventive services.

Background

The Commonwealth of Kentucky is suffering from staggering levels of diabetes- 11.4% of Kentuckians have been diagnosed with diabetes(ranked 4th nationally), and diabetes is the 7th leading cause of death in the state.¹ Diabetes is also a major threat to the financial well-being of Kentucky- the estimated cost associated with diabetes in Kentucky in 2006 was over \$ 2 billion.² The overwhelming burden of diabetes necessitates that local health departments (LHDs) improve the delivery of public health services that will decrease diabetes rates and improve health outcomes.

Evidence suggests that Quality Improvement (QI) techniques may be an effective means to improve the delivery of services by local health departments (LHDs).³ Although much time and money has been invested in attempts to promote the use of QI techniques in public health, much work needs to be done. In fact, evidence suggests a decline in the use of QI techniques by LHDs between 2005 and 2008, and a general lack of familiarity with the elements of QI and basic QI tools even among those engaged in QI activities.⁴⁻⁵ Innovative strategies for incorporating QI training and application in LHDs may be necessary to help LHDs improve the delivery of services they provide to protect population health. Public health practice based research networks (PBRNs) may provide an effective venue through which to deliver QI training. Given the often heavy demands on most LHDs to provide services to their communities with a minimum of resources, PBRNs may be a natural partner in QI training activities- they may have access to assets that can complement the pre existing capacity of LHDs, and the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of QI training and techniques in a real world setting, and tailor interventions to meet departmental needs. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the extent to which the adoption of organizational quality improvement (QI) strategies influences the delivery and outreach of Diabetes Self-Management Education (DSME) services provided by local health departments.

The morbidity and mortality related to diabetes is particularly disturbing because, if properly managed, many adverse complications of diabetes and pre-diabetes, and thus much of their cost, can be controlled.⁶ DSME has been shown to improve glycemic control in persons with diabetes which results in decreased risk of diabetic retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy.⁷⁻⁹ A systematic review of diabetes self- management education (DSME) conducted by the Task Force on Community Preventive Services found that DSME can be an effective public health system level intervention to improve glycemic control in adults¹⁰⁻¹¹, suggesting that DSME may be an important tool in attempts to improve outcomes related to diabetes. However, for many reasons, patients with diabetes often do not receive self- management education about their disease.

Methods

Study Settings

Study sites included six of Kentucky's 56 LHDs that, like the rest of the state, consist of a mix of single county (2) and district (4) departments that largely served rural areas. The study departments were chosen in 2006 by the Kentucky Department for Public Health (KDPH) as Diabetes Centers of Excellence (DCOE). The DCOEs, through support from the Kentucky Diabetes Prevention and Control Program (KDPCP), provide education and support to individuals with diabetes. The KDPCP provides DSME training and curriculum, modeled on the American Diabetes Association (ADA) Clinical Practice Recommendations, to each LHD that provides DSME. The participating LHDs are all members of the Kentucky Public Health Research Network (KPHReN), a public health PBRN. KPHReN members include 17 LHDs (including single county, district, and independent departments) and is in close partnership with the KDPH, Kentucky Public Health Association, and the University of Kentucky Center for Clinical and Translational Sciences (CCTS). The six health departments participating in this study serve 34 Kentucky counties (approximately 23% of the state's population) and vary greatly in population served, poverty rates, and methods for delivering DSME services to their communities. This study was approved by the University of Kentucky Institutional Review Board and the Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services Institutional Review Board.

Study Design

This is a quasi-experimental pretest/posttest intervention study to examine the impact of a QI training and facilitation model provided to LHD staff on the outreach and delivery of DSME services. The intervention in this study is an evidence-informed systems approach to QI that includes the use of Change Facilitation as a model to promote improvements in DSME services provided to communities by a LHD. Core components of the Change Facilitation model include 1) QI team development, 2) on-site QI training, and 3) facilitation in the design, development, and implementation of a specific QI project. The Change Facilitation model used in this study has been previously described in brief by the study investigators.¹²

For this study, each site designated a 4-6 member QI team. One team member was designated as the QI Champion and served as the QI team leader. Change Facilitators (CFs) are research study coordinators employed by the University of Kentucky CCTS. Each CF had previous training in QI principles and practice, clinical and health-services research methods, and previous experience in community-based participatory research through the Kentucky Ambulatory Network (a primary care PBRN). CFs provided in person QI training and facilitation to QI teams at each LHD site. The CFs also received two 2 hour COACH 4 DM project specific training sessions led by the study investigators.

