

# CapStar Health System Feedback Report





# CapStar Health System Feedback Report

The CapStar Health System Case Study was prepared for use in the 2002 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Examiner Preparation Course. The CapStar Health System Case Study describes a fictitious not-for-profit health system. There is no connection between the fictitious CapStar Health System and any health system, either named CapStar Health System or otherwise. Organizations cited in the case study also are fictitious, with the exception of a few national organizations.

CapStar Health System scored in band 3, showing that the organization demonstrates an effective, systematic approach responsive to the basic requirements of most Items, but deployment in some key Areas to Address is still too early to demonstrate results. In addition, early improvement trends and comparative data in areas of importance to key organizational requirements are evident. If this were an actual Baldrige application with this scoring profile instead of a case study, the CapStar Health System probably would have been evaluated by a group of Examiners, each working independently during the Stage 1—Independent Review. For the 2002 Examiner Preparation Course, the CapStar Health System Case Study was evaluated using the Stage 2—Consensus Review Process, and site visit issues were developed and included as part of the case study scorebook.





## **INTRODUCTION**

Your application for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award has been evaluated by the Board of Examiners. Strict confidentiality is observed at all times and in every aspect of the application review and feedback.

This feedback report contains the Examiners' findings, including a summary of key themes of the application evaluation, a detailed listing of strengths and opportunities for improvement, and scoring information. Background information on the examination process is also provided.

## **APPLICATION REVIEW**

### **Stage 1, Independent Review**

The application evaluation process (shown in Figure 1) begins with Stage 1, the independent review, in which members of the Board of Examiners are assigned to each of the applications<sup>1</sup>. Assignments are made according to the Examiners' areas of expertise and to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Each application is evaluated independently by Examiners who write comments relating to the applicant's strengths and opportunities for improvement and use a scoring system developed for the Award Program. All applicants in all categories (manufacturing, service, small business, education, and health care) go through the Stage 1 evaluation process.


### **Stage 2, Consensus Review**

Based on Stage 1 scoring profiles, the Panel of Judges selects applicants to go on to Stage 2, the consensus review. For those applicants that do progress to Stage 2, a team of Examiners, led by a Senior Examiner, conducts a series of conference calls to reach consensus on comments that capture the team's collective view of the applicant's strengths and opportunities for improvement. Additionally, the team decides on a score for each Item and identifies the issues to clarify and verify if the applicant is selected for a site visit. The team documents its comments, scores, and site visit issues in a consensus scorebook. The consensus process is shown in Figure 2.

If an applicant is not selected for consensus review, one Examiner reviews the comments written by the other Examiners at Stage 1 and uses those evaluations to prepare a feedback report.

---

<sup>1</sup> There were 49 applications received in 2002; all 49 went through Stage 1 of the evaluation process.



**Figure 1—Application Evaluation Process**

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
<p><b>Consensus Planning:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritize Items for Discussion</li> <li>• Assign Category/Item Discussion Leaders</li> <li>• Review Findings From the Independent Evaluations</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consensus Calls:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss Key Business/Organization Factors</li> <li>• Discuss Items and Key Themes</li> <li>• Achieve Consensus on Comments, Scores, and Site Visit Issues</li> <li>• Document Findings</li> </ul>	<p><b>Post-Consensus Call Activities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare Final Consensus Report</li> <li>• Prepare Feedback Report</li> </ul>

**Figure 2—Consensus Review Process**

**Stage 3, Site Visit Review**

After the consensus review process, the Panel of Judges verifies that the evaluation process was followed properly. Following their review, the Judges select applicants to receive a site visit based upon the scoring profiles of all consensus review applicants. If an applicant is not selected for site visit review, one of the Examiners on the Consensus Team edits the final consensus report that becomes the feedback report.

Site visits are conducted for the highest scoring applicants to clarify any uncertainty or confusion the Examiners had regarding the written application and to verify that the information in the application is correct. After the site visit is completed, the team of Examiners prepares a final site visit scorebook. The site visit examination process is shown in Figure 3.

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
<p><b>Team Preparation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Consensus Findings</li> <li>• Review Site Visit Issues</li> <li>• Plan Site Visit</li> </ul>	<p><b>Site Visit:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make/Receive Presentations</li> <li>• Conduct Interviews</li> <li>• Record Observations</li> <li>• Review Records</li> </ul>	<p><b>Site Visit Scorebook:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolve Issues</li> <li>• Summarize Findings</li> <li>• Finalize Comments</li> <li>• Prepare Final Site Visit Scorebook</li> <li>• Prepare Feedback Report</li> </ul>

**Figure 3—Site Visit Review Process**

Application reports, consensus scorebooks, and site visit scorebooks for all applicants receiving a site visit are forwarded to the Panel of Judges, which makes final recommendations on which applicants should receive an Award. The Judges discuss applications in each of the five Award categories separately, and then they vote to keep or eliminate each applicant. The Judges then rank order the applicants and eliminate those that rank lowest. This process is repeated until the top three applicants remain. Next, the Judges decide whether each of the top applicants should be recommended as an Award recipient based on an “absolute” standard: the overall excellence and the appropriateness of the applicant as a national role model. The process is repeated for each Award category; there may be as many as three recipients in each of the categories. The Judges’ evaluation process is shown in Figure 4.

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
<p><b>Panel of Judges Reviews:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application Reports</li> <li>• Consensus Scorebooks</li> <li>• Site Visit Scorebooks</li> <li>• Feedback Reports</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evaluation by Category:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manufacturing</li> <li>• Service</li> <li>• Small Business</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Health Care</li> </ul>	<p><b>Assessment of Top Organizations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall Strengths/ Opportunities for Improvement</li> <li>• Appropriateness as National Model of Performance Excellence</li> </ul>

**Figure 4—Judges’ Review Process**

Judges do not participate in discussions or vote on applications in which they have a competing or conflicting interest or in which they have a private or special interest such as an employment or a client relationship, a financial interest, or a personal or family relationship. All conflicts are reviewed and discussed so that Judges are aware of their own and others’ limitations on access to information and participation in discussions and voting. Following the Judges’ review and recommendation of Award recipients, one of the Examiners on the Site Visit Team edits the final site visit scorebook that becomes the feedback report.



## SCORING

The scoring system used to score each Item is designed to differentiate the applicants in the Stage 1 and Stage 2 reviews and to facilitate feedback. The Scoring Guidelines for Business, Education, or Health Care (shown in Figure 5) are based on (1) evidence that a performance excellence system is in place, (2) the depth and breadth of its deployment, and (3) the results it is achieving.

In the feedback report, the applicant receives a percentage range for each Criteria Category (e.g., Leadership, Strategic Planning). The percentage range is based on the Scoring Guidelines which describe the characteristics typically associated with specific percentage ranges.

An applicant's total score falls into one of eight scoring bands. Each band corresponds to a descriptor associated with that scoring range. Figure 6 provides scoring information on the percentage of applicants scoring in each band at Stage 1. Scoring adjustments resulting from the consensus review and site visit review stages are not reflected in the distribution. Site visit teams find that some applicants are stronger in some or all of the Categories than was indicated by their original Category score, while others are weaker. Consequently, some applicants' scores may have increased if they had been reassessed at site visit, while the scores of other applicants may have decreased.

