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Presentation Overview

- The Critical Access Hospital Community Apgar Questionnaire (CAH CAQ)
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  - Development
- Results
- Next Steps
- Case Study One and Two
- Questions/Comments for Discussion
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Background

- How did we get here – Why research?
  - Boise State University: Ed Baker, PhD
  - Family Medicine Residency of Idaho: Dave Schmitz, MD
  - Office of Rural Health and Primary Care: Mary Sheridan
  - An intersection of workforce, education and advocacy
  - Practical knowledge, relationships, experience and investment
  - Answering needs and necessary questions
  - Applied research: Development of tools
  - Partnerships with those with “skin in the game”
Devised in 1952 by Virginia Apgar, an anesthesiologist, as a simple and repeatable method to quickly and summarily assess the health of newborn children immediately after birth.

Determined by evaluating the newborn baby on five simple criteria (Appearance, Pulse, Grimace, Activity, Respiration) on a scale from zero to two, then summing up the five values thus obtained.
Mind Mapping
Apgar Scoring

How Ready is this Child?

Apgar score

Appearance
- Skin color/Complexion:
  - blue all over: 0
  - blue at extremities, body pink (acrocyanosis): 1
  - no cyanosis: 2

Pulse
- <60, asystole: 0
- >60 but <100: 1
- >100: 2

Grimace
- Reflex irritability: 0
- no response to stimulation: 1
- grimace/feeble cry when stimulated: 1
- sneeze/cough/pulls away when stimulated: 2

Activity
- Muscle tone:
  - none: 0
- some flexion: 1
- active movement: 2

Respiration
- Breathing:
  - absent: 0
  - weak or irregular: 1
  - strong: 2

Heart rate, Respiratory effort, Irritability, Tone, and Color

Scores 3 and below are generally regarded as critically low, 4 to 6 fairly low, and 7 to 10 generally normal

Taken on 1st min and 5th min of life and later if necessary

determined by evaluating the newborn baby on five simple criteria on a scale from zero to two, then summing up the five values thus obtained
What if there was a similar test for hospitals – quick and repeatable with intervention measures on standby – to assess readiness for recruiting physicians?

• Something new
• Something based on quantifiable data
• Something that incorporates the whole community
• Something that shows people on graphs and charts where they are and how to achieve their goals.
A History of Community Apgar

Year 1 (2007)
Idaho Family Physician Rural Work Force Assessment Pilot Study [Published in the Journal of Rural Health]

Year 2 (2008)
Critical Access Hospital Community Apgar Questionnaire (CAH CAQ) [Published in the Rural & Remote Health Journal]

Year 3 (2009)
- Examining the Trait of Grit and Satisfaction in Idaho Physicians [Accepted for publication in the Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine]
- Community Apgar Program (CAP) Pilot for Critical Access Hospitals in Idaho
- Nursing Community Apgar Questionnaire (NCAQ)

Year 4 (2010)
- Community Health Center Community Apgar Questionnaire (CHC CAQ) [Accepted for publication in the Rural and Remote Health Journal]
- Community Apgar Program (CAP) for Community Health Centers in Idaho
- Community Apgar Solutions Pilot Project

Years 5 & 6 (2011/2012)
- Expansion of the Community Apgar Program (CAP) for Critical Access Hospitals and Community Health Centers
  - Wyoming, North Dakota, Wisconsin and Alaska (CAHs)
  - Maine (CHCs)
The Critical Access Hospital Community Apgar Questionnaire (CAH CAQ) is a validated tool used in a rural community self-evaluation to assess assets and capabilities in recruiting and retaining physicians.

Designed to be a real-time assessment tool providing guidance for the most helpful interventions at the present.

