

Quality of Medical Care Delivered to Medicare Beneficiaries

A Profile at State and National Levels

Stephen F. Jencks, MD, MPH

Timothy Cuerdon, PhD

Dale R. Burwen, MD, MPH

Barbara Fleming, MD, PhD

Peter M. Houck, MD

Annette E. Kussmaul, MD, MPH

David S. Nilasena, MD, MSPH, MS

Diana L. Ordín, MD, MPH

David R. Arday, MD, MPH

AS CONCERN GROWS THAT ATTEMPTS to control the cost of health care will crowd out quality, evidence has also emerged that quality of care is and has been far more uneven than previously recognized. The public health report entitled *Healthy People 2010*¹ showed wide gaps between public health performance goals and actual achievements on many measures, including some delivered by the fee-for-service (FFS) health care system. Reviews, most notably by Schuster et al.,² showed that there were major gaps in acute, chronic, and preventive care almost everywhere that studies have been done. More recently, a report from the Institute of Medicine showed serious problems of harm to patients from medical errors.³ This kind of evidence was reflected in the recommendation of a recent presidential commission that quality of health care should become a major national priority.⁴ Despite condition-specific and managed care-specific reports, there has been no systematic pro-

Context Despite condition-specific and managed care-specific reports, no systematic program has been developed for monitoring the quality of medical care provided to Medicare beneficiaries.

Objective To create a monitoring system for a range of measures of clinical performance that supports quality improvement and provides repeated, reliable estimates at the national and state levels for fee-for-service (FFS) Medicare beneficiaries.

Design, Setting, and Participants National study of repeated, cross-sectional observational data collected in 1997-1999 on all Medicare FFS beneficiaries or on a representative sample of beneficiaries with a particular condition. Data were collected using medical record abstraction for inpatient care, analysis of Medicare claims for some ambulatory services, and surveys for immunization rates. Separate samples were drawn for each topic for each state.

Main Outcome Measures Beneficiary patients' receipt of 24 process-of-care measures related to primary prevention, secondary prevention, or treatment of 6 medical conditions (acute myocardial infarction, breast cancer, diabetes mellitus, heart failure, pneumonia, and stroke) for which there is strong scientific evidence and professional consensus that the process of care either directly improves outcomes or is a necessary step in a chain of care that does so.

Results Across all states for all measures, the percentage of patients receiving appropriate care in the median state ranged from a high of 95% (avoidance of sublingual nifedipine for patients with acute stroke) to a low of 11% (patients with pneumonia screened for pneumococcal immunization status before discharge). The median performance on an indicator is 69% (patients discharged with heart failure diagnosis who received angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors; diabetic patients having an eye examination in the last 2 years). Some states (particularly less populous states and those in the Northeast) consistently ranked high in relative performance while others (particularly more populous states and those in the Southeast) consistently ranked low.

Conclusions It is possible to assemble information on a diverse set of clinical performance measures that represent performance on the range of services in a health insurance program. These findings indicate substantial opportunities to improve the care delivered to Medicare beneficiaries and urgently invite a partnership among practitioners, hospitals, health plans, and purchasers to achieve that improvement.

JAMA. 2000;284:1670-1676

www.jama.com

gram for monitoring the quality of medical care provided to FFS Medicare beneficiaries.

Except for the clinical measures of the Health Plan Employer Data and In-

Author Affiliations: Health Care Financing Administration, Baltimore, Md.

