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INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE

When you look closely at many of the complex changes underway in today’s health care system—from global budgeting to value-based purchasing—a common theme becomes apparent: public and private payers are no longer content to purchase health care services blindly. They want assurance that those services are of the highest quality and offer clear clinical value. Most often that means quality that can be demonstrated through better patient outcomes, care that is appropriate for the patient, and greater patient safety.

In 2011, the Philips Healthcare “Reimbursement Simplified” Webinar Series explored some of the dimensions of quality and how to achieve it. The common message was that quality counts, that quality sells, and that quality is attainable in ways large and small.

Thus, as you look through this e-book of the 2011 webinars, you will learn about innovative approaches now being used by providers, payers, and other organizations. They include:

- Efforts by quality organizations and provider groups to examine some of the basic processes of care—from hand-washing to conducting imaging exams—to help caregivers better achieve the highest degree of quality and patient safety.

- Research and data-analysis by payers and providers to identify performance gaps and pinpoint improvement strategies, including a collaborative effort by Dartmouth-Hitchcock, Intermountain Healthcare, the Mayo Clinic, and other leading institutions to identify and share best practices in such conditions as knee surgery, diabetes and hip surgery.

- Greater focus in all levels of health delivery to better ensure the appropriateness of care for patients by setting standards for quality and performance, and basing accreditation, recognition, and payment on the ability to achieve those goals.

Running through all of these examples—and many more that you will hear when you listen to the individual webinars—is some of the most creative thinking about how to address some of the hard questions of the day. Such as: How do we achieve patient safety on the front lines of care? How can we reduce medical errors? And how can we put these to work in our own institutions such that they can fundamentally change the experience for patients?

This e-book is just an overview of our webinars in the 2011 “Reimbursement Simplified” webinar series. It is based on a selection of slides from webinar speakers, and it links electronically to the original webinars in case you want more details or a sense of the complete discussion. But this book is just a beginning. You will learn much more by taking the time to listen to the webinars themselves. The webinars are available on the Philips Healthcare reimbursement site: www.philips.com/reimbursement. We wish you good listening and great learning.
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Public and private payers are no longer content just to purchase health care services. They want to purchase services that offer clear value and clear quality. For providers, that means achieving a variety of clinical or other quality standards that demonstrate improved health for patients. Of course, this trend of linking reimbursement and quality improvement is not new. This webinar explored three unique approaches to achieving quality performance. Each model takes its own pathway in establishing or adopting measures and using a variety of approaches in encouraging providers to achieve them.

Sarah Thomas set the stage by defining an agenda for High-Value Health Care:

- Promoting effective care
- Measuring quality, getting results
- Advancing delivery system reform (Medical Homes, ACOs)
- Identifying value: high quality, efficient care (Relative resource use measures)
- Addressing preference sensitive care and
- Promoting high-value in exchanges
**Strategies for Each Type of Care**

*What gets measured gets improved*

- **Promote effective care**
  - Use HEDIS to address underuse
  - Can improve with public reporting, pay for performance, patient-centered medical homes

- **Measure supply-sensitive care**
  - Payment and delivery system reform (ACOs)
  - Measure whether providers use appropriately

- **Engage patient in preference-sensitive care**
  - Use patient engagement, shared decision making to promote appropriate use

**Preference-sensitive care**
Comparative effectiveness research, shared decision making and patient activation

**Supply-sensitive care**
Comparative effectiveness research, shared decision making and patient activation

15% **Effective care**
Making health plans and delivery systems accountable, rewarding results

25% **Supply-sensitive care**

60% **Preference-sensitive care**

Source: Wennberg estimates based on Medicare claims
NCQA’s ACO Position

- We can define evidence-based structure & process measures to ID if ACOs have infrastructure to improve quality and costs
- Performance measures are also needed but it will take time to judge outcomes

Draft criteria address:
- Program structure operations
- Access and availability
- Primary care
- Care management
- Care coordination and transitions
- Patient rights & responsibilities
- Performance reporting

NCQA’s New Medical Home Standards

- Emphasis on patient-centeredness
- Reinforces incentives for meaningful use (HIT)
- NCQA’s success in medical homes
- Research shows medical homes work
Relative Resource Use (RRU) Measures

- Indicate how intensely physician, hospital, other resources are used vs similar plans
- With HEDIS quality measures, RRUs address both quality & cost functions together: VALUE
- Focus on 6 high-cost chronic conditions that total over 50% of costs: diabetes, asthma, COPD, cardiac care, hypertension, low back pain
- Can be used at plan and large group level

What Can We Learn From RRU?