Developed to differentially diagnose a CAHs relative component strengths and challenges

- prioritize improvements
- identify marketing opportunities
The CAH CAQ

Questions aggregated into 5 Classes
- Geographic
- Economic
- Scope of Practice
- Medical Support
- Hospital and Community Support

Each Class contains 10 factors for a total of 50 factors/questions representing specific elements related to recruitment and retention of family medicine physicians in rural areas

Three open-ended questions
CAH CAQ Development: Class/Factor Examples

Geographic
- Schools
- Climate
- Perception of Community
- Spousal Satisfaction

Economic
- Loan Repayment
- Competition
- Part-time Opportunities
- Signing Bonus

Scope of Practice
- Emergency Care
- Mental Health
- Obstetrics
- Administration Duties

Medical support
- Nursing Workforce
- Call/practice Coverage
- Perception of Quality
- Specialist Availability

Hospital and Community Support
- EMR
- Welcome & Recruitment
- Televideo Support
- Plan for Capital Investment
The Community Apgar Program (CAP)

- Year 1 of Program
  - Participants mailed the CAH CAQ survey with consent form [IRB approval from Boise State University]
  - CAH CAQ surveys administered in separate structured one hour interviews for each participant
  - CAH CAQ Board Reports
    - Individual data from each critical access hospital reviewed with Board of Directors each year of the program
    - Action plans developed in Year 1 for improvement in areas identified by the CAH CAQ
  - State level results presented at state selected forum
    - Aggregate state level data
    - Review of hospital specific analytics
    - Case study input by state research partner
The Community Apgar Program

- Year 2 of Program
  - Second round of CAH CAQ surveys
  - Year 2 Board presentation focuses on movement towards achieving improvement identified in Year 1

- Making the most of the CAP:
  - community self-evaluation
  - prioritizing improvement plans
  - advertising and interviewing
  - negotiation strategies and contract construction
The CAQ Value Proposition

- Beyond “Expert Opinion”
- A new approach to the old problem of physician recruiting
- Self-empowering for the community: knowledge as power, not an outside “headhunter”
- Beyond physician recruitment to community improvement
Future of the CAH CAQ

- With further research and collaboration, this tool could also be used to share successful strategies communities have used to overcome challenges which may be difficult or impossible to modify.

- CAH CAQ surveys may be useful in identifying trends and overarching themes which can be further addressed at state or national levels.
States Participating/Interested

- States Participating in the CAP
- States Interested in Implementing the CAP
Results
Top 10 Advantages - CAH

### Idaho (2012)
- Recreational opportunities
- Internet access
- Community need/physician support
- Loan repayment
- Community volunteer opportunities
- Income guarantee
- Perception of quality
- Competition
- Ancillary staff workforce
- Employment status

### Wyoming (2011)
- Employment status
- Community need/physician support
- Loan repayment
- Recreational opportunities
- Income guarantee
- Ancillary staff workforce
- Revenue flow
- Transfer arrangements
- Start-up/marketing costs
- Moving allowance

### North Dakota (2011)
- Internet access
- Perception of quality
- Transfer arrangements
- Income guarantee
- Loan repayment
- Community need/physician support
- Ancillary staff workforce
- Hospital leadership
- Schools
- Start-up/marketing costs (tie for 10th)
- Recreational opportunities (tie for 10th)
- Part-time opportunities (tie for 10th)
- Moving allowance (tie for 10th)