Corresponding Author and Reprints: Stephen F. Jencks, MD, MPH, S3-02-01, Health Care Financing Administration, 7500 Security Blvd, Baltimore, MD 21244.

formation Set (HEDIS)⁵ and the Diabetes Quality Improvement Project (DQIP)⁶ there is no clinical quality measure set in general national use. About 4 years ago, the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) began to implement a program to measure and track the quality of the care for which Medicare pays. Simultaneously, HCFA committed to using its peer review organization (PRO) contractors to systematically promote improved performance on the quality measures tracked under this program using a voluntary, collaborative, and nonpunitive educational strategy.⁷

This article describes the 24 initial measures used in this program and reports the baseline values measured in 1997-1999. The Medicare measurement system we developed includes most of the HEDIS clinical measures, but it addresses more conditions, measures more elements of care, and measures the care delivered to the 85% of Medicare beneficiaries who are covered under FFS. The sampling frame provides state-level results to target PRO activities, evaluate PRO and HCFA effectiveness in improving care, and create a national picture of care under Medicare FFS.

Even though purchasers and beneficiaries are primarily interested in outcomes, we focused on measuring processes of care critical to outcomes rather than on measuring outcomes themselves. Five reasons drove this choice: (1) in comparison to outcomes of care, there is more consensus on appropriate processes of care and the target rates (nearly 100%); (2) measuring processes of care generally does not require the risk adjustment that has been so controversial in comparisons of outcomes; (3) it is easier for providers, practitioners, and plans to identify and fix the reasons why critical processes of care were not carried out than to determine why outcomes are not optimal; (4) many important outcomes take years; and (5) because significant, achievable improvements in outcomes are generally much smaller in relative terms than improvements in processes, unrealistic sample sizes are necessary to measure signifi-

cant improvements in outcomes. While we report only process measures here, HCFA intends to track outcomes, risk-adjusted when possible, at the national level for the targeted conditions.

METHODS

Clinical Topic and Measure Selection

The clinical topics were selected using 5 criteria: (1) the disease is prevalent and a major source of morbidity or mortality in the Medicare population; (2) there is strong scientific evidence and practitioner consensus that there are processes of care that can substantially improve outcomes; (3) reliably measuring the delivery of these processes is feasible; (4) there is a substantial "performance gap" between current performance and desirable performance; and (5) there is at least anecdotal evidence that PROs can intervene effectively to improve performance on the measures. Using these criteria, we adopted or developed 24 process-of-care measures (TABLE 1) relating to primary prevention, secondary prevention, or treatment of acute myocardial infarction (AMI), breast cancer, diabetes mellitus, heart failure, pneumonia, and stroke.

Measures

Each measure is based on professionally developed, widely accepted practice guidelines that were translated into measures either as part of a larger partnership (HEDIS and DQIP) or national public health surveillance effort (Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System [BRFSS]) or by HCFA staff in consultation with experts and relevant professional groups. Whenever possible, we used measures that have wide acceptance and have been used and tested. The detailed measure specifications and the scientific evidence supporting each of these measures is summarized on the HCFA Web site.⁸

Acute Myocardial Infarction. We updated and/or expanded measures that had been used for the Medicare Cooperative Cardiovascular Project.^{9,10}

Heart Failure. We created measures based on treatment recommendations

from the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, which were reviewed by clinical expert technical advisory panels and extensively field tested by PROs.

Stroke. We adapted measures based on treatment recommendations from the American College of Chest Physicians, the American Heart Association, the National Stroke Association, and the American Academy of Neurology; the measures were reviewed by clinical expert technical advisory panels and extensively field tested by PROs.

Treatment of Pneumonia. We used measures developed in collaboration with the American Thoracic Society, the Infectious Diseases Society of America, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; the measures were reviewed by clinical expert technical advisory panels and extensively field tested by PROs.

Prevention of Pneumonia. We used outpatient immunization measures in the BRFSS, which correspond both to the HEDIS system and to commitments that HCFA has made to Congress under the Government Performance and Results Act and inpatient measures corresponding to recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices.

Breast Cancer. We adopted the breast cancer screening measure used in HEDIS,⁵ which measures the percentage of women aged 52 to 69 years who have received a mammogram in the past 2 years.

Diabetes. We selected those measures developed by the DQIP that can be computed from claims data. Indicators based on chart abstraction were not included because a representative sample of office records is not currently available to PROs.