- Little correlation between quality and resource use
- Tremendous variation within regions among plans
- High quality care can be delivered at either high or low resource levels
- Moving to high-quality, low-resource use would yield significant savings
## PPACA Definition of Quality Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPACA</th>
<th>How NCQA Lines Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve health outcomes</td>
<td>• Many measures of process (case management, continuity and coordination of care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Case management</td>
<td>• Intermediate outcomes measures (HbA1C, blood pressure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Care coordination</td>
<td>• HOS and CAHPS measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medical homes</td>
<td>• Patient-centered medical home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality reporting and documentation of care</td>
<td>• HEDIS used to measure disparities: Multicultural Health Care Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disparities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce readmissions</td>
<td>• New measure for use in Medicare to be collected in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve patient safety</td>
<td>• Ambulatory measures such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Antibiotic overuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Medications to be avoided; monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Falls prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness and health promotion</td>
<td>• Measures of process around identifying needs, engagement in activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Immunization rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tobacco cessation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BMI measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nancy Foster highlighted the year’s familiar rulemaking along with new rulemaking around health reform while explaining how the American Hospital Association (AHA) is helping hospitals adopt strategies to improve performance:

- Understand current performance gaps
- Identify and adopt improvement strategies and
- Ensure a supportive environment

AHA provides advocacy, resources, and research to America’s hospitals and health systems to support them in the achievement of these commitments:

- Central line associated bloodstream infections (safety)
- Readmissions (efficiency)
- Mortality (quality)
Value-Based Purchasing (VBP) Quality Measure

For FY 2013, CMS proposes 18 total measures
» 17 process measures
» HCAHPS patient experiences with care
For FY 2014, CMS proposes 20 additional measures
» 3 mortality measures
» 9 AHRQ patient safety measures
» 8 HACs
For FY 2013, performance measured July 1, 2011—March 31, 2012

Scoring Hospitals’ Performance

- Hospitals will receive the higher of its attainment or improvement score on each measure
- For FY 2013, process measures account for 70% of total performance score, HCAHPS 30%
- CMS proposes linear scale to translate total performance score into incentive payment
- Program budget neutral...some hospitals receive more than withheld, others less
Lisa Weiss provided a summary of the Collaborative’s two goals:

1. Demonstrate better care, better health, at lower cost, and
2. Accelerate widespread adoption of care models and payment models.

And six partners, which included:

- Cleveland Clinic
- Dartmouth-Hitchcock
- Denver Health
- Geisinger
- Intermountain Healthcare
- Mayo Clinic
Collaborative rapid innovation process (6-month cycle)

Innovation Team:
- **Define cohort**
  - Based on:
    - Literature
    - Clinical practice
    - Feasibility

- **Define episode(s) of care**
  - Based on:
    - Data analysis
    - Literature
    - Clinical practice
    - ACO vision

- **Share site care models**

- **Identify best practice care models**
  - Based on:
    - High value goals
    - Gaps in evidence

- **Prioritize research questions**
  - Based on:
    - Care models associated with best metrics
    - Literature

- **Construct optional pilot tests**

Measurement Team:
- **Define and extract measures**

- **Conduct aggregate analysis**

- **Define analytic plan**

- **Conduct comparative analysis**

- **Set up data capture for new measures**

- **Measure results of pilot tests**
Collaborative to participate in measurement "Data Trust"

- **Dartmouth Atlas**
  - CMS Claims
  - e.g., SPORT, NNE, CF

- **Clinical Trials**
  - CMS, private payer, clinical

- **ACO Learning Network**
  - Admin, clinical, patient-reported
  - e.g., Cleveland Clinic, Dartmouth-Hitchcock, Denver Health, Geisinger, Intermountain, Mayo Clinic

