

# PMH Measurement Tool Version 1.0

## What is it?

The Patient's Medical Home (PMH) Measurement Tool Version 1 (V1.0) is a new tool to assess progress of PMH implementation in primary care clinics. Development of this tool began in 2019, testing of a prototype was completed in early 2020, and revisions were completed in late 2020. As such, please consider this version of the PMH Measurement Tool to be 'experimental', as it requires further validation.

## How does it relate to the PMH Assessment?

While the purpose of this tool is aligned with the [PMH Assessment](#), this new tool has some notable differences:

- Every clinic is unique and will be at different stages along the PMH implementation journey. This tool collects contextual information, such as clinic demographics and team composition, important for interpreting and understanding the larger context that the PMH operates in
- Measures include a list of behaviours and teams are asked to select the behaviours that are exhibited by their clinic. This reduces the burden of trying to choose a score on a scale, which can be subjective.
- Definitions of terms that may be unfamiliar to clinics are provided in each section.



Like the previous version of the PMH Assessment Tool, this tool was designed to be used with the support of a Practice Facilitator to guide teams through the assessment. If repeated at regular intervals, the assessment will help track a clinic team's PMH implementation progress. The approach of this assessment tool is complementary to the vision and framework of the Safety Net Medical Home Initiative (2013), which outlined the 8 implementation elements, shown in the PMH diagram.

## How to use it?

This assessment is a team endeavour; it is recommended that the tool be completed with the involvement of team members representing various roles within your clinic. A Practice Facilitator who is familiar with the tool and the definitions used within is an essential member of this 'assessment team'. To prepare for the assessment, it is recommended that the clinic team start to gather sources of data that may inform their responses to the tool (e.g. HQCA Panel Report, current EMR reports, etc.). Certain sections of the tool could be completed ahead of time by someone who is able to provide the information. For example, a clinic manager may be the best team member to complete Sections 1 (Clinic Demographics) and 2 (Team Composition).

As noted above, V1.0 requires further testing to validate a scoring rubric presented in the last section (Summary). This section summarizes the responses to each of the 20 items in the assessment and automatically shows how the responses align to a postulated capability maturity model ranging from Level 0 to Level 4. Currently, there are no questions pertaining to Engaged Leadership, which will be developed in the next iteration of the Tool. Questions and/or feedback on any aspect of V1.0 are welcome and, in fact, are needed in order to move this draft forward.

If you are interested in using the PMH Measurement Tool V1.0, please contact Wanda Truong, [wanda.truong@albertadoctors.org](mailto:wanda.truong@albertadoctors.org), for support or to request more information.

## How to provide your feedback

Given the experimental nature of this first draft of the PMH measurement tool, it is recommended that this tool be tested with a clinic that you know well and can access evidence to substantiate your responses to the questions. Providing feedback or anonymized data to the PMH measurement tool development team would help to validate and improve the tool for future use. After conducting the initial prototype testing, the following questions are left outstanding and keeping the PMH measurement tool development team up at night. Your feedback is very much appreciated.

### SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

#### Team composition

This section lists several functions and asks what role has been assigned to the function. The purpose of this section is to understand whether the clinic has adequate coverage of functions by team members. When completing this section for your clinic, did you identify any gaps? Did you experience any challenges in completing this section?

#### Organized evidence-based care

Questions 6.3 and 6.4 are similar but get at different underlying concepts. Are there any improvements you would make to the wording of these questions?

#### Summary/scoring

##### Summary (1)

This version of the summary page provides a draft rubric. Automated formulas are used to assign responses to each question on a maturity model level. This model is a first attempt and requires further validation.

- Did you agree with the scoring criteria (maturity model definitions provided)?
- Did you agree with the automated scores?
- Did your manual score differ significantly from the automated scores?

##### Summary (2)

This version of the summary page does not provide a maturity model. Rather, it provides a sum for each question, based on number of items selected.

- Were the summed scores consistent with your expectation?
- Did the summed scores accurately reflect the level of progression or stage in which this clinic is at?

### GENERAL QUESTIONS

#### How did you answer the questions?

- Did you experience any barriers in answering the questions?

#### Have we captured the right content?

- What, if anything, seems confusing or unnecessary?

#### How well did the Summary pages aid in interpretation?

- Do you prefer the scoring methodology in Summary (1) or Summary (2)? Why?