Data Sources and Sampling Frame

In all measures except immunization status, the denominator or sampling frame is patients enrolled in FFS Medicare, and Medicare+Choice (managed care) plan members are excluded. All states in the United States

were sampled, plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Inpatient Measures (AMI, Heart Failure, Atrial Fibrillation, Stroke, Treatment of Pneumonia). We sampled from Medicare hospital claims data in each state for each condition. The discharges were eligible for selection only if the principal diagnosis met the criteria for the target condition, except for

stroke prevention, for which we accepted any diagnosis of atrial fibrillation. We sampled the discharges for a 6-month period within each state. For a third of the states, this period was from April to October 1998; for another third of the states, July to December 1998; and for the remaining states, October 1998 to March 1999. We sampled up to 850 discharges for AMI,

pneumonia, and stroke, and up to 900 discharges for heart failure and used a census of all discharges for states with fewer than the targeted number of discharges during the period. The universe of eligible claims was first sorted by age, race, sex, and hospital, and cases were then sampled systematically from a random starting point. Data for the performance measures were

Table 1. Quality Indicators for Care of Medicare Beneficiaries

Clinical Topic	Indicator	Short Name	Sampling Frame for Denominator	Data Source
Inpatient setting Acute myocardial infarction	Administration of aspirin within 24 h of admission	Aspirin 24 h	All Medicare patients with principal discharge diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction and no contraindications	Systematic random sample of up to 750 inpatient records per state
	Aspirin prescribed at discharge	Aspirin disch		
	Administration of β -blocker within 24 h of admission	BB 24 h		
	β -blocker prescribed at discharge	BB disch		
	ACE Inhibitor prescribed at discharge for patients with left ventricular ejection fraction <40%	ACEI in AMI		
	Smoking cessation counseling given during hospitalization	Smoking		
	Time to angioplasty, min	PTCA (min)		
	Time to thrombolytic therapy, min	Lytic (min)		
Heart failure	Evaluation of left ventricular ejection fraction	LVEF	All Medicare patients with principal discharge diagnosis of heart failure	Systematic random sample of up to 800 inpatient records per state
	ACE Inhibitor prescribed at discharge for patients with left ventricular ejection fraction <40%	ACEI in HF		
Stroke	Warfarin prescribed for patients with atrial fibrillation	Afibrillation	All Medicare patients with any discharge diagnosis of atrial fibrillation	Systematic random sample of up to 750 inpatient records per state
	Antithrombotic prescribed at discharge for patients with acute stroke or transient ischemic attack	Antithrombotic	All Medicare patients with principal discharge diagnosis of stroke (nifedipine and antithrombotic) or transient ischemic attack (antithrombotic)	Systematic random sample of up to 750 inpatient records per state
	Avoidance of sublingual nifedipine for patients with acute stroke	Nifedipine		
Pneumonia	Antibiotic within 8 h of arrival at hospital	Antibiotic time	All Medicare patients with a discharge diagnosis of pneumonia	Systematic random sample of up to 750 inpatient records per state
	Antibiotic consistent with current recommendations	Antibiotic Rx		
	Blood culture drawn (if done) before antibiotic given	Blood culture		
	Patient screened for or given influenza vaccine	Flu screen		
	Patient screened for or given pneumococcal vaccine	Pneu screen		
Any setting Pneumonia	Influenza immunization every year	Flu immun	All noninstitutionalized persons aged ≥ 65 y	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System
	Pneumococcal immunization at least once ever	Pneu immun		
Breast cancer	Mammogram at least every 2 y	Mammography	All female Medicare beneficiaries aged 52-69 y	All Medicare claims
Diabetes	Hemoglobin A _{1c} at least every year	HbA _{1c}	All Medicare patients with 2 ambulatory diagnoses or 1 inpatient diagnosis of diabetes	All Medicare claims
	Eye examination at least every 2 y	Eye exam		
	Lipid profile at least every 2 y	Lipid profile		

*ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; PTCA, percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; and HF, heart failure.

abstracted from the hospital medical records by 2 clinical data abstraction centers (which are administratively independent of individual PROs) using computerized abstraction tools with explicit criteria that were developed and tested specifically for these measures. The abstraction tools collected information on contraindications to the treatment process being studied. Informed consent was not required because the data were collected for administration of the Medicare program, not for research, and access to these data is given to the program by law.