## SCORING GUIDELINES—HEALTHCARE CRITERIA

SCORE	APPROACH-DEPLOYMENT	SCORE	RESULTS
0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No systematic approach is evident; information is anecdotal.</li> </ul>	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no results or poor results in areas reported.</li> </ul>
10% to 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item is evident.</li> <li>Major gaps exist in deployment that would inhibit progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item.</li> <li>Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident.</li> </ul>	10% to 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are some improvements <i>and/or</i> early good performance levels in a few areas.</li> <li>Results are not reported for many to most areas of importance to your key organizational requirements.</li> </ul>
30% to 40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident.</li> <li>The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in early stages of deployment.</li> <li>The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of basic Item processes is evident.</li> </ul>	30% to 40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements <i>and/or</i> good performance levels are reported in many areas of importance to your key organizational requirements.</li> <li>Early stages of developing trends and obtaining comparative information are evident.</li> <li>Results are reported for many to most areas of importance to your key organizational requirements.</li> </ul>
50% to 60%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the overall requirements of the Item and your key organizational requirements, is evident.</li> <li>The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units.</li> <li>A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process is in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes.</li> <li>The approach is aligned with your basic organizational needs identified in the other Criteria Categories.</li> </ul>	50% to 60%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement trends <i>and/or</i> good performance levels are reported for most areas of importance to your key organizational requirements.</li> <li>No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels are evident in areas of importance to your key organizational requirements.</li> <li>Some trends <i>and/or</i> current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons <i>and/or</i> benchmarks—show areas of strength <i>and/or</i> good to very good relative performance levels.</li> <li>Organizational performance results address most key customer, market, and process requirements.</li> </ul>
70% to 80%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item and your current and changing health care needs, is evident.</li> <li>The approach is well deployed, with no significant gaps.</li> <li>A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and organizational learning/sharing are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and improved integration as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing.</li> <li>The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in the other Criteria Categories.</li> </ul>	70% to 80%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current performance is good to excellent in areas of importance to your key organizational requirements.</li> <li>Most improvement trends <i>and/or</i> current performance levels are sustained.</li> <li>Many to most trends <i>and/or</i> current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons <i>and/or</i> benchmarks—show areas of leadership and very good relative performance levels.</li> <li>Organizational performance results address most key customer, market, process, and action plan requirements.</li> </ul>
90% to 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to all the requirements of the Item and all your current and changing health care needs, is evident.</li> <li>The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units.</li> <li>A very strong, fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and extensive organizational learning/sharing are key management tools; strong refinement and integration, backed by excellent organizational-level analysis and sharing, are evident.</li> <li>The approach is fully integrated with your organizational needs identified in the other Criteria Categories.</li> </ul>	90% to 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current performance is excellent in most areas of importance to your key organizational requirements.</li> <li>Excellent improvement trends <i>and/or</i> sustained excellent performance levels are reported in most areas.</li> <li>Evidence of health care sector and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas.</li> <li>Organizational performance results fully address key customer, market, process, and action plan requirements.</li> </ul>

Figure 5

## 2002 SCORING BAND DESCRIPTORS

Band	Band Number	% Applicants in Band <sup>2</sup>	Descriptors
0-250	1	**	The organization demonstrates early stages of developing and implementing approaches to Category requirements. However, important gaps exist in most Categories.
251-350	2	**	The organization demonstrates the beginning of a systematic approach responsive to the basic requirements of the Items, but major gaps exist in approach and deployment in some Categories. The organization is in the early stages of obtaining results stemming from approaches, with some improvements and good performance observed.
351-450	3	**	The organization demonstrates an effective, systematic approach responsive to the basic requirements of most Items, but deployment in some key Areas to Address is still too early to demonstrate results. Early improvement trends and comparative data in areas of importance to key organizational requirements are evident.
451-550	4	**	The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches to many Areas to Address, but deployment may vary in some areas or work units. Fact-based evaluation and improvement that are responsive to the basic requirements of the Items are evident. Results address key customer/ stakeholder and process requirements, and they demonstrate some areas of strength and/or good performance.
551-650	5	**	The organization demonstrates an effective, systematic approach responsive to many of the Areas to Address and to key organizational needs, with a fact-based evaluation and improvement process in place in key Areas. There are no major gaps in deployment, and a commitment exists to organizational learning and sharing. Improvement trends and/or good performance are reported for most areas of importance. Results address most key customer/stakeholder and process requirements and demonstrate areas of strength.
651-750	6	**	The organization demonstrates refined approaches, including key measures, good deployment, and very good results in most Areas. Organizational alignment, learning, and sharing are key management tools. Some outstanding activities and results address customer/stakeholder, process, and action plan requirements. The organization is an industry <sup>3</sup> leader in some Areas.
751-875	7	**	The organization demonstrates refined approaches, excellent deployment, and good to excellent performance improvement and levels in most Areas. Good to excellent integration and alignment are evident, with organizational analysis, learning, and sharing of best practices as key management strategies. Industry leadership and some benchmark leadership are demonstrated in results that address most key customer/stakeholder, process, and action plan requirements.
876-1000	8	**	The organization demonstrates outstanding approaches, full deployment, and excellent and sustained performance results. Excellent integration and alignment are evident, and organizational analysis, learning, and sharing of best practices are pervasive. National and world leadership is demonstrated in results that fully address key customer/ stakeholder, process, and action plan requirements.

<sup>2</sup> Percentages are based on scores from the Stage 1 review.

<sup>3</sup> Industry refers to other organizations performing substantially the same functions, thereby facilitating direct comparisons.

**Figure 6 — Score Band Descriptors**

## KEY THEMES

CapStar Health System (CapStar) scored in band 3 in the first stage review of written applications for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. For an explanation of the scoring bands, please refer to Figure 6, “2002 Scoring Band Descriptors.”

CapStar demonstrates an effective, systematic approach responsive to the basic requirements of most Items, but deployment in some key Areas to Address is still too early to demonstrate results. Early improvement trends and comparative data in areas of importance to key organizational requirements are evident.

**a. The most important strengths or outstanding practices (of potential value to other organizations) are as follows:**

- CapStar uses its Critical Success Factors (CSFs) to organize systemwide and Operating Unit (OU) leadership structures and work. The leadership system includes a leadership team at each level that has seven Interlocking Committees (ICs), each of which relates to a CSF. At least one leadership team member at each level serves on each IC, with at least one additional executive who overlaps with another IC. This strategically focused and linked leadership structure helps CapStar balance value for patients and other customers and ensures alignment of directions and expectations across the organization.
- CapStar’s seven-step Strategic Planning Process and 12-part Drill Down include bottom-up and top-down inputs. Coupled with Triannual Action Plans (TAPs), these processes ensure that key organizational objectives and their associated action plans are regularly reviewed for progress and that senior leaders and their respective OUs and ICs respond with agility to performance shortfalls.
- CapStar demonstrates a focus on patients and other customers by systematically determining the requirements of patients, their families, physicians, payors, and employers, using multiple listening and learning strategies; building relationships based on these requirements; and assessing satisfaction results. Each potential new customer and market segment is assessed for alignment with organizational direction. The Customer Focus Team (CFT) uses survey results to create updated approaches, such as a Web-based survey, and best practices are shared at Patients First fairs and incorporated into customer service training programs. Additionally, colleagues use the Customer Concern and Recovery (CCR) process with on-the-spot resolution and automatic escalation if needed to systematically capture, track, and resolve customer concerns from all six customer segments.
- CapStar’s Knowledge Information System (KIS) electronically links clinical, financial, and operational data and information to support data-driven decisions. The Balanced Scorecard (BSC), for example, is made available through KIS and Knowledge Boards

(KBs) to colleagues and key customers and suppliers. In addition, KIS includes national benchmarks from 125 similar health care systems to drive performance improvements.

- CapStar has created Patient Centered Teams (PACTs) that design care around the needs and preferences of patients and their families, in keeping with the organization's Patients First CSF and primary purpose. These multidisciplinary teams use scripted messages, bedside question cards, individualized critical pathways, follow-up calls, and other innovations to deliver highly responsive care. PACTs are key differentiators from traditional hospitals for CapStar; they capitalize on hospitalists and result in efficiencies in care (e.g., reduced admission cycle time). This approach is an important source of satisfaction for both team members and admitting physicians.
- CapStar has built benchmarking into its core design process (Figure 6.1-1), and it benchmarks successful organizations that are external to its own industry in order to develop effective new approaches. For example, the strategic planning framework and best practices in human resources were adapted from Baldrige Award recipients in manufacturing and service, benchmarking capacity with 125 other hospitals is part of KIS, and CapStar's daily briefings are patterned after those of a hotel industry leader.
- CapStar's key operating processes have undergone cycles of improvement, and they now extend across the organization to support the ongoing needs of the business. For example, the Process Evolution Cycle (PEC) and the Process Improvement Cycle (PIC) serve as templates for all new health care design and delivery processes, business processes, and support processes for the life cycle of each process. The PEC and PIC are used to ensure that customer and organizational requirements such as quality, cycle time, and cost control are met or exceeded. Additionally, CapStar conducts organizational self-assessments based on Baldrige Criteria and has systematic methods in place to ensure that successes and lessons learned are shared with other organizational units and used to update training.

