



Getting Started Kit: Governance Leadership

How-to Guide

5 Million Lives Campaign

We invite you to join the 5 Million Lives Campaign, a national initiative to dramatically improve the quality of American health care. The Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI) and its partners seek to engage thousands of U.S. hospitals in an effort to reduce harm for five million American patients between December 2006 and December 2008. This ambitious work builds upon the great energy and commitment shown by hospitals during the 100,000 Lives Campaign, a national, IHI-led initiative that focused on reducing unnecessary mortality and ran from December 2004 to June 2006. Complete details, including materials, contact information for experts, and web discussions, are on the web at <http://www.ihl.org/IHI/Programs/Campaign/>.

This document is in the public domain and may be used and reprinted without permission provided appropriate reference is made to the Institute for Healthcare Improvement.

This How-to Guide is dedicated to the memory of David R. Calkins, MD, MPP (May 27, 1948 – April 7, 2006) -- physician, teacher, colleague, and friend -- who was instrumental in developing the Campaign's science base. David was devoted to securing the clinical underpinnings of this work, and embodied the Campaign's spirit of optimism and shared learning. His tireless commitment and invaluable contributions will be a lifelong inspiration to us all.

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

Campaign Donors

The Institute for Healthcare Improvement extends its sincere gratitude to the distinguished group of individuals, foundations, and companies whose generous contributions support the 5 Million Lives Campaign:

Cardinal Health Foundation
Blue Shield of California Foundation
Aetna Foundation
Baxter International, Inc.
Abbott Laboratories

The 100,000 Lives Campaign, on which our current work builds, was generously supported by:

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts
Cardinal Health Foundation
Rx Foundation
Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation
The Colorado Trust
Blue Shield of California Foundation
The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Baxter International, Inc.
The Leeds Family
David Calkins Memorial Fund

Contributors

The work of several leading organizations has informed the development of this guide. These include: Center for Healthcare Governance, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Estes Park Institute, Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, National Center for Healthcare Leadership, National Quality Forum, The Governance Institute

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

“I think that we should declare 2007 ‘The Year of Governance’ and start to put back on the table of the boards not just a request, but an absolute sense of obligation, that learning who does better and then doing at least that well is central to proper stewardship of health care. Until leaders own that problem, I don’t think spread is going to happen. The buck stops in the board room.”

--“An Interview with Donald Berwick,” *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* (2006;32(12):666)

“Leaders are responsible for everything in the organization, especially everything that goes wrong.”

--Paul O’Neill, Former Secretary of the Treasury and Chairman and CEO of Alcoa

Goal:

Boards of Trustees in all hospitals will undertake the six key activities to improve quality and reduce harm in their hospitals recommended in this Guide (pp. 14-19). At a minimum, boards should start by spending more than 25% of their meeting time on quality and safety issues and conducting, as a full board, a conversation with at least one patient, or family member of a patient, who sustained serious harm at their institution within the last year.

Introduction: A New Kind of Intervention

After the first 18 months of the 100,000 Lives Campaign (December 2004-June 2006), the team at the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI) paused to study the participating hospitals that had the most success over the course of the initiative. We wanted to learn more about those facilities that had introduced Rapid Response Teams and seen precipitous drops in codes outside of the ICU; we wanted to understand the clinical insights and operational breakthroughs that had allowed other organizations to go more than a year without a single ventilator-associated pneumonia or central-line infection.

5 Million Lives Campaign

How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

In hospitals across the country, we uncovered innovations and local adaptations for each of the six 100,000 Lives Campaign interventions (documented in detail in the “Tips and Tricks” sections of the updated How-to Guides for each). We also noticed several core characteristics of facilities whose work was outstanding, no matter what intervention they were trying to introduce. These exceptional hospitals seemed to have created an organizational context better able to support change of any kind, whether it involved providing reliable care for acute myocardial infarction, reducing adverse drug events through effective medication reconciliation, or introducing other best practices to make patients safer and care more trustworthy. These highest-achieving organizations shared in common a small set of foundational properties, including clear aim-setting and prioritization, transparent measurement, investment in building quality improvement capacity, and mindfulness of the role that every stakeholder in the care process has in driving improvement. These common elements were the basis for our previously issued How-to Guide on [“Running a Successful Campaign in Your Hospital,”](#) and what we learned from this research molded our thinking about senior leadership, itself, as we designed the 5 Million Lives Campaign.

We were also informed by the innovative work of a number of national and regional associations and agencies seeking to determine essential executive and board activities to help hospitals and health care systems deliver care with the quality characteristics explored by the Institute of Medicine in its seminal report, *Crossing the Quality Chasm*. Our driving question is clear and important: What is the proper role of the people at the senior-most levels of the organization in the pursuit of better quality? How can senior leaders and boards exert the greatest positive influence on change?