Influenza and Pneumococcal Immunization Rates. We used the BRFSS,¹¹ which is coordinated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and carried out by state health departments, to estimate statewide vaccination coverage. The BRFSS is a random-digit-dialed telephone survey of the noninstitutionalized adult population, and the estimates are for all persons older than 65 years; the national sample is 26 469 for this age group, with a median state sample of 430 in 1997 (estimated from the 1997 BRFSS Public Use Data File¹²). The estimates therefore differ from those for other samples by including beneficiaries who are enrolled in managed care and excluding persons younger than 65 years old. Rate estimates reported here are from the 1997 survey. Screening for or administration of influenza and pneumococcal vaccine for inpatients with pneumonia was ascertained from nursing and physician notes and other information in the medical record.

Breast Cancer (Mammography). The denominator was all women aged 52 to 69 years who were enrolled in Medicare FFS in both 1997 and 1998. Whether a mammogram had been performed in the 2 years was determined by whether Medicare had paid a claim for a diagnostic or screening mammogram in that period.

Diabetes. The denominator was all FFS beneficiaries aged 18 to 75 years who had 2 outpatient claims or 1 inpatient claim with a diagnosis of diabetes mellitus during a 1-year period

starting January 1998-July 1998, with the start date determined by the date when the PRO's contract began in that state. Whether a service had been provided was determined by whether Medicare had paid a claim for the service.

Statistical Methods

For the inpatient measures, patients found to have a clinical contraindication to the process of care were either included as having received appropriate care (heart failure measures) or excluded from both the numerator and denominator (other appropriateness of care measures). Reliability was calculated as the percentage agreement on an indicator for 2 blinded, independent abstractions at different abstraction centers. Performance was calculated at the state level for each of the measures. For 22 measures, results were calculated as the percentage of patients receiving appropriate care; for time to angioplasty or thrombolytic therapy, the result was calculated as the median number of minutes from arrival at the hospital to beginning of angioplasty or thrombolytic agent instillation. We primarily direct our attention to variation among states (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico). We therefore calculated, for each measure, performance of the median state rather than a national average. We also calculated the rank of each state on each performance measure and then calculated the average rank for each state across the 22 measures (we excluded time to angioplasty and time to thrombolytic therapy from this calculation because the sample size was too small in many states) and the SD of the 22 ranks for each state. We mapped the distribution of average ranks to display geographic patterns.

RESULTS

Across the 4 inpatient conditions we obtained 94.3% to 99.2% of sampled records (median, 95.3%). The reliability of measures based on medical record abstraction ranged from 80% to 95% with a median interrater reliability of 90%. TABLE 2 shows the number of charts in the denominator of each rate

in 2 ways: the individual rate or time number is formatted in a type that reflects the number of charts used; the Table also provides the median number of charts across all states. Even though more than 700 records were obtained for each condition in most states, the number of patients who qualified for a particular indicator was rarely even half that number and sometimes much less. Table 2 shows 3 kinds of results: (1) the performance of the median state on each measure, (2) the average of each state's performance ranks across the 22 measures, and (3) the rank of each state among all states based on this average rank. More detailed results are available at the HCFA Web site.⁸