**b. The most significant opportunities, concerns, or vulnerabilities are as follows:**

- While CapStar has a comprehensive strategic planning process that has gone through several refinements, the defined strategic objectives do not appear to address all key strategic challenges. For example, medical staff collaboration and integration, uncompensated care, staffing shortages, managed care price pressure, increasing drug costs, and the lagging performance of the most recently acquired hospital are not specifically addressed through strategies or action plans. In addition, CapStar does not appear to address its longer-term strategic challenges with approaches and measures to reach planned targets. For example, action plans and measures are not presented for plans to invest heavily in information systems, to capture a competitor's advanced-care

image, to open and staff six primary care outpatient centers, or to renovate two aging plants. It is not clear how CapStar will be able to achieve its Purpose and Destiny without addressing all key challenges.

- Although measures are used throughout the organization, it is generally not clear how they are identified, how they are aligned throughout the organization, or how they support key strategies, processes, or challenges. For example, the baselines and references for percent and percentile changes are unclear, and BSC and Healthy People 2010 measures are not defined. Performance measures are lacking for several objectives, particularly those related to large financial investments, such as colleague training, information system improvements, and renovation of aging plants.
- From a systems perspective, it is not evident that CapStar's strategic objectives, action plans, and approaches address and balance the needs of all key stakeholders. CapStar frequently demonstrates a systematic approach responsive to the requirements of inpatients and physicians, and its community support program integrates all key customer requirements with CapStar's strategic challenges. However, gaps exist in approaches to meet the needs of others identified in the Organizational Profile, such as inpatients who are not served by PACTs or on clinical pathways, potential or inactive patients, patients treated on night or weekend shifts, patients in clinics, home care patients, families, payors, and employers.
- Deployment of effective, systematic approaches to some key areas of the organization is not yet complete. For example, electronic data that are available to on-site colleagues and physicians are not yet available to 35 percent of CapStar's 711 staff physicians, information needs of patients and communities are not addressed, and recognition programs based on the Purpose, Destiny, and SPIRIT Values (PDV) are not deployed to volunteers, trainees, or contract partners.
- Deployment of CapStar's key staff work systems and education and training approaches to its multiple job classifications and to all OUs is not clear. For example, it is not apparent how CapStar promotes cooperation, initiative, innovation, and knowledge and skill sharing for non-PACT colleagues, including volunteers and nonhospitalists, and in non-PACT venues. Additionally, beyond PACTs and the residency training program, CapStar's processes for reinforcing the use of knowledge and skills on the job across all OUs and colleague job classifications are not evident.
- CapStar describes few approaches to systematically address or improve its key legal, regulatory, and accreditation responsibilities, and the Corporate Compliance Officer position is vacant. Several of these missing approaches also relate to gaps in ensuring a safe, healthy work environment for colleagues.



**c. Considering CapStar’s key business/organization factors, the most significant strengths, opportunities, vulnerabilities, and/or gaps (related to data, comparisons, linkages) found in its response to Results Items are as follows:**

- CapStar demonstrates both patient-centered excellence and a focus on results in its achievement of continuous improvement in delivery of evidence-based medicine over three years in the treatment of acute myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, and pneumonia—its three top priority conditions. All results for these conditions currently exceed regional averages, and two of six measures equal or exceed national averages (Figure 7.1-1). CapStar also has improved clinical outcomes for patients by reducing adverse events associated with medication errors by 50 percent in two years (Figure 7.1-7) and by decreasing its readmission rates faster than the national average (Figure 7.4-5).
- Consistent with its FY 2002 target, CapStar has maintained an “A” bond rating for most key financial measures presented. Days Cash on Hand has improved from 150 days in 1996 to 170 days in 2001, demonstrating recovery from the effects of the Balanced Budget Act (BBA), and results for 2001 exceed the Standard and Poor’s (S&P) target that CapStar has set (Figure 7.2-3).
- The improving maturity and expanding deployment of the PEC/PIC approach to process design and process improvement is supported by the significant reductions in the cycle time to complete designs or improvements, together with the reduction in the number of problems discovered after implementation.
- CapStar is in the early stages of using segmented data, comparative data, benchmarks, and in-depth analyses, such as trends, projections, correlation, and cause-effect relationships, to support its improvement efforts and organizational performance management system. For example, limited comparative data are presented to help colleagues assess progress related to market and volume performance, operational performance, or outpatient, physician, payor, and employer satisfaction.
- Although CapStar operates in diverse communities with colleagues in multiple job classifications, and hospitals vary in several areas of deployment and results presented, there is little evidence of segmentation of key results by customer group or characteristics, colleague job types, or OU. This limits the availability of actionable information to achieve strategic goals.
- CapStar does not yet demonstrate results of organizational learning across OUs. For example, one hospital lags far behind the others for most measures, and fewer than one-third of patients at three hospitals are on evidence-based clinical pathways five years after implementation, compared to 90 percent at Excelsion (Figure 7.4-7).

- Results are not reported for areas that CapStar designates as important for meeting customer requirements and achieving strategic goals. These include key measures and indicators of customer satisfaction and dissatisfaction for the payor, employer, and community customer segments (Item 7.1). CapStar does not present results for its indicators of colleague satisfaction or dissatisfaction identified in Category 5 (Item 7.3). Limited results are reported for key areas of operational performance listed in Figures 6.2-1 and 6.3-1, for outpatient or home health programs, for key areas of public responsibility and citizenship, or for many of CapStar's strategic objectives (Figure 2.2-1). This lack of results suggests that CapStar is in the early stages of management by fact and of focusing on results to create value for all stakeholders.



## **DETAILS OF STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

### **Category 1 Leadership**

Your score in this Criteria Category is in the 50–60 percentage range. (Please refer to Figure 5, “Scoring Guidelines.”)

#### **1.1 Organizational Leadership**

##### **STRENGTHS**

- CapStar’s senior leaders set, deploy, and reinforce the organization’s values, short- and longer-term directions, and performance expectations through a leadership system that includes the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) and seven interlocking committees (ICs). Each IC focuses on one of the organization’s Critical Success Factors (CSFs). Each Operating Unit’s (OU’s) leadership system connects to and mirrors the ELT and its ICs (Figure 1.1-1).
- Senior leaders use a variety of methods to communicate the organization’s PDV, strategic and tactical direction, and expectations to all colleagues. These methods include triannual Colleague Dialogues, an inspirational newsletter, Knowledge Boards, Knowledge Today e-mails, Inspiration Awards, physicians’ involvement in operational and strategic decisions, and the Triannual Action Process (TAP).
- Senior leaders use several methods to create a high-performance and innovative environment. Senior leaders refer to those who work in the organization as “colleagues” or “staff” (rather than employees), include physicians in several leadership positions, support the self-governing PACTs in patient care areas, and ensure that such efforts as the Open Door Policy, sharing of performance results, the Inspiring Ideas program, and the Rapid Recovery \$\$ Program are systematically carried out. In alignment with the organization’s Destiny, the High Performing Colleagues (HPC) IC at each OU oversees empowerment initiatives.
- Senior leaders use the Agility Process (AP) to schedule and support the regular review of organizational performance. This process (Figure 1.1-1) provides a systematic way to ensure that senior leaders meet on a regular basis to review performance and that emerging issues relating to the CSFs are addressed quickly.

- Senior leadership teams translate review findings into improvement priorities through their regular review process. Results that fall below prespecified expectations are assigned to an IC for corrective action. If the issue requires input from several colleagues across OUs or departments, a PIC Team is established. Identified corrective actions are added to the 120-day TAP review and monitored to ensure sustained improvement. All senior leaders and managers have 120-day plans that cascade from the CSFs to assure aligned deployment across the organization. Partners who work on site attend the 120-day TAP reviews and participate in the IC and PIC teams.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- While senior leaders use a variety of methods to create an environment for innovation and provide a number of ways for staff to provide suggestions, it is not clear how or if staff outside of the PACTs are empowered to respond to patients and other customers or to improve organizational performance.
- While the process for reviewing organizational performance and capabilities is described, recent performance review findings are not presented, which makes it difficult to understand what performance measures senior leaders regularly review and how effectively review findings are translated into priorities for improvement.
- While senior leaders review information from the BSC, Baldrige self-assessments, and individual Performance Evaluation Plans (PEPs) to assess the effectiveness of their own leadership and that of the leadership system, it is not clear how the information from the annual assessment process is systematically translated into priorities for improving the organization's leadership system.