As we move forward in the 5 Million Lives Campaign, an extraordinarily ambitious effort to radically reduce patient injuries in American hospitals, we have decided to augment our six original and five new clinical interventions (11 in total) with an intervention of a different type—a non-clinical intervention—that focuses on one of the most crucial attributes of those organizations that have demonstrated the greatest, sustained

progress in patient safety: *deeply engaged leadership, starting with the Board of Trustees.*

Background: The Power of Engaged Leadership and Governance

One primary function of senior leaders in health care is to support their “followers” in developing behaviors, skills, habits, processes, and technologies that lead reliably to dramatically improved performance. This influence has elements of both “push” (making the status quo uncomfortable) and “pull” (making the future attractive). IHI’s previously published [Framework for Leadership Improvement](#) suggests five core leadership activities relevant to improvement:

1. **Establish the Mission, Vision, and Strategy** as a “relentless drumbeat” for communicating the direction of the organization to all stakeholders.
2. **Build the Foundation for an Effective Leadership System** by choosing, developing, and aligning a leadership team capable of transformational tasks, and then ensure that, throughout this team, improvement capability is exceptional.
3. **Build Will** in the form of visible, constant, unrelenting, and well-explained commitment, starting with the organization’s leaders, to make measurable systemic improvement as quickly as possible.
4. **Ensure Access to Ideas** about the clinical best practices and support processes, and insights about how to introduce them, so that the organization has readily available designs and concepts that are superior to the *status quo*.
5. **Attend Relentlessly to Execution**, integrating improvement deeds and review in the daily work of the organization, and ensuring that better results are effective, sustained, and spread throughout the organization.

In many of our programs, we at IHI have witnessed the powerful impact that skilled and committed senior leaders can have in driving the improvement of care; we’ve seen that in Breakthrough Series projects, Pursuing Perfection, Transforming Care at the Bedside, the IMPACT Network, and, most recently, the 100,000 Lives Campaign. Every

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

organization achieving exceptional results appears to have activated senior leaders in each of the five elements in the Leadership Framework: *Vision, Foundation, Will, Ideas,* and *Execution*. Moreover, if any one of these elements is missing, the process of change can easily stall. Deficient will is a common culprit. Without it, senior leadership will be insufficient even where innovations and best practices are plentiful, and even where energetic project managers and clinicians show thrilling resourcefulness in testing, adapting, and implementing new ideas. Leaders who ignore improvement activity, or fail adequately to support it, send a strong implicit message that improving the quality of care is of secondary importance to other considerations (e.g., financial concerns), a message that we have seen destroying energy and driving resources into activities that have far less impact on patient outcomes. When that happens, in the longer term, the energy for improvement, even if it starts off high, dissipates.

Highly engaged executive leadership teams working with highly engaged boards in a trusting partnership can be the source of will for the entire organization. As hospitals try to drive rapid improvement, boards have an opportunity—we believe, indeed, a significant responsibility—to make better quality of care the organization’s top priority.

Outmoded views of hospital governance sometimes suggest that hospital boards are responsible only—or primarily—for the organization’s financial health and reputation. Board duties in these areas are unquestionably important, especially in light of heightened community benefit standards, changing reimbursement formulas from payers, increased consumer expectations, and the alarming increase in the number of uninsured. But the board’s duties do not end with financial stewardship. Boards oversee mission, strategy, executive leadership, quality, and safety on behalf of the owner—whether the hospital is community-owned or investor-owned. As noted consistently in JCAHO accreditation standards, boards especially guard quality of care; they are expected to fulfill an oversight role in the credentialing of the medical staff, quality assurance, and the continuous improvement of the care provided by the hospital. In the modern view, boards bear direct responsibility for the hospital’s mission to provide the best possible care and to avoid harm to patients. The board’s responsibility

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

for ensuring and improving care cannot be delegated to the medical staff and executive leadership; ensuring safe and harm-free care to the patients is the board's job, at the very core of their fiduciary responsibility. An activated board, in partnership with executive leadership, can set system-level expectations and accountability for high performance and the elimination of harm, and, properly conducted, this leadership work can dramatically and continually improve the quality of care in the hospital.

Both [Standard and Poor's](#) and [Moody's Investors Service](#) have released opinions recently on the importance they will attach to the leadership of clinical quality outcomes and safety in making determinations of hospital bond rating decisions. This has drawn further attention to the stewardship of improvement by health care Boards of Trustees and senior leaders.

In the last 10 years, management literature has been replete with articles underscoring the responsibility and impact of hospital boards on quality and safety. In 1999 the Institute of Medicine (IOM) made this responsibility explicit in its landmark study, *To Err Is Human*, and reinforced it again in *Crossing the Quality Chasm* in 2001 and in subsequent reports. Over the last five years many assessment tools, publications, and presentations have emerged through IHI and leadership organizations working in the area of governance, including the Center For Healthcare Governance, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Estes-Park Institute, the Healthcare Research and Educational Trust, the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the National Center for Healthcare Leadership, the National Quality Forum, and The Governance Institute (see the Annotated Bibliography and Additional Resources: Governance and Leadership of Quality Reference List). Recent research on the role of governance in high-performing organizations (Lockee, Kroom, Zablocki, Bader, 2006; Vaughn, Koepke, Kroch, Lehrman, Sinha, Levey, 2006) shows a direct correlation between high performance in hospitals and specific attributes of their boards.

