

# Priority Evidence-Practice Gaps in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Acute Rheumatic Fever and Rheumatic Heart Disease Care

## Final Report

Engaging stakeholders in identifying priority evidence-practice gaps and strategies for improvement in primary health care (ESP project)

November 2016



**NATIONAL  
RESEARCH  
PARTNERSHIP**

*Improving practice  
through research*



**One21seventy**  
National Centre for Quality Improvement  
in Indigenous Primary Health Care

# Table of Contents

1	Guide to reading this report.....	6
2	Key messages .....	7
3	Executive summary .....	8
3.1	Purpose .....	8
3.2	Approach .....	8
3.3	Summary of findings .....	8
3.4	Next steps.....	11
4	Priority Evidence-Practice Gaps and Stakeholder Views on Barriers and Strategies for Improvement in ARF/RHD Care.....	13
4.1	ABCD National Research Partnership/One21seventy.....	13
4.2	Large-scale health system strengthening.....	14
4.3	Engaging stakeholders in identifying priority evidence-practice gaps and strategies for improvement.....	14
5	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ARF/RHD Care .....	16
5.1	Stakeholder engagement .....	16
5.2	Phase 1: Identifying priority evidence-practice gaps .....	17
5.3	Phase 2: Identifying barriers and enablers to addressing the priority evidence–practice gaps and strategies for improvement .....	20
5.4	Strategies for addressing the priority evidence-practice gaps .....	23
6	ESP Project strengths and limitations .....	25
7	Conclusions .....	26
	References.....	27
	Appendix A: One21seventy data collection and reporting .....	28
	Appendix B: Overview of the ESP Project.....	30
	Appendix C: Survey respondents.....	31
	Appendix D: Responses to Phase 2 survey on barriers and enablers to addressing priority evidence-practice gaps in ARF/RHD care.....	34
	Appendix E: Evidence Brief.....	38

## Figure List

Figure 1. ESP Project phases.....	14
Figure 2. Use of aggregated CQI data for stakeholder identification of system wide evidence-practice gaps and strategies for improvement .....	15
Figure 3. How to read boxplots representing service delivery in 2012-2014 .....	17
Figure 4. Evidence Practice Gap priorities with a selection of representative indicators from Phase 1 report (n=health centres, patient records) .....	18
Figure 5. How to read trend boxplots over years and cycles.....	20

## Table List

Table 1. Key barriers and enablers to improving ARF/RHD care across all priority areas .....	9
Table 2. Level of engagement in the ARF/RHD health care ESP Project.....	16
Table 3. Trends in key indicators of the priority evidence-practice gaps .....	21

## Abbreviations

ABCD	Audit and Best practice for Chronic Disease
ARF	Acute rheumatic fever
ATSIHP	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Health Practitioner
BPG	Benzathine penicillin G
CQI	Continuous quality improvement
ESP	Engaging Stakeholders in Identifying Priority Evidence-Practice Gaps and Strategies for Improvement
PHC	Primary health care
RHD	Rheumatic heart disease
SAT	Systems Assessment Tool
WHO	World Health Organisation

## Authorship

Authors of this report: Jodie Bailie, Veronica Matthews, Alison Laycock, Ross Bailie

## Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank the range of employees of stakeholder organisations and individuals who have provided generous contributions to the ESP Project. The success of this project is built on feedback, engagement and participation by a range of individuals and groups within and beyond the ABCD National Research Partnership. We acknowledge the input of RHD Australia in Phase 1 of the RHD ESP process. In particular, Sara Noonan and Sandra Downing who played lead roles in the analysis and interpretation of data and writing of the Phase 1 report; and Judy Katzenellenbogen from the 'End RHD' Centre for Research Excellence who provided comment and advice in later stages of the project. We thank Perri Hull for her contribution in formatting and distributing the ESP reports.

The ABCD National Research Partnership is led by Menzies School of Health Research and funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council (ID No.545267) and the Lowitja Institute. The Partnership includes Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation peak bodies and member services, government health departments, academic institutions, and primary health care services in five states and territories: the Northern Territory, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and New South Wales. Ethical approval has been granted by the Human Research Ethics Committees in all jurisdictions where there are participating health services.

### Suggested citation:

Bailie J, Matthews V, Laycock A, Bailie R. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Acute Rheumatic Fever and Rheumatic Heart Disease Care: Final Report, ESP Project, Menzies School of Health Research. November 2016.

# 1 Guide to reading this report

This Final Report presents the findings from each of the phases of the Engaging Stakeholders in Identifying Priority Evidence-Practice Gaps and Strategies for Improvement in Primary Health Care (ESP) Project for Acute Rheumatic Fever and Rheumatic Heart Disease (ARF/RHD) care.

The Final Report is presented in the following format:

- A brief statement of **key messages** – that is, the headline messages of particular interest to policy makers and managers.
- An **executive summary** that provides a brief background and description of the approach, findings and conclusions of the ESP ARF/RHD care processes. This executive summary is designed for people who want to know a little more about the project, beyond the key messages.
- The **main report** that provides a more complete description of the project, suited to the needs of those with a more specific and detailed interest in the project.

The appendices contain further detail on specific aspects of the project.

This Final Report presents findings for all participating health centres from all jurisdictions together. It collates analysis of aggregated continuous quality improvement (CQI) data and stakeholder views on priority evidence-practice gaps, barriers and enablers to addressing the priority evidence-practice gaps, and strategies for improvement.

The report is designed for people working in a range of roles including national and jurisdictional policy makers, managers, community-controlled organisations and government health authorities, peak bodies, clinical leaders, researchers, primary health care staff and CQI practitioners who may have an interest in the interpretation and use of aggregated CQI data to drive decision making.

A Data Supplement accompanies the report. The Supplement contains the detailed analysis of the findings presented in the first two phases of the project, which were the basis of the higher level findings presented in this Final Report. The Data Supplement is available by clicking [here](#) or emailing [abcd@menzies.edu.au](mailto:abcd@menzies.edu.au).

More detailed reports on each phase of the ESP Project are available on request.

## 2 Key messages

Healthcare stakeholders in diverse roles and organisations provided input to interpret continuous quality improvement data on acute rheumatic fever (ARF) and rheumatic heart disease (RHD) care, using data from 60 health centres. The findings and key messages are relevant to healthcare policy and planning.

### Key message

1

**Significant improvements in ARF/RHD care will be achieved by focusing on seven important 'evidence-to-practice gaps' in care delivery. These gaps in care are common across many health centres.**

The identified top priorities were: improving 1) the coverage of injections to at least 80% for clients who are prescribed benzathine penicillin G (BPG); 2) client follow-up; 3) recording of key information in client files and master charts, and; 4) disease management planning. Better recording of; 5) ARF diagnoses and; 6) interventions, and; 7) strengthening the practice and recording of rheumatic fever education for all clients were also identified as high priorities.

### Key message

2

**Many health services and centres experience similar barriers to addressing the priority evidence-to-practice gaps in ARF/RHD care. Overcoming these barriers involves strengthening systems for workforce recruitment and support, patient- and community-centred care, use of clinical information systems and coordination of services. Community - health centre partnerships are very important.**

The identified barriers and enablers highlighted the importance of population health approaches and continuous quality improvement. They identified the need for processes that build community health literacy and expectations about care quality, and staff ability to provide care that is guided by clients' values.

### Key message

3

**Strategies for improving ARF/RHD care include strengthening patient information systems, coordinating services across regional boundaries and between providers, and improving access to specialised services. They include dedicated resources and flexible options (including outreach services) for providing BPG injections, and ARF/RHD education in various formats. Putting these strategies into action will have flow-on benefits in other areas of care.**

The development of strategies needs to focus on overcoming specific barriers and strengthening known enablers for improving care, and engaging a range of stakeholders in developing interventions. It should take account of evidence about how effective and well suited strategies are in different settings.

## From messages to action: an opportunity for wide-scale improvement

Many of the barriers and enablers experienced across health centres are similar to those identified in the ESP project on other aspects of PHC (e.g., chronic illness care). Therefore, taking action on the key messages for wide-scale improvement of ARF/RHD care will strengthen other key areas of care.

Policy makers, funders, leaders, managers and staff across levels of the health system need to take a coordinated approach to supporting key strategies within their levels and areas of influence.

## 3 Executive summary

### 3.1 Purpose

The purpose of this project has been to engage key stakeholders in the use of aggregate continuous quality improvement (CQI) data to identify and address system-wide evidence-practice gaps in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ARF/RHD health care. We sought to engage a range of stakeholders in different roles and across different levels of the primary health care (PHC) system, including service providers, managers, policy-makers and researchers. We aimed to capture their knowledge on the barriers and enablers to addressing the identified priority-evidence practice gaps and their suggestions on strategies for improvement.

System-wide gaps identified through the project are likely to be due to deficiencies in the broader PHC system, indicating that system-level action is required to improve performance. Such system-level action should be developed with a deep understanding of the holistic nature of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander wellbeing beyond just physical health (including healthy connections to culture, community and country). It should take account of the impact of Australian colonial history on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and how social systems – including the health system – should be shaped to meet the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

This project builds on the collective strengths within PHC services in order to continue improving the quality of care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

### 3.2 Approach

This Final Report forms the final phase of the Engaging Stakeholders in Identifying Priority Evidence-Practice Gaps and Strategies for Improvement (ESP) project for ARF/RHD care. We have used de-identified trend data from 60 health centres participating in the ABCD National Research Partnership that conducted audits of care for clients with diagnosed ARF/RHD over the period January 2008 – December 2014 (2,581 client records; 80 system assessments).

