

Hospital Admission Risk Program (HARP): Establishing the base for preventive services

Evaluation report: July 2001 to June 2003



**Hospital Admission Risk Program (HARP):
Establishing the base for preventive services**

Evaluation report: July 2001 to June 2003

Produced by



April 2004

Published by the Metropolitan Health and Aged Care Services Division
Victorian Government Department of Human Services, Melbourne, Victoria.

May 2004

© Copyright State of Victoria, Department of Human Services 2004

This publication is copyright. No part may be reproduced by any process except
in accordance with the provision of the Copyright Act 1968.

Authorised by the State Government of Victoria, 555 Collins St, Melbourne.

This document is available to download at www.health.vic.gov.au/hdms/harp/
(031005)

Printed by BigPrint, 520 Collins Street, Melbourne, 3000

Contents

Foreword	1
Acknowledgements	2
Glossary	3
Executive summary	5
1 Introduction	7
2 HARP impact in HARP hospitals	9
2.1 Overview	9
2.2 HARP project summary	9
2.2.1 Project numbers	9
2.2.2 Project models/interventions	11
2.2.3 Project commencement	11
2.3 HARP hospitals–hospital emergency use	12
2.4 Emergency department presentations	12
2.4.1 HARP hospital emergency department presentations	13
2.4.2 Individual patients attending HARP hospital emergency departments	15
2.4.3 Emergency department diagnosis–top 10	18
2.4.4 Emergency department discharge destination	18
2.5 Emergency department re-presentations	19
2.5.1 Re-presentation frequency	19
2.5.2 Re-presentation for ‘any reason’	20
2.5.3 Re-presentation for the ‘same reason’	21
2.6 Emergency department presentation and subsequent admission	22
2.6.1 Emergency department presentation and subsequent admission	22
2.7 Emergency admissions	24
2.7.1 Emergency admissions from all sources	24
2.7.2 Emergency admissions for COPD, CHF or diabetes	25
2.7.3 Emergency admissions–occupied bed days	27
2.7.4 Emergency admissions–patient discharge destination	28
2.8 Summary of the key observations within data for HARP Hospitals	29
2.9 Self-reported project experiences	30
2.9.1 Project staffing	30
2.9.2 Project management/reporting	31
2.9.3 Project teams	31
2.9.4 Project resources	32
2.9.5 Support for projects	33
2.9.6 Collaborative approaches across sectors	33
2.9.7 Target groups	34
2.9.8 Data systems	34
2.9.9 Evidence based models	36
2.9.10 Project establishment/implementation	36

3 Cluster analysis	39
3.1 Overview	40
3.2 Event based clusters	40
3.2.1 Introduction	40
3.2.2 Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	40
3.2.3 Chronic heart failure	45
3.2.4. Diabetes	50
3.2.5 Falls	54
3.3 Model based clusters	60
3.3.1 Emergency department care coordination	60
3.3.2 Acute/primary care liaison	63
3.4 Utilisation based clusters	67
3.4.1 Frequent/high volume acute service use	67
4 Implementation–issues	71
4.1 Project level developments within the HARP context	71
4.1.1 Project staffing	72
4.1.2 Project establishment/implementation	72
4.1.3 Project governance	72
4.1.4 Project design	73
4.1.5 Project funding	74
4.1.6 Evaluation activities	75
4.1.7 Information systems	75
4.2 Policy level issues for consideration during the development of HARP initiatives	76
4.2.1 Brokerage	76
4.2.2 Service system pressure	77
4.2.3 Project models/interventions	78
Appendixes	81
A Outline of HARP and the evaluation	83
A.1 About HARP	83
A.1.1 Overview	83
A.1.2 Hospital Demand Management Strategy	83
A.1.3 HARP aims and objectives	84
A.1.4 Conceptualisation of HARP	86
A.1.5 HARP evaluation timeline	87
A.2 Evaluation of HARP	88
A.2.1 Overview	88
A.2.2 Evaluation requirements	88
A.2.3 Evaluation framework	88
A.2.4 Evaluation progression	91
A.2.5 Future evaluation activities timeline	92
A.2.6 Evaluation challenges	92
B HARP projects–illustrative examples	95