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

Boards can make an enormous difference when:

- The CEO is held accountable for quality and safety goals;
- The board participates in the development of explicit criteria to guide medical staff credentialing and privileging;
- The board quality committee annually reviews patient satisfaction scores;
- The board sets the board agenda for quality; and
- The medical staff is involved in setting the agenda for the board's discussion surrounding quality.

Lockee, Kroom, Zablocki, Bader, 2006.

Better outcomes are associated with hospitals in which:

- The board spends more than 25% of its time on quality issues;
- The board receives a formal quality performance measurement report;
- There is a high level of interaction between the board and the medical staff on quality strategy;
- The senior executives' compensation is based in part on quality performance; and
- The CEO is identified as the person with the greatest impact on quality, especially when so identified by the executive in charge of quality.

Vaughn, Koepke, Kroch, Lehrman, Sinha, Levey, 2006.

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

But best practices among boards remain uncommon. Proceedings from an invitational meeting hosted by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (Department of Health and Human Services, 2006) summarize and reinforce much of the work on how boards and leaders who accept responsibility for the quality of care should act. Those proceedings also introduce disturbing new data from the National Patient Safety Foundation, Estes Park Institute, and AIG Insurance suggesting there is a significant gap between, on the one hand, best practice in governance, and on the other hand, how the governing board, executive leadership, and middle management in a sample of American hospitals actually think and behave with respect to improving quality and safety in their organizations.

With all of the focus on the board's role in driving quality, an IHI scan, with the help of governance experts, of the 5,000-plus hospitals in the country today, suggests that the current state of hospital governance activity is, at best, highly variable. Our analysis suggests that boards fall into four general categories with respect to their level of engagement in improving quality and safety, their effectiveness in doing so, and their understanding of quality principles:

- Actively engaged and capable; already leading a high-performance organization, and wondering how they can do their board work even better;
- Actively engaged; often showing that commitment through a high-profile event, but needing a much stronger foundation for continual work on improvement;
- Not fully engaged, but having strong, latent capabilities and talent on the board; looking to light a fire with the full board, but not sure how to proceed; and
- Neither engaged nor capable; feeling quality is just fine; viewing quality of care as not the board's proper business, but rather that of the medical and executive leadership.

Our aim in this Guide is to offer insight into the behavior of the most effective boards, to apply what is being learned about governance to the IHI Framework for Improvement, and to suggest several straightforward steps for developing effective governance activity in your organization.

How Do the Most Effective Boards Behave in Order to Improve Quality?

Through review of the literature, the research evidence, and best practices, we can identify conduct in governance that will increase the odds of rapid quality improvement throughout the hospital. Observing the actions of the most effective boards is the place to start.

Boards in high-achieving, rapidly improving hospitals have the following characteristics:

- They set a clear direction for the organization and regularly monitor performance.
- They take ownership of quality problems and make quality an agenda item at every board meeting.
- They invest time in board meetings to understand the gap between current performance and the best in class.
- They aggressively embrace transparency and publicly display performance data.
- They partner closely with executives, physicians, nurses, and other clinical leadership in order to initiate and support changes in care.
- They drive the organization to seek the regular input of patients, families, and staff, and they do the same, themselves.
- They review survey results on culture, satisfaction, experience of care, outcomes, and gaps at least annually.
- They establish accountability for quality-of-care results at the CEO level, with a meaningful portion of compensation linked to it.

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

- They establish sound oversight process, relying appropriately on quality measurement reports and dashboards (“Are we achieving our aims/system-level goals?”).
- They require a commitment to safety in the job description of every employee and require an orientation to quality improvement aims, methods, and skills for all new employees and physicians.
- They establish an interdisciplinary Board Quality Committee, meeting at least four times a year.
- They bring knowledgeable quality leaders onto the board from both health care and other industries.
- They set goals for the education of board members about quality and safety, and they ensure compliance with these goals.
- They hold crucial conversations about system failures that resulted in patient harm.
- They allocate adequate resources to ongoing improvement projects and invest in building quality improvement capacity across the organization.

Overall Actions Governance Should Take for Oversight of Quality and Safety and to Reduce Harm

Another way to think about the work of effective boards (in addition to describing key characteristics of effective boards, as in the previous section) is to use the [IHI Framework of Improvement](#) to recommend specific actions for governing boards to take within each of the framework's five categories:

1. ***Establish the Mission, Vision, and Strategy***

- a. Set direction and monitor performance.
 - i. Monitor the culture of quality and safety.
 - ii. Establish aims for safety and quality improvement.

2. ***Build the Foundation for an Effective Leadership System***

- a. Establish an interdisciplinary Board Quality Committee.
- b. Bring knowledgeable quality leaders onto the board.
- c. Set and achieve educational standards for the board members.
- d. Build a culture of real (not pro forma) conversations about improving care at board and committee meetings, with physician leaders, and with administration.
- e. Allocate adequate resources to ongoing training of employees and medical staff about quality improvement.