- **Collaborative sites**
  - Admin, clinical, patient-reported

- **TDI Collaborative Data Trust**

- **Health measurement**
  - Benchmarking
  - Transparency
  - Best Practices

- **Clinical population registries**
  - Disease monitoring
  - Community health
  - Outreach

- **Research**
  - Cohort queries using anonymized data
  - Access to data partition for IRB-approved studies
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While the previous webinar examined initiatives to improve value and quality in health care, this webinar looked at what might be considered the bedrock of quality—that is, reducing medical errors and improving patient safety. These quality goals are inextricably linked to reimbursement and payment issues. Studies have estimated that measurable medical errors cost this country $17 billion annually. Some see the evolution toward a performance-based payment system as the key to long-term cost-growth reduction and quality improvement, just as the Medicare prospective payment system was seen as a necessary innovation against continued hospital cost inflation in the 1980s. There are many efforts underway by hospitals, physicians, payers, private organizations, and Medicare to address the issue and fundamentally change the way health care is delivered and paid for in the US. This webinar was designed to highlight several of these—all of which are designed to get to the root cause of quality breakdowns through process improvements, standardized methods, and the use of innovative new technology.

Klaus Nether began with the Health Care Quality Challenge:

- More than 400,000 harmful, preventable bad outcomes occur in hospitals every year
- Costs associated with unsafe care and poor quality in hospitals are unacceptable
- Strong demand from health care organizations (HCOs) for specific guidance on how to solve these problems
- HCOs want highly effective, durable solutions and are ready to implement them
Why the Joint Commission’s Center for Transforming Healthcare (CTH) was created:

- **Mission**: transform healthcare into a high reliability industry and to ensure patients receive the safest, highest quality care they expect and deserve
- **Presents a new approach to address critical safety and quality problems sought by The Joint Commission, healthcare organizations, patients and their families, physicians and other clinicians, and other public and private stakeholders**

**Robust Process Improvement (RPI)**

- **Systematic approaches to problem solving proven in many other spheres of work**
  - Lean, six sigma, change acceleration, Toyota
  - Different from what came before (CQI, TQM)
- **Equally effective when applied to our toughest healthcare safety and quality problems**
- **Directly address critical failings of current QI**
- **Appealing to physicians and other clinicians**
Center Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>Hand Hygiene Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>Wrong Site Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>Hand Off Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>Surgical Site Infection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td>Preventing Avoidable Heart Failure Hospitalizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Causes Differ by Hospital

→ Each cause requires a very different strategy to eliminate

### Main Causes of Failure to Clean Hands
( across all participating hospitals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective placement of dispensers or sinks</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand hygiene compliance data are not collected or reported accurately or frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accountability and just-in-time coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety culture does not stress hand hygiene at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective or insufficient education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands full</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing gloves interferes with process</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that hand hygiene is not needed if wearing gloves</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care workers forget</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distractions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that not all of the main causes of failure appear in every hospital. The chart above represents the validation of the root causes across hospitals. This underscores the importance of understanding hospital-specific root causes so that appropriate solutions can be targeted.
How to Spread Improvement?

- To maximize impact, improvement knowledge must be able to reach healthcare organizations of varying sizes and capabilities
- Leverage reach of 19,000 accredited organizations
- CTH developed simple assessment and problem solving tools for organizations without RPI (Robust Process Improvement) capacity
  - Measure process (e.g., hand hygiene)
  - Assess specific causes of failures
  - Match interventions to organization’s causes
- Engaging industry in Center projects

Targeted Solutions Tool (TST):

- Platform to connect to all Center solutions
  - No cost barriers for access to TST
  - Simplified, data-driven problem solving, based directly on RPI methods
  - Confidential; instantaneous data analysis
- Guides users to customized solutions
- Educational, no jargon, no special training
- All solutions proven by testing in hospitals
In explaining how information systems, data standards and a national infrastructure are key to improving safety, Becky Rufo outlined a paradigm shift:

