Published in final edited form as:

Transplant Proc. 2017 ; 49(6): 1211–1214. doi:10.1016/j.transproceed.2017.01.078.

A STANDARDIZED DONOR DESIGNATION RATIO TO ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF DRIVER'S LICENSE AGENCIES

Neil K. R. Sehgal¹, Catherine Sullivan, MS, RD, LD², Maria Figueroa², Julie Pencak², Douglas Einstadter, MD, MPH^{3,4,5}, and J. Daryl Thornton, MD, MPH^{2,5,6}

¹University School, Hunting Valley, Ohio

²Center for Reducing Health Disparities, MetroHealth Campus of Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

³Center for Health Care Research and Policy, MetroHealth Campus of Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

⁴Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio

⁵Department of Internal Medicine, MetroHealth Campus of Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

⁶Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, MetroHealth Campus of Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

Abstract

Evaluating Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) locations based on the percent of patrons who register as donors does not account for individual characteristics that may influence willingness to donate. We reviewed the driver's licenses of 2997 randomly selected patients at an urban medical system to obtain donor designation, age, gender, and DMV location and linked patient addresses with census tract data on race, ethnicity, income, and education. We then developed a Standardized Donor Designation Ratio (SDDR), i.e. the observed number of donors at each DMV divided by the expected number of donors based on patient demographic characteristics. Overall, 1355 (45%) patients were designated as donors. Donor designation was independently associated with younger age, female gender, non-black race, and higher income. Across 18 DMVs, the proportion of patients who were donors ranged from 30–68% while SDDRs ranged from 0.82–1.17. Among the 6 facilities in the lowest tertile by SDDR, 3 were in the lowest tertile by percent donation. In conclusion, there is a great deal of variation across DMVs in rates of organ donor designation. SDDRs that adjust for DMV patron characteristics are distinct measures that may more accurately describe the performance of DMVs in promoting organ donation.

Corresponding Author: J. Daryl Thornton, MD, MPH, Center for Reducing Health Disparities, 2500 MetroHealth Drive, Rammelkamp R209A, Cleveland, OH 44109. Phone: (216) 778–3732 Fax: (216) 778–8401 daryl.thornton@case.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Keywords

Organ donation; health disparities

INTRODUCTION

Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) facilities play a crucial role in organ donation.^{1,2} For example, 95% of designated organ donors in Ohio signed up at their local DMV.³ DMVs are evaluated in part by how many of their patrons register to be organ donors. Organ procurement organizations (OPOs) use this information to decide where to target their efforts. In addition, awards are given to facilities with the highest donor designation rates.^{4,5} However, previous research indicates that the characteristics of individuals greatly influence their willingness to donate.^{6–14} Failure to account for such characteristics may lead to inaccurate assessments of DMV performance. Accounting for these individual characteristics may allow OPOs to better target truly low performing DMVs and optimize resource distribution.

We sought to develop a novel method to better assess DMV performance with respect to organ donation. Specifically, we developed a Standardized Donor Designation Ratio (SDDR) which adjusts for the characteristics of each DMV's patrons. We determined organ donor designation and DMV location from driver's licenses, state identification cards, and learner's permits. We were able to examine these because they are scanned into patient electronic health records at each clinical encounter within a large urban safety-net medical system.

METHODS

This study was conducted at an urban safety-net medical system in northeast Ohio that includes a large tertiary care hospital and a dozen community centers located in both poor and wealthy communities. We randomly selected 3500 active adult patients, i.e. those age >18 years who saw their primary care physician at least twice in the preceding two years. From electronic health records, we obtained scanned driver's licenses, state identification cards, or learner's permits. Two researchers independently examined these documents to determine each patient's organ donor designation, age, gender, home address, and DMV location. A third researcher resolved any discrepancies between the two researchers. We linked patient addresses with census tract data on percent of tract residents who are black, percent who are Hispanic, average household income, and percent who graduated high school. Census tracts are small subdivisions of a county that average about 4000 inhabitants. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of MetroHealth Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio (approval number 685, protocol number 13-00548).