Change Facilitators facilitated a monthly ½ day QI learning session for 3 consecutive months at each LHD. The 3 facilitation sessions occurred between September and December 2010. Each team member received a QI manual with information on the following topics: team building, goal setting, aim statements, practice assessment, brainstorming techniques,

plan do study act (PDSA), root cause analysis, cause and effect (fishbone) diagramming, process (flow) mapping, and logic models. Each team member also received a copy of *Embracing Quality in Public Health: Michigan's Quality Improvement Guidebook*. CFs put specific focus on the PDSA technique during the training sessions. CFs tailored the facilitation sessions to meet the specific needs of each LHD.

CFs also used applied learning by aiding each QI team in developing and implementing a 9-12 month QI project specific to their community that was intended to improve the delivery of DSME services. CFs encouraged the development of cycles of small positive changes as vehicles to attain larger, sustainable changes following a PDSA framework. CFs provided support through telephone and e-mail communications with the QI champion as needed throughout the 9-12 month implementation period for the QI projects. Each participating LHD received \$3,000 for participation in the study.

Data Collection and Analysis

Pre- and post- intervention surveys were administered to the DCOE director or QI Champion at each participating site. Pre- intervention surveys were administered prior to the first facilitation session (September 2010) and post- intervention surveys were administered after completion of each LHD QI project (August- September 2011). The surveys looked at eight DSME outreach and service delivery variables: the number of persons attending DSME classes per month, the number of persons completing a series of DSME, the number of referring healthcare providers, the number of referrals received per month, the locations where DSME services were provided, the timing and availability of DSME services, the frequency of DSME, and the content of DSME classes. The pre intervention survey determined existing levels of these variables, and the post intervention survey asked about changes in these variables and also included questions regarding change in the outreach or delivery of DSME services provided. Pre-intervention and post-intervention surveys were analyzed using SPSS version 19.0. Descriptive statistics were conducted. Additionally, questionnaires were administered to all participating QI team members after completion of the QI projects. These questionnaires asked the participants to list the most and least helpful components of COACH 4 DM, and any additional QI activities initiated by the LHD during or after participating in COACH 4 DM.

Results

The QI projects implemented by the LHDs focused on two major themes- increasing community outreach to patients and providers (3 projects), and improving internal operations related to the delivery of DSME services (3 projects). Motivations for the projects were diverse. For example, one of the projects focused on internal operations was targeted towards process improvement relative to departmental operations with a private Medicaid managed care provider, while two of the six QI teams reported creating QI projects that would help satisfy the standards and measures contained in the voluntary national accreditation program overseen by the Public Health Accreditation Board. The projects used innovative methods of reaching target populations. For example, one site

began sending personalized invitations to friends and acquaintances of DSME clients who also had diabetes.

The QI projects led to changes in the delivery of DSME services to the community in response to data gathered on patient needs and preferences. Prior to the intervention, LHDs primarily offered services in the LHD, hospitals, and physicians offices, with a few classes delivered in community centers and faith based organizations. After the intervention, 50% of the participating LHDs reported increasing outreach by offering classes in additional community gathering places, such as libraries, gas stations and convenience marts. This is in keeping with the conclusion from the Task Force on Community Preventive Services that DSME is an effective intervention when delivered to adults with diabetes in community gathering places, specifically locations other than home, clinic, school, or worksite, and follows recommendations from the Guide to Community Preventive Services.¹³ Participants also reported changing the frequency, duration and timing of DSME classes. For example, one LHD began offering night classes, while another increased session length, but decreased session frequency.

The changes brought about by the projects seemed to have a notable impact on a number of the DSME related variables examined. Table 1 displays the average number of individuals participating in DSME classes per month, the number of individuals that completed an entire course of DSME training, and the number of healthcare providers who referred patients to the LHD for DSME per month. A notable increase in the average number of individual participation of DSME classes per month was observed, 14%. A substantial increase in the average number of individuals completing a full course of DSME training was observed, which increased by over 100%. A notable change in the average number of providers referring per month was observed, which increased almost 15% post-intervention. A seasonal pattern in participation was observed, with significant decreases in attendance during the winter months. It is interesting to note that attendance post intervention was higher, even in the winter months (see Figure 1).

Study participants reported certain aspects of COACH-4 DM were quite effective in helping them to develop and implement a QI project, and others were less helpful. Developing a QI team, and the project facilitation sessions were ranked as being the most helpful aspects of COACH-4 DM by the most respondents (seven each). Regular contact with a facilitator was ranked as being the least helpful aspect of the project by the most respondents, eight.