### Alaska (2012)
- Moving allowance
- Income guarantee
- Emergency medical services
- Recreational opportunities
- Inpatient care
- Community volunteer opportunities
- Community need/physician support
- Payor mix
- Perception of quality
- Perception of community
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Top Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>• Shopping/other services&lt;br&gt;• Spousal satisfaction&lt;br&gt;• Mental health&lt;br&gt;• Schools&lt;br&gt;• Access to larger community&lt;br&gt;• Allied mental health workforce&lt;br&gt;• C-section&lt;br&gt;• Electronic medical records&lt;br&gt;• Obstetrics&lt;br&gt;• Religious/cultural opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>• Spousal satisfaction&lt;br&gt;• Shopping/other services&lt;br&gt;• Access to larger community&lt;br&gt;• Mental health&lt;br&gt;• Social networking&lt;br&gt;• Allied mental health workforce&lt;br&gt;• Climate&lt;br&gt;• Religious/cultural opportunities&lt;br&gt;• Electronic medical records&lt;br&gt;• Nursing home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>• Climate&lt;br&gt;• Spousal satisfaction&lt;br&gt;• Shopping/other services&lt;br&gt;• Mental health&lt;br&gt;• Access to larger community&lt;br&gt;• Allied mental health workforce&lt;br&gt;• Emergency room coverage&lt;br&gt;• Social networking&lt;br&gt;• Demographic/patient mix&lt;br&gt;• Call/practice coverage (tie for 10th)&lt;br&gt;• Electronic medical records (tie for 10th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>• Spousal satisfaction&lt;br&gt;• Shopping/other services&lt;br&gt;• Climate&lt;br&gt;• C-section&lt;br&gt;• Access to larger community&lt;br&gt;• Part-time opportunities&lt;br&gt;• Endoscopy, surgery&lt;br&gt;• Employment status&lt;br&gt;• Electronic medical records&lt;br&gt;• Social networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Idaho         | 2012 | • Spousal satisfaction  
• Loan repayment  
• Income guarantee  
• Call/practice coverage  
• Recreational opportunities  
• Revenue flow  
• Schools  
• Perception of quality  
• C-section  
• Obstetrics |
| Wyoming       | 2011 | • Revenue flow  
• Spousal satisfaction  
• Competition  
• Income guarantee  
• Physician workforce stability  
• Call/practice coverage  
• Perception of quality  
• C-section  
• Employment status  
• Loan repayment (tie for 10th)  
• Obstetrics (tie for 10th) |
| North Dakota  | 2011 | • Spousal satisfaction  
• Perception of quality  
• Call/practice coverage  
• Physician workforce stability  
• Loan repayment  
• Physical plant/equipment  
• Transfer arrangement  
• Emergency room coverage  
• Employment status  
• Income guarantee |
| Alaska        | 2012 | • Spousal satisfaction  
• Physician workforce stability  
• Call/practice coverage  
• Schools  
• Perception of quality  
• Loan repayment  
• Moving allowance  
• Recreational opportunities  
• Nursing workforce  
• Income guarantee |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Recreational opportunities, Internet access, Community need/physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support of physician, Loan repayment, Income guarantee, Perception of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quality, Competition, Stability of physician workforce, Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>status, Call/ practice coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Employment status, Loan repayment, Income guarantee, Community need/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>physician support, Recreational opportunities, Revenue flow, Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ancillary staff workforce, Transfer arrangements, Moving allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Perception of quality, Transfer arrangements, Internet access, Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>repayment, Income guarantee, Community need/physician support, Ancillary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>staff workforce, Employment status, Moving allowance, Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Moving allowance, Recreational opportunities, Income guarantee, Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medical services, Inpatient care, Community need/physician support,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ancillary staff workforce, Employment status, Moving allowance, Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of quality, Community volunteer opportunities, Physical plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and equipment, Welcome and recruitment (tie for 10th), Perception of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community (tie for 10th)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bottom 10 Apgar Factors - CAH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spousal satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shopping/other services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allied mental health workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• C-section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to larger community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Electronic medical records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Obstetrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Religious/ cultural opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spousal satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shopping/other services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to larger community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allied mental health workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Religious/cultural opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spousal satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shopping/other services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to larger community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Emergency room coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Demographic/patient mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allied mental health workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Electronic medical records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spousal satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shopping/other services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• C-section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Part-time opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Endoscopy, surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Electronic medical records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social networking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cumulative CAH Community Apgar Score by Hospital – Across Four States
Cumulative CAH Community Apgar Score by Hospital – Across Four States
## Top 10 Advantages - CHC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>- Recreational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Loan repayment</td>
<td>- Loan repayment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retirement package</td>
<td>- Community need/physician support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perception of quality</td>
<td>- Inpatient care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mid-level provider workforce</td>
<td>- Obstetrics: deliveries, C-section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perceived fiscal stability</td>
<td>- Obstetrics: prenatal care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CME benefit</td>
<td>- Mid-level provider workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minor trauma (casting/suturing)</td>
<td>- CHC leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community need/physician support</td>
<td>- Perception of quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schools (tie for 10th)</td>
<td>- Call/practice coverage (tie for 10th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teaching (tie for 10th)</td>
<td>- Physical plant and equipment (tie for 10th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ancillary staff workforce (tie for 10th)</td>
<td>- Office GYN procedures (tie for 10th)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top 10 Challenges - CHC