We used descriptive statistics (percentages, means, and standard deviations) to describe the characteristics of the patients. For each DMV, we calculated the percent of patients who used that facility and were designated as organ donors. We used the chi-square test to determine the univariate relationship between organ donation status and patient demographic characteristics. We used logistic regression to determine the multivariate relationship

between organ donation status and patient characteristics, including age, gender, and census tract variables. We used this multivariate model to calculate the expected probability of donor designation (as opposed to actual donor designation) for each patient after accounting for patient characteristics. For each DMV, we summed the expected probability of donor designation across all patients who used that facility to determine the total expected number of organ donors. We then calculated a Standardized Donor Designation Ratio (SDDR) as the observed number of donors at each DMV divided by the expected number of donors. To ensure an adequate sample size, we focused on DMVs that had thirty or more patients. This allowed us to estimate percent donors to within + 15% of the true value with a 90% confidence level.¹⁵ We calculated the coefficient of variation (standard deviation divided by mean) for both the percent of patients who were donors at each DMV and the SDDR. We used the nonparametric Spearman rank correlation coefficient ρ to examine the correlation between ranks based on percent donation and those based on SDDR. Spearman ρ^2 values were used to indicate the amount of variation in ranks by one method that were accounted for by ranks in the other method. P values less than .05 or 95% confidence intervals that excluded 1.00 were considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were performed using JMP Pro 12.0 (SAS Institute, Cary, North Carolina).

RESULTS

Of 3,500 randomly selected patients, 3095 (88%) had their organ donation status documented on a state driver's license (2301 patients), state identification card (748 patients), or learner's permit (46 patients). We excluded 67 patients with documents from DMVs outside of Ohio. In addition, 31 patient addresses could not be matched to a census tract. This resulted in a final sample of 2997 patients. The demographic characteristics of these patients are in Table 1. Their mean age was 46.1 years, and a majority were female.

Overall, 1355 (45%) patients were designated as donors on their DMV documents. On univariate analysis, donor designation was associated with a number of patient characteristics (Table 2). For example, 49.9% of patients less than 30 years of age were organ donors compared to 36.9% of patients older than 55 years of age. On multivariate analysis, donor designation was independently associated with younger age, female gender, non-black race, and higher income. For example, patients younger than 30 years of age had 1.83 times greater odds of donor designation compared to patients 55 years of age or older.

The SDDRs ranged from 0.82–1.17 across 18 DMVs, with a coefficient of variation of 9.1% (Table 3). The percent of patients who were donors ranged from 30.4–68.2% DMVs, with a coefficient of variation of 22.0%. DMVs with high SDDRs also tended to have high percent of donors. For example, facility A was the highest ranked facility for both SDDR and percent donation. However, the rankings of mid- and low-ranking DMVs differed when measured by SDDR or percent donors. For example, facility R was ranked last by SDDR but tenth by percent donors. Facilities M, N, O, P, Q, and R were in the lowest tertile by SDDR. Of these 6 facilities, 3 (50%) were in the lowest tertile by percent donation (facilities N, P, and Q). The correlation between the 2 measures indicated that about half of the variation in SDDR was explainable by percent donors (Spearman $\rho^2 = 0.53$).

DISCUSSION

We found that about half of patients at a large urban safety-net medical system were designated as donors on their driver's licenses. This is similar to national figures on the percentage of Americans who are registered as donors.¹⁶ In addition, we found that several demographic characteristics were independently associated with donor designation, including younger age, female gender, non-black race, and higher income. These findings are generally consistent with previous studies on willingness to donate.^{9,11,12,17} More importantly, we found that there is a more than two-fold variation across DMVs in rates of organ donor designation. Use of SDDRs that adjust for characteristics of DMV patrons greatly reduced this variation and may more accurately describe the performance of DMVs in promoting organ donation. There was a modest correlation between unadjusted (percent donors) and adjusted (SDDR) measures of DMV performance suggesting that SDDRs are distinct measures. Strengths of this study include a large and diverse sample of patients and DMVs, direct verification of donor designation rather than relying on self-reported willingness to donate, and adjustment for a number of key demographic characteristics.

Current evaluations of DMVs do not adjust for patron characteristics.^{4,5} Our SDDR measure is analogous to other standardized ratios such as standardized mortality ratios or standardized hospitalization ratios that adjust for demographic or medical characteristics.^{18,19} In addition, a previous study developed methods to adjust for age, sex, and race when evaluating performance of organ procurement organization.²⁰ We recommend that DMVs and regulatory agencies use SDDRs to monitor performance of individual facilities. By accounting for patron characteristics, SDDRs can better identify high or low performing facilities. Examining practices at high performing facilities may lead to insights about how to increase donor designations at low performing facilities. Focusing only on the percent of DMV patrons who are donors may give organ procurement organizations (OPOs) an inaccurate assessment of DMV performance. We recommend that OPOs use the SDDR in order to better target DMVs that are truly underperforming. Furthermore, the low coefficient of variation in SDDRs indicates that there is substantially less variation across facilities than is suggested by examining percent donation.

