Adaptation of a Quality Improvement Approach to Implement eSceening in VHA Healthcare Settings

James Pittman^{1,2,3} Borsika Rabin^{1,4} Erin Almklov^{1,2} Niloofar Afari^{1,2,3} Elizabeth Floto⁵ Eusebio Rodriguez¹ & Laurie Lindamer^{1,2,3} ¹VA Center of Excellence for Stress and Mental Health, ²VA San Diego Healthcare System, ³University of California, San Diego, Department of Psychiatry, ⁴University of California, San Diego, Department of Family Medicine and Public Health, ⁵VA Roseburg Healthcare System

Background

- eScreening is a VA mobile health technology that provides customized and automated self-report mental and physical health screening via iPad, clinical alerts, patient feedback, and medical record integration.
- eScreening is used to support quality improvement efforts such as measurement-based care and early identification/intervention of health problems.
- eScreening has demonstrated a significant impact on clinical care and there is overwhelming demand from the field.
- But limited knowledge of how best to broadly implement and scale up health technologies.

Aims

We aimed to develop a process guide for eScreening implementation in VHA clinics to automate self-report screening of mental health symptoms and psychosocial challenges.

Methods

• This was a two-phase, mixed methods implementation project building on an adapted quality improvement method.

Phase 1:

- We adapted and conducted a Rapid Process Improvement Workshop (RPIW) to develop a generalizable process guide for eScreening implementation (eScreening Playbook).
- A RPIW is a systematic process in which stakeholders focus for several days of data collection, analysis, process mapping, and action planning toward improving a process. It serves to identify current state challenges, the future state solution, and gaps between them.



Our Modified RPIW Approach

Methods Continued

Phase 2: Development of a multicomponent Implementation Strategy (MCIS)

- We integrated the eScreening Playbook and RPIW with additional strategies of training and facilitation to create a MCIS for eScreening.
- We then piloted the MCIS in two VHA sites

Data Collection and Analysis

- Quantitative data on the implementation strategy was obtained from a 29-item pre-implementation survey that was guided by the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) and Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF).
- Response options for each survey question were collapsed into three categories: disagree, neither agree nor disagree, and agree.
- The % of respondents who endorsed each category was calculated for the 2 sites. We gathered **Qualitative data** from Implementation Process Mini Interviews designed to identify
- diverse contextual barriers and facilitators.
- Data were collected from the implementation site visit to 6 months post-implementation.
- Data was coded using pre-defined codes and analyzed using a rapid qualitative analytic approach.
- CFIR intervention characteristics and process domains were used to support areas for coding including implementation strategies used by each site, challenges of implementation, solutions, and adaptations.

Results

Implementation Strategies by VA Site

Strategy	Site 1	Site 2
RPIW	X	
Playbook	X	X
Training	X	X
Facilitation	X	X

Quantitative Findings

- Both sites' staff provided positive responses on the questionnaire related to eScreening, but some slight differential trends emerged:
- Site 2 reported more leadership support & role communication than site 1. Site 1 had more agreement about the specific roles related to eScreening
- and its compatibility with workflow and resources than site 2.

Qualitative Findings

Mini interview data showed overall satisfaction and usefulness of the MCIS approach and identified some challenges, solutions, and potential adaptations across sites.

Implementation Challenges

Implementation Challenges by VA Site

	Technology	Workflow/Staffing	IT Support	Educational
Site 1	Χ		X	X
Site 2	X	X	X	X

Implementation Solutions

All four types of implementation barriers were resolved using the external facilitator and the playbook.



Key Findings

- 2 elected not to include the RPIW.
- eScreening from staff at both sites.
- were only reported by site 2

Discussion

- be addressed.
- flexible and contain multiple components.
- a playbook and an implementation strategy for process to employ automated, patient-facing assessment.
- and quality of healthcare.

References

- Services. 2017 Feb; 14(1):23-33.
- 2015.43.

For Further Information

James Pittman, PhD, LCSW VA San Diego Healthcare System (858) 552-8585 x7787 james.pittman@va.gov



 Data showed overall satisfaction and usefulness of our MCIS approach and identified some challenges, solutions, and potential adaptations across sites.

• Both sites used the components of the MCIS, but site

• Survey data revealed positive responses related to

 Interview data exposed implementation challenges related to the technology, support, and education at both sites. Workflow and staffing resource challenges

• RPIW can be an important factor in the adoption of health technology, but organizational factors also need to

• Successful adoption of health technology needs to be

• Our use of RPIW and other QI methods to both develop eScreening has created a testable implementation

• The efficient collection and communication of patient information has the potential to greatly improve access to

• Pittman JOE, Floto E, Lindamer L, Baker DG, Lohr JB, Afari N. VA escreening program: Technology to improve care for post-9/11 veterans. Psychological

Koning H, Verver JPS, Heuvel J, Bisgaard S, Does RJMM. Lean Six Sigma in Healthcare. Journal for Healthcare Quality. 2006 Jun; 28(2):4–11.

Williams N. Multilevel Mechanisms of Implementation Strategies in Mental Health: Integrating Theory, Research, and Practice. Administration and Policy in

Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research.





