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Children with Medical Complexity

1. chronic, severe health conditions
2. substantial health service needs
3. major functional limitations
4. high health resource utilization
   › CMC likely represent less than 1% of all children
   › account for more than 1/3 of paediatric health care costs
   › inpatient care is responsible for as much as 80% of health care cost for CMC
   › use of the hospital is increasing for CMC over time

» 0.4% - 0.7% all children based on literature (estimate a total of 3500-6000 children in Queensland)
Some quotes from families:

“It is important to voice your needs very loudly - which you should never have to do. It was not until I really put my foot down and made them listen that anything happened.”

“The monitor doesn’t tell you the full story. It doesn’t tell you the full picture of the child. They don’t listen to parents. We feel like we were getting pushed aside like you don’t know what you’re talking about we know better and we’ll deal with it so you guys just shut up.”

“It’s hard… and it shouldn’t be that hard.”
Benefits of Care Coordination

» “an individualised health plan has been shown to improve communication between health care providers, family goal setting and improved family experience”

» children … were hospitalized fewer times and their parents missed fewer days of work

» Importance of family buy-in – involved in design of program and reference committee

» Importance of physician leadership and engagement: leadership from physicians “committed to the idea that complex children could be cared for in the community, and … made a conscious decision that they wanted to improve their practices to accommodate children with complex problems”

Palfrey, 2004
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Evidence Base

Stiles et al, August 2014

» Center for Children with Complex and Chronic Conditions (C5) established in 2008 (North Carolina, 13 hospitals)

» 2008 to 2010, 234 children enrolled with complex conditions

» Including: tracheostomies, gastrostomy tubes, ventilators, feeding pumps, cerebral palsy, intellectual disabilities, complex genetic syndromes
Model of Care Coordination (Stiles et al; August 2014)

Interventions:
» comprehensive assessment of patient and family needs
» care plan development
» referrals to community services
» patient and caretaker education
» collaboration with providers and caregivers to facilitate transitions in care.
» “warm handoff” to the community-based care coordinators in primary care practices
» provide link between the subspecialist team and primary care professionals
» care plans posted on a secure web-based provider portal

Stiles et al, August 2014
Benefits of Care Coordination

» 20% reduction in average inpatient length of stay for ventilator-dependent patients
» 36% reduction in readmissions during the first month after discharge
» 26% reduction in readmissions during the first year after initial discharge
» 55% reduction in overall re-hospitalizations
» 11% reduction in emergency department visits
» calculated savings total for 2008 to 2010 is over USD $6 million

Stiles et al, August 2014
Statewide Consultation

All Directors of Paediatrics from QLD and Northern NSW came together at workshop.

Prioritisation of service goals

November 2013
Queensland Connected Care Program

Evolution of Program

» Reference committee with family involvement
» Articulated vision, philosophy and partnerships
» Goal to move patients through the program and towards family enablement and independence
» Medical engagement
» Explicit medical and care coordinator roles
» Wide consultation
» Regionalisation of the model but centralisation of intake
» Use of allegory
Marine Pilot

» “A pilot is a mariner who guides ships through dangerous or congested waters, such as harbours or river mouths.

» Pilots are expert shiphandlers who possess detailed knowledge of local waterways …

» (however) the master has full responsibility for safe navigation of his vessel, even if a pilot is on board.”

To ensure a ship arrives in port safely, it needs:

Captain (parent)
Pilot (Care Coordinator)
Lighthouse (Hub)
Connected Care Program

» State-wide Model
» a “Care Coordinator/team” for each child from within Connected Care Program.
» Partnership using a shared care model with other services throughout the state.
» a “Lead Specialist”
  › depends on health condition/s
  › region where family lives
  › will respect parental choice
Queensland Connected Care Program

A range of services depending on the level of support required.

» Appointment coordination

» Access to welfare support including complex travel needs

» Health Care Profile or Health Care Summary ("Care Plan")

» Individualised Proactive management of identified health issues

» Support for Transition

» Identify and support parent goals

» For regional children admitted to LCCH, daily rounding and support partnership between LCCH and region

» Pharmacist support

» Allied Health Assistant program for inpatients
Complex Care Management

Care Planning

Care Coordination

Shared Care/ Self-Management

Discharge/ Transition

Model of Care Options
Principles

» Family centred care
  › Family is the primary source of experience for a child
  › Families have the capacity to strengthen their capability to support their child
  › Work together to determine meaningful solutions to complex problems

» Shared Care
» Strengths- based approach – increase self-management
» Avoid duplication
» Add value to system
Health Care Profile / Summary