The performance rates in the median state for each of the 22 rate measures range from a high of 95% (avoidance of sublingual nifedipine in acute stroke) to a low of 11% (patients with pneumonia screened for pneumococcal immunization status before discharge). When performance indicators are ranked by the rate in the median state, the median performance is 69% (patients discharged with heart failure diagnosis who received angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors; diabetic patients having an eye examination in the last 2 years). The range of rates for each measure also varies widely across the states, from a low of a 13-percentage point range for avoidance of sublingual nifedipine for patients with acute stroke (Nevada, 86%; Wyoming, 100%) to a high of a 54-percentage point range for antibiotic administered within 8 hours of hospital arrival to patients with an admission diagnosis of pneumonia (Puerto Rico, 38%; Montana, 93%). The median of the ranges for performance indicators (other than time to angioplasty and thrombolytic therapy) is 33 percentage points and the median interquartile range is 8 percentage points. Table 2 shows the performance of each state on each quality measure.

Table 2 also shows the average of the ranking of each state compared with other states on all of the performance measures (except time to angioplasty and thrombolytic therapy) and the SD

Table 2. Rank and Performance on Medicare Quality Indicators by State*

State	Rank		Quality Indicators																								
	Overall	Average (SD) on 22 Indicators	Aspirin 24 h	Aspirin Disch	BB 24 h	BB Disch	ACEI in AMI	Smoking	Lytic (min)	PTCA (min)	LVEF	ACEI in HF	Afibrillation	Antithrombotic	Nifedipine	Antibiotic Time	Antibiotic Rx	Blood Culture	Flu Screen	Pneu Screen	Flu Immun†	Pneu Immun†	Mammography	HbA _{1c}	Eye Exam	Lipid Profile	
Median cases in a state, No.			301	211	154	75	78	84	17	6	356	93	237	513	138	637	480	333	339	599	420	409	44 430		25 627		
Performance in median state	27	25 (12)	84	85	64	72	71	40	40‡	20‡	65	69	55	83	95	85	79	82	14	11	66	46	56	71	69	57	
Alabama	44	35 (12)	78	86	55	59	64	35	54	103§	65	62	50	80	96	87	77	79	13	10	63	48	55	58	63	48	
Alaska	23	24 (16)	87	96	78	73	82	38	53§	99§	51	91	53	86	93	87	75	93	24	17	58	39	52	69	56	56	
Arizona	19	23 (13)	87	86	63	68	69	53	41	94	71	65	56	81	92	82	78	88	27	22	73	59	57	67	65	56	
Arkansas	51	42 (12)	75	78	55	62	57	24	58§	107§	52	64	50	78	92	88	78	82	6	4	61	39	50	57	67	43	
California	41	35 (12)	85	84	59	68	66	41	36	108	62	65	44	75	87	84	66	86	10	6	66	50	54	65	70	61	
Colorado	9	18 (10)	86	90	65	76	74	48	39	79	64	72	57	84	94	86	85	85	20	19	74	53	55	78	68	51	
Connecticut	6	15 (10)	91	91	68	75	75	41	37	108§	78	73	57	90	98	85	74	85	23	18	67	43	60	73	76	62	
Delaware	14	20 (11)	85	86	62	73	71	70	41	50§	73	73	50	87	98	82	81	87	13	10	69	53	59	71	75	57	
District of Columbia	34	31 (18)	97	83	74	93	74	27	50§	NA	71	76	54	80	99	77	73	67	22	16	54	32	52	60	69	52	
Florida	40	34 (14)	77	78	60	69	71	29	36	131§	70	66	56	80	92	76	74	81	6	4	62	46	62	69	75	69	
Georgia	47	37 (10)	79	80	62	69	68	34	34	104§	63	67	50	79	91	82	77	80	11	8	59	49	52	63	62	51	
Hawaii	22	23 (16)	85	81	56	51	75	36	45§	75§	75	72	46	90	97	90	79	85	11	11	71	52	52	75	69	73	