3. ***Build Will***

- a. Establish a policy of full transparency about data on quality and safety.
- b. Insist on the review of both data and stories from patients and families.
- c. Help patients and families tell their stories directly to staff, senior leaders, and the board.
- d. Establish policies and practices with respect to errors and injuries that emphasize through communication, respectful practice, disclosure, apology, support, and resolution. (See [When Things Go Wrong: Responding to Adverse Events. A Consensus Statement of the Harvard Hospitals.](#))

[Burlington, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Coalition for the Prevention of Medical Errors; March 2006.](#))

- e. Understand both the current performance of your organization and the performance levels of the best organizations in the world.
- f. Show that you own the problem and are driving the agenda by placing quality first on the board agenda and devoting 25% or more of the board's agenda to it.
- g. Show courage: don't flinch.

4. *Ensure Access to Ideas*

- a. Boards should ask management four idea-generating questions, when reviewing progress against quality and safety aims:
 - i. "Who is the best in the world at this?"
 - ii. "Have you talked to them to find out how they do it?"
 - iii. "How many ideas have you tried out?"
 - iv. "What ideas did our patients and families and front-line staff have for improvement?"

5. *Attend Relentlessly to Execution*

- a. Establish executive accountability for achievement of aims.
- b. Establish an effective oversight process, including:
 - i. Devoting 25% of board meeting time to quality and safety.
 - ii. Monitoring your own system-level measures for improvement (rather than being comforted by benchmarks).
 - iii. Reviewing data generated weekly, or, at a minimum, monthly.
- c. Ask hard questions, including:
 - i. Are we on track to achieve the aim?
 - ii. If not, why not? What is the improvement strategy? What are key steps planned toward full-scale execution?

The Governance Intervention: Six Things All Boards Should Do to Improve Quality and Reduce Harm

The 5 Million Lives Campaign asks boards of participating organizations to begin, at a minimum, by focusing on the following six activities:

1. **Setting Aims:** *Set a specific aim to reduce harm this year. Make an explicit, public commitment to measurable quality improvement (e.g., reduction in unnecessary mortality and harm), establishing a clear aim for the facility or system.*

Organizations should develop a specific statement of aims for improvement. For example, the leaders at Ascension Health, the largest not-for-profit health system in the US, formulated three strategic aims; they promise to provide:

- Healthcare That Is Safe;
- Healthcare That Works; and
- Healthcare That Leaves No One Behind.

Ascension's senior leaders and board spelled out each aim in detail, including quantitative goals. For example, for the aim, "Health Care That Is Safe," the specific goal statement is: "No preventable injuries or deaths by July 2008." Ascension's board and leaders review progress toward this aim regularly, and they have created a transparent system to transfer learning among hospitals all across the system. The aim, itself, is system-wide; it applies to all hospitals.

Another strategic aim of this type, with an associated goal (among others), from a different organization, is:

- "We will offer all the care and only that care that we know will help you. We will do nothing that will harm you."
- "One specific goal is to achieve zero central line infections for the entire institution across all services by August 31, 2008."

- 2. Getting Data and Hearing Stories:** *Select and review progress toward safer care as the first agenda item at every board meeting, grounded in transparency, and putting a “human face” on harm data.*

Many boards are now starting their meetings with a case review of a patient who experienced harm at their hospital in the prior month. These cases provoke new and different conversations, and provide added will to move to safer systems. At a recent board Clinical Quality Committee meeting of the Seton Family of Hospitals in Austin, TX, operational leaders reviewed a patient safety problem and their plans to prevent a recurrence. One of the lay board members pushed harder for a reliable plan. She noted that the plans proposed were not likely to produce reliability at best known levels, and that employing reliability science would be a better solution than working harder. That meeting was an important step toward creating a culture of reliability, and it began with informed questioning by a board member.

IHI recommends two very specific steps in initial assessment for every board and organization in the Campaign. Although both are challenging, we know of no steps more powerful than these two to accelerate commitment from the senior leader level:

- **An Initial Chart Audit for Harm:** The board should commission a review of 20 randomly chosen patient charts from the prior month to document all types and levels of injury. We suggest that this review, and the subsequent report to the board, be conducted by a team of clinicians with the help of IHI’s so-called “Global Trigger Tool” (although other supports can be helpful, as well). Specifications, examples, and brief training for the use of this tool can be found on [IHI’s website](#). In the longer run, organizations may choose monthly chart review of this size and type to become one of their key, system-level safety monitoring systems. Note: Findings from the field suggest that, to best learn about patterns of harm, organizations may choose to start their review with a focus on 20 charts from the medical surgical services, or 20 readmissions, or 20

deaths, rather than routine obstetrics cases (which may not contain many instances of harm).

