OBJECTIVES

• Understand importance of SDOH
  - Identify the concept of social needs
• Review pearls/pitfalls from “Hotspotting”
• Apply framework to use SDOH at varying levels of care
• Empower you to ask about and document social needs!
SDOH DEFINITION

• World Health Organization
  “The conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age.”
  “The social determinants of health are mostly responsible for health inequities - the unfair and avoidable differences in health status seen within and between countries.”
HEALTH OUTCOMES

- Individual Behavior: 36%
- Social Circumstances: 24%
- Genetics & Biology: 22%
- Medical Care: 11%
- Environment: 7%

SDOH matter because patients don’t live in your clinic! (usually)

Life expectancy by Utah Small Area was calculated using death counts over a span of 5 years (2014-2018).

If Camden, New Jersey, becomes the first American community to lower its medical costs, it will have a murder to thank. At nine-fifty on a February night in 2001, a twenty-
Health Care Hotspotting — A Randomized, Controlled Trial
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ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND

There is widespread interest in programs aiming to reduce spending and improve health care quality among “superutilizers,” patients with very high use of health care services. The “hotspotting” program created by the Camden Coalition of Healthcare Providers (hereafter, the Coalition) has received national attention as a promising approach.
INTERVENTION

• Enrolled during hospitalization
• Multidisciplinary team
  – RNs, SW, LPNs, Community health workers, coaches
• Performed home visits
• Scheduled and accompanied patients to initial primary care and specialty care
• Coordinated follow-up care, medication management
• BP, blood sugar, coached patients
• Helped patients apply for social services, appropriate behavioral health programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>No. of Patients</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Unadjusted Between-Group Difference (95% CI)</th>
<th>Adjusted Between-Group Difference (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readmission in total sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any (%)</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>62.34</td>
<td>0.64 (−6.17 to 7.46)</td>
<td>0.82 (−5.97 to 7.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of readmissions</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>−0.02 (−0.29 to 0.26)</td>
<td>0.01 (−0.25 to 0.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2 readmissions (%)</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>36.39</td>
<td>0.14 (−6.61 to 6.89)</td>
<td>0.27 (−6.22 to 6.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days in hospital</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>−0.59 (−2.49 to 1.31)</td>
<td>−0.32 (−2.17 to 1.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital charges ($)</td>
<td>114,768</td>
<td>116,422</td>
<td>1,654 (−25,523 to 28,831)</td>
<td>3,722 (−23,438 to 30,882)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital payments received ($)</td>
<td>17,650</td>
<td>18,130</td>
<td>480 (−3,613 to 4,573)</td>
<td>680 (−3,415 to 4,775)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any readmission according to subgroup (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of admissions in previous yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>52.12</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>0.51 (−10.2 to 11.22)</td>
<td>0.78 (−10.35 to 11.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>69.82</td>
<td>1.07 (−7.51 to 9.65)</td>
<td>1.27 (−7.38 to 9.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>63.11</td>
<td>62.61</td>
<td>−0.49 (−8.01 to 7.02)</td>
<td>0.1 (−7.42 to 7.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>60.94</td>
<td>4.69 (−11.58 to 20.96)</td>
<td>8.49 (−9.08 to 26.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE CLOSED. NEGATIVE RTC.

• NO!

• This leads us to a bigger discussion of how SDOH work
  – Specifically, how does this very large population level concept translate into clinical practice on an individual level?
INTERVENTION

- Enrollment during hospitalization
- Multidisciplinary team
  - RNs, SW, LPNs, Community health workers, coaches
- Performed home visits
- Scheduled and accompanied patients to initial primary care and specialty care
- Coordinated follow-up care, medication management
- BP, blood sugar, coached patients
- Helped patients apply for social services, appropriate behavioral health programs.

Majority of work was coordination within the healthcare system, for medical problems connected to social programs, but unclear if these met needs.
Social Determinants of Health:
The conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age, which are shaped by the distribution of money, power, and resources.