B.1 Aged Care Outreach Service	95
B.1.1 Project arms	96
B.1.2 Project management and governance	97
B.1.3 Project activity	98
B.1.4 Project achievements	98
B.1.5 Project lessons	99
B.2 Disease Management Unit	99
B.2.1 Project management and governance	100
B.2.2 Project activity and achievements	101
B.2.3 Project lessons	102
B.3 Hospital in the Home General Practitioner Liaison Project	102
B.3.1 Project management and governance	103
B.3.2 Project activity and achievements	104
B.3.3 Project lessons	105
Footnotes	107

Tables

Table 2.1: HARP projects	10
Table 2.2: Emergency department presentations, by age cohort	13
Table 2.3: Individual emergency department presenters, by age cohort	15
Table 2.4: Top 10 emergency department diagnoses, 2002–03	18
Table 2.5: Discharge destination following HARP hospital emergency department presentations	19
Table 2.6: Emergency admissions profile for people with COPD	25
Table 2.7: Emergency admissions profile for people with CHF	26
Table 2.8: Emergency admissions profile for people with diabetes	27
Table 2.9: Emergency admission discharge destination from HARP hospitals, by number and percentage of total emergency admissions	28
Table 3.1: HARP cluster classification	39
Table A.1.1: HARP evaluation timeline	87
Table A.2.1: HARP evaluation activity	91
Table A.2.2: Future evaluation activities timeline	92
Table B.2.1: Disease Management Unit, patient hospital use	101
Table B.2.1: Disease Management Unit, patient hospital use	101

Figures

Figure 2.1:	Effective HARP projects' 'live' dates	11
Figure 2.2:	Hospitals included as HARP hospitals	12
Figure 2.3:	Annual percentage change in emergency department presentations, by age cohort	14
Figure 2.4:	Proportion of additional presentations to HARP hospital emergency departments, by age cohort	15
Figure 2.5:	Annual percentage change in the number of individual patients who presented at emergency departments, by age cohort	16
Figure 2.6:	Proportion of additional patients presenting to HARP hospital emergency departments	17
Figure 2.7:	Emergency department presentations per presenting patient, by age cohort	17
Figure 2.8:	Annual percentage change in the number of emergency department re-presentations by individual patients	20
Figure 2.9:	Annual percentage change in HARP hospital emergency department re-presentations for 'any reason', by time between presentations	20
Figure 2.10:	Annual percentage change in HARP hospital emergency department re-presentations for the 'same reason', by time between presentations	21
Figure 2.11:	Frequency of admission to the same hospital following HARP hospital emergency department presentation, by age cohort	22
Figure 2.12:	Annual percentage change in HARP hospital emergency department presentation and subsequent admission, by age cohort	23
Figure 2.13:	Annual percentage change in HARP hospital emergency department admissions	24
Figure 2.14:	Annual percentage change in occupied bed days for HARP hospital emergency admissions	27
Figure 2.15:	Average length of stay for HARP hospital emergency admissions	28
Figure 3.1:	COPD summary figures	44
Figure 3.2:	CHF summary figures	49
Figure 3.3:	Diabetes summary figures	53
Figure 3.4:	Falls summary figures	59
Figure 3.5:	Case study A–service utilisation	69
Figure 3.6:	Case study A–emergency department presentation triage classification	69
Figure 3.7:	Case study B–service utilisation	70
Figure 3.8:	Case study B–emergency department presentation triage classification	70
Figure A.1.1:	HARP framework	85
Figure A.1.2:	HARP conceptual model	87
Figure A.2.1:	HARP evaluation framework	88
Figure A.2.2:	HARP evaluation levels	89