- **A “Deep Dive” Case Study:** The CEO, with the assistance of the CMO, should conduct a detailed, personal investigation of a significant patient injury in the hospital, including interviewing the involved patient, family, and staff. The purpose is to understand in great depth the “story,” in all of its complexity, to illuminate the nature and sources of hazard in a complex health care organization. The CEO should personally present that case to the board in a session of no less than one hour in length. If possible and desirable, the affected patient and family should be there at the board meeting to add their accounts and view in person. (In preparation for this review, the CEO and board may wish to read the book on “high reliability organizations” by Karl Weick and Kathleen Sutcliffe, *Managing the Unexpected: Assuring High Performance in an Age of Complexity*.)

3. **Establishing and Monitoring System-Level Measures:** *Identify a small group of organization-wide “roll-up” measures of patient safety (e.g., facility-wide harm, risk-adjusted mortality) that are continually updated and are made transparent to the entire organization and all of its customers.*

It is not enough for the executive leadership group and the medical staff to frame an aim. The board must know about the aim, understand it, care about it, and oversee its achievement. This is critical, because board engagement is essential to building the will needed to drive change at the scale and pace intended in the 5 Million Lives Campaign. When they receive reports on quality of care, many boards find themselves lost in the hundreds of minute but important measures at the patient level. It is not unusual for a board report on quality to contain several hundred measures and benchmarks, and yet not to contain metrics that can help the board to see quality or improvement at the system level. Boards of hospitals in IHI’s IMPACT Network now view a small set of system-level measures, called “Whole System

Measures,” including benchmarks against the best in the nation—sometimes the best in the world—as a way to monitor organization-wide progress. ([See IHI’s Whole System Measures Tool Kit.](#)) One such system-level metric—of particular relevance to the Campaign—is the rate of medical harm per 1,000 patient days, which can also be expressed as a rate per 100 admissions (see Appendix A for more information on these measures). Another is the Hospital Standardized Mortality Ratio (HSMR), which allows boards to compare their organization’s risk-adjusted mortality rate to others and to track it within the institution over time (download an IHI White Paper that describes how to use the HSMR [here](#)).

- 4. Changing the Environment, Policies, and Culture:** *Commit to establish and maintain an environment that is respectful, fair, and just for all who experience the pain and loss as a result of avoidable harm and adverse outcomes: the patients, their families, and the staff at the sharp end of error.*

To become safer, hospitals need to build cultures of quality and safety that are bound in respect and communication and committed to full disclosure, apology, support, and resolution for patients and families when there is harm. As organizations around the country struggle with this critical element of a culture of safety and patient and family partnership, other organizations are providing leadership and courage to draw from. The Harvard hospitals have issued their seminal work, [When Things Go Wrong](#), and the University of Michigan is writing a powerful story of learning, respectful practice, and results from a multi-year journey of communication, transparency, disclosure, support, and rapid case resolution. One option for boards, which we recommend strongly, is to study and adopt the guidelines articulated in [When Things Go Wrong](#).

- 5. Learning... Starting with the Board:** *Develop your capability as a board. Learn about how “best in the world” boards work with executive and MD leaders to reduce harm. Set an expectation for similar levels of education and training for all staff.*

Modules for board education should answer the questions:

- a. What is the Board of Trustees' responsibility and accountability for quality and safety?
- b. What is the current state of quality improvement and safety in health care overall, in your community, and in your hospital? How does prevailing practice stand up to best practice?
- c. How can board members effectively leverage their roles and experiences to affect the pace of quality improvement in their organization?
- d. What are the best strategies to sustain the gain and drive continuous improvement?

In our experience, most boards and leaders overestimate the front-line staff's ability to improve. In such cases, even with sufficient will and great ideas that have worked elsewhere, execution stalls. Boards can work to ensure that all physicians and staff know how to make performance changes, and leaders are able to help diffuse the new performance levels reliably across the entire system and to hold the gains over time. Some hospitals have set up "colleges" to build the new skills with staff, and to ensure that the adequate skills and staff are aligned to make progress. One measure of adequacy of the educational and resource systems is the pace of change. If the tempo is too slow, and change is taking months, the board should reconsider the effectiveness of the developmental support systems.

- 6. Establishing Executive Accountability:** *Oversee the effective execution of a plan to achieve your aims to reduce harm including executive team accountability for clear quality improvement targets.*

Boards should oversee the effective execution of a plan to achieve their aims to reduce harm, just as they oversee finance. The board can set the agenda for improvement through the linkages in performance review and compensation systems for all top leaders. The feedback to these leaders in reviews can create

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

energy around a patient-focused safety agenda, or it can focus more exclusively on financial performance. The board's choice about these messages tends to have a lasting impact on the day-to-day priorities and focus for the leader team's daily work.

If each facility in the nation could make a commitment to these practices, we predict enormous improvement in introducing the best practices at the heart of the 5 Million Lives Campaign and a dramatic national transformation in the quality and safety of hospital care.

Getting Started on the Governance Intervention

How does a hospital move forward?