Through two cyclical phases of reporting and feedback, we aimed to engage stakeholders in a theory-based process using aggregate CQI data to identify:

1. priority evidence-practice gaps;
2. barriers and enablers to high quality care and system-wide strategies for achieving improvement.

Implementation research suggests that by using evidence to identify and link priority gaps to theoretical domains that are known to be system enablers or barriers, strategies can be developed that will most likely produce the desired change.

### 3.3 Summary of findings

#### ***Phase 1 – identifying the evidence-practice gaps***

RHD/ARF CQI data from 2012 to 2014 were used to identify preliminary priority evidence-practice gaps (n=44 centres; 897 patient records; 22 system assessments). Stakeholders provided input to refine and confirm seven priority evidence- practice gaps in ARF/RHD care:

- Increase uptake of planned Benzathine penicillin G (BPG) injections to 80% or more for all clients who are prescribed injections
- Strengthen activity to follow-up clients who received less than 80% of planned BPG injections within a 12 month period

- Support health centres to prioritise disease management planning
- Improve recording of key information related to delivery of BPG injections, such as planned frequency of BPG injections, current prescriptions and clinic master charts
- Improve levels of recording ARF diagnoses (including suspected ARF)
- Strengthen efforts to provide interventions for clients who have ARF despite adequate injection delivery
- Improve the practice and recording of rheumatic fever education for all clients

These findings are based on 21 survey responses – 17 individual responses and 4 group responses on behalf of at least 33 people.

Although a proportion of health centres were doing well in many aspects of ARF/RHD care, the majority of health centres were not doing well in key areas. There was wide variation between health centres in almost all aspects of ARF/RHD care.

### ***Phase 2 – Barriers and enablers to addressing the evidence-practice gaps and system-wide strategies for improvement***

In the second phase, we presented trend audit data (2008 – 2014) to examine variation over time in key indicators relevant to the priority evidence-practice gaps (n=60 health centres; 2581 patient records; 80 systems assessments). We also provided a brief synthesis of published evidence on improving the quality of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC to stimulate feedback on strategies to overcome the identified barriers and enablers.

Health centre, system and staff attributes (or domains) relevant to implementation of change interventions were provided as prompts to help project participants identify barriers and enablers. There were 9 survey respondents, (5 individuals and 4 group responses on behalf of at least 64 people), who provided feedback on the relative importance of these domains to addressing the priority-evidence practice gaps through the phase 2 survey. We also drew on responses to the Phase 1 survey that identified barriers and enablers to addressing gaps and/or strategies for improvement. Table 1 lists the health centre, system and staff attributes considered to be the main barriers or enablers across all priority areas.

**Table 1. Key barriers and enablers to improving ARF/RHD care across all priority areas**

<b>HEALTH CENTRE AND SYSTEMS</b>	<b>Staffing and workforce</b>
	Systems to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adequate numbers of staff, and to support recruitment and retention of staff (particularly ATSIHPs and administrative staff - numbers of GP staff were generally perceived to be adequate)</li> <li>• PHC staff have support from experienced staff, especially when health centres are affected by staff turnover and shortages</li> </ul>
	<b>Self-management</b>
	Good resources available in the area of ARF/RHD, through more training for staff in the principles of self-management as relevant to ARF/RHD.
	<b>Population health</b>
	Systems to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• teams have an understanding of the size, diversity and other key features of their service populations</li> <li>• teams are able to apply the principles of population health</li> </ul>

---

**Teamwork**

Systems and processes to ensure PHC staff function effectively as teams.

---

**Community capacity, engagement and mobilisation**

Systems to:

- enhance communities' expectation and leadership for quality with regard to best practice care
  - enhance the health literacy of community members
  - build capability of PHC teams to develop links to work in partnership with communities
- 

**Clinical information systems and communication technology**

Further training and effective support to use clinical information systems and communication technology to support best practice.

---

**Training and development**

Systems to support inter-organisational and intra-organisational learning, and develop staff knowledge and skills.

---

**Patient-centred care**

Systems to:

- support all members of the PHC team to understand the needs and aspirations of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities;
  - provide care that is respectful of and responsive to individual patient preferences, needs and values, so that the patients' values guide all clinical decisions;
  - ensure training for all team members in the provision of patient centred care
- 

**Quality improvement systems**

Systems to support health centre staff to interpret improvement data, plan and implement strategies for improvement.

---

**Leadership and management**

Improve networks and regional coordination and further support from managers to develop partnerships across the health sector to enhance delivery of best practice care

---

**Knowledge**

PHC staff generally know the content and objectives of best practice care and are aware of how to provide this care in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander settings.

---

**STAFF**

**Focus**

At times staff have trouble focusing their attention to provide best practice care in ARF/RHD health due to competing demands.

---

**Strategies for improving ARF/RHD care across all priority areas**

Respondents were asked to identify new or refined strategies to address the most common barriers and enablers across all priority evidence-practice gaps. Stakeholder feedback recommended the following strategies:

*National level strategies*

- Establish a national data base of ARF/RHD patients to support BPG injection provision and disease management through better sharing of information across the health system. This would enable patients to receive care when not at their regular health service.
- Add a section about ARF/RHD to the annual health assessment (MBS 715)

*Jurisdiction, regional or service level strategies*

- Provide options for delivery of injections - including outreach models

- Improve resources and systems for staff to be able to follow-up patients who require BPG injections
- Strengthen regional programs and partnerships to enable care for patients who move across jurisdictional boundaries
- Improve access to specialist and hospital services
- Use CQI data to inform planning and service delivery
- Advocate for housing and sanitation interventions to address the underlying causes of ARF/RHD
- Provide staff education on the importance of the injection schedule to manage ARF/RHD and best practice guidelines
- Provide staff training in social determinants of health and patient-centred care

#### *Health centre and community strategies*

- Provide community, patient and family education on the importance of receiving injections – suggestions ranged from one on one education to family focus groups and broader community education such as films in local language
- Establish a dedicated staff role with responsibility for RHD care
- Offer incentive awards for completion of injections
- Arrange an interpreter to assist in the discussions with patients as required
- Encourage accurate and complete recording of delivery of care in patients' notes
- Conduct regular chart audits using a CQI approach; use CQI data to inform planning and service delivery

The ESP trend data show a small upward trend in overall delivery of ARF/RHD care for services who participated in three or more CQI cycles. Together with other evidence on the effectiveness of CQI methods, this suggests that a sustained commitment to CQI will result in improvements in the delivery of care.

Many of the suggested strategies are relevant to a number of the identified barriers and enablers. In developing strategies for overcoming the barriers it will be important to ensure the more general strategies include a focus on overcoming the specific identified barriers and strengthening specific enablers, rather than being too diffuse.

### **3.4 Next steps**

System-wide change is required to address the priority evidence-practice gaps in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ARF/RHD care through targeted strategies. The ESP process has enabled key people working within the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health sector to reflect on aggregate data reports and has collated their views on priority system-wide evidence-practice gaps, barriers and enablers, and strategies for improvement.

Further work is required to ensure the detailed design of strategies is based on published evidence and practical experience of using approaches that support effective interventions for improving the quality of ARF/RHD care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and communities.

The main purpose of the ESP Project was to engage a variety of stakeholders in the use of aggregate CQI data and to stimulate discussion on the key areas requiring system-wide improvement and how best to achieve that improvement. The suggested strategies could provide the basis for continuing dialogue on the development and implementation of plans to address the most common barriers across the agreed priority evidence-practice gaps in ARF/RHD care. Through such dialogue and joint planning, policy makers, managers, community-controlled organisations and government health authorities, peak bodies, clinical leaders,

researchers, PHC staff and CQI practitioners can ensure that the detailed design of strategies addresses local and organisational contexts.

The aggregated data and collated views and ideas provide a basis for stakeholders to continue to work collaboratively across regions and jurisdictions to share knowledge and experience, as strategies are put into action and evaluated.

This final report will be disseminated to respondents and more broadly to stakeholders across all levels of the health system, including national and jurisdictional community-controlled organisations and government health authorities, clinical leaders, researchers, PHC staff and CQI practitioners. We encourage stakeholders to utilise the report, along with the aggregate CQI data, to implement and advocate for change at local, organisational, regional and national levels.

## 4 Priority Evidence-Practice Gaps and Stakeholder Views on Barriers and Strategies for Improvement in ARF/RHD Care

In most developed countries acute rheumatic fever (ARF) and rheumatic heart disease (RHD) are rare, but rates among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are amongst the highest recorded globally [1, 2]. Mortality from rheumatic and other valvular heart disease has a higher differential mortality ratio between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians than any other disease [3].

### *What is acute rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease?*

**Acute rheumatic fever (ARF)** is an illness caused by the body's inflammatory response to infection with Streptococcal bacteria that are often found in skin sores and sore throats (often called 'strep throat'). Most importantly, it can cause inflammation of the heart, often resulting in permanent damage to the heart valves. **Rheumatic heart disease (RHD)** is a long-term condition caused by permanent damage to one or more of the heart valves following rheumatic fever. The heart valve(s) may become narrowed, obstructing the flow of blood and/or failing to close properly. This can lead to heart failure and sometimes the need for cardiac surgery to repair or replace the heart valves. It can also lead to formation of clots that may break off and lodge in the vessels in the brain, resulting in stroke. Because RHD is a complication of rheumatic fever, the best way of preventing RHD is to prevent episodes of rheumatic fever. People who have had rheumatic fever need regular penicillin injections to prevent recurrences and consequent heart complications. This is needed for at least 10 years, so health systems need to be strong to ensure adherence and effectiveness. People with RHD usually need regular cardiology reviews and medications. Because of the extra load pregnancy puts on the heart, RHD can be very dangerous for the mother and baby.