- Movement from paying more for quantity towards reimbursement for greater quality at the best cost
- Demonstrating value hit a crossroad
- Global integration of informatics and tele-health technology
- Innovative care delivery models

Resurrection eICU Program Operations

- Activated July 10, 2007
- 193 critical care beds monitored
- 15 ICUs, 5 acute care sites, 1 LTACH, 2 outreach
- eRN/DA: 24/7
- eMD: 14hr (M-F), 17 hrs (S-S)
- Operations Director
- Medical Director
Multi-Professional Care Delivery Model…
Safety/Quality

- A centralized, intensivist-led care team to continuously monitor, assess and intervene in support of the on-site caregivers
- Organizational infrastructure to promote standardized critical care and track results
- Information technology tools, decision support and business intelligence to incorporate best practice, standardization clinical resources, risk reduction, workflow redesign and enhanced bedside communication

First Six Months

- 98 lives saved
- $5-6M savings
- 41% decrease in mortality
- 3% decrease in DVTs
- 38% decrease in LOS (=$3M savings)
- 7% decrease in blood transfusions (=$11,200 savings)
Fast Track to Integration and Performance

Organizational and Executive Leadership Direction

- Integration Model
- Clinical Resource
- Multidisciplinary Collaboration
- Standardization
- Clinical Risk Reduction
- APACHE/Benchmark Reports
- IS and Clinical Partnership
- Evidence-Based Practice
- Balanced Scorecard
- National Recognition
- Leveraging Innovation
Tele-health Integration

- Sharing of comparative data and integration of best practice drives outcomes and accountability
- Collaboration is multi-dimensional and cross-functional
- Accountability, transparency and collaboration with key stakeholders are critical to success
- Growth:
  - Outreach
  - ED Integration
  - Sepsis
  - Best practice compliance
  - Orientation/Mentoring
Lessons Learned

- A quality framework is essential to executing change
- Framing change begins by a focused scope, goals, broad communication and helping the organization adapt to change
- Collaboration is multi-dimensional and cross-functional
- Sharing of comparative data and integration of best practice drives outcomes and accountability
- Regionalization initiatives promote a common purpose and stewardship
- Benchmark/APACHE reports are most effective to identifying areas of focused change
- Investment in human capital is empowering to growth
- Quality care directly impacts financial performance (V=Q/C)
Carolyn Langer began by defining and distinguishing Serious Reportable Events and Preventable Events:

**Serious Reportable Events (SRE, as defined by Massachusetts DPH):**

An event that occurs on premises covered by a hospital’s license that:

- Results in an adverse patient outcome
- Is clearly identifiable and measurable
- Has been identified to be in a class of events that are usually or reasonably preventable, and
- Of a nature such that the risk of occurrence is significantly influenced by the policies and procedures of the hospital

**Preventable Events (PE, as defined by Massachusetts DPH):**

Events that could have been avoided by proper adherence to:

- Applicable patient safety guidelines
- Best practices, and
- Hospital policies and procedures
Evaluation of the overall quality of care at an individual hospital should not be based solely on a raw number of SREs reported, because:

- A higher number of SREs may indicate a strong reporting culture, rather than a quality concern
- SRE data are counts, not rates (i.e., SREs per 1,000 admits)
- NQF (National Quality Forum) acknowledges that not all SREs are preventable

Underreported Events

Serious Reportable Events identified via POA (Present on Admission) Claims Report or Clinical Occurrence that were not reported to DPH:

- Deep Vein Thrombosis/Pulmonary Embolism
- Vascular catheter associated infection
- Acquired injury, dislocation, other injury, burn, other unspecified
Challenges with SRE Process