Idaho	21	23 (11)	88	85	70	73	59	56	43	133	54	87	57	80	98	89	78	83	13	10	66	50	53	77	68	59	
Illinois	46	36 (10)	75	77	67	56	74	29	38	139	65	60	55	80	92	85	78	77	12	9	68	45	54	63	63	49	
Indiana	30	28 (13)	84	87	61	70	68	54	21	161§	65	64	55	82	93	81	79	78	29	26	63	38	54	70	66	59	
Iowa	8	16 (9)	84	86	65	79	75	38	33	120§	53	71	57	83	99	87	78	86	21	19	70	52	60	81	80	51	
Kansas	37	32 (15)	79	84	54	59	59	43	45	85§	58	70	51	76	89	89	77	87	19	11	62	44	58	76	75	60	
Kentucky	36	32 (11)	80	83	64	74	70	36	31	119§	62	62	51	83	91	83	79	82	17	15	61	39	53	66	66	61	
Louisiana	49	40 (11)	81	79	58	73	64	40	33	94	60	47	47	75	94	81	72	83	8	4	58	32	50	57	63	54	
Maine	3	12 (10)	85	87	80	83	68	61	41	NA	66	72	61	87	97	88	78	86	39	19	72	50	66	76	78	60	
Maryland	27	25 (12)	86	84	68	76	79	40	54	168§	73	66	54	82	98	80	82	80	14	11	63	41	58	71	68	62	
Massachusetts	5	15 (11)	87	88	73	93	78	44	26	179§	76	63	64	86	96	86	82	86	13	9	66	53	63	80	78	58	
Michigan	28	27 (10)	84	86	67	73	74	42	39	139§	69	62	51	79	96	84	71	81	19	14	64	46	64	72	64	55	
Minnesota	4	14 (9)	90	89	66	83	80	39	40	97§	61	71	58	88	97	87	75	85	38	22	69	48	61	82	75	59	
Mississippi	50	42 (11)	80	78	44	47	61	34	45	378§	58	60	46	75	98	85	78	81	10	5	61	46	47	52	61	39	
Missouri	29	28 (12)	76	78	59	72	74	38	27	192	66	58	52	84	92	84	81	77	16	15	70	44	54	75	69	59	
Montana	15	21 (14)	86	90	54	72	59	63	47	87	48	71	60	86	96	93	79	88	15	11	68	51	59	70	73	49	
Nebraska	26	25 (10)	84	85	66	82	68	37	32	123§	60	66	58	84	89	87	82	82	15	12	66	50	56	75	78	56	
Nevada	38	33 (15)	82	80	58	70	77	44	43	195§	77	71	42	78	86	86	80	76	11	10	57	54	50	71	68	62	
New Hampshire	1	10 (11)	88	90	76	90	81	49	39	418§	79	83	62	85	99	89	75	89	37	19	65	50	63	82	76	60	
New Jersey	48	37 (12)	77	74	64	69	61	38	49	101§	72	73	55	73	96	79	74	80	12	8	61	34	50	62	72	66	
New Mexico	32	29 (16)	85	87	54	62	77	50	44	118§	58	68	57	78	91	88	71	86	24	18	73	50	51	65	63	50	
New York	31	28 (11)	83	81	67	72	75	49	37	140§	75	70	55	81	98	80	71	78	14	12	65	39	56	65	71	56	
North Carolina	17	22 (11)	82	90	65	80	77	35	52§	108§	71	79	60	87	97	84	81	79	19	12	65	51	57	73	72	55	
North Dakota	7	16 (16)	85	87	69	87	81	29	53	94	41	75	65	86	95	91	86	77	28	19	65	41	64	85	79	67	
Ohio	33	31 (11)	87	86	63	73	72	27	53	72§	70	64	52	80	92	81	72	82	23	13	65	39	56	65	67	52	
Oklahoma	42	35 (13)	79	79	46	63	69	25	38	84§	52	66	52	73	90	83	81	86	16	14	69	40	49	70	66	60	
Oregon	10	19 (11)	87	84	69	77	70	53	40	102	59	69	57	78	94	90	79	88	14	13	70	56	59	79	71	52	
Pennsylvania	18	22 (13)	82	81	71	88	84	42	39	191§	74	73	61	85	99	86	79	88	12	9	66	47	56	69	70	60	
Puerto Rico	52	48 (8)	65	60	33	52	59	30	66	NA	44	59	31	73	98	38	55	65	7	5	42	34	45	41	54	43	
Rhode Island	24	24 (16)	82	87	76	79	83	26	40	264§	77	80	59	88	95	80	84	81	10	7	68	43	58	71	77	55	
South Carolina	35	32 (13)	80	80	58	70	59	24	54	559§	67	66	53	84	99	81	80	85	8	6	74	42	55	70	68	57	
South Dakota	25	24 (14)	84	88	69	71	67	37	64	280§	51	65	61	84	90	91	85	84	14	14	66	41	57	78	75	60	
Tennessee	39	34 (14)	83	84	56	67	67	44	26	106§	66	51	61	77	94	79	80	78	11	8	69	45	53	66	61	48	
Texas	45	36 (14)	78	84	51	58	63	19	39	85§	64	62	45	72	90	80	80	84	12	8	68	44	51	73	68	66	
Utah	20	23																									