ARF and RHD are preventable. RHD is a consequence of repeated episodes of ARF, with approximately 60% of people with ARF going on to develop RHD [1]. Damage to the heart valves is a consequence of RHD, but around half these cases have no known history of ARF. Diagnosis of RHD is often delayed, either on ARF recurrence, or on patients becoming symptomatic with heart failure. Long-term ( $\geq 10$  years) monthly injections of penicillin are the mainstay of secondary prophylaxis to prevent ARF recurrence and development of RHD [4]. The incidence of ARF peaks between 5 and 15 years of age, being rare after 34 years [1], whereas prevalence increases with age.

### 4.1 ABCD National Research Partnership/One21seventy

The ABCD National Research Partnership (the Partnership) and One21seventy, the National Centre for Quality Improvement on Indigenous Primary Health Care\*, are founded on the premise that a holistic or comprehensive approach to PHC is fundamental to an effective health system. The One21seventy clinical audit and systems assessment tools are developed by expert reference groups and are based on widely accepted evidence-based guidelines that reflect best practice across the scope of primary health care. These tools have to date been used by more than 270 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander primary health care centres across the country. Automated reports are provided routinely to health centres and managers comprising their service level audit data as well as relevant regional or state comparison data to support

---

\* For more information on the ABCD Partnership Project: <<http://www.menzies.edu.au/abcd>>. For more information about One21seventy: <<http://www.one21seventy.org.au/>>.

local and regional level CQI efforts. Appendix A provides more information about the One21seventy data collection process and sources used to develop the audit tools.

One hundred and seventy-five of these PHC centres have agreed to allow their data to be used to address the aims of the Partnership, including improving understanding of barriers and enablers to high quality care, and informing development of strategies for improvement. The ESP Project contributes to this process, increasing understanding and use of national aggregate CQI data for achieving wider system change. The establishment of this dataset has been made possible by the active contributions of health centre staff, CQI facilitators, managers, policy makers, community-controlled organisations and government health authorities, researchers and clinical leaders. Their ongoing contributions are vital to making the most effective use of data for improving the quality of care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people across Australia.


## 4.2 Large-scale health system strengthening

Large-scale improvement in the delivery of PHC requires change at multiple levels of the health system, not only at the local health centre level. Where aspects of care are not being done well across a range of health centres, this is likely to be due to inadequacies in the broader PHC delivery system. These broader systems directly impact health care and health outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Improvements to systems should be based on evidence about what is working well and what service gaps need to be addressed. Aggregated CQI data can contribute to this evidence.

## 4.3 Engaging stakeholders in identifying priority evidence-practice gaps and strategies for improvement

The ESP Project is a major initiative of the Partnership, and is consistent with the purpose of supporting development of the health system to provide high quality comprehensive primary healthcare on a wide-scale. It explores how aggregated CQI data can be used across the broader health system in a series of action-research cycles to: 1) identify evidence-practice gaps; 2) identify barriers, enablers and system-wide strategies to addressing these evidence-practice gaps (Figure 1).

Figure 1. ESP Project phases




This phased approach (Figure 1) has been adapted from systematic methods designed to link interventions to modifiable barriers to address evidence-practice gaps [5,6]. As part of their approach, French and colleagues utilised previously tested theoretical domains relevant to behaviour change of healthcare professionals to identify barriers to be addressed as part of intervention strategies [5,7,8]. In recognition that there are multiple barriers at different levels of the health system, the ESP Project has drawn on other research to extend the theoretical domains to include broader system factors relevant to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC sector [6,9,10]. For more information about the ESP process, see Appendix B or Laycock et al (2016) [11].

The ESP Project aims to encourage national and State/Territory level conversations about systemic barriers or enablers that could affect improvement in the delivery of PHC, and help inform system changes to direct resources and efforts where they can most improve the health of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

Figure 2 illustrates the components of the ESP project cycle for ARF/RHD health care.

**Figure 2. Use of aggregated CQI data for stakeholder identification of system wide evidence-practice gaps and strategies for improvement**



## 5 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ARF/RHD Care

From 2008 to 2014, 60 PHC centres in five States/Territories conducted One21seventy quality improvement audits for patients with ARF/RHD. Over 2,500 clinical records were audited over this period and 94% were those of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander patients. A patient's health record was eligible for inclusion if they had a history of definite or suspected diagnosis of either ARF or RHD (excluding 'inactive' clients with a history of ARF (not RHD) for whom secondary prophylaxis has ceased) and had been resident in the community for 6 months or more in the last 12 months. Appendix A provides further information on audit sampling methods.

### 5.1 Stakeholder engagement

The ESP process for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ARF/RHD care began in January 2015. Our aim was to circulate reports as widely as possible to engage a variety of stakeholders in the use and interpretation of aggregate data on the quality of ARF/RHD care. We adopted a snowballing distribution technique, whereby key stakeholders were requested to forward reports on to other interested people. Our purpose was to draw on stakeholder knowledge and experience to identify priority evidence-practice gaps, barriers and enablers to improvement and gather views on strategies to address the gaps.

Around 260 stakeholders provided feedback through online surveys over the course of the project (Table 2). Organisations represented included community controlled and government health services, support organisations, research organisations and policy makers. Respondents included practitioners, ATSIHPs, CQI facilitators, managers, policy-makers, and researchers (Appendix C).

**Table 2. Level of engagement in the ARF/RHD health care ESP Project**

(n= Approximate number of stakeholder responses)	Phase 1 (n=50)		Phase 2 (n=69)	
	Individual	Group	Individual	Group
<b>Number of survey responses</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
Number of attendees	Less than 5	2		1
per group:	5 to 10	1		-
	11 to 20	-		-
	More than 20	1		3
	Jurisdictions of interest for respondents#			
	National	-		1
	NSW	1		0
	Queensland	5		2
	NT	12		4
	SA	2		1
	WA	2		4

Note: Some groups indicated large numbers – considerably more than 20 and in some instances more than 100. It was not clear how many individuals actually provided input. For the purpose of estimating the numbers who provided input we have used a figure of 20 individuals for groups that were reported to be larger than 20. The estimated number of people providing input may therefore be conservative.

Less than five responses were received during the third phase of feedback (draft final report). The feedback has been incorporated into the final report, however, information on the respondents is not shown.

# Numbers may not tally with the total number of respondents, as respondents were able to select multiple categories when answering some questions. For example, in a group response, group members may have represented a number of jurisdictions.

## 5.2 Phase 1: Identifying priority evidence-practice gaps

During Phase 1 we presented national clinical audit and systems assessment data collected between 2012 to 2014 on adherence to best practice across the broad scope of ARF/RHD care for the purpose of consulting with stakeholders to identify priority evidence-practice gaps (n=44 health centres; 897 client records; 22 systems assessments).


To start the discussion, the ABCD Project team and a clinical expert identified a preliminary set of priorities using the following criteria:

- important aspects of comprehensive PHC that were generally recorded at low levels;
- aspects of care where there was wide variation in recorded delivery of care;
- basic aspects of clinical care that were being delivered and recorded at a high level of performance by the majority of health centres, but that were being delivered at a much lower level by a proportion of health centres; and
- components of PHC centre systems that were relatively poorly developed.

The data show some health centres are doing very well in various aspects of ARF/RHD care, and it is important to acknowledge the good quality care provided by these services. However, there are a number of areas of care that are not being consistently delivered in some health centres. The evidence-practice gaps identified as priorities for improvement in Phase 1 are listed below. More detail on these and other parameters are presented in the Phase 1 [Data Supplement](#) and Appendix D.


The data and preliminary priorities were circulated to key stakeholders in a Phase 1 report. The data were presented as boxplots to show distribution of performance across health centres (Figure 3).




**Figure 3. How to read boxplots representing service delivery in 2012-2014**



The report was accompanied by an online survey that asked respondents to comment on the importance of each of the preliminary priorities; whether the number of priorities was about right, too many or too few; whether they aligned with priorities they were already aware of; and whether other priorities should be included. Approximately 50 people (17 individuals and 4 group responses on behalf of 33 people) provided input into the identification of priority evidence-practice gaps. The priority evidence-practice gaps, as confirmed by respondents, are shown below with relevant indicators from the Phase 1 report.

**Figure 4. Evidence Practice Gap priorities with a selection of representative indicators from Phase 1 report (n=health centres, patient records)**






All respondents stated that the evidence-practice gaps highlighted in Phase 1 were consistent with their views prior to reading the report.

### 5.3 Phase 2: Identifying barriers and enablers to addressing the priority evidence–practice gaps and strategies for improvement

In the second phase, we presented trend audit data (2008-2014: 2,581 audited records from 60 health centres) in boxplots to examine variation over time in key indicators relevant to the priority evidence-practice gaps (Figure 5). We asked respondents to focus on the trends in general over time, particularly whether the variation between health centres was getting less, and whether there was improvement for health centres at the lower end of the range. Table 3 summarises the trend data presented in the Phase 2 report (see [Data Supplement](#)).

