Enhancing Community and LTC Rehabilitation Services for Stroke Survivors: Improving the System of Care
South East Ontario

- Population ~ 525,000
- 20,000 km$^2$
Discharge Link: The Goal

Provide best practice and support health system improvement related to stroke rehabilitation and client transition to the community by:

- enhancing community rehabilitation therapy
  - intensity
  - timeliness
- augmenting provider communication
- building team capacity and stroke expertise
Discharge Link: The Intervention

The “Discharge Link” provides:

- *timely enhanced intensity (front-end loading)* of community-based rehabilitation for new stroke survivors on transition from hospital to home, a residential setting or a Long Term Care Home;
- *Discharge link meeting/conference* between community/LTC and hospital providers;
- *Development of stroke expertise* with an emphasis on interprofessional care.
2009 Rationale for Project: Evidence and Needs

- SE Regional Rehabilitation Needs Assessment (2001)
- SE Regional Rehabilitation Pilot Project (2002-04)
- Community Stroke Best Practice Guidelines (West GTA Stroke Network 2005)
- Provincial Stroke Rehabilitation Consensus Panel Report (HSFO 2007)
- Community Reintegration Needs Assessment 2007
- Ministry of Health priorities and LHIN Integrated Health Services Plan

New MOH directions related to ED-ALC and patient flow provided an opportunity to re-visit original pilot, leading to the LHIN proposal for community stroke rehabilitation
Rationale: Identified Need in SEO

Evaluation findings identified specific regional/local needs:

- High ALC rate and long ALC stays
- Large rural geography
- Limited and inequitable access to rehabilitation services ESPECIALLY outpatient and community rehab
- Stroke survivors/families identified access to rehab as a priority for community reintegration
Past Work

2002-04 Rehab Pilot Project demonstrated success for those with new stroke who received enhanced community rehabilitation on transition home from inpatient rehab:

- Half the hospital ED visits/readmissions;
- Faster change in function on discharge;
- Functional change maintained at 1 year;
- 17% net cost savings associated with decreased readmissions alone.
Pilot 2002-04: Hospital Readmission Costs

Cost of Re-Hospitalizations

- Enhanced (37) Cost: $87,514
- Usual Care (24) Cost: $48,034

Overall Cost:
- Enhanced: $48,034
- Usual Care: $36,466

Cost per person:
- Enhanced: $1,298
- Usual Care: $3646

Total Cost:
- Enhanced: $87,514
- Usual Care: $48,034
Pilot 2002-04: Cost Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usual Care</th>
<th>Enhanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave. readmission cost</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>3,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. cost of community therapy</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>2,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cost per person</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$500</th>
<th>$1,000</th>
<th>$1,500</th>
<th>$2,000</th>
<th>$2,500</th>
<th>$3,000</th>
<th>$3,500</th>
<th>$4,000</th>
<th>$4,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave. readmission cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings – Pilot (2002-2004)

- Faster improvement in functional outcomes and sustained functional ability at one year
- Decreased length of stay
- Cost savings
- Decreased ED visits and readmissions
Current Service

Enhancing Community and LTC Rehabilitation Services for Stroke Survivors: Improving the System of Care
February 2009 to April 2014
Current Program – Evaluation Focus

- Current focus on hospital utilization outcomes aligned with SE LHIN imperative of access to care and efficient health system utilization:
  - Length of Stay
  - Readmission Rates (09/10 – 10/11)
  - FIM Change (06/07 – 10/11) and LOS Efficiency for rehab group (07/08 – 10/11)
Current Program – Evaluation Focus

- Current focus also aligned with SE LHIN focus on quality of care:
  - Uptake of Best Practice
  - Advancement of IPC in community and LTC
  - Coordination of Services
  - Capacity Building
  - Patient Perspectives
Methods: Sample

Participant Eligibility:

- Be 16 years of age or older and live in Southeastern Ontario
- Have had a recent stroke or a diagnosis of stroke and be either:
  - Eligible for CCAC follow up therapy at home or in a residential care facility; or
  - Eligible for CCAC follow up therapy in a LTC Home
Methods: Process

Stroke Survivor Identified in Hospital

| Eligible for CCAC Services – CCAC Hospital Care Coordinator | Hospital Team recommends service plan x 4 weeks – Discharge Link |

Services Initiated in the Community per Service Plan

| CCAC Community Care Coordinator | OT, PT, SLP, SW – evaluate at 4 weeks and recommend next 4 weeks |

Enhanced Services Delivered up to 8 Weeks

| Stroke survivor with ongoing rehab needs and eligible for ongoing CCAC services: Continue under standard service delivery model |
Treatment Model: Community

- **Services** ⇒ PT, OT, SLP, SW
- **Time frame** ⇒ 8 weeks (flexibility re SW needs)
- **Front end loaded** ↑↑ services in first 4 weeks
- **Timely first visit:** within 5 days (CCAC ‘high priority’)

- **Individual Service Plan**
  - First 4 weeks by Hospital Team;
  - Second 4 weeks by Community Therapy Team