Social Needs:
- Informed care – information provided on a patient’s social context to inform care
- Targeted care – information provided to address patients social needs directly

Description of the Problem

How to use ORPCA.org/initiatives/social-determinants-of-health

@ASWallaceRNPhD @SonjaRaaum #UtahNursingResearch
Models for Sense-Making
Figure. Proposed Schematic for Social Determinants of Health (SDOH) Data

Risk Assessment for Clinical Decision-making
Requires time-efficient, focused, high-impact data

Performance Assessment
Requires enough granularity to adjust performance measures for population risk served

Person-Focused SDOH Interventions
Requires enough granularity to provide personalized whole-patient care

Population-Focused SDOH Interventions
Requires enough granularity to choose effective policies

Time and Cost
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Expansionist
Elevated Blood Lead Levels in Children Associated With the Flint Drinking Water Crisis: A Spatial Analysis of Risk and Public Health Response

Mona Hanna-Attisha, MD, MPH, Jenny LaChance, MS, Richard Casey Saller, PhD, and Allison Champney Schnepp, MD

Objectives. We analyzed differences in pediatric elevated blood lead level incidence before and after Flint, Michigan, introduced a more corrosive water source into an aging water system without adequate corrosion control.

Methods. We reviewed blood lead levels for children younger than 5 years before (2013) and after (2015) water source change in Greater Flint, Michigan. We assessed the percentage of lead pipes and lead plumbing, with estimates of lead service lines ranging from 10% to 80%. Researchers from Virginia Tech University reported increases in water lead levels (WLLs), but changes in blood lead levels (BLLs) were unknown.
PERSON FOCUSED INTERVENTIONS

• Community health workers, social workers, case managers, comprehensive care plans

• Very common – we are doing this every day!
PERSON FOCUSED INTERVENTIONS

• Success depends upon measurement...

Original Investigation

Patient-Centered Community Health Worker Intervention to Improve Posthospital Outcomes
A Randomized Clinical Trial

Shreya Kangovi, MD, MS; Nandita Mitra, PhD; David Grande, MD, MPA; Mary L. White; Sharon McCollum; Jeffrey Sellman, BA; Richard P. Shannon, MD; Judith A. Long, MD

IMPORTANTANCE Socioeconomic and behavioral factors can negatively influence posthospital outcomes among patients of low socioeconomic status (SES). Traditional hospital personnel often lack the time, skills, and community linkages required to address these factors.
### Table 2. Outcomes in 446 Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>No. (%)</th>
<th>Unadjusted Absolute Difference (95% CI)</th>
<th>NNT</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Adjusted&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt; Odds Ratio (95% CI) or B Coefficient (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posthospital primary care</td>
<td>92 (47.9)</td>
<td>115 (60.0)</td>
<td>12.0 (2.0 to 21.7)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-quality verbal discharge Communication</td>
<td>118 (78.7)</td>
<td>137 (91.3)</td>
<td>12.7 (4.5 to 20.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect medication adherence</td>
<td>115 (59.3)</td>
<td>123 (63.7)</td>
<td>4.5 (-5.2 to 14.0)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any readmission</td>
<td>30 (13.6)</td>
<td>33 (15.0)</td>
<td>1.4 (-5.2 to 7.9)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple readmissions</td>
<td>12 (5.5)</td>
<td>5 (2.3)</td>
<td>-3.2 (-6.9 to 0)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple readmissions among readmitted patients&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12 (40.0)</td>
<td>5 (15.2)</td>
<td>-24.8 (-44.5 to -2.8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Patient Activation Score, mean (SD)</td>
<td>1.6 (17.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (17.3)</td>
<td>1.8 (0 to 4.0)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Mental Health Score, mean (SD)</td>
<td>4.5 (12.2)</td>
<td>6.7 (14.0)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.4 to 4.8)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Physical Health Score, mean (SD)</td>
<td>4.8 (10.4)</td>
<td>5.5 (10.4)</td>
<td>0.7 (-1.3 to 2.8)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with medical care, mean (SD)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.2)</td>
<td>0 (-0.2 to 0.3)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: NA, not available; NNT, number needed to treat.

<sup>a</sup> Denominators of unadjusted outcomes do not include missing data. Adjusted outcomes include imputed missing data.

<sup>b</sup> Outcomes adjusted for baseline number of usual care providers and insurance status. Change in health and activation also adjusted for baseline health and activation scores.