Discussion

The QI projects developed and supported during COACH 4-DM led to improvements in DSME service delivery outcomes. While notable gains were seen in the number of patients receiving DSME, the number of patients completing an entire series of DSME classes increased by over 100%. This is particularly significant- because of the nature of the disease, diabetes self- management requires comprehensive education. Patients who receive any amount of DSME can benefit, but those who complete an entire training series will be more knowledgeable and better equipped to care for their disease. In fact, evidence suggests that sustained improvement in glycemic effects may require longer self- management

educational interventions.⁷ As a result DSME may be more effective after participants complete the full array of classes offered. The QI projects in this study also resulted in an increased network of referring healthcare providers. Because of the overwhelming burden of chronic disease, healthcare providers may have less time to devote to prevention education, such as DSME. Providing DSME through the LHD can ease the burden on physicians and other healthcare providers, and provide a more comprehensive series of educational opportunities for diabetic patients. In addition, this may strengthen ties between the LHDs and other public health system partners, and as a result lay the groundwork for increased referrals for other health conditions not related to diabetes, leading to a stronger public health system.

Accessibility is a major concern related to the provision of clinical public health services to populations. The Guide to Community Preventive Services concludes that offering DSME at community gathering places is an effective way to improve health outcomes related to diabetes. This suggests that LHDs may wish to increase the accessibility of the preventive services they offer to their communities. The QI training provided in the COACH-4 DM project led to substantial, patient focused changes that increased the accessibility of DSME services. Further research should be done to determine if the techniques used in the COACH-4 DM project are effective in increasing patient accessibility to other public health programs.

Sustainability is also a major concern when implementing activities intended to improve LHD operations- if the QI activities initiated during COACH-4 DM are abandoned after the project is completed, they may be of little long-term benefit to the department or the population served by the department. These results indicate that the QI training and projects implemented during COACH-4 DM may be sustainable. While participants reported the initial training and formation of the QI teams was quite useful, prolonged contact with the change facilitators appeared to be of little use. The teams, once formed and trained, were able to function effectively with little support. This suggests that the QI teams may continue to work to facilitate change in their agencies. Five of the 6 QI teams formed reported their department had undertaken additional QI activities since participating in COACH-4 DM, further evidence of the potential sustainability of the project. The initial investment necessary to provide QI training through a project like COACH-4 DM may yield long term benefits.

The heterogeneity of local health departments may pose major challenges to attempts to provide training for quality improvement. Like the LHDs in many states, the LHDs involved in this project all operate in a unique local context that significantly impacts the services they deliver- some serve single counties, while others serve districts; some are primarily rural, while others contain urban areas. These differences can pose difficulties in providing QI training that is relevant in a number of different contexts. The change facilitation model provided through the COACH 4-DM project seemed to be applicable to a wide variety of departmental contexts- the LHDs got basic training in QI, but were also provided with the support to adapt it to a number of innovative projects tailored to the unique needs of their communities. This suggests that the QI training and facilitation techniques used in

COACH-4 DM may be effective methods to incorporate quality improvement across a wide variety of departmental contexts.

This project, like all research, had some limitations. A relatively small number of LHDs were involved in the project (6). It is important to note, however, that this small number of LHDs served a large portion of the state- 34 counties, and almost ¼ of the population of Kentucky. This research involved LHDs from only one state, and LHDs that may be predisposed to being relatively high performers with regards to DSME (since they were designated as DCOEs), so these results may not be generalizable. Future research should be conducted to determine if similar improvements are found in LHDs in other states, and without the infrastructure found in the DCOEs. Another limitation is the study design- no control groups were matched with the LHDs receiving the intervention. While this would have been optimal, the researchers were advised that denying treatment to certain populations (in this case, the population served by a control department) involved in the study would be controversial, and did not have ample resources to implement a project using a more preferable design, such as a cross-over design. In addition, the project focused on process related outcomes. Future research should include health related outcome measures to confirm the effectiveness of the study protocol on improving patient outcomes. This project used self-reported data, and is susceptible to the biases inherent in its use, and the survey used to obtain the data was not validated. However, in spite of these limitations, the authors feel that the results and conclusions of this study provide important insight about ways to improve the delivery of public health services and foster a culture of quality improvement in local health departments.