## 1.2 Public Responsibility and Citizenship

### STRENGTHS

- CapStar uses the Regulatory and Accreditation Committee (RAC) to track and monitor compliance with regulations, laws, and accreditation standards. Sample targets for regulatory/legal performance are provided in Figure 1.2-1. The RAC also establishes policies/procedures and promotes the sharing of best practices with similar committees in the OUs.
- CapStar promotes ethical practices by providing the *Pride and Ethics Handbook* to job candidates, by giving *Compliance Commitment* to each colleague during orientation, and by maintaining an ongoing focus on ethics through discussions in each Dialogue, a toll-free hotline to report concerns, and an Ethics Consultant Team.
- At the October TAP meeting, CapStar evaluates community needs and identifies four long-term priorities for support. Colleagues who participate in these priority activities are eligible for paid time off. CapStar's approaches to building community health are responsive to all six of the key requirements of organizations in CapStar's communities and in alignment with many of CapStar's strategic challenges. For example, its program to help neighborhood low-wage earners to enter higher paying health care jobs also addresses its strategic challenge of uncompensated care at its main hospital.

### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- CapStar does not describe how it addresses societal concerns related to risks associated with management of health care services and other organizational operations.
- Although CapStar participates in collaborative disaster and disease planning with other health care providers and senior leaders participate in a number of community organizations, a proactive approach to anticipating and preparing for public concerns with current and future services and operations is not evident.
- Although CapStar has identified four long-term priorities for community support, measures used to track its support appear to be limited to monetary and in-kind contributions, which may make it difficult for the organization to understand the impact of its community support efforts and how these efforts are contributing to its strategic goals.

## Category 2 Strategic Planning

Your score in this Criteria Category is in the 30–40 percentage range. (Please refer to Figure 5, “Scoring Guidelines.”)

### 2.1 Strategy Development

#### STRENGTHS

- The organization has a systematic seven-step Strategic Planning Process (SPP) that begins each January and continues through October of every year (Figure 2.1-1). Participants in the SPP include the ELT, Senior Leadership Teams (SLTs), selected board members, and IC members from the OUs. The SPP begins with a bottom-up approach and is integrated with the TAP process to ensure that operational performance review is linked to strategic planning.
- As summarized in Figure 2.1-2, the SPP addresses many key factors, including patient and family needs, supplier capabilities, other stakeholder (e.g., payors, residents) needs, regulation, competitor information, technology capabilities, and economic conditions. These factors are assigned to specific ICs for analysis in the twelve-part Drill Down process.
- The organization has identified strategic objectives and targets for 2002–2005 (Figure 2.2-1). Each objective is aligned with at least one CSF to ensure that strategic initiatives are aligned and support the achievement of the organization’s Purpose and Destiny.

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- The Financial and Market Strength (FMS) IC (Figure 2.1-2) is responsible for responding to the numerous requirements and risks related to regulation and accreditation. However, it is unclear how these issues are systematically addressed during the SPP and no related strategic objectives are evident in Figure 2.2-1, Sample Strategic Objectives, Action Plans, Targets, and BSC Metrics.
- CapStar’s strategic objectives do not appear to address all of the key strategic challenges outlined in P.2 of the Organizational Profile. For example, staff collaboration, uncompensated care, staffing shortages, managed care price pressure, increasing drug costs, and Hergh performance are not specifically addressed through strategies or action plans. It is not clear how CapStar will be able to achieve its Purpose and Destiny without addressing all key challenges.
- It is not evident that the strategic objectives presented in Figure 2.2-1 balance the needs of all key stakeholders. For example, although CapStar identifies the needs of payors and employers in the Organizational Profile, specific strategic objectives and related action plans are not presented to support the needs of these two groups.

## 2.2 Strategy Deployment

### STRENGTHS

- Action plans are developed annually at organizational and OU levels as part of the SPP and are reviewed and approved in the October TAP. Resources are allocated in the form of annual budgets that are tied to action plan objectives.
- A sample of key short- and longer-term action plans and related measures is presented in Figure 2.2-1. Because plans and objectives are reviewed throughout the year, action plans can be modified frequently to reflect key changes in the organization's internal or external environment.
- The HPC IC uses input from the May retreat to develop action plans and targets for the organization's overall human resources plan. In addition, each OU identifies staffing implications of its strategies and action plans (e.g., staffing increases or decreases, skill needs, training needs, cross-departmental sharing opportunities, and budget). These staffing implications are added to the overall HPC CSF in the October TAP.

### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although budgets are approved in the October TAP, the process by which resources are allocated across multiple OUs is not clear.
- While the organization addresses many short-term action plans, it is not clear how the organization considers longer-term action plans to address strategic challenges and CSFs. For example, it is not clear how the organization plans to approach its goals of decreasing errors by 50 percent, opening ten health centers, or maintaining uncompensated care at \$42 million per year.
- Although the HPC IC uses input from the May retreat to develop action plans and targets for the organization's overall human resources plan, it is unclear what key human resource action plans and targets result from this process.
- Although CapStar provides future-based targets and historically based comparative data, it does not provide performance projections for its key short- and longer-term measures or for determining how its projections compare with those of competitors or other organizations providing similar health care services.

### **Category 3 Focus on Patients, Other Customers, and Markets**

Your score in this Criteria Category is in the 50–60 percentage range. (Please refer to Figure 5, “Scoring Guidelines.”)

#### **3.1 Patient/Customer and Health Care Market Knowledge**

##### **STRENGTHS**

- In conjunction with the CFT, the ELT uses the New Customer/Market Segment Analysis Process (Figure 3.1-1) during the TAP Drill Down to identify new customers and markets. This process ensures that alignment with the PDV is maintained and includes linkages to other key processes such as the SPP, the PEC, and the PIC.
- CapStar employs a variety of formal and informal listening and learning approaches to determine requirements of all key patient/customer groups, including former patients and patients of competitors. These approaches include market research, focus groups, satisfaction surveys, complaints, a toll-free number, a Web site, and ELT/SLT affiliations (Figure 3.1-2). In addition, CapStar tailors these approaches by customer group. For example, physicians and their key staff members are surveyed extensively in support of the Physician Distinction CSF.
- In pursuit of its goal of providing superior performance matched to community needs, CapStar cooperates with other hospitals in the region to complete an areawide analysis of health care needs, disease rates, and key demographic trends every two years.
- CapStar keeps satisfaction survey listening and learning methods current with health care service needs and directions through the use of two specific open-ended questions at the conclusion of each survey. Answers to these questions provide the CFT with feedback on changing customer needs and help ensure that listening and learning methods remain current. For example, the use of the Web site to conduct satisfaction surveys is evidence of refinement in methods.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although CapStar identifies six customer and patient segments, it is not clear whether CapStar considers other segmentation factors beyond customer type in light of the diversity of services provided and geographic locations, nor is it clear how it includes customers of competitors in its segmentation process.
- It is not evident that CapStar gathers data regarding the relative importance and value of health care service features to customers' purchasing decisions. Without these data it may be difficult for CapStar to adequately support health care service planning, marketing, improvements, and other business development processes.
- Although CapStar has implemented methods to contact inactive and former patients and reaches some patients of competitors through surveys, it is not evident that CapStar has a systematic approach to using relevant information such as patient and customer retention data or won-lost analyses.
- Although CapStar strives to keep the satisfaction survey up to date with changing customer needs, this is just one of many listening and learning methods that it uses. CapStar does not describe how other listening and learning methods such as market research, focus groups, complaints, ELT/SLT affiliations, and customer-initiated communications are kept current with health care service needs and directions.

## 3.2 Patient/Customer Relationships and Satisfaction

### STRENGTHS

- CapStar deploys a range of methods to build patient and customer loyalty aligned with its PDV and the Patients First CSF. For example, the organization utilizes PACTs, several systematic procedures related to the care of patients from admission to discharge, and open access scheduling at outpatient centers. The PACTs are designed to reduce the number of different staff contacts and to focus on patient needs. In addition, PACTs are used to deploy in-process and post-discharge methods to communicate with patients and build relationships.
- The Physician Distinction IC leads CapStar's efforts in building physician relationships by involving physicians in leadership positions, strategic decisions, and operational improvements and by enabling them to spend more time in offices and operating rooms. In addition, the organization builds physician loyalty by providing links to KIS, providing patient satisfaction survey results, providing referral feedback, and offering a daily on-line summary of key health care news in response to key customer requirements for this group.
- The CFT determines key patient/customer contact requirements through analysis of data from multiple listening posts, health care and other industry standards, best practices, and emerging applications. Key contact requirements include timeliness, convenience, efficiency, accuracy, and courtesy. These requirements are deployed to all colleagues and independent physicians through job descriptions, new colleague orientation, customer service training, newsletters, and distribution of customer satisfaction survey results.
- The CCR process (Figure 3.2-1) is used by all OUs to systematically capture, track, and resolve customer concerns from all six customer segments. The CCR process includes an automatic escalation mechanism to ensure that complaints are handled properly. Every colleague is empowered to resolve customer concerns on the spot or, if required, to stay with the problem until resolution. Customer concerns are aggregated across the organization by the Process Improvement Office (PIO) using the KIS system and SLTs and the PIO review monthly aggregated complaint data summaries to identify and resolve systemic issues.