<sup>c</sup> Among those readmitted, n = 63.
PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

- Risk adjustment for patient populations
  - Population level
  - Individual level

Adjusting for social risk factors impacts performance and penalties in the hospital readmissions reduction program

Karen E. Joynt Maddox MD, MPH1 | Mat Reidhead MA2 | Jianhui Hu PhD3 |
Amy J. H. Kind MD, PhD4 | Alan M. Zaslavsky PhD6 | Elna M. Nagasako MD, PhD,
MPH5 | David R. Nerenz PhD2
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Contextual Errors and Failures in Individualizing Patient Care: A Multicenter Study
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ACP POSITION STATEMENT

8. The American College of Physicians recommends adjusting quality payment models and performance measurement assessments to reflect the increased risk associated with caring for disadvantaged populations.”
RISK ASSESSMENT AND CLINICAL DECISIONS

• Social Needs Screeners

CMS

Box 1 | Accountable Health Communities
Core Health-Related Social Needs Screening Questions

Underlined answer options indicate positive responses for the associated health-related social need. A value greater than 10 when the numerical values for answers to questions 7-10 are summed indicates a positive screen for interpersonal safety.

Housing Instability
1. What is your housing situation today?
   - I do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter, living outside on the street, on a beach, in a car, abandoned building, bus or train station, or in a park)
   - I have housing today, but I am worried about losing housing in the future
   - I have housing
2. Think about the place you live. Do you have problems with any of the following? (check all that apply)
   - Bug infestation
   - Mold

PRAPARE

PRAPARE: Protocol for Responding to and Assessing Patient Assets, Risks, and Experiences
Paper Version of PRAPARE for Implementation As of September 2, 2016

Personal Characteristics
1. Are you Hispanic or Latino?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I choose not to answer this question

2. Which race(s) are you? Check all that apply.
   - Asian
   - Native Hawaiian
   - Pacific Islander
   - Black/African American
   - White
   - American Indian/Alaskan Native

7. What is your housing situation today?
   - I have housing
   - I do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter, living outside on the street, on a beach, in a car, or in a park)
    - I choose not to answer this question

8. Are you worried about losing your housing?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I choose not to answer this question
Figure 1. Percentage of Physician Practices and Hospitals That Screen Patients for Each of 5 Social Needs

- Few practices routinely incorporate screening
- Hospitals have opportunity to improve
ACP POSITION STATEMENT

• “9. The American College of Physicians recommends increased screening and collection of social determinants of health data to aid in health impact assessments and support evidence-driven decision making.”
When the rubber meets the road
CHALLENGES OF CLINICAL CARE INTEGRATION

• Screening for social determinants during clinical encounter remains controversial
  – Whose responsibility is it to deal with?
  – Does it distract from other medical care?
  – Concern/Implementation barriers

  • 66% of 154 physicians did not feel confident in their capacity to address SDOH\(^1\)
  • Lack of time, lack of resources to address cited as most significant barriers\(^1\)

\(^1\) Med Care. 2019;57(Suppl 6 2):S197-S201.
WHAT DOES THE PATIENT THINK?

• 50 interviews of patients and caregivers
1. Believe screening for social risks is important
2. Understand connections between social risks and overall health
3. Emphasized importance of patient-centered implementation of social risk screening
4. Recognize the limitations of healthcare’s capacity to address or resolve social adversity

EXAMPLE: THE UHEALTH ED

Clinical stakeholders communicated:
1. Concerns about assessing social needs without referral resources
2. Beliefs that “others” screen needs and refer patients to resources
3. Beliefs that support staff (e.g., registration vs nurses) can effectively screen, but need to be clinically integrated

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality R21 HS026505
**EXAMPLE: THE UHEALTH ED**

In the last month...

1. Have you not seen a doctor because you did not have a way to get to the clinic or hospital?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefer Not To Answer

2. Have you needed to see a doctor but could not because it costs too much?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefer Not To Answer

3. Did you not take medications to save money?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefer Not To Answer

4. Did you feel there was not enough money for food?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefer Not To Answer

5. Did you feel there was not enough money for items like clothing or furniture?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefer Not To Answer
EXAMPLE: THE UHEALTH ED

• ED patients screened
• United Way’s 2-1-1 service contacts patients within 48 hours
• Data from screening, 2-1-1 encounters, and the Enterprise Data Warehouse are compiled
Moving Forward
CURRENT RECOMMENDATIONS

• Universal – consider bias
• Address Literacy and other barriers
• Links to services
• Careful consideration of training and receptivity
Summary and Final Thoughts
CURRENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Develop and participate in models that
• Universally screen, or carefully consider bias
• Consider literacy and language barriers
• Establish links to service providers with clear referral process
• Integrate thoughtful staff training and address patient receptivity

Wallace, Luther, Guo et al. (in press)
Thank You!