1. Distribute the Getting Started Kit to the board and executive administrative and clinical staff immediately.
2. Put the 5 Million Lives Campaign on the agendas of the next meetings of the Board of Trustees and the Board Quality Committee, along with those of the executive leadership and the Medical Executive Committee.
3. Open these meetings with a short narrative of an actual patient event, illustrating a type or pattern of harm that occurred within the last month in that institution. This is most effective when connected to the organization's harm reduction strategy, including lessons learned from the event and specific actions being asked of the board.
4. Present the *Six Things All Boards Should Do to Improve Quality and Reduce Harm* and develop an action plan to move forward on each item within the next month.
5. Place your organization's system-level harm metrics on the board and senior leadership dashboards.

Annotated Bibliography

Alexander JA, Lee SD. Does governance matter? Board configuration and performance in not-for-profit hospitals. *The Milbank Quarterly*. 2006;84(4):733.

The article is valuable not only for showing how differences in governance mechanisms can be conceptualized and measured, but also for providing evidence that governance makes a difference on certain outcomes. It provides strong evidence that more attention is indeed warranted to the relationship between governance and performance, particularly in areas that are distinctive to the role of nonprofit institutions.

Bisognano M, McCannon J, Botwinick L. A campaign for 100,000 lives: The time is now for boards to lead quality and safety efforts. *Trustee*. 2005;58(8):12-14,19,1.

The board has a major role in the Institute for Healthcare Improvement's plan for saving 100,000 patient lives by 2006 through implementation of six proven quality interventions. This article underscores the role, the approach, and the outcomes.

Bjork D, Fairley JD. *Creating a Culture of Collaborative Leadership Between Boards and CEOs: A Practical Guide for Trustees*. Center for Healthcare Governance; 2006.

This publication is one in a series of recent monographs issued by the Center that can be accessed at

<http://www.americangovernance.com/american-governance/publications/monographs.html>

Specifically, it is designed to be a resource for both new and seasoned board members and CEOs. It should be included in new board member orientation materials and used as a primer in board leader and officer education programs. Understanding the nature and importance of the board-CEO relationship and how to work together effectively can help both parties get the most out of this critical leadership partnership and can also help pave the way for establishing a board culture of active, engaged governance. As Bjork and Fairley conclude, "...if the board accepts and acts on its responsibility to nurture this relationship, it will make the CEO's job easier, the board's job easier, and the organization more successful."

Chait R, Ryan W, Taylor B. *Governance as Leadership: Reframing the Work of Nonprofit Boards*. BoardSource and John Wiley and Sons: Hoboken NJ; 2005.

Written by noted consultants and researchers attuned to the needs of practitioners, *Governance as Leadership* redefines nonprofit governance. The book sheds light on the traditional fiduciary and strategic work of the board and introduces a critical third dimension of effective trusteeship: generative governance. It provides a powerful framework for a new covenant between trustees and executives: more macrogovernance in exchange for less micromanagement.

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

Department of Health and Human Services. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. *Hospital Leadership Summit: Moving from Good to Great*. CMS Headquarters, September 28, 2006. To be published December 2006 and available at the Commonwealth Fund, Oklahoma QIO, and IHI websites.

This is a summary of proceedings of an invitational conference representing a broad range of constituents, including health system and hospital executives, clinical leaders, representatives of public agencies, national and state hospital associations, and QI organizations, academicians, researchers, and consultants. The program presented in two areas: the review of recent research on the relationship between hospital leadership and institutional high performance; and case studies describing how hospital leaders have been successful in taking steps to address quality within their organizations.

Hospital Governing Boards and Quality of Care. A Call to Responsibility. National Quality Forum; 2004.

As follow-up to a March 2004 meeting, "A Call to Responsibility" was developed to call on hospital governing boards to review their policies and practices to make sure that they are consistent with four principles fundamental to delivering quality healthcare.

Joshi MS, Hines SC. Getting the board on board: Engaging hospital boards in quality and patient safety. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*. 2006;32(4):179-187.

The authors identified a series of steps by boards to improve a hospital's overall performance that include: (1) increasing education on quality to increase the board's quality literacy; (2) improving the framing of an agenda for quality; (3) more quality planning, focus, and incentives for leadership and governance for quality improvement; and (4) greater focus on the patients.

Kroch E, Vaughn T, Koepke M, Roman S, Foster D, Sinha S, Levey S. Hospital boards and quality dashboards. *Journal of Patient Safety*. 2006;2(1):10-19.

This study found much variation in dashboard content and in the implementation practices associated with them. The suggested relationship of dashboard content, development, and implementation practices to observed hospital performance is worth noting. Further research relating these preliminary findings to quality performance would enable the identification of characteristics of dashboards that are most useful in supporting hospital leadership in its QI activities.

Lockee C, Kroom K, Zablocki E, Bader B. *Quality*. The Governance Institute; 2006.

This publication is designed to give boards the insights and the tools they need to make a difference in the organization's quality journey towards understanding the fundamentals of quality, the importance of board engagement, the findings from research on best practices, measurement, building a culture of safety, the business case, resource allocation, and the power of oversight.