Figure 5. How to read trend boxplots over years and cycles



**Table 3. Trends in key indicators of the priority evidence-practice gaps**

<p><b>Over years 2008-2014</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since 2008, there were clear improvements in the overall service delivery of ARF/RHD health care, particularly to 2012 (health centre mean delivery from 42% to 66%). The mean health centre delivery in 2014 was 54%.</li> <li>• There was no reduction in variation in service delivery between health centres.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Example indicator from Phase 2 report</b> <b>Overall service delivery to ARF/RHD clients*</b></p>
<p><b>Over at least three audit cycles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For health centres that completed three or more audit cycles for ARF/RHD health, there were improvements, albeit small, in the mean level of care according to best practice guidelines.</li> <li>• There was little evidence of narrowing in the variation between health centres over successive audit cycles.</li> </ul>	

We encouraged stakeholders to reflect on the influences underlying the data trends, and on their experience in PHC, to identify barriers and enablers to improvement. To assist this process, the Phase 2 report survey listed health centre, system and staff domains drawn from international and national research [7, 9, 10] that could present potential obstacles to improvement. Respondents were asked to rate each domain according to its relative importance in improving each of the priority evidence-practice gaps. Approximately 69 stakeholders (5 individuals and 4 group responses on behalf of approximately 64 people) provided input, representing the community-controlled and government health sectors, general practice and research organisations. Roles represented included nurses, doctors, public health physicians, policy officers, middle and senior management, researchers, ATSIHWs and CQI facilitators. We also drew on the qualitative comments from several Phase 1 survey respondents who identified barriers and enablers to improvement and/or strategies to address gaps.

In relation to respondents' assessment of current health centre systems, the areas with the greatest impact on quality of care are listed below. Appendix E has all responses.

\*Composite indicator includes up to nine best practice indicators present in the RHD audit tool: RHD classification recorded in health summary; record of current and complete ARF/RHD management plan; record of planned frequency of BPG injections (if client prescribed regular BPG injections); ≥80% of BPG injections received (if client prescribed regular injections and there is record of planned frequency); record of active recall if <80% of injections received; timely doctor and specialist review and echocardiogram (according to recommended schedule based on RHD classification); and record of client education (provided within the last 12 months).

### ***Finance and resources***

Most respondents disagreed that there were sufficient financial supports from government or health authorities to support best practice in ARF/RHD health care.

### ***Staffing/workforce support, recruitment and retention***

Most respondents indicated that there were inadequate numbers of staff in PHC services. In terms of staff roles, most agreed that there were inadequate numbers of ATSIHPs and administrative staff. In terms of support systems for recruitment and retention, respondents felt there were inadequate systems in relation to all types of staff (nursing, medical specialists, allied health workers and administrative staff), but in particular more work needed to be done to recruit and retain ATSIHPs.

### ***Training and development***

A majority of respondents indicated that there are insufficient systems to support inter-organisational and intra-organisational learning. Respondents identified the priority areas for staff training were patient centred care and, to a lesser extent, team work and self-management support.

### ***Teamwork***

The majority of respondents disagreed that that PHC staff function effectively in teams. There were mixed views that PHC staff are generally clear on their respective roles and trained to work effectively in teams.

### ***Self- management and patient-centred care***

A majority of respondents indicated there were inadequate systems to support all members of the PHC team to:

- understand the needs and aspirations of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities
- provide care that is respectful of and responsive to individual patient preferences, needs and values and that patient values guide all clinical decisions

Respondents indicated there were good self-management resources relevant to ARF/RHD care, though the need for more training in the principles of self-management as relevant to ARF/RHD was identified. Further training in providing patient centred care was highlighted as a need.

### ***Population health***

Most respondents indicated that systems were lacking for the purpose of ensuring PHC teams have a clear understanding of the size, diversity and key features of their service populations and to apply this knowledge in relation to the principles of population health.

### ***Quality improvement systems***

Most respondents agreed that there needs to be support available to health centre staff to interpret quality improvement data, plan and implement strategies for improvement.

### ***Community capacity, engagement and mobilisation***

Most respondents agreed that systems needed to be developed to enhance the health literacy of community members; enhance communities' expectations for quality with regards to best practice; and to build capacity of health care teams to develop partnership links with the community.

## ***Leadership and management***

Respondents agreed that there needed to be improved networks and regional coordination; and further support from managers to develop partnerships across the health sector to enhance delivery of best practice care.

## ***Staff attributes***

Most respondents believed that PHC staff generally know the content and objectives of best practice care and are aware of how to provide this care. Most respondents, however, indicated that due to completing demands staff have trouble focusing their attention to provide best practice care in ARF/RHD.

The qualitative responses on health centre system barriers and enablers included the need to develop systems to improve recruitment and retention of staff, especially ATSIHs. Short term employment contracts were perceived to impact negatively on motivation; lack of interest from staff in working to improve ARF/RHD care was identified. Low staff numbers at health centres result in staff being task driven and lacking time to take a more holistic approach to care. Perceived lack of support from specialists and lack of awareness of ARF/RHD best practice guidelines were also identified as barriers.

The ESP trend data show a small upward trend in overall delivery of ARF/RHD care for services who participated in three or more cycles of CQI. This suggests that a sustained commitment to CQI is an enabler for improving the quality of care. Continuing use of CQI will see improvements in the delivery of care for those services.

## **5.4 Strategies for addressing the priority evidence-practice gaps**

We presented a brief synthesis of published evidence on improving the quality of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC (Appendix F). The purpose of this 'evidence brief' was to stimulate feedback on strategies to overcome the identified barriers and strengthen enablers.

The strategies suggested for addressing the identified barriers reflect the need for interventions at different levels of the health system. These strategies present areas of opportunity for those developing PHC policy and interventions to develop barrier driven, tailored interventions to improve health outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. Our hope is that the suggested strategies will spark conversations and ideas on how to address the known barriers to care, and that these will lead to wide-scale action using multi-level strategies that take account of existing resources and activities, and respond to local and regional priorities.

Respondents suggested the following strategies to improve ARF/RHD care:

### *National level strategies*

- Establish a national data base of ARF/RHD patients to support BPG injection provision and disease management through better sharing of information across the health system. This would enable patients to receive care when not at their regular health service.
- Add a section about ARF/RHD to the annual health assessment (MBS 715)

### *Jurisdiction, regional or service level strategies*

- Provide options for delivery of injections - including outreach models
- Improve resources and systems for staff to be able to follow-up patients who require BPG injections
- Strengthen regional programs and partnerships to enable care for patients who move across jurisdictional boundaries

- Improve access to specialist and hospital services
- Use CQI data to inform planning and service delivery
- Advocate for housing and sanitation interventions to address the underlying causes of ARF/RHD
- Provide staff education on the importance of the injection schedule to manage ARF/RHD and best practice guidelines
- Provide staff training in social determinants of health and patient-centred care

#### *Health centre and community strategies*

- Provide community, patient and family education on the importance of receiving injections – suggestions ranged from one on one education to family focus groups and broader community education such as films in local language
- Establish a dedicated staff role with responsibility for RHD care
- Offer incentive awards for completion of injections
- Arrange an interpreter to assist in the discussions with patients as required
- Encourage accurate and complete recording of delivery of care in patients' notes
- Conduct regular chart audits using a CQI approach; use CQI data to inform planning and service delivery

It will be important to ensure the detailed design of strategies is based on published evidence and expert knowledge of approaches that support effective interventions for improving the quality of ARF/RHD care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and communities. Strategies implemented in community settings need to be developed and/or adapted by people with local knowledge. It will also be important to evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies in a range of contexts. If intervention efforts are documented appropriately, use of this theory-based process will assist with developing the knowledge base of what works and in what contexts to improve ARF/RHD care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

The ESP trend data show a small upward trend in overall delivery of ARF/RHD care for services who participated in three or more cycles of CQI. This suggests that a sustained commitment to CQI is an enabler for improving the quality of care. Continuing use of CQI will see improvements in the delivery of care for those services.

## 6 ESP Project strengths and limitations

The dataset used for the ESP Project is the most comprehensive and broad scale dataset relating to health centre performance available for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ARF/RHD care. As stated, the aggregate CQI data are from around 2,500 clinical records of patients from multiple services across several jurisdictions, audited against best practice over multiple audit cycles. From this evidence base, stakeholders were able to identify current priority evidence-practice gaps.

An open process was used to engage stakeholders, consistent with the principle that 'CQI is everybody's business'. Stakeholders could choose to participate in any or all project phases. However, the ESP project has relied, in part, on stakeholders sending reports to others, thus it has not been possible to accurately measure reach or response rates. Although the survey information from Phase 2 may be of relatively limited generalisability, the data on barriers and enablers and on strategies for improvement are valuable in that they reflect tacit knowledge of front-line health workers and others working within the health system. In recognition that barriers exist across multiple levels of the health sector, we included questions on broader health centre and system determinants of performance in the Phase 2 survey. These additional questions on influences on quality of care have not been validated in the way that has been done for other questions covering the theoretical domains framework.

Responses to surveys could be made as an individual or representing a group. We have actively encouraged the facilitation of group discussion and group responses.

An iterative process was used to develop and refine reports through the project phases, with adjustments to content and presentation made over time in response to stakeholder feedback. A concurrent developmental evaluation has guided process improvements in the ESP projects for ARF/RHD and other aspects of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC [11], in an effort to improve engagement and use of reports.

## **7 Conclusions**

To our knowledge, this is the first use of a large-scale aggregate CQI dataset beyond the regional level to enable a range of key stakeholders to identify priority gaps in delivery of best practice ARF/RHD care in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. The main purpose of ESP was to engage a variety of stakeholders in the use of aggregate CQI data and to stimulate conversation on priority areas for improvement and how best to achieve improvement. Implementation research suggests that interventions to achieve improvement should be focussed on the key barriers and enablers of good performance, and that such interventions are more likely produce the desired change.