Idaho (2010)

- Televideo support
- Mental health
- Spousal satisfaction
- Production incentive
- Perception of community
- Salary (amount)
- Nursing workforce
- Demographic: underserved/payor mix (tie for 7th)
- Obstetrics: parental care (tie for 7th)
- Specialist availability (tie for 7th)

Maine (2012)

- Spousal satisfaction
- Social networking
- Access to larger community
- Salary (amount)
- Shopping/other services
- Specialist availability
- Mental health
- Televideo support
- Production incentive
- Physician workforce stability
### Top 10 Importance - CHC

#### Idaho (2010)
- Call/practice coverage
- Salary (amount)
- Spousal satisfaction
- Obstetrics: deliveries/C-section
- Recreational opportunities
- Obstetrics: prenatal care
- Loan repayment
- Competition
- Allied mental health workforce
- Schools (tie for 10th)
- Perception of quality (tie for 10th)
- Physician workforce stability (tie for 10th)

#### Maine (2012)
- Call/practice coverage
- Administration
- Loan repayment
- Spousal satisfaction
- Perception of quality
- Schools
- Competition
- Nursing workforce (tie for 8th)
- Salary (amount) (tie for 8th)
- Electronic medical records (tie for 8th)
- Physician workforce stability (tie for 8th)
Top 10 Apgar Factors - CHC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>• Loan repayment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loan repayment</td>
<td>• Recreational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perception of quality</td>
<td>• Community need/physician support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schools</td>
<td>• Inpatient care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retirement package</td>
<td>• Mid-level provider workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CME benefits</td>
<td>• Obstetrics: prenatal care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community need/physician support</td>
<td>• Perception of quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mid-level provider workforce</td>
<td>• Obstetrics: deliveries/C-section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minor trauma (casting/sururing) (tie for 9th)</td>
<td>• Call/practice coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Call/practice coverage (tie for 9th)</td>
<td>• CHC leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Bottom 10 Apgar Factors - CHC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>Spousal satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Televideo support</td>
<td>Social networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Spousal satisfaction</td>
<td>Access to larger community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Perception of community</td>
<td>Salary (amount)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Salary (amount)</td>
<td>Shopping/other services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Production incentive</td>
<td>Specialist availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Nursing workforce</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Demographic: underserved/payor mix</td>
<td>Televideo support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Obstetrics: parental care (tied for 9th)</td>
<td>Physician workforce stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Administration (tied for 9th)</td>
<td>Production incentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Specialist availability(tied for 9th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Welcome/recruitment program (tied for 9th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cumulative CHC Community Apgar Score by Facility – Across Two States
Cumulative CHC Community Apgar Score by Facility – Across Two States
Case Study One
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score

Cumulative Apgar Score
Community Apgar Class

Overall Apgar
Geographic
Economic
Scope of Practice
Medical Support
Hospital and Community Support

Wyoming (All Sites) Baseline
Carbon County Memorial Hospital
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Geographic Class

Cumulative Apgar Score
Geographic Factors
Wyoming (All Sites) Baseline
Access to larger community
Demographic, patient mix
Social networking
Recreational opportunities
Spousal satisfaction
Schools
Shopping and other services
Religious, cultural opportunities
Climate
Perception of community
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Economic Class

Cumulative Apgar Score

Economic Factors

- Employment status
- Part-time opportunities
- Loan repayment
- Income guarantee
- Signing bonus
- Moving allowance
- Start-up, marketing costs
- Revenue flow
- Payor mix
- Competition
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Scope of Practice Class

