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Objectives

- Understanding the increasing importance for states to publicly demonstrate the value of their APCDs, Washington State and Onpoint partnered to create three publicly available dashboards using data from the state’s APCD, which examined:
  1. Relationships between social determinants of health (SDOH) and outcome measures
  2. Chronic condition and disease prevalence by region
  3. Trends in quality of care, utilization, and cost measures
- This online resource was designed to maximize analytic value to the public while adhering to strict data security practices
Combining APCD Data with Public Data

• Based on longitudinal claims for 6.7 million members using data from the WA-APCD
• 15 measures at launch
  – HEDIS measures
  – Utilization and cost metrics
  – Chronic conditions
• APCD data was linked to SDOH measures from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey, which includes rates of:
  – Poverty, unemployment, Medicaid enrollment, uninsured, and non-white races
Outcomes

• Results are presented in public-facing, interactive dashboards
• Users are provided with tools to examine the interactions between chronic conditions and utilization/expenditure outcome measures with the ability to drill down into specific subsets of the population by geographical and demographic factors
Challenges

• Need to balance flexibility of data with strict security requirements for public reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention and Screening</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>Breast Cancer Screening</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>74.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cervical Cancer Screening</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Chlamydia Screening in Women</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• External benchmarks were required in order to meet stakeholder needs
• Custom geographical regions were required to increase usability and representation
Lessons Learned

• This study demonstrated the capability to...
  – Report APCD claims-based measures both interactively and transparently with relationship to SDOH
  – Offer opportunities for greater understanding of the relationships between socioeconomic factors and healthcare delivery and outcomes
  – Preserve the granularity of a ZIP-code-level data set while taking a careful approach to blinding results for public reporting

• Dashboard available from the WA Office of Financial Management website:
  