mechanism for HCFA to move beyond its historical focus on individual cases and providers and to take responsibility as a purchaser for the care delivered to the population of Medicare beneficiaries. Although it is customary to speak of holding providers, practitioners, and health plans accountable for the care they provide, it is at least as important to hold purchasers, whether Medicare or Medicaid or commercial or government employers, accountable for the quality of the care they purchase, because they are making continual and important decisions that potentially balance quality against expenditures. As required by the Government Performance and Results Act, HCFA is beginning to assume this responsibility by reporting some of these measures to Congress as part of its annual budget submission.

HCFA intends to extend the Medicare clinical performance tracking system in 3 ways. First, for those measures based on medical record abstraction, we are now collecting a continuous sample large enough to provide accurate trending of national data every few months, although too small to provide state-level estimates more than every few years. Second, we will collect enough data to make accurate state-level estimates every 3 years (synchronous with PRO contract cycles). This will allow us to evaluate the success of each PRO in meeting its major contractual requirement, which is to improve statewide performance on the measures. Third, we will extend the system to include other settings, such as nursing homes, home health agencies, and other providers and to include other clinical priorities.

Obviously, pervasive gaps between what is being done and what could be done invite us to consider what policies might lead to improvements. A future article will describe the quality improvement strategy that HCFA is pursuing to improve performance on these and other measures. Recent reports^{3,4} have emphasized the importance of focusing on system failure rather than practitioner failure to working to close these performance gaps. The United States has poured enor-

mous resources into practitioner training and very little into improving processes in the systems within which those practitioners work, and it is time to redress that balance. Available evidence suggests that, at least for preventive services, systems changes are more effective than either provider or patient education in improving provision of services.¹⁴

The data should also remind us of the need for partnership among HCFA, beneficiaries, practitioners, providers, and health plans to achieve improvements. The HCFA PROs are charged with promoting improvement. They now have performance-based contracts with more than \$200 million a year for improving performance on the measures reported. Their contracts hold them accountable for successful promotion of improvement, and there is good evidence that they can contribute to significant improvement in care.¹⁰ Nevertheless, neither HCFA nor PROs deliver care. They can only provide technical assistance to practitioners, providers, and plans; take steps that will make it easier for practitioners and providers to deliver and for beneficiaries to receive needed care; and serve as conveners for partnerships among local stakeholders. Only practitioners and providers can make such systems changes as putting appropriate standing orders in place, installing failure-resistant information systems, and designing processes that deliver critical services within the optimum window of time. Segmenting improvement efforts according to payment source is inefficient and counterproductive. Partnerships among all of the stakeholders, regardless of source of payment, can make improvement possible and are urgently needed.

Funding/Support: All funding for this work was provided by the Health Care Financing Administration.
Disclaimer: The opinions herein are the authors' and not necessarily those of the Health Care Financing Administration.