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

McDonagh K. Hospital governing boards: a study of their effectiveness in relation to organizational performance. *Journal of Healthcare Management*. 2006;51:6.
Umbdenstock R. Practitioner Application.

This article describes the development and evolution of governing boards and summarizes critical findings from a research study on hospital governing boards. The factors that measure governing board performance were found to be consolidated into one single factor of collaborative board functioning consistent with emerging governance theory.

Moody's Investor Service. *Improving clinical quality and patient safety of greater importance to not-for-profit hospitals*. Special Comment. Moody's Investor Service; May 2006.

This article reflects the growing importance of clinical quality and patient safety in the eyes of multiple stakeholders: patients, physicians, payers, employers, and hospitals. In the Summary Opinion, the authors write, "Moody's anticipates that in the short-term, strategies to improve quality and patient safety will likely reduce operating results for many hospitals as the tools and steps to implement the strategy may require adding costs faster than benefits are realized. However, hospitals that eventually demonstrate a sustainable link between quality investments and better clinical outcomes will likely gain competitive advantage, thereby improving financial performance and possibly their bond ratings."

Orlikoff JE. Building better boards in the new era of accountability. *Frontiers of Health Services Management* (American College of Healthcare Executives). 21:3.

Health care boards are entering a new era of heightened accountability, scrutiny, and reform. The authors note the structure, composition, and specific required functions of boards can be legislated or mandated, but the effective function of boards cannot. At the same time that governance faces this new era of accountability, it is also being bombarded with the legions of monumental challenges in the tumultuous health care field. Chief executive officers and their boards must be willing to recognize the challenges and risks to the field of governance in general and to their boards in particular. Furthermore, they must be willing to implement new strategies and approaches for successful governance, including becoming compliant with Sarbanes-Oxley requirements; conducting a comprehensive audit of the structure, function, composition, and culture of the board; and seeking board members from outside the community, among many others.

Reinertsen J. Boards, administrators, medical staffs and quality: Sorting out the roles. *Trustee*. 2003;1-11.

The purpose of this article is to address the roles of hospital boards, administrators, and medical staff leaders in clinical quality, with the emphasis on clarifying the key responsibilities of trustees in overseeing the core work of their institutions—caring for

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

the sick. The board's roles can be summarized as follows: Understand the important things your community expects from your hospital; See that a few system-level measures of those things are established, understood and monitored (the "Big Dots."); Aim to improve the Big Dots, and link the improvement of those things to your main strategic goals; Build the hospital's will to achieve these aims; Maintain constancy of purpose for the long-term quality transformation of the hospital; and Promote collaboration across the community for redesign of care.

Schryve PM. What you can do: the trustee, patient safety, and JCAHO. *Trustee*. 2003;56(2):19-21.

The Joint Commission has developed patient safety standards that hospital leaders, including trustees, are responsible for implementing, along with National Safety Goals and recommendations. The author examines these standards through the lens of the board.

Standard and Poor's. Sweeney L, editor. *Quality And Transparency Could Transform U.S. Not-For-Profit Health Care*. Standard and Poor's; 2006.

S&P is modifying its credit rating process to incorporate an assessment of quality programs and outcomes in healthcare organizations and the role of leadership at the Board and executive levels to drive those outcomes. In this report, S&P outlines the questions they are asking as well as their plan for increasingly intensive scrutiny in the future.

Taylor B, Chait R, Holland T. *The New Work of the Nonprofit Board*. Harvard Business Review, Reprint 96509; 1996.

Too often, the board of a nonprofit organization is little more than a collection of high-powered people engaged in low-level activities. But that can change, the authors say, if trustees are willing to discover and take on the new work of the board. When they perform the new work, a board's members can significantly advance the institution's mission and long-term welfare. The authors give many examples of boards that have successfully embraced the new work. The stakes are high: if boards demonstrate that they can change effectively, the professional staff at the institutions they serve just may follow suit.

Vaughn T, Koepke M, Kroch E, Lehrman W, Sinha S, Levey S. Engagement of leadership in quality improvement initiatives: executive quality improvement survey results. *Journal of Patient Safety*. 2006;2(1):2-9.

The results of the survey show that hospital leadership is engaged in quality, but in a manner that can be enhanced. Several changes in leadership structures and systems relating to boards and senior administrative management teams are recommended so that the pace of improvement that Americans want can be realized in the hospital industry.

5 Million Lives Campaign
How-to Guide: Governance Leadership

When Things Go Wrong: Responding to Adverse Events. A Consensus Statement of the Harvard Hospitals. Burlington, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Coalition for the Prevention of Medical Errors; March 2006.

This consensus paper of the Harvard-affiliated hospitals proposes full disclosure, including an apology to the patient, when adverse events or medical errors occur. The paper represents the collaborative effort of a group of clinicians, risk managers, and patients participating from several Harvard teaching hospitals and the Risk Management Foundation.