» Summary of conditions
» Current Management
» Care Team incl. GP
» Functional Assessment
» Emergency Care plan/s
» After Hours Action Plan
» Immunisation report
» Medication summary

# Eligibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronicity/Complexity</th>
<th>Frailty</th>
<th>Intensity of Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child’s condition is expected to last at least 6 more months or is lifelong.</td>
<td>The child has severe and/or life threatening disease.</td>
<td>Child requires prolonged intravenous administration of nutritional substances or drugs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Health care interventions delivered in multiple locations:  
  - Home  
  - Out of home care  
  - School  
  - Hospital | Failure of equipment or treatment places the child at immediate risk - including limitations to access to health care as a result of isolation. | Child has prolonged (>1 month) dependence on device-based support, e.g.:  
  - tracheostomy tube care  
  - suctioning  
  - oxygen support or  
  - tube feeding  
  - Mechanical ventilation |
| The child has had 10 or more medical specialist outpatient clinic visits in the past year. | Short term changes in the child’s health status (e.g., an intercurrent illness) put them at immediate serious health risk. | Child has prolonged (>1 month) dependence on any other medical devices to compensate for vital bodily functions and requires daily or nearly daily nursing care, e.g.:  
  - apnea monitors  
  - renal dialysis  
  - urinary catheters/colostomy bags plus nursing care |
| The child has had two or more prolonged admissions (LOS >10 days) to hospital in the past year. | As a consequence of the child’s illness, the child remains at significant risk of unpredictable life threatening deterioration, necessitating round-the-clock monitoring by a knowledgeable caregiver. | Child is not technologically dependent but has any chronic condition that requires as great a level of care as the above group e.g.:  
  1. children who, as a consequence of their illness are completely dependent on others for activities of daily living at an age where they would not otherwise be so dependent  
  2. children who require constant medical or nursing supervision or monitoring, resulting from the complexity of their condition and/or the quantity of oral drugs and therapy they receive  
  3. children whose level of care is disproportionate to carer capacity, which may include families with multiple family members with high care needs |

Child is preparing for, undergoing or recovering from major surgery or other intervention which places them temporarily in the high intensity of care category – will be eligible for a time limited period, until return to baseline status, or referred to another service.
Connected Care Program Evaluation

» Current patient caseload = 655 patients across Qld and Northern NSW
» This evaluation performed on sample of first 80 patients
» Enrolled on the program for a minimum of twelve months
» Sample mix of patients from metropolitan, regional and rural health services
» Pre-enrolment activity compared with clinical service utilisation and measures in first 12 months post-enrolment
Geographical Distribution

- Cairns & Cape York (CBH) - 45
- Townsville (TTH) - 22
- Mackay (MBH) - 7
- Wide Bay: Bundaberg – 28; Hervey Bay - 9
- Central Queensland (Rockhampton) – 46
- Darling Downs (Toowoomba) - 37
- Gold Coast - 44
- Sunshine Coast - 45
- North West (Mt Isa) – 18
- South West – 11
- Central West - 2
- West Moreton (Ipswich) – 51
- Greater Brisbane - 268
- Northern NSW – 22
- Northern Territory - 2
Geographical distribution of 80 patients

Patient sample by HHS

- Cairns and Hinterland, 15
- CHQ Hub, 23
- Wide Bay, 6
- Central Queensland, 3
- Central West, 1
- Sunshine Coast, 6
- South West, 2
- North West, 1
- Mackay, 3
- Gold Coast, 7
- Darling Downs, 1
- West Moreton, 7
- Townsville, 5
Successful outcomes – first 80 patients

» Reduced Admissions in 12 months after compared with 12 months pre-enrolment
Successful outcomes – first 80 patients

- Reduced Emergency presentations in 12 months after compared with 12 months pre-enrolment

![Bar chart showing reduced Emergency Department presentations](chart.png)

- **Prior**: 131
- **Post**: 87
Fewer days spent in hospital

Total days in hospital

Average Length of Stay
Other outcomes of note

Increase in ambulatory service use

Improved pharmacist-prepared electronic medication summary

![Bar chart showing increase in OPD appointments from 700 to 888](chart.png)

![Bar chart showing improvement in eLMS from 33% to 51%](chart2.png)
Challenges

» Statewide consistency
» Determining resources
» Pharmacy support
» Psychosocial resources
» Support for care coordinators
» Enable families
» Emergency management

Opportunities

- Special Interest Group
- Electronic record
- Nurse Navigators
- Research
Allegory

» Literary device - a story, poem, or picture which can be interpreted to reveal a hidden meaning, typically a moral or political one

» A memorable illustration of the vision
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