- Lack of standardization and wide variability in definition (or interpretation of definition) and identification of SREs; lack of consistency in applying SRE categories and under-reporting to MA DPH
- Significant "lag period" between actual SRE and eventual review, delaying root cause analyses requests and corrective action plan reviews
- SRE identification through multiple channels (e.g., POA claims report, Clinical Concern/Occurrence report) is time consuming, requires additional resources, is confusing and causes delays in obtaining and reviewing clinical records
- Inconsistent responses to requests for root cause analyses (RCAs) and corrective action plans (CAPs)
  » some organizations view RCA/CAPs as protected internal QA documents
  » others refer RCA/CAPs to existing QA committees for review with no follow-up available
- Limited resources to monitor CAPs in order to gauge successful implementation and monitoring of improved patient safety efforts
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There is no doubt that medical imaging has profoundly changed the face of health care delivery. Not only does imaging dramatically reduce diagnostic time, but it plays a critical role in disease prevention, early detection and treatment. Over the years, imaging has reduced the need for exploratory surgery, rendering the term itself (almost) obsolete. All of these advances, however, have prompted a series of questions by public and private payers and policymakers. They have increasingly raised concerns about the rapid growth and utilization of imaging, questioning the appropriateness of the technology. In addition, questions have been raised around the issue of radiation safety. This webinar was designed to answer these questions and learn from the experts “in the field:”

- What new policies will affect medical imaging in the coming years?
- Can we expect additional reimbursement cuts?
- How do we respond to concerns about radiation safety?
- Is imaging on the table in the debt ceiling debates?
- Will Congress fix the SGR?

**Congressman Pomeroy** explained that the imaging “wars” largely began as a result of three trends:

- Growth in imaging services, spending
- Concerns about appropriate utilization
- Pressure on rising federal spending

**The main elements of battle consist of:**

**Congress**
- significant legislation since 2006 changed payments, policies
- Health reform introduced new incentives, new energy

**CMS**
- introduced new initiatives through rules, demonstrations
- now implementing health reform

**Federal Deficit**
- budget battles since 2006 are unequalled
Timeline of Federal Imaging Policy
2006 - 2013

**Key terms**
- **MPPR** = same day multiple procedure payment reduction of 25% in DRA and 50% in PPACA
- **HOPPS cap** = limits non-hospital payment levels to no higher than hospital outpatient levels
- **RVU** = relative value units, how physician services are valued on a revenue neutral scale
- **AC pilot** = testing the use of imaging appropriateness criteria or clinical guidelines
- **PPIS** = AMA’s physician practice information survey, lacked representative data
- **Utilization rate (UR)** = how often equipment is in use, part of the payment formula
- **CMMI policy** = CMS Innovation Center test varied payments based on adherence to guidelines
- **MPPR PC** = same day multiple procedure professional component (diagnosis) reduction of 25%

*2006 Moran Co. analysis concludes impact to be $13B over ten years.

**Sample of Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>procedure</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRI brain</td>
<td>$1,118</td>
<td>$439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA neck</td>
<td>$968</td>
<td>$662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT abdomen</td>
<td>$745</td>
<td>$457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI lower extremity</td>
<td>$1,089</td>
<td>$446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-ray artery</td>
<td>$564</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-ray chest</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammography</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s Next?

- **Debt Ceiling, Super Committee**
  - $1.2 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years
  - to be accomplished in two stages: Stage 1, no Medicare cuts; Stage 2, if no agreement then $140 billion in Medicare cuts, potentially including imaging

- **Deficit reduction bill does not fix the Medicare Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR)**
  - so Congress must pass legislation by January 1, 2012 to prevent a drastic, unpopular reduction in physician reimbursements
Dr. Cristoph Wald began his remarks with an overview of Appropriateness Criteria:

- Appropriateness criteria helps ordering physicians make better informed choices and curb unnecessary testing
- Practice experience + medical literature + sets of recommendations
- Online search engine, mobile solution, web-interface (API)

Pilots underway at U Wisconsin and Henry Ford Hospital, in collaboration with CMS
Keys to Dose Reduction

Justification: any medically indicated imaging test is justified, and benefits outweigh the risks – medical radiation exposure aids immediate diagnosis and subsequent therapy.