We encourage stakeholders to take on the key messages and utilise the report, along with the aggregate CQI data, to implement and advocate for change at the local, regional and national level.

## References

1. Carapetis JR, McDonald M, Wilson NJ. Acute rheumatic fever. *Lancet* (London, England). 2005;366(9480):155-68. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673605668742>
2. Carapetis JR, Steer AC, Mulholland EK, Weber M. The global burden of group A streptococcal diseases. *The Lancet Infectious diseases*. 2005;5(11):685-94. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S147330990570267X>
3. AIHW. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Performance Framework 2006 report - detailed analysis. Canberra: AIHW, 2007 AIHW cat. no. IHW 20. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://www.aihw.gov.au/publication-detail/?id=6442467995>
4. Remenyi B, Carapetis J, Wyber R, Taubert K, Mayosi BM. Position statement of the World Heart Federation on the prevention and control of rheumatic heart disease. *Nature Reviews Cardiology*. 2013;10(5):284-92. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://www.nature.com/nrcardio/journal/v10/n5/full/nrcardio.2013.34.html>
5. French SD, Green SE, O'Connor DA, McKenzie JE, Francis JJ, Michie S, Buchbinder R, Schattner P, Spike N & Grimshaw JM (2012) Developing theory-informed behaviour change interventions to implement evidence into practice: a systematic approach using the Theoretical Domains Framework. *Implementation Science* 7(1):38. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://www.implementationscience.com/content/pdf/1748-5908-7-38.pdf>
6. Tugwell P, Robinson V, Grimshaw J & Santesso N (2006) Systematic reviews and knowledge translation. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 84(8):643-651. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/84/8/05-026658.pdf>
7. Huijg J, Gebhardt W, Crone M, Dusseldorp E & Pesseau J (2014) Discriminant content validity of a theoretical domains framework questionnaire for use in implementation research. *Implementation Science*. 9:11. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://www.implementationscience.com/content/pdf/1748-5908-9-11.pdf>
8. Michie S, Johnston M, Abraham C, Lawton R, Parker D & Walker A. (2005) Making psychological theory useful for implementing evidence based practice: a consensus approach. *Quality & Safety in Health Care* 14:26-33. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1743963/pdf/v014p00026.pdf>
9. Schierhout G, Hains J, Si D, et al. (2013) Evaluating the effectiveness of a multifaceted, multilevel continuous quality improvement program in primary health care: developing a realist theory of change. *Implementation Science*. 8:119. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://www.biomedcentral.com/content/pdf/1748-5908-8-119.pdf>
10. Wagner E, Austin B, Davis C, et al. A. (2001) Improving chronic illness care: translating evidence into action. *Health Affairs*. 20(6):64-78. (viewed 31 Mar 2016)  
<http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/20/6/64.full.pdf+html>
11. Laycock A, Bailie J, Matthews V and Bailie RS (2016). Interactive dissemination: engaging stakeholders in the use of aggregated quality improvement data for system-wide change in Australian Indigenous primary health care. *Frontiers in Public Health* 4:84. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2016.00084 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2016.00084>

## Appendix A: One21seventy data collection and reporting

**Where do the data in this report come from?** The report is based on analysis of audits of clinical records of clients with acute rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease who attend services that use One21seventy CQI tools AND participate in the ABCD National Research Partnership. The ARF/RHD audit tool was developed by an expert working group, with participation of RHD experts and health service staff. The tool is designed to enable services to assess their actual practice against best practice standards, and is accompanied by a protocol that includes reference to the guidelines and standards that form the basis of the tool (the reference list is included in Appendix B). The audit data are supported by a summary of system performance as assessed by staff in health centres that completed a systems assessment tool (SAT) related to RHD service delivery. Copies of the One21seventy ARF/RHD Audit Tool and how the audits are conducted are available on request.

**Who collects the audit and systems assessment data?** The clinical audits are generally done by health centre staff, trained in the use of One21seventy tools and supported by quality improvement facilitators and One21seventy staff. In some centres where staff are not available or lack skills or confidence the audits are done by CQI facilitators. The Systems Assessment is completed by health centre staff in a process that is facilitated by a CQI facilitator.

**How do health centres use the data?** The data collected through One21seventy CQI tools and entered into the One21seventy web-based information system are analysed and made available to health centres in real time for use in quality improvement processes. Reports of aggregated data for clusters of health centres, by region or by state are also available through the One21seventy web-based information system in order to support regional or state/territory level CQI efforts. The ESP Project is intended to contribute to enhancing the quality of reporting and use of aggregated CQI data for the purpose of service improvement.

**Restrictions and limitations on the data presented.** The data in this report are not expected to be representative of all health centres nationally or for specific jurisdictions because participation of health centres is either through self-selection or through regional decision making processes.

The data reflect what has been documented in electronic and paper based client records, depending on what record systems are used in each health centre. There has been a trend in recent years to increasing use of electronic records. Many health centres are still using paper-based systems, and some are using a mix of paper and electronic systems. The quality of recording of clinical care is variable in both paper and electronic systems, and the audit data may not provide a true reflection of actual care. We have no way of collecting data or reporting on services that are not recorded. Accurate and clear recording of care is an important aspect of quality of care and has important implications for continuity and coordination of care, for medico-legal purposes and for efficient use of resources.

**Criteria for inclusion of records in the audit:** To be eligible for inclusion in an ARF/RHD clinical audit, a client must: have a clear, documented history of definite or suspected diagnosis of either acute rheumatic fever or rheumatic heart disease; and have been a resident in the local community for six months or more in the last twelve months. Clients classified as Priority 4, with a history of ARF (but no RHD) for whom secondary prophylaxis has been ceased, are excluded as they do not require elements of care necessary for ARF/RHD for which the audit is intended. Where the eligible population is 30 clients or less, the audit protocol recommends including all records. Where the eligible population is greater than 30, the protocol provides guidance on the *random* selection of a number of records, with the number depending on the precision of estimates required by health service staff.

## Systems assessment data

The ABCD/One21seventy Systems Assessment Tool (SAT) has been developed to enable providers of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander primary health care services to undertake a structured assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of their systems to support best practice care. The SAT evolved from the Chronic Care Model and the associated Assessment of Chronic Illness Care (ACIC) tool and from the World Health Organization's (WHO) Innovative Care for Chronic Conditions (ICCC) Framework.

International experience has identified five key components of health systems to be effective across primary health care in improving the quality of care of clients with chronic illness (Table A1). These five components are incorporated into the SAT. Each component contains a number of items that health centre teams (managers and staff) discuss and come to a consensus about how well their systems are working. Each item is scored separately on a scale of 0-11. System component scores are derived from the average of the scores for each item within the system component. Higher scores reflect better function.

**Table A1: ABCD/One21seventy systems assessment tool components and items**

Components of systems	Items for each component
<p><b>Delivery system design</b> This component refers to the extent to which the design of the health centre's infrastructure, staffing profile and allocation of roles and responsibilities, client flow and care processes maximise the potential effectiveness of the centre.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team structure and function</li> <li>• Clinical leadership</li> <li>• Appointments and scheduling</li> <li>• Care planning</li> <li>• Systematic approach to follow-up</li> <li>• Continuity of care</li> <li>• Client access/cultural competence</li> <li>• Physical infrastructure, supplies and equipment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Information systems and decision support</b> This component refers to clinical and other information structures (including structures to support clinical decision making) and processes to support the planning, delivery and coordination of care.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance and use of electronic client list</li> <li>• Evidence-based guidelines</li> <li>• Specialist-generalist collaborations</li> </ul>
<p><b>Self-management support</b> This component refers to structures and processes that support clients and families to play a major role in maintaining their health, managing their health problems, and achieving safe and healthy environments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment and documentation</li> <li>• Self-management education and support, behavioural risk reduction and peer support.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Links with the community, other health services and other services and resources</b> This component refers to the extent to which the health centre uses external linkages to inform service planning, links clients to outside resources, works out in the community, and contributes to regional planning and resource development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication and cooperation on governance and operation of the health centre and other community-based organisations and programs</li> <li>• Linking health centre clients to outside resources</li> <li>• Working out in the community</li> <li>• Communication and cooperation on regional health planning and development of health resources.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Organisational influence and integration</b> This component refers to the use of organisational influence to create a culture and support organisational structures and processes that promote safe, high quality care; and how well all the system components are integrated across the centre.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organisational commitment</li> <li>• Quality improvement strategies</li> <li>• Integration of health system components.</li> </ul>

## Appendix B: Overview of the ESP Project

### **Phase 1 – Evidence-practice gaps**

This phase focuses on the identification of priority areas for improvement (priority evidence-practice gaps) in the delivery of ARF/RHD care in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC.

#### **Information provided to participants**

1. aggregated CQI data (2012-2014) about the delivery of care presented in national and State/Territory reports
2. preliminary priority areas for improvement, based on national data

#### **Feedback/data collection**

Online survey, workshop sessions and email responses.

#### **Outputs**

Draft report on preliminary priority evidence-practice gaps in best practice care. Refinements based on stakeholder feedback and survey data will be incorporated into Phase 2 report.

### **Phase 2 – Barriers and enablers to addressing gaps and strategies for improvement**

This phase focuses on trends in indicators relevant to the identified priority evidence-practice gaps, and on influences that may enable or hinder improvement at different points in the health system. In particular, it seeks to:

1. identify those factors that may be most important in addressing the identified priority evidence-practice gaps in best practice care identified in Phase 1.
2. identify new or existing strategies that could be introduced or strengthened to enable improvement in priority evidence-practice gaps.