Several limitations must be considered in interpreting the study results. First, all of the subjects were individuals receiving care from a single health system so the results may not generalize to patients in other health systems or to the general public. Second, all DMVs were from the same geographic region. Third, we did not have direct measures of certain variables of interest such as race, income, and education. While some of these variables may be available from patient electronic health records, we purposely focused on variables that would be available to DMVs and state regulators, i.e. data from driver's licenses and census files.

In conclusion, we recommend that evaluation of DMVs with respect to organ donor designation account for the characteristics of DMV patrons. The SDDR is a practical method for accomplishing this goal and will allow OPOs to better optimize their resources.

Acknowledgments

Funding: Supported in part by grants MD002265 and TR000439 from the National Institutes of Health and grants R39OT22056 and R39OT26989 from the Health Resources and Services Administration.

References

1. Rodrigue J, Fleishman A, Fitzpatrick S, Boger M. Organ donation knowledge, willingness, and beliefs of motor vehicle clerks. *Transplantation*. 2014; 98(10):1025–1028. [PubMed: 25222015]
2. Rodrigue J, Krouse J, Carroll C, Giery K, Fraga Y, Edwards E. A Department of Motor Vehicles intervention yields moderate increases in donor designation rates. *Prog Transplant*. 2012; 22(1):18–24. [PubMed: 22489439]
3. Donate Life Ohio. Report Card : The State of Organ, Eye & Tissue Donation in Ohio. 2010. Available from: <http://lifelinedofohio.org/wp-content/uploads/State-of-Donation-Report-Card-lowres.pdf>. Accessed on December 19, 2016
4. Lifeline of Ohio. BMVs Awarded for Work on Donation's Front Lines. 2013. Available from: <http://lifelinedofohio.org/2013/04/bmvs-awarded-for-work-on-donations-front-lines/>. Accessed on December 19, 2016
5. Joffe-Walt, C., Chace, Z. Planet Money Episode 518: Your Organs, Please. National Public Radio. Oct 28. 2015 Available from: <http://www.npr.org/sections/money/2015/10/28/452655987/episode-518-your-organs-please/>. Accessed on December 19, 2016
6. Sehgal NK, Scallan C, Sullivan C, Cedeno M, Pencak J, Kirkland J, et al. The Relationship Between Verified Organ Donor Designation and Patient Demographic and Medical Characteristics. *Am J Transplant*. 2016; 16:1294–7. [PubMed: 26603147]
7. Sehgal NK, Sullivan C, Scallan C, Cedeno M, Pencak J, Kirkland J, et al. Is Signature Size Associated with Organ Donor Designation on Driver's Licenses? *Transplant Proc*. 2016; 48(6): 1911–1915. [PubMed: 27569921]
8. Baughn D, Rodrigue J, Cornell D. Intention to register as organ donors: a survey of adolescents. *Prog Transplant*. 2006; 16(3):260–267. [PubMed: 17007163]
9. Boulware LE, Ratner LE, Sosa AJ, Cooper LA, LaVeist TA, Powe NR. Determinants of willingness to donate living related and cadaveric organs: identifying opportunities for intervention. *Transplantation*. 2002; 73(10):1683–1691. [PubMed: 12042662]
10. Wakefield CE, Reid J, Homewood J. Religious and ethnic influences on willingness to donate organs and donor behavior: an Australian perspective. *Prog Transplant*. 2011; 21(2):161–168. [PubMed: 21736247]
11. Wakefield CE, Watts KJ, Homewood J, Meiser B, Siminoff LA. Attitudes toward organ donation and donor behavior: a review of the international literature. *Prog Transplant*. 2010; 20(4):380–391. [PubMed: 21265292]
12. Siminoff LA, Burant CJ, Ibrahim SA. Racial disparities in preferences and perceptions regarding organ donation. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2006; 21(9):995–1000. [PubMed: 16918748]
13. Wylie, M., Siddiqui, N., Hazel, J. Organ and Tissue Donations: Canadian Public Awareness Knowledge and Attitudes. Toronto: Environs Research Group Limited; Available at <http://www.organsandtissues.ca/s/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/Survey-Canadian-Public-Donation.pdf>. Accessed December 19, 2016
14. Thornton JD, Wong KA, Cardenas V, Curtis JR, Spigner C, Allen MD. Ethnic and Gender Differences in Willingness among High School Students to Donate Organs. *J Adolesc Health*. 2006; 39(2):266–274. [PubMed: 16857540]
15. Hulley, S., Cummings, S., Browner, W., Grady, D., Newman, T. Designing Clinical Research. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2013.
16. Donate Life America. 2015. Annual Update. Available at https://www.donatelifenet.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/2015-DLA_Annual-Report_FINAL-for-onscreen-viewing.pdf. Accessed December 19, 2016