Conclusion

The ultimate responsibility of local health departments is to protect and promote the health of the populations that they serve. COACH-4 DM was intended to provide the departments involved with a framework from which they can continue to improve the services they provide, and improve the health of the populations that they serve. It led to substantial improvements in the QI infrastructure of the departments involved in the project- they were able to assemble a QI team that, after training, helped effect positive changes in LHD outreach and practice activities, and resulted in improved service delivery and patient care. More patients were trained to care for their diabetes, and will likely experience improved health outcomes as a result. The COACH-4 DM project demonstrates the suitability of the PBRN model to conducting research in a LHD setting. COACH 4-DM was able to mobilize the volume of resources available to a PBRN, for example, the in kind use of change facilitators, and combine it with a relatively small incentive package (\$3000.00 per LHD) to improve service delivery and lay the groundwork for systems level change. Researchers interested in engaging practice partners in projects may wish to consider how to best array the full range of assets available to them. While COACH-4 DM was targeted toward a specific condition, the techniques used during COACH-4 DM were applicable to a wide variety of contexts, and are likely applicable to attempts to improve the delivery of other clinical and community preventive services.

Acknowledgments

Funding for this research was provided by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation through the National Coordinating Center for Public Health Practice- Based Research Networks. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. This project was also supported by the National Center for Research Resources, UL1RR033173, and is now at the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH.

The authors would like to acknowledge and thank the six LHDs and their staff who made up the QI teams in this study. These committed individuals worked diligently on QI projects to improve care of persons with diabetes in their communities. We would also like to acknowledge the Kentucky Department for Public Health, Dr. Kevin Pearce, Ann Williamson, Mary Barron, and Dr. Douglas Scutchfield for their substantial contribution to this project.

References

1. Kentucky Fact Sheet. CDC; 2009. http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/states/KY_2012.pdf
2. The Estimated Cost and Prevalence of Diabetes in Kentucky. ADA; 2009. www.diabetesarchive.net/advocacy-and-legalresources/cost-of-diabetes-results.jsp?state=Kentucky&district=0&DistName=Kentucky+%28Entire+State%29
3. Riley W, Parsons H, McCoy K, Burns D, Anderson D, Lee S, Sainfort F. Introducing Quality Improvement Methods into Local Public Health Departments” Structured Evaluation of a Statewide Pilot Project. *Health Services Research*. 2009; 44(5):1863–1879. [PubMed: 19686251]
4. Beitsch L, Leep C, Shah G, Brooks R, Pestronk R. Quality Improvement in Local Health Departments: Results of the NACCHO 2008 Survey. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*. 2010; 16(1):49–54. [PubMed: 20009644]
5. Davis P, Solomon J, Gorenflo G. Driving Quality Improvement in Local Public Health Practice. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*. 2010; 16(1):67–71. [PubMed: 20009647]
6. Rubin R, Dietrich K, Hawk A. 1998 Clinical and economic impact of implementing a comprehensive diabetes management program in managed care. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism*. 1998; 83(8):2635–2642. [PubMed: 9709924]
7. Norris S, Lau J, Smith J, Schmid C, Engelgau M. Self- management education for adults with type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis of the effect on glycemic control. *Diabetes Care*. 2002; 25(2):1159–1171. [PubMed: 12087014]
8. Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group. The effect of intensive treatment of diabetes on the development and progression of long-term complications in insulin- dependent diabetes mellitus. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 1993; 329:977–86. [PubMed: 8366922]
9. Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) Study Research Group. Intensive diabetes treatment and cardiovascular disease in patients with type 1 diabetes. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2005; 353:2643–53. [PubMed: 16371630]
10. Strategies for Reducing Morbidity and Mortality from Diabetes through Health- Care System Interventions and Diabetes Self- Management Education in Community Settings: A Report on Recommendations of the Task Force on Community Preventive Services. *MMWR Weekly Report*. 2001; 50:RR-16.
11. Norris S, Nichols P, Caspersen C, Glasgow R, Engelgau M, Leonard J, Snyder S, Carande-Kulis V, Isham G, Garfield S, Briss P, McCulloch D, the Task Force on Community Preventive Services. Increasing Diabetes Self- Management Education in Community Settings: A Systematic Review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2002; 22(4S):39–66. [PubMed: 11985934]
12. Ingram R, Dearinger A. Using Practice Based Research to Strengthen the Quality Improvement Infrastructure of Local Health Departments in Kentucky. 2012: NACCHO Exchange. 11(1):18.
13. Strategies for Reducing Morbidity and Mortality from Diabetes through Health- Care System Interventions and Diabetes Self- Management Education in Community Settings: A Report on Recommendations of the Task Force on Community Preventive Services. *MMWR Weekly Report*. 2001; 50:RR-16.

Figure 1.
Average Number of Individuals Receiving DSME Before and After Change Facilitation

Table 1

Participation of individuals in DSME training and number of referring providers

	Mean # Pre-intervention	Mean # Post-intervention
Participating in DSME classes/month	28	32
Completing entire DSME training course	71	149
Healthcare providers referring patients for DSME/month	22.5	26