Acknowledgment: The authors especially thank Joyce V. Kelly, PhD, who coordinates the national PRO quality improvement efforts and Jeffrey Kang, MD, MPH, without whom this work would not have been possible. We also thank the following individuals: Robert Peterson, Stephanie Monroe, PhD, and Edwin D. Huff, PhD, MA, for work on the sampling and sample validation for the inpatient measures; Marjorie Bedinger

and James Michael, MS, for validation of the analytic code and production of the inpatient measures; Cynthia G. Wark, RN, MSN, Martha J. Radford, MD, Harlan M. Krumholz, MD, Deron Galusha, MS, and Jennifer Lewis, BSN, for work on the acute myocardial infarction measures; D. Jo DeBuhr, Edward P. Havranek, MD, Harlan M. Krumholz, MD, Frederick A. Masoudi, MD, and Debra Ralston for work on heart failure measurements; Wato Nsa, MD, PhD, Hui Jiang, MS, Dale Bratzler, DO, MPH, Claudette Shook, RN, for work on the pneumonia measurements; Marian Brenton, MPA, Marc Hendel, MS, June Wilwert, RN, Timothy Kresowik, MD, and Rebecca Hemann, BLS, for work on the stroke measurements; Lawrence La Voie, PhD, Rebecca Rogers, and Gary E. Thoni for production of the mammography measurements; David Nicewander for work on the diabetes measurements; and Kelly Westfall and Pam Wolfe, MA, MS, for creating the Figure.

REFERENCES

1. US Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy People 2010: Understanding and Improving Health*. Washington DC: US Dept of Health and Human Services; 2000.
2. Schuster MA, McGlynn EA, Brook RH. How good is the quality of health care in the United States? *Milbank Q*. 1998;76:509, 517-563.
3. Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS, eds. *To Err Is Human: Building a Safer Health System*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1999.
4. *Quality First: Better Health Care for All Americans*. Washington, DC: The President's Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry; 1998.
5. National Committee for Quality Assurance. *HEDIS 1999, Volume 2: Technical Specifications*. Washington, DC: National Committee for Quality Assurance; 1998.
6. Fleming B. Quality of Care—National Projects: Diabetes Quality Improvement Project (DQIP). Health Care Financing Administration, 1999. Available at: <http://www.hcfa.gov/quality/3l.htm>. Verified September 12, 2000.
7. Jencks SF, Wilensky GR. The health care quality improvement initiative: a new approach to quality assurance in Medicare. *JAMA*. 1992;268:900-904.
8. Health Care Financing Administration. Quality of Care—PRO Priorities: National Clinical Topics (Task 1). Health Care Financing Administration, 2000. Available at: <http://www.hcfa.gov/quality/11a.htm>. Verified September 12, 2000.
9. Ellerbeck EF, Jencks SF, Radford MJ, et al. Quality of care for Medicare patients with acute myocardial infarction. *JAMA*. 1995;273:1509-1514.
10. Marciniak TA, Ellerbeck EF, Radford MJ, et al. Improving the quality of care for Medicare patients with acute myocardial infarction. *JAMA*. 1998;279:1351-1357.
11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Influenza and pneumococcal immunization rates among adults age greater than or equal to 65 years—United States. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 1998;47:797-805.
12. National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. *Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 1997 Survey Data*. Atlanta, Ga: US Dept of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 1999. CD-ROM Series 1, No. 3.
13. Health Care Financing Administration: Health Care Compare. Health Care Financing Administration, 2000. Available at: <http://www.medicare.gov/mphCompare/home.asp>. Verified September 12, 2000.
14. Shekelle P, Stone E, Breuder T. *Interventions That Increase the Utilization of Medicare-Funded Preventive Services for Persons Age 65 and Older*. Baltimore, Md: US Dept of Health and Human Services, Health Care Financing Administration; 2000.