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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Additional Service Areas
- The Emergency Department (ED), remains the most common additional service area across the last three (3) National Hospital Case Management Survey (NHCMS) collection cycles (Graph 1).
- The proportion of departments providing services to admissions increased significantly from 2009 to 2011 while the proportion providing services to outpatient settings decreased significantly (Graph 1).

Facility Size
- With the exception of SNF, the proportion of large facilities (500+ beds) offering CM services in additional areas appears to be decreasing (Graph 2a-2f).

Reporting Location
- For CM departments reporting to nursing or patient care services, involvement in ED and outpatient settings appears to be decreasing while involvement in ambulatory clinics is increasing (Graphs 3a-3f). Additionally, the proportion of departments reporting to nursing who also provide services to admissions increased significantly from 19% in 2009 to 36% in 2011 (Graph 3b).

Staff Characteristics
- In the 2007 collection, average SW CM salary in departments providing services to the ED, admissions, or SNF were significantly lower than in departments not providing services to these areas (Graph 4b). However, no significant difference in average SW CM salary was found in the 2009 or 2011 NHCMS collection cycles.
- Average RN CM FTEs is significantly higher for departments providing services to the ED, ambulatory clinics, and rehab for the 2011 cycle (Graph 5a).
- Average SW CM FTEs is significantly higher for departments providing services to ambulatory clinics and rehab settings during this same cycle (Graph 5b).
- Total department FTEs in 2011 are significantly higher for CM departments providing services to the ED, ambulatory clinics, and rehab than for those who do not (Graph 5c).

Key Outcomes
- Across all collection cycles, the proportion of CM departments reporting avoidable delays/days as a key outcome is significantly higher for departments providing services to the ED compared to those that do not (Graph 6a).

Top Challenges
- The proportion reporting physician buy-in and length of stay are top challenges is consistently lower for departments providing CM services to ambulatory clinics compared to those that do not (Graph 7c).
Introduction: Additional Service Areas

Research Questions:
1. Is the expansion of Case Management into additional service areas associated with identifiable variation in staffing characteristics, outcomes, and departmental challenges?

Purpose & Source:
The following report is the product of additional investigation on the expanding role of Case Management into additional service areas and the effects on staffing characteristics, outcomes, and departmental challenges. The independent variables utilized in these analyses are the provision of services in departments or areas other than inpatient medical/surgical. Data for this study was collected during the 2007, 2009, and 2011 ACMA National Case Management Survey. Respondents were asked to identify additional practice settings in which their departments provide Case Management services.

Variables:
Independent (additional service areas)       Dependent
• Emergency Department
• Admissions
• Ambulatory Clinics
• Rehab
• Outpatient
• SNF

• Facility size
• Staff salary
• Staffing
• Key outcomes
• Top challenges

Methods:
Analytical methods for this study included z-tests and Chi-square tests of independence. All statistical tests performed used an alpha level of .05.

Data Sources:
This report is comprised of data from the 2007, 2009, and 2011 NHCMS.

The survey samples included hospitals with greater than or equal to 100 staffed beds. The samples were directed at acute care facilities. Psychiatric, Rehab, and VA facilities were excluded from participation.

Each survey collected data from more than 400 hospital Case Management departments around the country. These data are nationally representative with a 95% confidence level (C.I. +/- 5%).
CM in additional service areas (2007 – 2011)

KEY FINDING:

1. As shown in Graph 1, the Emergency Department (ED), remains the most common additional service area across the last three (3) National Hospital Case Management Survey (NHCMS) collection cycles.

2. The proportion of departments providing services to admissions increased significantly from 2009 to 2011 while the proportion providing services to outpatient settings decreased significantly.
Graph 1: CM in additional service areas (2007 – 2011)

- **ER Department**: 78% in 2011 (n=407), 76% in 2009 (n=426), and 88% in 2007 (n=427). The proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly higher than in previous years.
- **Admissions**: 40% in 2011, 31% in 2009, and 40% in 2007. The proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly lower than in previous years.
- **Ambulatory Clinics**: 29% in 2011, 24% in 2009, and 29% in 2007.
- **Rehab**: 27% in 2011, 26% in 2009, and 34% in 2007.
- **Outpatient**: 23% in 2011, 33% in 2009, and 23% in 2007.
- **SNF**: 14% in 2011, 15% in 2009, and 18% in 2007.

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly higher than in previous years.
↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly lower than in previous years.
CM additional service areas by facility size

KEY FINDING:

1. With the exception of SNF, the proportion of large facilities (500+ beds) offering CM services in additional areas appears to be decreasing (Graph 2a-2f).