- CapStar determines its customer satisfaction relative to competitors through the use of an independent annual “report card” process sponsored by the Greater Cincinnati Business Roundtable. These data are correlated with other survey results and internal data for strategic planning and improvement purposes. CapStar also uses customer satisfaction data gathered through its participation in national improvement activities with similar health care provider organizations outside the greater Cincinnati area.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- The processes used to build loyalty and positive referral for the employer and payor customer segments are not clearly described. Although examples of communication methods and other services to these groups are presented, it is not evident that CapStar has systematically deployed a process to determine the requirements and preferences of these customer segments or provided access mechanisms and other services that match customer requirements.
- CapStar does not describe how the CFT keeps customer relationship and satisfaction approaches current with health care service needs and directions and it is not evident that the processes used to evaluate and improve these approaches are fact based and systematic.
- It is not clear how CapStar ensures that the patient/customer satisfaction determination process captures actionable information from groups other than inpatients and physicians, such as employers and payors. Although some contact methods are presented for these groups, it is not evident that the process enables CapStar to predict future interactions with the organization and/or potential for positive referral.
- Although CapStar uses a number of methods to follow up with inpatients, ambulatory surgery patients, and their families, it is not evident that CapStar follows up with other patient/customer groups following the delivery of service or completion of other transactions to obtain prompt and actionable feedback. For example, the independent physician survey is only conducted annually. Without prompt and actionable feedback from all customer groups, CapStar may have difficulty achieving its CSFs.

## **Category 4 Information and Analysis**

Your score in this Criteria Category is in the 30–40 percentage range. (Please refer to Figure 5, “Scoring Guidelines.”)

### **4.1 Measurement and Analysis of Organizational Performance**

#### **STRENGTHS**

- The Information Anywhere Anytime (IAA) IC uses KIS to gather data and information from OUs and functional areas. KIS integrates and disseminates information across the organization through linked systems such as the Clinical Information System to support patient care and the Administrative Decision Support System to guide daily operations and decision-making (Figure 4.1-1). The system includes benchmarking data from 125 similarly sized health care systems nationwide.
- The SLT for each OU selects clinical, financial, and operational measures that align with the CSFs. ICs oversee the cascading of these measures to operating departments and functional areas in each OU.
- The ELT’s organizational performance review is supported through a color status analysis of key measures associated with the BSC and CSFs. CapStar uses green, yellow, and red to assist ELT members in reviewing organizational performance.
- The organization communicates the results of its TAP reviews and ongoing monitoring of key performance measures and indicators through the IC structure and the BSC available on KIS, and on KBs posted throughout the organization.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- While references are made throughout the application to the BSC and key measures, it is not clear what these measures are, nor is it clear how the organization ensures that the measures selected by the OUs are aligned for tracking overall organizational performance.
- Although users have access to comparative data and information through KIS, it is not clear how CapStar selects and ensures the effective use of comparative data and information in assessing performance and identifying areas of improvement. Few comparative measures are presented in the sample of BSC metrics (Figure 2.2-1) or in CapStar's results (Category 7).
- CapStar appears to be in the early stages of using techniques such as comparisons, cause-and-effect relationships, root cause analysis, and data correlations to give senior leaders an in-depth view of organizational performance. For example, although CapStar uses color designators to indicate performance relating to BSC and CSF measures, the analyses performed to support these designations are not evident.
- It is not evident that CapStar aligns the results of organizational-level analysis with key organizational performance results, strategic objectives, and action plans to provide a basis for projections for improvement.

## 4.2 Information Management

### STRENGTHS

- Supporting its CSF of Information Anywhere Anytime, CapStar makes needed data and information on KIS widely available through personal computers and kiosks. Access is available in clinical and administrative areas and physicians' offices and homes. In addition, some insurers and employers have access to selected KIS data. This data availability is aligned with several of the organization's PDVs; customer requirements; strategic objectives; and CSFs, including error reduction, real-time clinical data access for physicians, and cost management.
- An IC, the Chief Information Officer (CIO), and the work of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Task Force guide policies and procedures to address key requirements surrounding data and information, such as automation of data entry and access code restrictions to protect confidentiality (Figure 4.2-1).
- CapStar's approach to ensure the user friendliness of hardware and software systems includes beta testing prior to full implementation to provide the opportunity for the colleagues who will use the system to evaluate the functionality of the system and to evaluate other related issues, such as training.
- The IT Department addresses information system reliability by using a modified PEC process to assess, purchase, and begin use of hardware and software.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- While data and information are widely available to on-site colleagues and physicians, especially through the KIS, it does not appear to be as readily available to several other key partner groups. For example, approximately 250 of CapStar's independent physicians are not on KIS, only one of four key service partners (Reliastate Insurance Management System) is on automatic data interchange, and there is no mention of how patients or community organizations have access to needed data and information.
- It is not clear what process is used by the IAA IC and the CIO to establish the policies and procedures (Figure 4.2-1) for ensuring data and information integrity, reliability, accuracy, timeliness, security, and confidentiality. Although the implementation of the KIS was a significant improvement to the organization's approach to address these factors, significant features of this system are not yet implemented or not implemented in all OUs.
- Although CapStar relies on the primary software vendor to provide upgrades, it is not evident that this results in a systematic approach to keep information availability mechanisms or related software and hardware systems current with health care service needs and directions. This is of particular importance to CapStar because of its plan to invest \$5 to \$8 million per year in information systems over the next ten years in a time of increasing price and cost pressures.

## Category 5 Staff Focus

Your score in this Criteria Category is in the 50–60 percentage range. (Please refer to Figure 5, “Scoring Guidelines.”)

### 5.1 Work Systems

#### STRENGTHS

- CapStar has implemented the evidence-based Patient Focused Care (PFC) approach that places the patient in the center of the care process and clusters patients with similar care needs together with small multidisciplinary teams for treating chronic diseases and other clinical priorities (Figure 5.1-1). Since these teams are cross-functional, this structure supports cooperation, flexibility, communication, and knowledge and skill sharing. This approach is implemented through PACTs in three of the four hospital OUs.
- In support of the Physician Distinction CSF, CapStar provides a work structure that enhances communication and efficient care practices to streamline physician-related work processes and information access and availability. This approach relies heavily on full-time, hospital-based physicians, or hospitalists, to improve coverage and communication with admitting physicians.
- To motivate staff to utilize their full potential and support high performance in key areas of organizational priority, CapStar has implemented a PEP, which is a shared responsibility of the supervisor and each colleague. This process requires monthly coaching and formal reviews every six months based on the development and ongoing amendment of performance expectations by supervisors and colleagues for each six-month period. Performance expectations are developed in the three key areas of career and personal growth, organizational performance targets, and the PDV.
- CapStar emphasizes colleague, individual, and team recognition and has implemented a number of award programs to support and recognize high performance, in keeping with its Purpose to improve health, its Destiny to nurture the finest talent, and its SPIRIT Values of pride and teamwork. In addition to the one or two colleagues from each OU who are recognized annually for role-model performance, individual OUs have implemented their own internal programs to recognize exceptional performance.

- CapStar focuses on increasing internal promotion to senior positions. Its succession planning process includes identification of key leadership competencies, evaluation of potential candidates against these competencies, and the use of the Nine-Box Matrix Assessment. All ELT and SLT positions have succession plans that are reviewed with the Board. In addition, during the formal six-month PEP, colleagues and their supervisors discuss individual progress in growth and development.
- In response to the strategic challenge of staffing shortages, CapStar uses both traditional approaches (e.g., newspaper classified ads) and innovative approaches (e.g., flexible benefits) to meet its recruitment and hiring needs. Additionally, as part of its community support CSF efforts, CapStar works with K-12 school districts to develop future health care workers through job “shadowing” in fields with shortages such as nursing and pharmacy, and it promotes regional economic development by helping low-wage earners enter higher paying health care disciplines.