17. Thornton JD, Curtis JR, Allen MD. Completion of advanced care directives is associated with willingness to donate. *J Natl Med Assoc.* 2006; 98(6):897–904. [PubMed: 16775911]
18. McMichael AJ. Standardized Mortality Ratios and the “Healthy Worker Effect”: Scratching Beneath the Surface. *J Occup Environ Med.* 1976; 18(3):165–8.
19. Tüchsen F. Working Hours and Ischaemic Heart Disease in Danish Men: A 4-Year Cohort Study of Hospitalization. *Int J Epidemiol.* 1993; 22(2):215–21. [PubMed: 8505176]
20. Stogis S, Hirth RA, Strawderman RL, Banaszak-holl J, Smith DG. Methods Using a Standardized Donor Ratio to Assess the Performance of Organ Procurement Organizations. *Health Serv Res.* 1999; 37(5):1329–44.

Highlights

- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) facilities play an integral role in consent for organ donation.
- Organ procurement organizations (OPO) and others evaluate DMVs in part by how many of their patrons register to become organ donors.
- Previous studies suggest that characteristics of individuals influence their willingness to consent to donation.
- Failure to account for individual characteristic may lead to inaccurate assessments of DMV performance.
- We developed the standardized donor designation ratio (SDDR) to better assess DMV performance while accounting for the characteristics of each DMV's patrons.

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of 2997 patients and their census tracts. *

Patient age, years	46.1 (16.4)
Patient gender	
Female	1785 (60%)
Male	1212 (40%)
Tract, % black	33.8 (35.3)
Tract, % Hispanic	8.4 (11.4)
Tract, household income, 1000\$	41.5 (21.7)
Tract, % graduated high school	82.8 (11.2)

* Numbers indicate mean (standard deviation) for continuous variables and n (percentage) for categorical variables.

Table 2

Univariate and multivariate relationship between patient characteristics and donor designation on driver's license (n=2997).

	n	Organ donor, %	Univariate p value	Multivariate odds ratio (95% confidence interval)
Age, years			<.001	
<30	646	49.9		1.83 (1.48, 2.25)
30–44.9	694	51.3		1.81 (1.48, 2.22)
45–54.9	686	46.5		1.53 (1.25, 1.88)
55	971	36.9		1.00
Gender			<.001	
Female	1785	48.2		1.39 (1.19, 1.62)
Male	1212	40.8		1.00
Tract, % black			<.001	
<5	860	55.6		1.78 (1.28, 2.46)
5–14.9	554	49.1		1.59 (1.15, 2.20)
15–59.9	823	42.9		1.35 (1.02, 1.80)
60	760	33.2		1.00
Tract, % Hispanic			.069	
<5	1785	45.7		1.00 (0.76, 1.32)
5–9.9	421	48.9		0.97 (0.73, 1.29)
10	791	42.2		1.00
Tract income, 1000\$			<.001	
<25	702	34.8		1.00
25–34.9	704	38.4		1.02 (0.80, 1.31)
35–54.9	920	49.8		1.26 (0.92, 1.73)
55	671	57.1		1.52 (1.02, 2.26)
Tract, % graduated high school			<.001	
<75	727	36.3		1.00
75–84.9	761	40.0		1.09 (0.85, 1.41)
85–89.9	457	47.9		1.21 (0.86, 1.69)
90	1052	54.0		1.24 (0.87, 1.77)

Table 3

Percent Donors, SDDR, and Rankings of DMVs (n=18).

DMV	N	SDDR (Rank)	Percent Donors (Rank)	Differences in ranks
A	44	1.168 (1)	68.2 (1)	0
B	99	1.137 (2)	64.6 (2)	0
C	120	1.103 (3)	59.2 (3)	0
D	86	1.101 (4)	45.3 (9)	-6
E	221	1.064 (5)	50.7 (5)	0
F	146	1.052 (6)	54.8 (4)	+2
G	73	1.012 (7)	46.6 (7)	0
H	515	0.997 (8)	43.5 (12)	-4
I	43	0.986 (9)	44.2 (11)	-2
J	110	0.978 (10)	38.2 (14)	-4
K	299	0.977 (11)	36.5 (16)	-6
L	37	0.973 (12)	40.5 (13)	-1
M	305	0.970 (13)	46.2 (8)	+4
N	108	0.965 (14)	37.0 (15)	-1
O	81	0.943 (15)	46.9 (6)	+9
P	135	0.892 (16)	30.4 (18)	-2
Q	230	0.879 (17)	34.8 (17)	0
R	74	0.821 (18)	44.6 (10)	+8