2. The table below summarizes the apparent trends in additional service areas by facility size. Significant differences between 2009 and 2011 are identified (*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed size</th>
<th>ED  (Graph 2a)</th>
<th>Admissions  (Graph 2b)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Clinics (Graph 2c)</th>
<th>Rehab  (Graph 2d)</th>
<th>Outpatient (Graph 2e)</th>
<th>SNF  (Graph 2f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 or less</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 – 300</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 – 500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 500</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question:
Are there identifiable trends in providing CM services to additional areas by facility size?
Graph 2a: CM additional service areas by facility size (ED)

- 200 or less: 83%, 72%, 70%
- 201 - 300: 76%, 83%, 84%
- 301 - 500: 89%, 81%, 89%
- 500 or more: 91%, 85%, 43% (↓)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly higher than in previous year(s).
↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
Graph 2b: CM additional service areas by facility size (Admissions)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly higher than in previous year(s).
↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
Graph 2c: CM additional service areas by facility size (Ambulatory Clinics)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly higher than in previous year(s).
↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
Graph 2d: CM additional service areas by facility size (Rehab)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly higher than in previous year(s).
↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
Graph 2e: CM additional service areas by facility size (Outpatient)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly higher than in previous year(s).
↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
Graph 2f: CM additional service areas by facility size (SNF)

- Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly **higher** than in previous year(s).
- Proportion of departments providing services to this area is significantly **lower** than in previous year(s).
KEY FINDING:

1. For CM departments reporting to nursing or patient care services, involvement in ED and outpatient settings appears to be decreasing while involvement in ambulatory clinics is increasing (Graphs 3a-3f). Additionally, the proportion of departments reporting to nursing who also provide services to admissions increased significantly from 19% in 2009 to 36% in 2011 (Graph 3b).

2. The table below summarizes the apparent trends in CM involvement in additional service areas by reporting location. Significant differences between 2009 and 2011 are identified (*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Location</th>
<th>ED (Graph 3a)</th>
<th>Admissions (Graph 3b)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Clinics (Graph 3c)</th>
<th>Rehab (Graph 3d)</th>
<th>Outpatient (Graph 3e)</th>
<th>SNF (Graph 3f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing/ Pt care</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Affairs</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 3a: CM additional service areas by reporting location (ED)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly higher than in previous year(s).
↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
Graph 3b: CM additional service areas by reporting location (Admissions)

- Finance: 44% (2007), 47% (2009), 48% (2011)
- Nursing or Patient Care Services: 39% (2007), 36%↑ (2009), 34% (2011)
- Quality: 34% (2007), 20% (2009), 41%↑ (2011)
- Medical Affairs: 30% (2007), 30% (2009), 32% (2011)
- Other: 51% (2007), 38% (2009), 34% (2011)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly higher than in previous year(s).
↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
Graph 3c: CM additional service areas by reporting location (Ambulatory Clinics)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly higher than in previous year(s).

↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
Graph 3d: CM additional service areas by reporting location (Rehab)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly higher than in previous year(s).

↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
Graph 3e: CM additional service areas by reporting location (Outpatient)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly **higher** than in previous year(s).

↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly **lower** than in previous year(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing or Patient Care Services</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Affairs</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copyright 2011 American Case Management Association. All rights reserved. This data and information is the property of the American Case Management Association, ACMA. Using this data without ACMA permission is prohibited.
Graph 3f: CM additional service areas by reporting location (SNF)

↑ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly higher than in previous year(s).
↓ Proportion of departments providing services to this area and reporting to this location is significantly lower than in previous year(s).
CM additional service areas and staff salary

KEY FINDING:

1. As shown in Graph 4a, while average RN CM salaries have increased across collection cycles, no significant difference was found when comparing departments providing CM services in additional settings to those that do not.

2. SW CM salaries have also increased. In the 2007 collection, average SW CM salary in departments providing services to the ED, admissions, or SNF were significantly lower than in departments not providing services to these areas (Graph 4b). However, no significant difference in average SW CM salary was found in the 2009 or 2011 NHCMS collection cycles.
Graph 4a: CM additional service areas and staff salary (RN CM)

- Outpatient: $57,056, $59,673, $68,007, $66,750, $66,710, $66,707
- SNF: $59,646, $66,446, $68,575, $66,435, $69,235, $68,228

↑ Average is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Average is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 4b: CM additional service areas and staff salary (SW CM)

↑ Average is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Average is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
CM additional service areas and staffing

KEY FINDING:

1. As shown in Graph 5a, average RN CM FTEs is significantly higher for departments providing services to the ED, ambulatory clinics, and rehab for the 2011 cycle.

2. As shown in Graph 5b, average SW CM FTEs is significantly higher for departments providing services to ambulatory clinics and rehab settings during this same cycle.

3. Similarly, total department FTEs in 2011 are significantly higher for CM departments providing services to the ED, ambulatory clinics, and rehab than for those who do not (Graph 5c).
Graph 5a: CM additional service areas and staffing (RN CM)

- **ED**: 12.29, 12.26↑
- **Admissions**: 12.86, 12.95, 12.68↑
- **Ambulatory Clinics**: 14.76↑, 11.11, 11.49
- **Rehab**: 12, 11.94, 12.21↑
- **Outpatient**: 13.06, 12.49, 12.50
- **SNF**: 11.58, 11.53, 11.50

- \(↑\) Average is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
- \(↓\) Average is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
**Graph 5b: CM additional service areas and staffing (SW CM)**