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- While the PACTs address job responsibilities for several job classifications (e.g., nurse, pharmacist), CapStar is operating in an environment with 315 job classifications, 4,981 colleagues, 1,945 volunteers, two unions, and contracted staff in areas such as radiology and emergency medicine. Thus, it is not clear how work is organized and managed to promote cooperation, initiative, innovation, and knowledge and skill sharing for non-PACT colleagues.
- The organization considers its 1,945 volunteers to be an important component of its human resources, and it relies on contract labor for radiology, anesthesiology, pathology, and emergency medicine. However, it recognizes volunteers only for years served rather than for the PDV-focused performance that it promotes for colleagues, and no reward or recognition system for contract labor, for the 711 independent physicians on hospital staff, or for trainees is described.
- It is unclear how CapStar’s work system capitalizes on the diversity of the communities in which it operates to better serve its population base.

## 5.2 Staff Education, Training, and Development

### STRENGTHS

- The HPC IC is responsible for developing a comprehensive annual education, training, and development plan. This plan is designed to fit into the budget and align with the results of the TAP Drill Down, annual action plans, and Colleague Development Plans from individual six-month PEPs. The plan also supports colleagues in meeting their specific licensing and credentialing requirements.
- The OU-level HPC ICs gather input from colleagues regarding educational needs through a number of mechanisms in order to establish the Education Plan. For example, the system-level HPC IC conducts focus groups, colleagues provide input via CapStar’s suggestion program, Inspiring Ideas (I2), and exit interviews, and specific areas are identified in the annual Colleague Opinion Survey.
- CapStar has developed a graduate studies program tailored to the needs of colleague segments such as nurses, pharmacists, support staff, and independent physicians in partnership with a local university. With a goal of a minimum of 50 hours of training per year, per colleague, courses are offered by CapStar’s own in-house “college” in areas such as safety and KIS. Tuition reimbursement also is provided to colleagues pursuing undergraduate and advanced degrees in their career paths.
- CapStar provides formal and informal training through a number of methods. For example, CapStar’s in-house “college” offers in-classroom courses, self-study programs, video conferences, and computer-based training. CapStar also has begun to benchmark other corporate universities with distance learning. Additionally, some courses are offered on campus at a local university. Other education methods include daily Knowledge Today e-mail messages from the ELT, coaching during Dialogues, articles in an inspirational newsletter, KBs in each facility, and quarterly Patients First fairs.



## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- It is not clear how CapStar’s education, training, and development efforts address some key organizational needs such as performance measurement and improvement, evidence-based medicine, and diversity. Also, although CapStar has provided additional education to support the expanding use and capabilities of KIS, CapStar’s approach to training related to changing technology associated with patient care and other colleague job responsibilities is not described.
- CapStar’s approach to the evaluation of the effectiveness of education and training appears to be limited to collecting input from colleagues on their satisfaction with education and training. Although CapStar has recognized the need to evaluate education in relation to organizational and clinical performance, such as the planned deployment and use of the Kirkpatrick Model, these approaches are in the early stages of development and deployment.
- Although CapStar has described cross-training and skill sharing in some types of jobs, such as those for colleagues who work in PACTs and the residency training program, it is not evident that CapStar systematically reinforces the use of knowledge and skills on the job across all OUs and colleague job classifications.

### 5.3 Staff Well-Being and Satisfaction

#### STRENGTHS

- CapStar supports safety in the workplace through the establishment of a Colleague Care Committee and a Safety Office and the assignment of safety experts in each OU. Other activities include Weekly Safety Rounds in patient care units and PACTs, the availability of safety training by request from the in-house “college,” and safety training as part of New Colleague Orientation.
- In response to the strategic challenge of staff shortages, CapStar originally determined key factors that affect colleague well-being and satisfaction through an organization-wide assessment. Ongoing refinement of these factors occurs through the use of information gathered from Colleague Opinion Survey focus groups. Senior leaders also monitor performance related to these factors on a regular basis through daily rounds and the I2 on-line suggestion program.
- In response to the competition for critically needed skills, CapStar provides an expanded benefits package that includes features such as flexible work schedules, reimbursement for child care, transportation assistance, and paid sabbaticals in addition to the traditional health, dental, vacation, and pension benefits.
- CapStar conducts a Colleague Opinion Survey administered according to colleagues’ birth dates to provide timely input throughout the year. I2 also is used as a key source of information regarding colleague well-being, satisfaction, and motivation. Human Resources monitors other measures such as turnover, absences, complaints, grievances, and disciplinary actions.
- Colleague well-being and satisfaction indicators are reviewed as part of the Strategic Planning Process and TAP Drill Down to relate colleague results to key organizational performance results. Priorities are defined and improvement actions undertaken through a cross-functional PEC team.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Performance measures and targets for key environmental factors that affect workplace health, safety, and ergonomics are not provided.
- It is unclear how CapStar identifies significant differences based on the diverse locations and the work done by different colleague segments.
- It is unclear how CapStar determines the factors that affect well-being, satisfaction, and motivation for particular segments of its diverse workforce and for its varying categories and types of staff, including volunteers and union members.
- It is not clear how CapStar tailors its formal and informal assessment methods and measures to its diverse workforce and for its varying categories and types of staff.

## Category 6 Process Management

Your score in this Criteria Category is in the 50–60 percentage range. (Please refer to Figure 5, “Scoring Guidelines.”)

### 6.1 Health Care Service Processes

#### STRENGTHS

- CapStar uses a team-based PEC (Figure 6.1-1) to design, pilot, and benchmark processes for health care services and delivery systems. The work of the cross-functional PEC Teams is integrated with current organizational structures and processes (the ELT, the SLT, ICs, and the TAP).
- To minimize errors and rework in the deployment of new systems and processes, CapStar has incorporated a test phase into the PEC. All new programs are pilot tested in this phase. Once the pilot program is successful, the process is deployed across the organization. This process has recently been enhanced by use of a mock-up prior to a live-site pilot test for new processes that involve workplace or workflow modifications.
- CapStar defines its key health care delivery processes, subprocesses, operational requirements, and performance measures (Figure 6.1-5). Clinical pathways, which consist of evidence-based, scientifically validated clinical process steps, are used to diagnose and treat disease.
- The Central Intake Office uses a standardized Intake Process to record the patient’s medical condition, social and family circumstances, and care expectations. For patients who are receiving care through a PACT, a customized care plan is designed as part of the clinical pathway. Once completed, this care plan ensures that caregivers, the patient, and the patient’s family share a common understanding of the patient’s care.
- CapStar uses the PIC (Figure 6.1-4) and coordinated activities of the PIO, ICs, and PACTs to systematically improve health care service delivery systems and processes. As improvements are identified and quantified, they are posted on KIS, on KBs, and in CapStar’s newsletter and are used to update training courses.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although CapStar indicates one of its primary goals is to design and deliver the best quality health care at the lowest cost, it is not clear when or how CapStar factors financial considerations into its PEC or how a balance between quality health care and cost is achieved.
- Although the IAA IC prioritizes the needs for new information system technologies using defined criteria based on the PDV, it is not clear how medical technologies are addressed. It also is not clear how technology is systematically incorporated into the design of health care service delivery systems and processes. This may limit CapStar's opportunities to achieve the desired advanced-care image that its research-funded university competitor now holds.
- The organization's approach to establishing performance requirements and measures related to regulatory and accreditation standards is not clear in light of the vacancy in the Compliance Officer position and the dependence upon this position in the PEC design process.
- CapStar does not appear to have fully deployed its health care service delivery processes in several areas. For example, it is unclear how expectations are determined and monitored for patients who are not on a clinical pathway or in a PACT area or how day-to-day operations of key health care service delivery processes are ensured where PACTs have not yet been deployed.
- It is not clear that the processes for the design, management, and improvement of health care delivery systems and processes are deployed to all OUs and functional areas, such as the six primary care outpatient centers and home care program.