Additional Resources: Governance and Leadership of Quality

(Available at IHI.org:

<http://www.ihl.org/IHI/Topics/LeadingSystemImprovement/Leadership/Literature/>)

Bader B. Best Practices for Board Quality Committees. Great Boards. Accessed April 20, 2006.

http://www.greatboards.org/newsletter/reprints/Board_quality_committees_best_practices.pdf

Bibby J, Reinertsen J. Leading for Improvement: Whose Job Is It Anyway? Pursuing Perfection and the NHS Modernisation Agency; October 2004. (Unpublished Manuscript).

Botwinick L, Bisognano M, Haraden C. *Leadership Guide to Patient Safety*. IHI Innovation Series white paper. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Healthcare Improvement; 2006. (Available on www.IHI.org)

Gautam KS. A call for board leadership on quality in hospitals. *Qual Manag Health Care*. 2005;14(1):18-30.

Gosfield AG, Reinertsen JL. The 100,000 Lives Campaign: Crystallizing standards of care for hospitals. *Health Affairs*. 2005;24(6):1560-1570.

Great boards ask tough questions: What to expect from management on quality. *The Governance Institute*. 2005;16(2).

Joshi MS, Hines SC. Getting the board on board: Engaging hospital boards in quality and patient safety. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf*. 2006;32(4):179-187.

Move Your Dot™: Measuring, evaluating, and reducing hospital mortality rates. IHI Innovation Series white paper. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Healthcare Improvement; 2003. (Available on www.IHI.org)

Patient safety survey. *Trustee*. 2005;58(1):8-9.

Reinertsen J, Pugh M, Bisognano M. *Seven Leadership Leverage Points for Organization-level Improvement in Health Care*. IHI Innovation Series white paper. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Healthcare Improvement; 2005. (Available on www.IHI.org)

Reinertsen J. *A Theory of Leadership for the Transformation for Health Care Organizations*. The Reinertsen Group; May 2003. (Unpublished manuscript, revised January 2004.)

Governance Institute Publications:

(Available at IHI.org:
<http://www.ihl.org/IHI/Topics/LeadingSystemImprovement/Leadership/Literature/>)

Board Quality Committees: The Governance Institute's Fax Poll Results. Dec 2002.

Getting on Board with Quality. Board Room Press. February, 2005.

Taking a Strong Stance on Quality Oversight. Board Room Press. October, 2006.

The Board's Role in Quality Oversight: Not a Responsibility That Can Be Delegated. Board Room Press. October, 2004.

Total Quality Management: A Committee Takes the Reins. Board Room Press. April, 2006.

IHI National Forum Presentations:

Bader B, Joshi M. *Hospital Boards: No Pain, No Gain.* IHI National Forum, Dec. 2005. Accessed April 20, 2006.

http://www.delmarvafoundation.org/html/content_pages/presentations/Maulik/ihidecember2005.pdf

Joshi M, Christian D. *How Governance Makes a Difference in the Quality of a Hospital's Performance.* IHI National Forum, Dec. 2004. Accessed Apr 20, 2006.

http://www.delmarvafoundation.org/html/content_pages/presentations/Maulik/forihi11_27_2005newbackground.pdf

Publications from the AHA Center for Healthcare Governance:

(To order copies, call 888-540-6111 or e-mail bladewski@americangovernance.com)

Does Excellent Health Care Governance Lead to Excellent Performance? (Or, can a Great Board make a Difference?)

Hospital Patient Safety and Quality Monitoring: A Resource for Governing Boards and Trustees

Patient Safety and Quality Reporting for Governance: Data Reporting Guide for Hospital Staff

Major Associations in Governance Leadership:

Center for Healthcare Governance <http://www.americangovernance.com/>

CMS <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/>

Estes Park Institute <http://www.estespark.org/>

JCAHO: <http://www.jointcommission.org/>

National Center for Healthcare Leadership <http://www.nchl.org/>

National Quality Forum <http://www.qualityforum.org/>

The Governance Institute <http://www.governanceinstitute.com/>

Appendix A: Recommended Intervention-Level Measures

The following measures are relevant for this intervention. The Campaign recommends that you use some or all of them, as appropriate, to track the progress of your work in this area.

Outcome Measure(s):

Rate of Medical Harm per 100 Admissions
Owner: IHI Owner Measure ID: N/A Measure Information: [Campaign MIF] Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This measure is almost identical to Rate of Medical Harm per 1000 Patient Days; the only difference is the denominator used. The main benefit of looking at harm per 100 admissions (rather than per 1000 patient days) is that it is more accessible, especially to non-clinical audiences, and so might be better for building will.

Rate of Medical Harm per 1000 Patient Days
Owner: IHI Owner Measure ID: N/A Measure Information: [Campaign MIF] Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This measure is almost identical to Rate of Medical Harm per 100 Admissions; the only difference is the denominator used. The main benefit of looking at harm per 1000 patient days (rather than per 100 admissions) is that your results will be more comparable to other hospitals' results (useful, for example, if the hospital is participating in a collaborative or system-wide improvement project), because the use of patient days in the denominator serves as a crude risk-adjustment mechanism.