- **ED**: 6.95\(\uparrow\) 7.18
- **Admissions**: 5.99 5.45 4.46 4.47
- **Ambulatory Clinics**: 6.90 7.13 5.94 4.56
- **Rehab**: 8.60\(\uparrow\) 6.61 6.60 4.72
- **Outpatient**: 8.00\(\uparrow\) 5.78 5.47 5.13
- **SNF**: 8.32\(\uparrow\) 6.55\(\uparrow\) 6.78 5.3

- **FTEs**
  - 2007 Provides Services
  - 2007 Does Not
  - 2009 Provides Services
  - 2009 Does Not
  - 2011 Provides Services
  - 2011 Does Not

- **Average**:
  - \(\uparrow\) Average is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
  - \(\downarrow\) Average is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 5c: CM additional service areas and staffing (CM dept overall)

ED  Admissions  Ambulatory Clinics  Rehab  Outpatient  SNF

 ↑ Average is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
 ↓ Average is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
CM additional service areas and key outcomes

KEY FINDING:

1. Graphs 6a-6f display the proportion of departments that identified length of stay, avoidable delays/days, denials/appeals, observations, or readmissions as key departmental outcomes by service area.

2. Across all collection cycles, the proportion of CM departments reporting avoidable delays/days as a key outcome is significantly higher for departments providing services to the ED compared to those that do not (Graph 6a).

3. The table below summarizes apparent trends in the likelihood of indicating each key outcome for departments providing services in these settings compared to those that do not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Outcome</th>
<th>ED (Graph 6a)</th>
<th>Admissions (Graph 6b)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Clinics (Graph 6c)</th>
<th>Rehab (Graph 6d)</th>
<th>Outpatient (Graph 6e)</th>
<th>SNF (Graph 6f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>Converging</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidable Days/Delays</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denials/Appeals</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmissions</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question:
Are there patterns associated with the identification of key departmental outcomes and providing CM services to additional areas?
Graph 6a: CM additional service areas and key outcomes (ED)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 6b: CM additional service areas and key outcomes (Admissions)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly **higher** for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.

↓ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly **lower** for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 6c: CM additional service areas and key outcomes (Ambulatory clinics)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 6d: CM additional service areas and key outcomes (Rehab)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 6e: CM additional service areas and key outcomes (Outpatient)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.

↓ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 6f: CM additional service areas and key outcomes (SNF)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Proportion of departments reporting this key outcome is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
CM additional service areas and top challenges

KEY FINDING:

1. Graphs 7a-7f display the proportion of departments reporting physician buy-in, patient flow/throughput, or length of stay as top challenges by service area.

2. The proportion reporting physician buy-in and length of stay are top challenges is consistently lower for departments providing CM services to ambulatory clinics compared to those that do not (Graph 7c).

3. The table below summarizes apparent trends in the likelihood of indicating each top challenge for departments providing services in these settings compared to those that do not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top challenge</th>
<th>ED (Graph 7a)</th>
<th>Admissions (Graph 7b)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Clinics (Graph 7c)</th>
<th>Rehab (Graph 7d)</th>
<th>Outpatient (Graph 7e)</th>
<th>SNF (Graph 7f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physician Buy-In</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Flow/Throughput</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question:
Are there patterns associated with the identification of top challenges and providing CM services to additional areas?
Graph 7a: CM additional service areas and top challenges (ED)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.

↓ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 7b: CM additional service areas and top challenges (Admissions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>2007 Provides Services (n=167)</th>
<th>2007 Does Not (n=260)</th>
<th>2009 Provides Services (n=131)</th>
<th>2009 Does Not (n=295)</th>
<th>2011 Provides Services (n=163)</th>
<th>2011 Does Not (n=260)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physician Buy-In</td>
<td>35%↑</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Flow/Throughput</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 7c: CM additional service areas and top challenges (Ambulatory clinics)

- **Physician Buy-In**
  - 2007 Provides Services (n=98): 32%
  - 2007 Does Not (n=329): 22%
  - 2009 Provides Services (n=99): 29%
  - 2009 Does Not (n=327): 23%
  - 2011 Provides Services (n=118): 21%
  - 2011 Does Not (n=305): 20%

- **Patient Flow/Throughput**
  - 2007 Provides Services (n=98): 26%
  - 2007 Does Not (n=329): 21%
  - 2009 Provides Services (n=99): 25%
  - 2009 Does Not (n=327): 24%
  - 2011 Provides Services (n=118): 27%
  - 2011 Does Not (n=305): 16%

- **Length of Stay**
  - 2007 Provides Services (n=98): 11%
  - 2007 Does Not (n=329): 9%
  - 2009 Provides Services (n=99): 11%
  - 2009 Does Not (n=327): 12%
  - 2011 Provides Services (n=118): 13%
  - 2011 Does Not (n=305): 17%

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 7d: CM additional service areas and top challenges (Rehab)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.

↓ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 7e: CM additional service areas and top challenges (Outpatient)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
Graph 7f: CM additional service areas and top challenges (SNF)

↑ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly higher for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.
↓ Proportion of departments reporting this top challenge is significantly lower for departments providing services to this area than departments that do not.