## 6.2 Business Processes

### STRENGTHS

- CapStar defines its seven key business processes (Figure 6.2-1) as technology acquisition, knowledge management, supply chain management, supplier partnering, nonclinical revenue activities, community outreach, and successful business growth. These processes also have related subprocesses and identified operational requirements.
- CapStar uses the PEC to design business processes to meet strategic and operational requirements. Performance of each business process is monitored with specified sets of measures (Figure 6.2-1).
- Through its partnership with PHNA, CapStar has reduced its supply base from 750 suppliers to 530 suppliers and has developed 16 partners. These initiatives have led to reductions in incoming inspections, product testing, and performance audits.
- CapStar uses the PEC and PIC models to improve its business processes. These results are shared via the KIS system, on KBs, and in an inspirational newsletter. In addition to monitoring its own performance through the PIO, CapStar compares the performance of its business processes with industry benchmarks and best practices.

### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although suppliers and partners participate on PEC and PIC teams, systematic processes to collect and use feedback from suppliers and partners in the management of the business processes are not evident.
- Other than by reducing the number of suppliers and partners, it is not clear how CapStar minimizes costs associated with inspections and tests while maintaining and improving supplier performance.
- Although CapStar identifies methods for sharing key lessons learned, it is not clear how this information is systematically incorporated into performance improvement opportunities across all OUs.

## 6.3 Support Processes

### STRENGTHS

- CapStar identifies human resources, education/training, the KIS system, facilities management, billing and payment, and corporate compliance as key processes for supporting daily operations and staff in delivering health care services (Figure 6.3-1). These processes also have related subprocesses, identified operational requirements, and performance measures.
- The PEC model is used to design key support processes and develop measures to track process performance that links to strategic requirements. The PIO and appropriate IC monitor performance.

### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- It is not clear how CapStar systematically uses the information available through KIS and continuous staff interactions to ensure that key support processes are meeting key performance requirements.
- Although CapStar has identified many key performance measures to control and improve the support processes (Figure 6.3-1), it is not clear whether some of the key operational requirements for these processes (e.g., accuracy for human resources, competence for education/training, or timeliness of billing) have related measures.
- It is not evident how oversight by the PIO reduces the need for inspections, tests, and process audits. Furthermore, it is unclear how the organization systematically reduces audit and inspection costs related to support processes.
- Although an example is provided, it is unclear how CapStar systematically shares improvements of support processes with other organizational units and processes to achieve better performance across OUs.

## Category 7 Organizational Performance Results

Your score in this Criteria Category is in the 30–40 percentage range. (Please refer to Figure 5, “Scoring Guidelines.”)

### 7.1 Patient- and Other Customer-Focused Results

#### STRENGTHS

- CapStar has established strategic objectives for achieving distinctive outcomes in the treatment of acute myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, and pneumonia. Evidence of success in these key areas is shown by the representative treatment results presented in Figure 7.1-1. Results for all three conditions have improved over the 1999–2001 time period, all exceed the regional mean, and two of six measures meet or exceed the national benchmark.
- In areas of patient care such as Mammography, C-section, and Pap Smear Rates, CapStar has achieved consistent gains over the 1999–2001 time period, and all measures currently exceed the regional benchmark (Figure 7.1-2). Likewise, stroke, arthroscopy, and trauma rehabilitation results show improvement trends over the 1999–2001 time frame and currently meet or exceed the goal of being in the top 25th percentile of national results (Figure 7.1-3).
- Geriatrics/behavioral health services, orthopedic and rheumatology services, and patient satisfaction with pain control show sustained improvement trends over the 1999–2001 time frame, and all currently are better than the benchmarks (Figures 7.1-4, 7.1-5, and 7.1-6). Additionally, the rate of readmissions due to secondary effects has shown continuing improvement and has been better than the national average since 1998 (Figure 7.4-5). The percentage of patients on appropriate clinical pathways has increased at Excelsion since 1996, at Founders since 1997, and at Hergh since 1998 (Figure 7.4-7).
- Through an improvement in the organizational culture, CapStar increased the frequency of reported medical errors seven-fold and potential adverse drug events three-fold from 1999 to 2001, while the rate of actual adverse drug events was cut in half in the same period. These results suggest that error-reporting accuracy (rather than errors) increased as intended in CapStar’s strategic objectives and action plan, and they indicate that patient outcomes related to drug delivery improved by 50 percent (Figures 2.2-1 and 7.1-7).
- With the exception of Hergh, overall inpatient satisfaction and satisfaction with physician care, nursing care, and the emergency department all show generally improving trends over the 1996–2001 time frame for the OUs shown (Figures 7.1-9 through 7.1-12). Patient satisfaction with primary care outpatient centers also has shown improvement in four survey areas from 1998–2001 (Figure 7.1-13).



- Independent physician satisfaction (Figure 7.1-15) has increased steadily over the last five years for Excelsion, Roseleaf, and Founders and over the past two-and-a-half years for Hergh. Furthermore, independent physicians have indicated increasing loyalty to the organization. Over 90 percent of physicians in three hospitals would recommend the organization as a place to practice (Figure 7.1-20). Likewise, referring physicians at Excelsion and Founders show an increased willingness to recommend the organization to colleagues (Figure 7.1-21), and approximately 90 percent would recommend the organization again to patients (Figure 7.1-22).

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although the health care service results indicate generally improving trends in key areas of interest, they are not segmented by CapStar's market segments (OUs). Without appropriate segmentation, CapStar may find it difficult to understand the relative performance of its OUs and identify and prioritize improvement opportunities.
- Although CapStar has explained the difficulty in obtaining comparative data in many areas of patient/customer results, many of the results presented lack relevance and clarity because of the absence of such comparisons. For example, in areas such as emergency department patient satisfaction (Figure 7.1-12) and independent physician satisfaction (Figure 7.1-15), CapStar may find it difficult to assess the true significance of these improvement trends as they relate to its CSFs without relevant comparisons to key competitors. This difficulty may be particularly important in instances in which satisfaction results are not on track to reach CapStar's 2002 goal of overall patient satisfaction of 94 percent (Figure 2.2-1).
- Results are not reported for key measures and indicators of customer satisfaction/dissatisfaction for the payor, employer, and community customer segments. Likewise, there are no measures presented for patient-/customer-perceived value, patient/customer retention, or positive referral. The absence of these measures may make it difficult for CapStar to achieve its CSF goals.
- Although CapStar's community quality image for best overall hospital has improved steadily since 1999, performance still lags behind that of its best competitor, RUH (Figure 7.1-17). In addition, CapStar exceeds all competitors but shows declining trends for its community quality image for best doctors and best nurses (Figures 7.1-18 and 7.1-19). Since perception of nursing and physician care is a driver of overall satisfaction for CapStar, these trends are particularly important to its future success in achieving its desired role model status in this area.

## 7.2 Financial and Market Results

### STRENGTHS

- In support of its key CSF of Financial Strength, CapStar has maintained its A bond rating for most key financial measures presented and Cash Flow/Current Liabilities is better than the two hospital system comparisons provided (Figure 7.2-1). Notwithstanding the negative impact of the BBA of 1997, Days Cash on Hand (Figure 7.2-3) has improved from 150 days in 1996 to 170 days in 2001. It is better than the two hospital system comparisons provided and has exceeded the S&P target (Figures 7.2-2 -and 7.2-3). During the same period, Long-Term Debt and Capitalization has improved from 36 percent to 31 percent (Figure 7.2-4).
- CapStar's operating margin (Figures 7.2-6 and 7.2-7), while impacted by the BBA, is above the S&P target and the performance of one of two comparison health care systems.
- Annual gifts to CapStar's Charitable Trust have continued to improve, increasing from approximately \$2 million in 1996 to nearly \$9 million in 2001 (Figure 7.2-10).
- Three of CapStar's four hospitals show increased overall market share through 2001 (Figure 7.2-11). Excelsion has regained the market share lost during 1998 and 1999.
- In areas of emphasis, CapStar shows increased numbers of emergency department visits, open heart surgery cases, hospital admissions, and orthopedic/rheumatology volume (Figures 7.2-12 through 7.2-15). Tertiary care referrals for oncology and cardiac patients from outside Excelsion's primary service area also show improvement (Figure 7.2-16).
- The three-year trend in visits to CapStar's primary care centers has increased from approximately 8,000 in 1999 to over 18,500 in 2001. CapStar attributes the increase of approximately 250 inpatient admissions at two of its hospital OUs to this increase in primary care center patient visits (Figure 7.2-13).