Cumulative Apgar Score
Scope of Practice Factors

Obstetrics | C-section | Emergency room coverage | Endoscopy, surgery | Nursing home | Inpatient care | Mental health | Mid-level supervision | Teaching | Administration

-20.00 | -15.00 | -10.00 | -5.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 | 10.00 | 15.00 | 20.00

Wyoming (All Sites) Baseline
Carbon County Memorial Hospital
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Medical Support Class
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Community and Hospital Support Class

Hospital and Community Support Factors

- Physical plant and equipment
- Plans for capital investment
- Electronic medical records
- Hospital leadership
- Internet access
- Televideo support
- Hospital sponsored CME
- Community need, physician support
- Community volunteer opportunities
- Welcome and recruitment

Cumulative Apgar Score
Hospital X
Top 10 Cumulative Apgar Variance Factors across All 50 Factors

Social networking
Nursing workforce
Signing bonus
Hospital sponsored CME
Hospital leadership
Moving allowance
Competition
Revenue flow
Plans for capital investment
Transfer arrangements
Hospital X
Bottom 10 Cumulative Apgar Variance Factors across All 50 Factors

Bottom 10 Apgar Variance Factors

- Inpatient care
- Call, practice coverage
- Perception of quality
- Climate
- Mid-level supervision
- Emergency medical services
- Shopping and other services
- Payor mix
- Physical plant and equipment
- Allied mental health workforce

Cumulative Apgar Score

-24.00
-22.00
-20.00
-18.00
-16.00
-14.00
-12.00
-10.00
-8.00
-6.00
-4.00
-2.00
0.00
Case Study Two
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Geographic Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Factors</th>
<th>Cumulative Apgar Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to larger community</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic patient mix</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networking</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal satisfaction</td>
<td>-10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>-15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping and other services</td>
<td>-20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious, cultural opportunities</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of community</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Apgar Score

Baseline Mean Providence Valdez Medical Center
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Economic Class

Cumulative Apgar Score vs Economic Factors

Economic Factors

- Employment status
- Part-time opportunities
- Loan repayment
- Income guarantee
- Signing bonus
- Moving allowance
- Start-up, marketing costs
- Revenue flow
- Payor mix
- Competition

Baseline Mean
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Scope of Practice Class

Cumulative Apgar Score
Scope of Practice Factors

Baseline Mean Providence Valdez Medical Center

Obstetrics C-section Emergency room coverage Endoscopy, surgery Nursing home Inpatient care Mental health Mid-level supervision Teaching Administration
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Medical Support Class

Cumulative Apgar Score
Medical Support Factors
Baseline Mean Providence Valdez Medical Center

Perception of quality
Physician workforce stability
Specialist availability
Transfer arrangements
Nursing workforce
Allied mental health workforce
Mid-level provider workforce
Ancillary staff workforce
Emergency medical services
Call, practice coverage
Hospital X
Comparative Cumulative Apgar Score for Hospital and Community Support Class

Baseline Mean Providence Valdez Medical Center

Comparison of Cumulative Apgar Score for Hospital and Community Support Class

Factors:
- Physical plant and equipment
- Plans for capital investment
- Electronic medical records
- Hospital leadership
- Internet access
- Televideo support
- Hospital sponsored CME
- Community need, physician support
- Community volunteer opportunities
- Welcome and recruitment

Graph shows the comparative cumulative Apgar score for various hospital and community support factors.
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- Loan repayment
- Call, practice coverage
- Emergency room coverage
- Hospital sponsored CME
- Climate
- Specialist availability
- Mid-level provider workforce
- Electronic medical records
- Internet access
- Transfer arrangements

Cumulative Apgar Score

Bottom 10 Apgar Variance Factors
Next Steps

- Continue to expand the Critical Access Hospital and Community Health Center Community Apgar Programs
- Expand and refine the “CAP Solutions” initiative
- Complete the beta-testing of the Nursing Critical Access Hospital Community Apgar Program
- Consider development CAP to other workforce bottleneck areas (e.g., PAs)
- Mine the national comparative database
Questions/Comments for Discussion