#### **Information provided to participants**

- Report on trends over time for key indicators relevant to priority evidence-practice gaps in best practice care.
- An evidence brief synthesising findings from research about barriers, enablers and strategies for improvement in the delivery of PHC, with particular attention to research in the Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health context.

#### **Feedback/data collection**

Online survey, including questions about barriers and enablers to improvement based on international, national and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-specific evidence and frameworks.

Participants will be encouraged to draw on their own experience, the evidence brief and the data presented throughout the project to identify strategies to address priority evidence-practice gaps.

#### **Outputs**

Draft report on barriers and enablers to improvement in care relevant to identified priority evidence-practice gaps and identified strategies for improvement, based on responses to the online questionnaire. The draft report will be returned to participants for review.

### **Review and final report**

A draft report on strategies for improvement will be returned to participants for review. Comments from the review will be used to inform a final report on strategies for improvement in identified priority-evidence practice gaps. This final report will be provided to key stakeholders in all participating jurisdictions. Project findings will be reported in academic journals and in conference presentations and workshops.

## Appendix C: Survey respondents

	Phase 1		Phase 2	
	Individual responses	Group responses	Individual responses	Group responses
<b>Number of responses</b>	17	4	5	4
<b>Number of attendees per group (recorded attendees in group)</b>				
Less than 5		2		1
5 to 10		1		-
11 to 20		-		-
More than 20		1		3
<b>Jurisdictions of interest for respondents*</b>				
National	0		1	
ACT	0		0	
NSW	1		0	
Queensland	5		2	
NT	12		4	
SA	2		1	
WA	2		4	
Victoria	0		0	
Tasmania	0		0	
<b>Rurality of population group to which responses relate*</b>				
Urban	12		3	
Regional	12		5	
Remote	20		7	
<b>Number of group responses to question about Indigenous status</b>				
All		0		2
Majority (more than half)		1		2
Minority (less than half)		2		
None		1		

<b>Number of individual responses identified as Indigenous</b>				
Indigenous	1		0	
Non Indigenous	16		5	
Not stated	0		0	
<b>Position types</b>				
Nurse	3	3	1	1
Middle Manager	0	2	0	0
Doctor	2	1	1	1
Public Health Physician	2	0	0	0
Other Medical Specialist	3	1	0	1
Senior Management/executive	0	1	0	1
CQI facilitator	1	2	0	0
Board member	0	0	0	0
Policy officer	0	1	0	0
Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Practitioner	1	3	0	2
Research/Academic	3	1	0	1
Other	2	1	3	2
<b>Organisation types</b>				
Community controlled health centre	6	2	1	2
Community controlled peak body	1	0	0	0
Government health centre	3	0	0	2
Government health department	7	1	3	0
Medicare Local	2	1	0	0
General Practice	0	0	0	0
University/Research organisation	4	0	0	1
Other	0	0	1	1

\*Numbers may not tally with total number of respondents as respondents were able to select multiple answers

## Appendix D: Responses to phase 1 survey on relative importance of gaps

Respondents were asked to rank the relative importance of the identified evidence-practice gaps on a scale of 1-10, where 10 is the most important and 1 is least important.

**Table D1: Ranking by respondents of the most important gaps to address, scored 7 – 10.**

Priority evidence-practice gaps	% and n
Increase uptake of planned BPG injections to 80% or more for all clients who are prescribed injections.	100%(21/21)
Record of follow-up action if BPG injections <80% of planned frequency	100%(20/20)
Improve disease management planning	95%(20/21)
Improve recording of key information related to delivery of BPG injections, such as planned frequency of BPG injections, current prescriptions and clinic master charts	95%(20/21)
Improve levels of recording ARF diagnoses (including suspected ARF)	90%(19/21)
Strengthen efforts to provide interventions for clients who have ARF despite adequate injection delivery.	90%(19/21)
Improve the practice and recording of rheumatic fever education for all clients.	90%(18/20)

Note 1: Total responses represent the number of responses entered; it includes 4 groups.

Note 2: Provision of advice on nutrition and physical activity - This evidence-practice gap was identified in the first phase as a preliminary priority. It was not included in the survey for stakeholders to rank its relative importance.

## Appendix E: Responses to Phase 2 survey on barriers and enablers to addressing priority evidence-practice gaps in ARF/RHD care

Table E1: Responses regarding the extent to which health centre and system attributes present barriers or enablers to addressing priority evidence-practice gaps

		Strongly Disagree	Partly Disagree	Partly Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No. of respondents
Within the socio-political context, there is sufficient financial support (e.g., from local/regional health authorities, government) to support best practice in ARF/RHD health care as relevant to the priority evidence-practice gaps		2	3	3	1	0	9
PHC facilities are generally of adequate, size, design, and condition		2	3	2	2	0	9
PHC facilities generally have adequate equipment		1	3	2	2	0	8
PHC centres generally have adequate numbers of staff		4	3	1	1	0	9
PHC centres generally have appropriate numbers of each of the following categories of staff	Nurses	2	2	3	1	0	8
	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Health Workers	6	1	1	1	0	9
	Doctors (GPs)	3	0	5	1	0	9
	Medical specialists	3	2	3	1	0	9
	Allied health workers	3	2	3	0	1	9
	Administrative staff	3	3	2	1	0	9
There are good systems in place to ensure PHC staff have support from experienced staff, especially when health centres are affected by turnover of staff and staff shortages		5	3	0	0	1	9
There are good systems in place to recruit, retain and support each of the following categories of staff (full time or visiting) as integral members of PHC teams.	Nurses	3	3	1	0	2	9
	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Health Workers	6	0	1	0	2	9
	Doctors (GPs)	4	2	1	0	2	9
	Medical specialists	3	2	2	0	2	9
	Allied health workers	3	3	1	0	2	9
	Administrative staff	3	2	1	1	2	9
PHC staff function effectively in teams		1	5	1	1	1	9
PHC staff are generally clear about their roles in relation to other members of the PHC team		1	3	2	1	2	9
PHC staff are trained to work effectively in teams		2	1	2	1	3	9

	Strongly Disagree	Partly Disagree	Partly Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No. of respondents
There are good systems in place to support staff development, including the development of knowledge and skills required	2	4	2	0	1	9
There are good systems in place to support inter-organisational and intra-organisational learning	3	2	1	0	3	9
Staff are well trained in the principles of client self-management as relevant to ARF/RHD health care	2	3	2	1	1	9
There are good self-management resources that are relevant to ARF/RHD health care available to PHC staff	1	1	3	2	2	9
There are good systems in place to support all members of PHC teams in understanding the needs and aspirations of people living in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities for the purpose of providing best practice ARF/RHD health care	4	2	2	0	0	8
There are good systems in place to support all members of PHC teams to provide care that is respectful of and responsive to individual patient preferences, needs, and values, and ensuring that patient values guide all clinical decisions	4	4	0	0	0	8
There are good systems in place to train all members of PHC teams in providing patient-centred care for people living in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities	5	1	2	0	0	8
There are good systems in place to ensure PHC teams have a clear understanding of the size, diversity and other key features of their service populations and to apply this knowledge	3	3	1	0	1	8
There are good systems in place to ensure PHC teams are able to apply the principles of population health	2	4	1	0	1	8
There are good systems in place to ensure PHC teams staff are well trained in the principles of population health	3	3	1	0	1	8
Best practice guidelines and other decision support resources are available to PHC staff	0	2	2	3	1	8
PHC staff are adequately trained to use the available best practice guidelines and other decision support resources	2	2	2	1	1	8
The clinical information systems and communication technology in place have the functionality to support provision of best practice care	4	1	2	1	0	8
PHC staff are trained and effectively supported to use clinical information systems and communication technology for supporting and providing best practice	2	4	2	0	0	8
There are good quality improvement tools available in health centres for supporting and improving delivery of best practice care	1	3	1	1	2	8
There are good processes in place to support health centre staff to interpret quality improvement data, plan and implement strategies for improvement	3	2	1	0	2	8

	Strongly Disagree	Partly Disagree	Partly Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No. of respondents
PHC staff are adequately trained to use quality improvement tools and resources for supporting and improving delivery of best practice care	2	2	1	0	2	7
Managers are adequately trained to support effective use of quality improvement tools and resources for monitoring and enhancing delivery of best practice care	4	0	2	0	2	8
There is good local ownership by PHC staff of CQI data and CQI processes for supporting and improving delivery of best practice care	4	1	1	0	2	8
Managers provide clear and appropriate support for effective use of quality improvement tools and resources by PHC staff for monitoring and enhancing delivery of best practice care	4	1	1	0	2	8
PHC staff generally believe that CQI data and CQI processes can be used for supporting and improving delivery of best practice	2	3	1	0	2	8
There are good systems in place to increase the expectation of community members with regard to best practice care	5	1	0	1	1	8
There are good systems in place to strengthen community leadership for quality with regard to best practice	5	1	1	0	1	8
There are good systems in place to enhance the health literacy of community members with regard to best practice care	4	1	1	0	1	7
There are good systems in place to build the capability and to support PHC staff to develop effective links to work in partnership with the communities they serve in providing best practice care	4	2	1	0	0	7
There is good clinical and management leadership at the regional, state, national level for supporting and providing best practice	2	2	2	1	1	8
There are good networks and regional coordination between parties involved in supporting and providing best practice	3	3	0	1	1	8
Managers actively support the development of partnerships across the health sector for the purpose of enhancing delivery of best practice care	3	3	1	0	1	8

