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Introduction

Chronic disease is the leading cause of death worldwide. Managing complex chronic disease requires access to health services across the care spectrum and places significant economic burden on health systems.

Chronic disease management requires an integrated approach to care that is not always feasible due to the fragmentation of the current health systems. Team-based models are a promising approach to closing gaps in chronic care delivery.

Team-based care:
- Provides high quality, coordinated, patient-centered care
- Improves population health and patient outcomes

Methods

1. Mixed-methods multiple-case study design
2. Multiple data types used: focus groups, interviews, observations, environmental scan, team mapping, surveys.
3. Data Analysis
   - Cross case analysis
   - Iterative analysis
   - Coding performed by 2 researchers individually and in aggregate.
   - Informed by theory: Kompier’s 5 Factors for Implementation Success

Kompier’s 5 Factor Theory

- Systemic and Gradual Approach
- Theory Driven
- Identify Risks
- Participatory Approach
- Sustained Commitment

Successful Implementation

Our Objectives

1. Identify characteristics of successful teams
2. Create a description of integrated teams to support the development, maintenance, and sustainability of other teams

Studying the implementation of two integrated care teams’ chronic disease approaches will help future integrated care teams in refining their intervention design and implementation.

Results

Team A – Successful Implementation

- Made up of physicians, nurses, and respiratory therapists
- 40 participants
- Data collected: 28 surveys, 7 focus groups, 25 documents

Team B – Unsuccessful Implementation

- Made up of physicians and nurses
- 7 participants
- Data collected: 6 surveys, 3 interviews (4 with providers and 2 with patients), 30 documents

Theoretical Factor | Team A | Team B
--- | --- | ---
Systemic and gradual approach | Dedicated time to planning and implementation. Able to adapt to changes within the healthcare system. | Adapted to the changes and dedicated time to planning and discussing. | More stringent and aggressive timeline, less flexible.
Theory driven | Aligning theory with implementation, all team members need a common understanding and belief of stated theory. | Implemented a theory-in-use. | Team B was theory planned, had clear espoused theory.
Identify risks | Risks: funding, naysayers, the larger system, communication among stakeholders, and people who felt their opinion was superior. | Had plans to mitigate risk. | Poorly anticipated risks.
Participatory approach | Interdisciplinary approach was required. People felt they did not play a meaningful role in the large team, were included solely to collect their data, or did not receive enough compensation. | Sought participants’ opinions in creating care plans. | Integrated planning, although not all key stakeholders were engaged in planning.
Sustained commitment | Continuous growth of the team and leadership shared amongst those involved. | Constantly revisited commitment. | Did not actively participate in implementation.

Conclusion

- Both teams met the five factors, Team B experienced failed implementation, Team A succeeded.
- Success was dependent on the implementation process and the plan in action.
- Researchers learned the importance of:
  - networking to find the right people and creating links between networks
  - buy-in and support from individuals and leaders
  - knowing, wanting, and planning for sustainability, scale, and spread.
- Teams and team-based care when they perform well, meet the demands of the system, the provider, and the patient.
- For organizations to advance, members need to develop a culture that reflects responsibilities, procedures, and decision-making.

Acknowledgements

We thank all of our participants and the study sites for the insight they provided, which greatly assisted in our research.