The Permanente Federation joined the MOC Portfolio Program in 2011. Under this program, The Permanente Medical Group (TPMG) created a MOC Part 4 project, Blood Pressure Control for People with Hypertension (BPCPH). The project was based on a TPMG quality initiative with prescribed workflows and improvement options and was open to physicians certified by the American Boards of Internal and Family Medicine.

Participation in the BPCPH project was as follows:

Physicians could choose from the following improvement options:

- Implementing tools, such as workflows, job aids, and patient education materials
- Optimizing workflows with team members to take accurate blood pressure readings
- Reviewing evidence-based guidelines on appropriate care for hypertensive patients
- Applying communication best practices to reinforce medication adherence or lifestyle changes

Participants were required to complete an online attestation in order to receive MOC Part 4 credit for the project.

For physicians in The Permanente Medical Group who completed the BPCPH project between September 2011 and November 2013, is there a relationship between the improvement in each physician's patient panel, the types of interventions chosen to complete the project, and whether the type of intervention chosen affects the participant's perception of the workload that the project requires?

If the chosen intervention includes team discussions, what were the interventions, and did those discussions impact the participant's perception of the workload for participating in the project?

This non-experimental retrospective analysis was based on data collected through an online attestation between September 2011 and November 2013. Once we received the de-identified data, we did the following:

Physicians' Mean Improvement for Primary and Secondary Outcome Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Improvement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables Compared and P Value

- Number of IOs and percent improvement
  - Primary outcome measure (n = 73): 0.16
  - Secondary outcome measure (n = 26): 0.78
- Type of IO used and percent improvement
  - Primary outcome measure (n = 73): 0.72
  - Secondary outcome measure (n = 26): 1.00
- Type of IO used and perceived workload (n = 73): 0.88

Conclusion

We conclude that in this GI effort, there is no association between the IO, percentage of improvement, and perception of workload. In addition, most of the project participants showed improvement in their practice regardless of the intervention chosen and without additional perceived burden to their practice.

For more information contact:
Vallerie Kolasinski
Vallerie.X.Kolasinski@kp.org