**Note: PHC, primary health care; CQI, continuous quality improvement. Group responses are counted as one respondent.**

**Table E2: Responses regarding the extent to which primary health care staff attributes present barriers or enablers to addressing priority evidence-practice gaps**

	Strongly Disagree	Partly Disagree	Partly Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No. of respondents
PHC staff know the content and objectives of best practice care	1	1	5	0	1	8
PHC staff are aware of how to provide best practice care in ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres	1	2	4	1	0	8
PHC staff have the skills to provide best practice care in ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	1	3	4	0	0	8
PHC staff recognise that it is their professional responsibility to provide best practice care in ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander	1	2	3	1	1	8
PHC staff are confident in their ability to provide best practice care in ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	3	1	3	0	1	8
With regard to providing best practice care in ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, PHC staff are optimistic about the future	2	2	3	0	1	8
PHC staff believe that if they provide best practice care in ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, it will have benefits for the health of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people more generally at a population level	1	1	4	1	1	8
PHC staff believe that if they provide best practice care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people it will have disadvantages for their relationships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	2	1	3	1	1	8
How strong is the intention of PHC staff to provide best practice care in ARF/RHD health care every day to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people attending their services <i>Note response options: Not strong at all; Quite strong; Mostly strong; Always very strong; Don't know</i>	2	3	2	0	1	8
How often do PHC staff remember to provide best practice care in ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people <i>Note response options: Never; Occasionally; Often; Always; Don't know</i>	0	5	2	0	1	8
PHC staff believe that when they need to concentrate to provide best practice care in ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, they have no trouble focusing their attention	2	3	2	0	1	8
Most people of influence in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC services are seen by primary health care staff to support the provision of best practice care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	1	4	2	0	1	8
Are PHC staff who provide ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people currently able to enjoy their normal day-to-day work activities? <i>Note response options: Never; Occasionally; Often; Always; Don't know</i>	0	2	1	1	4	8
Do PHC staff who currently provide ARF/RHD health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people feel unhappy, anxious or depressed about their work? <i>Note response options: Never; Occasionally; Often; Always; Don't know</i>	0	2	2	1	3	8

**Note: PHC, primary health care; CQI, continuous quality improvement. Group responses are counted as one respondent.**

## Appendix F: Evidence Brief

# Improving the quality of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander primary health care

## What the research shows

This draft evidence brief has been prepared for the 'Engaging Stakeholders in Identifying Evidence-Practice Gaps and Strategies for Improvement in Primary Health Care (ESP)' project. You are invited to provide feedback to refine the brief, using the online project questionnaire.

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander primary health care (PHC) sector has embraced continuous quality improvement (CQI) as a way of improving the overall quality of care delivered to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians, in order to **improve health outcomes**. This evidence brief presents an overview of findings from local and international research about **barriers, enablers and strategies** for using CQI to make improvements in PHC quality.

Local research has reflected the diversity and complexity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC delivery – geographic diversity, remote-rural-urban health care settings and community-controlled, government, non-government or private providers. Data have been gathered in settings in which political, cultural, social, educational, technological, emotional and ideological factors interact in complex ways. Despite this diversity and complexity, there are some common messages from the research findings, which are supported by international literature about CQI.

### Who is this evidence brief for?

Primary health care policy makers, managers, clinical governance groups. The information will also interest providers and practitioners.

## Key messages

- Don't wait for perfect data before commencing CQI. Even where good quality data on care processes are not consistently available at the start, the use of data in CQI cycles can act as a catalyst for improved data quality. Meanwhile, invest in developing good health centre systems and staff skills in using data.
- Emphasise use of CQI data for improving care for patients and populations. Practical use of CQI data helps to motivate clinicians and managers to participate in CQI.
- Design improvement strategies to suit local conditions – or adapt strategies that are working successfully in similar settings.
- Build on staff skills and strengths to implement improvement strategies. Share success stories and information about CQI between health centres to enable learning between peers.
- Work on developing a common vision and culture for CQI. Address any underlying organisational leadership and management issues that may detract from implementing CQI.
- Empower Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff and managers to lead, participate in and promote CQI, to ensure improvement strategies match local population and community needs.
- Invest in developing leadership for CQI at each level of the system.
- Use system-wide approaches to integrate CQI across the whole system. Use CQI processes to achieve large-scale change.

**Don't wait for perfect data before commencing CQI. Even where good quality data on care processes are not consistently available at the start, the use of data in CQI cycles can act as a catalyst for improved data quality. Meanwhile, invest in developing good health centre systems and staff skills in using data.**

In PHC generally, clinical information systems are often poor and fragmented. Policy makers may therefore find it difficult to access consistent and broad scale data on relative need, priorities, performance and quality of care. In addition, there is limited focus and capability at various levels of the system to manage, interpret and use data for the purpose of improving system performance<sup>1</sup>, and skills in the use of data to inform improvements in service delivery appear highly variable across all levels of the health system<sup>2,3</sup>.

The quality of data is important. Technical advancements (electronic patient information and recall systems, tools, guides, practice standards) can make CQI processes easier and quicker, but if CQI data are perceived to be inaccurate it will not be credible<sup>4,5</sup>. At the health centre level, there is evidence that the quality of health system data can be improved by staff carrying out audits of client records<sup>4</sup>.

Competing pressures and perceptions about unreasonable workloads, poor resources and support are often seen as barriers to CQI in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health centres. Staffing constraints influence capacity to deliver guideline-scheduled care – or to make improvements in care. Health centres able to sustain performance in the face of high staff turnover tend to have strong regional support systems together with commitment to good health centre systems<sup>6</sup>.

**Emphasise use of CQI data for improving care for patients and populations. Practical use of CQI data helps to motivate clinicians and managers to participate in CQI.**

For CQI to work successfully, staff need to value the use of data for improvement purposes and believe they can influence change<sup>6</sup>. Local staff increase their support for CQI when they see demonstrated improvements in care and clinical outcomes for clients. Hands-on auditing and participation in feedback and planning sessions by nurses and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander practitioners also increases staff support<sup>2,4</sup>.

Many staff in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC have enthusiasm and a sense of urgency to improve health outcomes<sup>4</sup>. In remote areas in particular, staff may also have a sense of burden and hopelessness (due to long work hours and lack of apparent improvement in health and social determinants) that can lead to clinical inertia. Quality improvement initiatives have been demonstrated to boost morale in these contexts, because they can demonstrate that the hard work is producing results<sup>4,6</sup>.

**Design improvement strategies to suit local conditions – or adapt strategies that are working successfully in similar settings.**

There is strong evidence that improving the quality of care requires a good match between the conditions or context for care delivery, and the strategies used to achieve improvement<sup>7</sup>. Decision makers need to consider **what works, for whom, under what conditions** when planning for improvement. A one-size-fits-all approach is unlikely to be successful. However, successful strategies for improvement may require taking on the core elements of a proven product or strategy and adapting the way it is presented or used locally<sup>8</sup>.

Adaptability is important in large-scale application of strategies for improvement; however the underpinning logic of a new product or strategy should be made explicit, so implementers understand the core that should not be compromised. In addition, problem-solving suggestions may help implementers make adaptations for the local context<sup>9</sup>. This approach may help policy makers and program managers to meet the dual challenges of supporting large-scale

implementation of best practice, while also enabling local decision making and tailoring to specific needs.

**Build on staff skills and strengths to implement improvement strategies. Share success stories and information about CQI between health centres to enable learning between peers.**

Strategies for improvement need to build on the skills and attributes of the existing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC workforce. Staff need to be involved in completing the latter steps of CQI cycles in order to strengthen the interpretation of data, but also to go beyond focusing only on data or specific indicators to define and act on systemic problems, including through group interpretation and community consultation<sup>3</sup>. The ability to work and communicate effectively in cross- and inter-cultural settings is a critical component of the skills and attributes needed to achieve improvements<sup>10,11</sup>.

CQI networks and training events are important opportunities to build relationships, share CQI knowledge and learn practical information about 'what works' from others<sup>2,3</sup>. The remote location and geographic dispersion of many health centres serving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations mean that staff tend to value opportunities to connect through CQI and to form CQI networks<sup>6</sup>.

### **How evidence was identified**

We drew evidence from the ABCD program of work and other publications on CQI in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC, then extended our search to include relevant national and international literature about implementation of CQI and innovations in PHC.

**Work on developing a common vision and culture for CQI. Address any underlying organisational leadership and management issues that may detract from implementing CQI.**

Effective and sustained quality improvement needs a shared understanding of the purpose of CQI and a common vision shared by multiple stakeholders. CQI needs to be embedded into the day to day work of front-line health workers, clinical leaders and managers through routines and relationships that function across and between organisations<sup>4</sup>.

What helps to develop a culture of quality improvement?

- Top and middle managers aligned in their CQI vision and goals.
- Commitment to workforce development, with management and staff participation in CQI training at all levels of an organisation.
- Strong team orientation and 'no blame' culture.
- Active management of CQI (e.g., dedicated CQI facilitators, regular progress reviews)
- Use and promotion of small scale projects that demonstrate change is possible and which, if successful and appropriate, may be scaled up across the health system.
- Willingness to embrace change and initiative<sup>4,5,12,13</sup>.