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although Days in Accounts Receivable (Figure 7.2-5) shows an improving trend from 2000 to 2001, CapStar's results are slightly worse than one of the comparisons provided and worse than the S&P target.
- The financial performance results presented are not segmented by market segment or OU. Without such segmentation, it is not clear how CapStar can fully assess current performance and identify strengths and opportunities for improvement for specific OUs, understand the financial implications of its involvement in primary care centers, or assess the impact of the aging plant and equipment at specific facilities.
- Results from several key financial measures lack relevant comparisons, making it difficult to understand how CapStar tracks its progress relative to other organizations providing similar health care services and sets meaningful targets and projections in these areas. These measures include Cost per Case (Figure 7.2-8), Net Patient Revenue as a Percent of Budget (Figure 7.2-9), and Annual Gifts to CapStar Charitable Trust (Figure 7.2-10).
- Many of the results related to CapStar's market share and targeted care areas lack relevant comparison data, making it difficult to determine if CapStar is competitive in these areas. These results include Overall Market Share (Figure 7.2-11), Number of ED Visits (Figure 7.2-12), Hospital Admissions (Figure 7.2-13), and Roseleaf Orthopedic/Rheumatology Volume (Figure 7.2-15). In addition, no results are presented to show relative market share for insurers (payors) and employers, two of CapStar's key customer segments.

### 7.3 Staff and Work System Results

#### STRENGTHS

- Colleague satisfaction in areas such as place to work, work group, type of work, recognition, and quality of services reported in Figures 7.3-1 through 7.3-6 indicate generally neutral to positive trends for the three years presented. The percentage of colleagues who either are mostly dissatisfied or very dissatisfied is somewhat better than the Peoplego comparison in all areas reported.
- Concurrent with CapStar’s “Way to Wellness” program, which includes preventive care and educational and behavioral support, colleagues’ general health factors have improved significantly since 1997 (Figure 7.3-7). For example, the percentages of overweight colleagues and colleagues with high cholesterol have been reduced by over 20 percent in each category.
- Needle stick injuries per 100 beds, a key measure of colleague safety, have decreased steadily since 1999 and are below the national mean (Figure 7.3-9). The expense for workers’ compensation claims also has dropped 38 percent since 1997 to \$97,000, compared to \$185,000 for the Soranez Institute.
- The implementation of PACTs in one hospital OU has been successful in reducing work time significantly in key areas of patient care, such as complete blood count, chest x-ray, electrocardiogram, and physical therapy (Figure 7.3-10). CapStar also reports higher physician satisfaction in nursing units organized as PACTs when compared to traditional approaches (Figure 7.3-11). These results support the effectiveness of this work system approach.
- Nurse turnover has improved during the three years reported and has dropped below the industry average (Figure 7.3-12).

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although one satisfaction measure is provided for nurses (Figure 7.3-6) and CapStar explains that the colleague survey data presented in Figures 7.3-1 through 7.3-5 do not vary significantly by OU, most results are not segmented by the different categories and types of colleagues employed by CapStar. Because CapStar has colleagues in jobs as varied as physicians and custodial staff, these aggregated colleague satisfaction data may not provide CapStar with a clear view of colleague issues or actionable information.
- Results are not presented for a number of key indicators of colleague satisfaction/dissatisfaction identified in Category 5. These include absenteeism, complaints, grievances, and work-related injuries. Additionally, no results are reported for lost workdays, recruiting, diversity, labor relations, union contract completion, I2 submissions, training effectiveness, and staff development (Figures 2.2-1 and 6.3-1).
- Although CapStar has 4,981 colleagues in 315 job descriptions with two unions and uses contract labor for radiology, anesthesiology, pathology, and emergency medicine, current levels and trends in key measures of work system performance and effectiveness are not presented except for two safety measures and two PACT measures from one hospital OU (Figures 7.3-10 and 7.3-11).

## 7.4 Organizational Effectiveness Results

### STRENGTHS

- CapStar’s success in reducing the cycle time of the design and implementation of new service delivery processes is supported by sustained improvement over the 1997 to 2001 time frame in the cycle time from inception to installation, the average number of changes after implementation, and the number of projects completed per year (Figure 7.4-1).
- Measures/indicators of performance related to the Patients First and Compassionate Operational Excellence CSFs include time from arrival in the emergency department to arrival in the inpatient room, satisfaction with the discharge process, and consistency of follow-up post discharge. Results in these areas (Figures 7.4-2 through 7.4-4) have shown improvement from 1997 through 2001.
- The organization shows improvement in the following key supply chain measures from 1996 through 2001: inventory accuracy, supply effectiveness (the correct supplies for the procedure), and the amount of supplies being procured from partners (Figure 7.4-8). In addition, order fulfillment, the key indicator for supply chain performance, has improved in each of the four hospitals over the past six years (Figure 7.4-9).
- CapStar’s focus on its strategic plans and CSFs, as well as the effectiveness of its PEC process, is supported through yearly increases in the “Status Green” CSFs (Figure 7.4-6). Specific measures of the accomplishment of organizational strategies include the numbers of returning and referred patients (Figure 7.4-11), as well as the level of community involvement in areas such as sponsored events, presentations, professional society memberships, and community health programs (Figure 7.4-13). Improvement has occurred in each of these measures over time.
- All of CapStar’s hospital OUs were surveyed by JCAHO during 1999 and, with the exception of the Hergh facility, each earned an overall score that compared favorably to the Ohio average (Figure 7.4-12). Additionally, all regulatory and legal goals noted in Figure 1.2-1 have been met since 1998, and CapStar has received no findings from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, or state and regional environmental and safety agencies over the past five years.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Although Excelsion has shown steady progress and is demonstrating a high percentage of appropriate patients on pathways, the performance of the other OUs is lower, even though they have shown improvement since 1996 or 1997 (Figure 7.4-7). There appears to be a lack of organizational learning, as would be evidenced by other OUs benefiting from Excelsion's progress.
- Results are not reported for a number of key areas of operational performance, including measures related to the IAA CSF or for measures of performance related to CapStar's outpatient programs, home health programs, or teaching programs. Likewise, no results are reported for many strategic objectives listed in Figure 2.2-1, including obtaining more performance data on the plan to counter the River's Edge threat, recruitment of more hospitalists and other specialists, expansion of physician leadership training, or deployment of more PACTs.
- Although CapStar reports results related to participation in various community efforts, results are not presented for some areas of public responsibility and citizenship. For example, no results are presented relating to staff licensing, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) denials, or the effectiveness of targeted community involvement activities.
- With the exception of the results on readmission rates shown in Figure 7.4-5, the utility of the results presented in this Item is unclear due to the absence of appropriate comparative data. For example, without industry or local comparative data in areas such as returning and referred patients (Figure 7.4-11) or emergency department to inpatient room time (Figure 7.4-2), it may be difficult for CapStar to assess its competitive standing and take appropriate action.

## Baldrige National Quality Program

**Baldrige National Quality Program**  
**National Institute of Standards and Technology**  
**Technology Administration**  
**United States Department of Commerce**  
Administration Building, Room A600  
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 1020  
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-1020

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) is a nonregulatory federal agency within the Commerce Department's Technology Administration. NIST's primary mission is to strengthen the U.S. economy and improve the quality of life by working with industry to develop and apply technology, measurements, and standards. The Baldrige National Quality Program (BNQP) at NIST is a customer-focused federal change agent that enhances the competitiveness, quality, and productivity of U.S. organizations for the benefit of all citizens. BNQP develops and disseminates evaluation criteria and manages the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. It also provides global leadership in promoting performance excellence and in the learning and sharing of successful performance practices, principles, and strategies.

Call BNQP for

- information on improving the performance of your organization
- information on applying for the Baldrige Award
- information on becoming a Baldrige Examiner
- information on the Baldrige Award recipients
- individual copies of the Criteria for Performance Excellence—Business, Education, and Health Care (no cost)
- information on BNQP educational materials

Telephone: (301) 975-2036; Fax: (301) 948-3716; E-mail: [nqp@nist.gov](mailto:nqp@nist.gov)  
Web address: <http://www.quality.nist.gov>

**American Society for Quality**  
600 North Plankinton Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53203

The American Society for Quality (ASQ) advances individual and organizational performance excellence worldwide by providing opportunities for learning, quality improvement, and knowledge exchange. ASQ administers the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award under contract to NIST.

Call ASQ to order

- bulk copies of the Criteria
- case studies
- Award recipients' videos

Telephone: (800) 248-1946; Fax: (414) 272-1734; E-mail: [asq@asq.org](mailto:asq@asq.org)  
Web address: <http://www.asq.org>