Executive Summary

These indicators (Inpatient Quality Indicators, Version 4.4) were developed by the federal Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) and are provided by OSHPD for use by California consumers, healthcare purchasers, and healthcare providers. The indicators use existing data that all California-licensed hospitals are required to report to the state. The first report using these indicators was produced with 2006-2007 data and compared the quality of care of nearly 400 California hospitals using risk-adjusted mortality rates for 5 procedures and 3 conditions. The previous 2008-2009 report compared the quality of care of 337 California hospitals using risk adjusted mortality rates for 6 procedures and 6 conditions. In the 2009 report, 119 hospitals were rated “Better” than the state average on at least one indicator, and 64 were rated “Worse” than the state average on at least on indicator. In the 2008 report, 95 hospitals were rated “Better” and 86 were rated “Worse”.

The updated 2010-2011 report uses a newer version of AHRQ’s software that incorporates changes made by AHRQ and OSHPD. Importantly, OSHPD no longer incorporates national data in benchmarking California hospital performance – all hospital comparisons are with California data only. This has resulted in a more balanced number of “Better” and “Worse” performing hospitals this year. It has also made comparisons of hospital performance with prior years not possible. As in the previous report, the indicators are risk-adjusted, taking into account patients’ pre-existing health problems to “level the field” and allow fair comparisons among hospitals.

For 2011, there are 331 hospitals included in the report. Findings from the report show:

- 65 hospitals were rated “Better” than the state average on at least one indicator, and 95 were rated “Worse” than the state average on at least one indicator.

- 183 hospitals were rated as “Average,” or not significantly different from the state average, on all 12 indicators.

- Concerning hospitals with “Worse” ratings, 70 were rated “Worse” on a single indicator, 19 on two indicators, 5 on three indicators and 1 on five indicators.

- Concerning hospitals with “Better” ratings, 46 were rated “Better” on a single indicator, 15 on two indicators, and 4 hospitals was rated “Better” on three of the 12 indicators.
For 2010, there are 331 hospitals included in the report. Findings from the report show:

- 56 hospitals were rated “Better” than the state average on at least one indicator, and 82 were rated “Worse” than the state average on at least one indicator.

- 194 hospitals were rated as “Average,” or not significantly different from the state average, on all 12 indicators.

- Concerning hospitals with “Worse” ratings, 55 hospitals were rated “Worse” on a single indicator, 16 on two indicators, 7 on three indicators, 3 on four indicators, and 1 on five indicators.

- Concerning hospitals with “Better” ratings, 34 hospitals were rated “Better” on one indicator, 14 on two indicators, 7 on three indicators, and 1 hospital was rated “Better” on four indicators.

Individual hospitals showed relatively consistent performance across the 12 mortality indicators. That is, only a small number of hospitals had “mixed” results—fewer than 12 hospitals in a given year were ranked as “Better” on one indicator and “Worse” on another. In addition, many hospitals showed consistent performance across the two years. Hospitals that scored “Worse” on at least one indicator in 2010 were 5.7 times more likely than other hospitals to score “Worse” on at least one indicator in 2011. This was also true for “Better” hospitals in 2010, who were 6.5 time more likely to perform “Better” in 2011.