- **Discharge Link meeting**
Treatment Model: Long Term Care (LTC)

- **Services** ⇒ PT, OT, SLP, SW
  - PT Services in LTC through contracted provider, not CCAC
- **Time frame** ⇒ 8 weeks
- **Front end loaded** ↑↑ services in first 4 weeks
- **Timely first visit**

**Individual Service Plan** ⇒ Initial OT assessment with recommendation re care team for first 4 weeks, second 4 weeks by that therapy team

- Therapists to connect with LTC staff (e.g., DOC, contracted PT in LTC)
# Methods: Enhancing Service

**Enhanced Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhanced Service</th>
<th>Physio</th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>SLP</th>
<th>Social Work (may extend to 12 weeks)</th>
<th>Total extra Therapy Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 4 wks</td>
<td>Up to 2 / wk X 4 wks</td>
<td>Up to 2 / wk X 4 wks</td>
<td>Up to 1 / wk X 4 wks</td>
<td>Up to 1 / wk X 4 wks</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd 4 wks</td>
<td>Up 1 / wk</td>
<td>Up 1 / wk</td>
<td>Up 1 / wk biweekly</td>
<td>Up 1 / wk biweekly</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total additional visits</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total = 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process Findings
Referral Numbers

Data collection and analysis are ongoing. As of March 2014, 1104 clients have received enhanced community-based therapy. 1008 referred to community and 95 referred to LTC (1 unknown destination)

For fiscal years 10/11 to 13/14, the average age of those participating was 75.9 years (median 78) with a range from 21 to 99 years. 52% of referrals (fiscal 09/10 to 11/12) were male
Hospital discharge to first scheduled CCAC rehabilitation therapy provider visit has averaged 4.5 days (median 4) for the last four fiscal years. There has been a gradual decline in this measure since fiscal 10/11. Prior to implementation of the enhanced program, the average time to first scheduled rehabilitation therapy visit was 44 days.
Destination on Discharge

Discharge destination is primarily to the community.
Referrals from the rehab setting constitute the greatest proportion of referrals.
Referral rates to all therapies have remained relatively constant since program inception. OT has consistently been the service most frequently requested followed by PT. Speech language pathology and social work remain much lower at less than half the referral rate to PT and OT.
Total rehabilitation visits have remained relatively constant over the last three fiscal years.
Average visits/client for each rehabilitation discipline for clients discharged from acute beds have remained relatively stable with exception of fiscal 11/12.

SLP tends to show the greatest variation in average visits per client which is likely a reflection of the intensive needs of individual clients as well as the lower overall numbers (refer to previous graph which illustrates a relative stability of overall SLP total visits).
Visit rates for clients referred from rehabilitation beds show a greater stability than those referred from acute care.
Outcomes
Pilot 2002-04: Length of Stay

Program Impact FY2009/10 and beyond

Average Length of Stay (days)

FY 2006/07 FY 2007/08 FY 2008/09 FY 2009/10 FY 2010/11

Fiscal Year

Avg. ALC Rehab
Avg. Active Rehab
Avg. ALC LOS
Avg. Acute LOS
Outcomes: FIM Change for Rehab Group - Consistency
FIM Efficiency by Fiscal Year

FIM Efficiency

Avg. FIM Efficiency - active days
Avg. FIM Efficiency - total days
Readmission Rates (9/10 to 10/11)

% with at least one readmission within 1 yr of index stroke event
Readmission Visits (9/10 to 10/11)

Average visits per follow up client within 1 year after index stroke event
Summary – Quantitative Findings

- 15.7-day decrease in mean total hospital length of stay
- FIM change scores remain stable
- Substantially improved FIM LOS Efficiencies
- Decreased readmission rates and visits per client for those receiving enhanced community service
- Decreased wait time to first scheduled rehab visit (44 days pre-implementation to median of 4 days)
Qualitative Findings

In fiscal 2010/11, the Stroke Network Regional Rehabilitation Coordinator conducted interviews with clients who had received the enhanced therapy services. A sampling of their comments speaks to the value of this program:

- “You tend to work a little bit better for somebody out of your home, a professional, more than you would for family or for yourself”
- “SW set me up with the stroke support group, Queen’s University… access bus… helpful in linking me to places”
- “[OT] had enough material to give a wide range of mental and physical exercises”.
- "[The client] really valued the [PT} exercise training programs and shoulder rehab".
- "This [SLP] therapy is so valuable for [stroke survivor] and our entire family."

In other comments, clients and families spoke to an overall desire to increase rehab intensity and duration. There were also some comments about varied stroke expertise of therapists providing care.
CQI & Discharge Link

Semi-annual review of data. Recommendations emerging from the last data analysis (fiscal 13/14):

- All providers/CCAC Care Coordinators consider referrals to Social Work
- Care providers consistently connect through Discharge Link meetings and other interprofessional meetings
- Considered referral to program for all discharges to LTC
- Advance stroke care expertise and skills through Shared Work Days funding
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