Optimization: ALARA → Optimization. Team effort, systems based effort, multipronged approach to dose control

Diagnostic Reference Levels (DRLs): Technique factors and scan parameters that are common and appropriate for a diagnostic image while maintaining lowest required dose

National Radiology Dose Registry

- ACR initiative to trend CT dose parameters and protocols
- Effective May 2011
- Dose Index Registry permits automated, anonymized web-transfer of data via local, networked software client
- Facilities can compare their exposure data to regional and national level benchmarks
- Challenges: body habitus normalization, protocol complexity and lack of uniformity in protocol nomenclature
- Enrollment @ https://nrdr.acr.org
Strategies for Radiology Departments/Practices and Hospitals

- Work with referring physicians on appropriate test ordering
- Educate ordering physicians about alternative imaging tests without ionizing radiation
- Understand, encourage and enforce the use of the radiation dose reduction tools on your scanners
- Optimization of protocols ("right size" the scan)
- Monitor skin dose in interventional radiology, record monitor fluoro times
- Obtain ACR accreditation
- Participate in the ACR Dose Registry Index
- Staff credentialing in different modalities and across departments
- Monitor compliance with department protocols, feedback to techs
- Department wide comprehensive dose management database
Education and Leadership: New Roles for Radiologists

- Radiologists, Radiation Oncologists, Medical Physicists have dedicated training in the effects of radiation exposure
- Tailored information is available for groups of imaging professionals
- Lead organizations to a state where ALARA is pervasive in the whole spectrum of care
- Guidance on equipment purchasing, education about radiation dose reduction, appropriate use, and ensuring proper credentialing
- Pledge to IMAGE WISELY at www.imagewisely.org

The High Reliability Organization

- Communication
- Mistakes recognized and addressed without repercussion
- Constant process improvements
Earl Pomeroy is counsel in Alston & Bird’s Washington, D.C., office, focusing his practice on healthcare regulatory and legislative matters. He brings special expertise on advising clients on health policy and legislative strategies for healthcare delivery. Mr. Pomeroy served as North Dakota’s lone representative in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1992. During this term, he earned a reputation as an independent-minded leader that brought North Dakota common sense to the debate over issues that affected our nation.

Mr. Pomeroy was first elected to the North Dakota House of Representatives in 1980, and voters selected him as the state insurance commissioner in 1984. During his tenure as insurance commissioner, he served as president of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

Throughout his time in Congress, Mr. Pomeroy made the concerns of North Dakota his top priority. Called “articulate, cheerful and sincere” by the Almanac of American Politics and a “billboard for North Dakota values” by the Bismarck Tribune, Pomeroy’s leadership and hard work earned him a spot on the powerful House Ways and Means Committee. This post gave him influence over key policy decisions on tax, trade, and Social Security and Medicare issues. In addition, Pomeroy was one of the few members of the Ways and Means Committee to secure a post on a second House committee. His leadership and advocacy on behalf of rural America earned him a special waiver allowing him to also hold a seat on the House Agriculture Committee.

With his dual roles in the House committees that oversee tax and agriculture policy, Pomeroy was in a unique position to shape the last farm bill to provide a stronger safety net for family farmers and ranchers in North Dakota. His ongoing work made him one of the nation’s most respected advocates of producers and rural America. He earned undergraduate and law degrees from the University of North Dakota before returning to his hometown to practice law for five years.
Dr. Christoph Wald is the Vice Chairman of the Department of Radiology in Boston’s Lahey Clinic, a physician-led group practice with medical centers serving some 4,000 patients each day. Dr. Wald has served with the Lahey Clinic since 1998, specializing in body imaging and 3D/advanced image analysis.

He is a member of the American College of Radiology (ACR) and Radiological Society of North America (RSNA) joint task force focused on improving imaging appropriateness, reducing radiation, and educating patients on the risks and benefits of imaging.

Dr. Wald is an Associate Professor of Radiology at Tufts University School of Medicine and currently serves as President of the MA Radiological Society.
Appendix: The Philips Healthcare
“Reimbursement Simplified” Webinar Series

Imaging Wars: Report from the Front Lines
October 20, 2011
View the webcast: http://vmx.highroadsolution.com/se/Meetings/Playback.aspx?meeting.id=321468

On the Quality Front: New Approaches in Improving Patient Safety
July 28, 2011
View the webcast: http://vmx.adobeconnect.com/p66n6hnaz35/

Quality Check: Three Unique Approaches for Improving Value in Healthcare
March 23, 2011
View the webcast: http://vmx.na5.acrobat.com/p65547835