Organisations with a strong CQI culture treat barriers such as funding or staff shortages as motivators for CQI. Instead of being viewed as 'extra work', CQI is seen as 'a way of working smarter and making jobs easier'. Disruptions such as restructuring or disease outbreaks can slow CQI work, but can also be used as a platform to apply CQI approaches in responding to the issue<sup>13</sup>.

Where there is a culture of CQI, staff values are more likely to align with best practice in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC<sup>1</sup>.

Where there is poor management, uncertainty and confusion over roles, staff are discouraged and place less value on their data. Interventions to tackle unfavourable service delivery conditions need to be developed alongside CQI implementation<sup>6</sup>.

Poor support for collaboration for CQI can lead to competitiveness, fatigue, staff who feel disillusioned with CQI and lack of cooperation. Identifying health centres with similar conditions and working to build adequate trust for networking might help staff believe they can influence change<sup>6</sup>.

**Empower Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff and managers to lead, participate in and promote CQI, to ensure improvement strategies match local population and community needs.**

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leadership in CQI is most important<sup>4,5,14</sup>, for example, through active involvement of community health boards or Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff and managers committed to CQI. This leadership for CQI can help ensure the 'cultural, linguistic and practical relevance of health care and population health services'<sup>14</sup>.

When planning or implementing strategies for change, the risk of overlooking cultural and historical influences on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health care contexts is reduced where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health practitioners actively lead or are engaged in CQI initiatives. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health practitioners' involvement in clinical care and CQI processes is important in influencing the extent to which CQI processes result in improvements in delivery of guideline-scheduled services<sup>15</sup>.

In Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander settings the credibility of a strategy for improvement is likely to be influenced by who makes the decision to adopt a particular strategy, and how that decision is made<sup>10,16</sup>.

**Invest in developing leadership for CQI at each level of the system.**

Leadership for improving the quality of care is needed at all levels of the health system to guide, support and facilitate CQI efforts<sup>4,5,7,13</sup>. Leaders for

CQI are not necessarily in management roles; 'distributed' leadership with leadership functions vested in 'a set of people who can collectively perform them' is effective<sup>12</sup>. Shared responsibility and control of CQI by local staff as well as area/regional and jurisdiction managers is important for successful and sustainable CQI in health systems<sup>5,17</sup>.

The attitudes of leaders and managers within the health system towards CQI can influence how clinic staff respond<sup>4,13</sup>. If management or reporting requirements are focused more on using data for accountability than to drive improvements in care, other managers and staff are likely to be suspicious of CQI and perceive it as 'checking up'<sup>3-5</sup>.

**Use system-wide approaches to integrate CQI across the whole system. Use CQI processes to achieve large-scale change.**

The Australian health system operates at three levels; the service and health centre level (individual organisations), the regional level (regional and state/territory health bodies, community-controlled peak bodies, general practice networks), and the national level (nationwide policies and programs, accreditation and regulatory regimes)<sup>18</sup>. At each level, multiple factors influence the context in which improvement might take place. What happens at each level is partly dependent on, and influences, what happens at other levels. So achieving large-scale improvement in the quality of care is likely to require specific attention at each level of the health system<sup>7</sup>.

Mechanisms needed to support improvement at the upper levels of the system are often overlooked. Large-scale change may require a package of interventions and long term 'institution-building' for regional and national level organisations to adapt to new ways of functioning<sup>19</sup>.

Building a system wide and sustainable approach to CQI across Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander PHC centres requires certain and sustained funding<sup>3,5</sup>. Dedicated funding has resulted in measurable improvement outcomes in service delivery, often achieved by allocating responsibility for CQI processes to a particular staff member and/or establishing regional quality

systems<sup>5,6,15</sup>. Resources invested in CQI facilitator roles enable health centres to move to a higher level of capability and capacity in CQI<sup>3</sup>.

Applied system-wide, integrated CQI uses multi-site, multi-faceted approaches that reflect the enablers described by the evidence and aim to achieve change at various levels of the system. In successfully integrated CQI models, CQI programs are: part of core business (rather than an add-on or one-off project); engage front-line workers, clinical leaders, and managers in CQI processes; distribute leadership for CQI across the whole

health system; use CQI processes and tools to address multiple enablers of good quality care, and; use data from different stakeholders at different levels of relevant organisations to understand and inform broader system level performance<sup>17,20,21</sup>.

A **Partnership Learning Model**<sup>20</sup> illustrates how large-scale change can lead to improved Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population health outcomes, through the interaction of comprehensive PHC, integrated CQI, system-based research networks, and system-based participatory action research. In its development and application through the ABCD National Research Partnership (2010-2014), the model showed potential for achieving wide-scale engagement of researchers, practitioners, managers, and policy makers in efforts to scale-up and spread effective quality improvement programs. It provides mechanisms to build or strengthen the capacity of a health system to continually work towards improving its performance.

### For more information

Contact the ABCD National Research Partnership.

**email:** [ABCD@menzies.edu.au](mailto:ABCD@menzies.edu.au)

**phone:** 07 3169 4201

**website:** [www.menzies.edu.au/abcd](http://www.menzies.edu.au/abcd)

**Prepared by:** Alison Laycock and Jenny Brands

**Acknowledgements:** ESP team input from Ross Bailie, Gill Schierhout, Jodie Bailie, Anna Sheahan, Veronica Matthews and Cynthia Croft.

**Date:** March 2014

## References for the evidence brief

1. Baillie R., Griffin J., Laycock A., Kelaher M., McNeair T., Percival N., & Schierhout G. (2013). Sentinel Sites Evaluation: A place-based evaluation of the Indigenous Chronic Disease Package 2010-2012. Summary Report. Menzies School of Health Research for the Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing, Canberra.
2. Riley W.J., Parsons H.M., Duffy G.L., Moran J.W. & Henry B. (2010). Realizing transformational change through quality improvement in public health. *Journal of Public Health Management Practice* 16(1): 72-8.
3. Allen and Clarke (2013). Evaluation of the Northern Territory Continuous Quality Improvement Investment Strategy. Summary Report. Department of Health, Canberra.
4. Gardner K.L., Dowden M., Togni S. & Baillie R. (2010). Understanding uptake of continuous quality improvement in Indigenous primary health care: lessons from a multi-site case study of the Audit and Best Practice for Chronic Disease project. *Implement Science* 5: 21.
5. Wise M., Angus S., Harris E. & Parker S. (2013). National Appraisal of Continuous Quality improvement Initiatives in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Primary Health Care. The Lowitja Institute, Melbourne.
6. Schierhout G., Hains J., Si D., Kennedy C., Cox R., Kwedza R., O'Donoghue L., Fittock M., Brands J. & Loneragan K. (2013). Evaluating the effectiveness of a multifaceted, multilevel continuous quality improvement program in primary health care: developing a realist theory of change. *Implement Science* 8(1): 119.
7. Kaplan H.C., Provost L.P., Froehle C.M. & Margolis P.A. (2012). The Model for Understanding Success in Quality (MUSIQ): building a theory of context in healthcare quality improvement. *BMJ Quality & Safety* 21: 13-20.
8. Greenhalgh T., Robert G., Macfarlane F., Bate P. & Kyriakidou O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: systematic review and recommendations. *Milbank Quarterly* 82(4): 581-629.
9. Bauman L.J., Stein R.E. & Ireys H.T. (1991). Reinventing fidelity: the transfer of social technology among settings. *American Journal of Psychology* 19(4): 619-639.
10. Brands J., Monson-Wilbraham I., Gall A. & Silburn K. (2013). Implementation of innovations in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health care: a review of the literature. Unpublished.
11. Wilson A. (2012). Addressing uncomfortable issues: The role of White health professionals in Aboriginal health. Adelaide, Flinders University.
12. Best A., Greenhalgh T., Lewis S., Saul J.E., Carroll S. & Bitz J. (2012). Large-System Transformation in Health Care: A Realist Review. *Milbank Quarterly* 90(3): 421-456.
13. Davis M.V., Mahanna E., Joly B., Zelek M., Riley W., Verma P. & Fisher J.S. (2014). Creating Quality Improvement Culture in Public Health Agencies. *American Journal of Public Health* 104(1): E98-E104.
14. Lloyd J.E., Wise M.J. & Weeramanthri T. (2008). Changing shape: workforce and the implementation of Aboriginal health policy. *Australian Health Review* 32(1): 174-185.
15. Schierhout G., Brands J. & Baillie R. (2010). Audit and Best Practice for Chronic Disease Extension Project, 2005-2009: Final Report. The Lowitja Institute, Melbourne.
16. Australian Institute for Primary Care (2010). Evaluation of the Cooperative Research Centre for Aboriginal Health. Unpublished report.
17. Powell A.E., Rushmer R.K. & Davies H.T.O. (2009). A systematic narrative review of quality improvement models in health care, Social Dimensions of Health Institute, University of Dundee & St Andrews.
18. Phillips C.B., Pearce C.M., Hall S., Travaglia J., Lusignan S.D., Love T. & Kljakovic M. (2010). Can clinical governance deliver quality improvement in Australian general practice and primary care? A systematic review of the evidence. *Medical Journal of Australia* 193(10): 602-607.
19. Ovreteit J. (2011). Widespread focused improvement: lessons from international health for spreading specific improvements to health services in high-income countries. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 23(3): 239-246.
20. Baillie R., Matthews V., Brands J. & Schierhout G. (2013). A systems-based partnership learning model for strengthening primary healthcare. *Implementation Science* 8(1): 143.
21. Minkman M., Ahaus K. & Huijsman R. (2007). Performance improvement based on integrated quality management models: what evidence do we have? A systematic literature review. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 19(2): 90-104.