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The Relationship Between Accreditation and Quality Improvement

Accreditation
- External validation
- Consistently applied
- Process-oriented

Goal: Favorable Patient Outcomes

Quality Improvement
- Internal review
- Tailored to program needs
- Quality indicator-based
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Quality Improvement
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- Quality indicator-based
A Review of FACT’s Premises

- Patients and caregivers could benefit from a valid, reliable system for assessing clinical outcomes and patient safety
- A voluntary organization of practicing health professionals is best positioned to develop such a system
- A valid, reliable system is scientifically and statistically more difficult than most would expect

Challenges

- Many risk factors in clinical outcome
- Comparative assessments of outcomes is new territory
- Avoid incentives for cherry picking patients
- Program reimbursements and personnel retention
- Patient access to transplants
- Minimize unintended consequences to current system
- Maintain benefits and credibility of FACT accreditation
- Efforts should advance in calibrated, incremental steps
- Loss or suspension of accreditation can have devastating impacts
- Patient access to transplants
- Allow FACT and programs to gain solid footing
Goals of the FACT Clinical Outcomes Task Force

- Incorporate validated and objective outcome data into FACT Standards and accreditation process
  - Use CIBMTR data and other surrogate metrics
  - Require formal action plans when performance does not meet expectations
- Establish ongoing Clinical Outcomes Improvement Committee
  - Educate transplant centers on how outcomes can be improved
  - Facilitate specific improvements in clinical outcomes and patient safety

Progression of FACT Standards

1st Edition (1996): QM focus on adverse events
2nd Edition (2002): QM more sophisticated; audits
3rd Edition (2006): GTPs; review of time to engraftment
4th Edition (2008): Outcomes and efficacy for other products (e.g., DLIs)
5th Edition (2012): 100-day and 1-year overall and treatment-related morbidity and mortality
6th Edition (2015): Recommendation for meeting at least expected one-year survival using comparative data; corrective action plan required if not met
New Internal Analyses Required in 6th Edition

– Acute GVHD grade within one hundred (100) days after transplantation.
– Chronic GVHD grade within one (1) year after transplantation.
– Central venous catheter infection.

6th Edition Benchmarking Requirement

• The Clinical Program should achieve one-year survival outcome within or above the expected range when compared to national or international outcome data.
  – U.S. allo programs: SCTOD report
• If expected one-year survival outcome is not met, the Clinical Program shall submit a corrective action plan.
Special Public Comment Request: General Responses

- Weaknesses in data
- Consequences to high-risk patients and research
- Detriments to small programs
- Decrease in number of transplant centers
- Need for clarification (most common comment)
- Need for education
- Burden of corrective action plans
- Overreach of FACT purview

Expectations of Transplant Centers

Choose Data
- U.S. allo: CIBMTR Transplant Center-Specific Report
- Other regions: CIBMTR, regional comparative data, published literature, etc. (inform FACT)

Evaluate and Report Data
- Was expected one-year survival met or exceeded?
- Provide information to FACT on Compliance Application and Annual Reports

Corrective Action Plan
- Identify root causes
- Create an action plan (submit to FACT on Compliance Application and Annual Reports)
- Implement, and then evaluate, the plan
Implementation

• Centers begin reporting one-year survival via pre-inspection documentation for inspection under 6th edition
• If lower than expected range, program required to submit a corrective action plan prior to being awarded FACT accreditation
  – Will be reviewed by Clinical Outcomes Improvement Committee
• After achieving accreditation, reporting of one-year survival (and submission of corrective action plan if applicable) required on annual reports

Failure to Meet Expected Outcomes

• Consistent underperformance (three consecutive years beginning with 6th edition inspection year) would have consequences, up to loss of FACT accreditation
• Predict 7th edition Standards would require programs to meet or exceed expected one-year survival
  – Programs not meeting at least expected outcomes suspended
  – If expected outcomes not met in next year, accreditation terminated
  – Terminated programs must reapply for accreditation to regain accredited status. To be eligible, one-year survival must be at expected or better than expected levels.
  – Potential for mitigating factors similar to CMS
Assistance to Transplant Centers

• Ultimate goal is to improve clinical outcomes and patient safety
  – Additional standards are only means to an end
• Education will be key
  – Workshops and webinars related to promoting good outcomes and safety
  – Best practices
• New FACT committee charged with providing resources
  – Identify examples of comparative data for autologous and international programs (immediate need)
  – Determine review criteria for corrective action plans
  – Create tools for gap assessments and root cause analysis
• FACT Consulting Services a separate option
  – More in-depth assistance with reviewing outcomes and root causes of poor outcomes
  – Consulting does not guarantee expected outcomes or FACT accreditation

THANK YOU