

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Running Head: Implementation of the AbilityQuotient

Title: The AbilityQuotient Dashboard: Outcomes of Implementing Patient-Specific Predictive Modeling in Inpatient Team Conference

Authors:

James A. Sliwa, DO^{1,2}, Julia Carpenter, SLP², Andrew Bodine, PhD.², Caitlin Deom, DPT², Richard L Lieber, PhD^{1,2}

- 1) Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine
- 2) Shirley Ryan AbilityLab

ORCID IDs

- James A. Sliwa: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0156-2609>
- Julia Carpenter: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2463-0360>
- Caitlin Deom: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8630-3713>
- Andrew J. Bodine: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6116-500X>
- Richard L. Lieber: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7203-4520>

A portion of this article was presented at the American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine 2020, 2022 annual meetings.

Please send correspondence to:

James A. Sliwa, DO
355 E. Erie St.
Chicago, IL, 60611

Phone: 312-238-4094
Fax: 312-238-5846
Email: jsliwa@sralab.org

Reprints will not be available

35 **Title:** The AbilityQuotient Dashboard: Outcomes of Implementing Patient-Specific Predictive Modeling in
36 Inpatient Team Conference

37 **Abstract:**

38 **Objective:** Recent reports have highlighted the importance of data-driven decision making as it relates
39 to precision medicine and the field of rehabilitation. One promising method to facilitate the integration
40 of data into patient care involves the use of data warehousing to process and host patient data, analytics
41 to produce useful results, and dashboarding technology to disseminate analytical results to care teams in
42 a digestible and interpretable format. This report describes the implementation of a new composite
43 rehabilitation outcome score (cROS), the AbilityQuotient, and predictive modeling into inpatient
44 interdisciplinary conferences through a patient data dashboard and its impact on outcomes.

45 **Design:**

46 **Setting:** Inpatient Rehabilitation Hospital

47 **Participants:** 13,397 patients completing inpatient rehabilitation from January 1, 2019 to December 31,
48 2023

49 **Intervention:** A patient centered, composite rehabilitation outcome score (cROS) and predictive
50 modeling dashboard implemented into team conference

51 **Main Outcome Metrics:** Self-care and mobility IRF-PAI Form GG change scores, length of stay pre- and
52 post-dashboard implementation; GG change scores compared to weighted national averages; clinician
53 survey regarding perspectives of dashboard use; GG item long term goal modifications and goal
54 attainment as a measure of influence on clinical plan of care

55

56 **Results:** After implementation of the patient outcomes dashboard into routine care, IRF-PAI Form GG
57 self-care scores rose by 2.09 points and corresponding mobility scores rose by 7.18 points despite a 2.29
58 day reduction in length of stay. Further exploration investigating these changes as they pertained to
59 payor revealed that these benefits occurred irrespective of insurer. Reports comparing facility to national
60 averages extracted from eRehabData, a national outcomes data system and registry, suggest that the use
61 of the outcomes dashboard resulted in greater reductions in length of stay and greater improvements in
62 functional outcomes during the 2019-2023 period compared to the previous period. A corresponding
63 survey assessing clinical perceptions of dashboard implementation revealed that it facilitated tracking
64 and summarizing patient progress, reinforced the use of outcome metrics, and was perceived as valuable
65 in goal setting and adjustment. Clinicians modified self-care goals six times more frequently and patients
66 met these goals 19% more of the time after introduction of the cROS while they changed mobility goals
67 nine times more frequently and patients met these goals 21% more of the time after introduction.

68 **Conclusion:** The incorporation of individual patient data and predictive modeling into rehabilitation
69 patient care through use of a team conference dashboard has potential to provide an objective basis

70 from which to perform precision rehabilitation. It also has the potential to impact outcome metrics
71 improving value-based care and consequently deserves further study.

72

73 **Funding Statement:** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
74 commercial, or non-profit sectors.

75

76 **Key Words:** outcome assessment, inpatients, rehabilitation research

77

78 **List of Abbreviations:** CMS = Center for Medicare and Medicaid, AQ = Ability Quotient, FIM = Functional
79 Independence Measure, IRF = inpatient rehabilitation facility, CFA = confirmatory factor analysis, MIRT =
80 multidimensional item response theory, EHR = electronic health record

81

82

83 **Introduction**

84 The ability to measure patient function and thus track progress during rehabilitation is required to
85 demonstrate the benefit of interventions, establishing criteria for quality and value, and accurately
86 making comparisons across patient groups, institutions, and post-acute care settings. There are
87 established common data elements to measure status and change in self-care and mobility function in
88 post-acute care, mandated as part of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid's (CMS) payment and quality
89 reporting programs. Additionally, there is emphasis from national professional organizations, private
90 payors, institutions, and researchers to standardize outcome measure collection. Currently, such
91 measures are used to demonstrate outcomes and value of rehabilitation services. Unfortunately, such
92 data are rarely used to consider individualized prognoses, guide referral to post-acute levels of care, and
93 monitor longitudinal progress (Butzer et al. ,2019).

94 In contrast, the concept of precision rehabilitation is that the right treatment is applied at the
95 right time to the right person, in the right setting (French et al. 2022). This philosophy emphasizes the
96 importance of predictive modeling to enable clinicians to make data-driven treatment decisions based
97 on an individual patient's needs. Critical components of precision rehabilitation include the
98 identification of patient subgroups who share specific characteristics related to disease progression and
99 outcomes, standardized measurement of function, precise and frequent longitudinal measurement of
100 real-world function, a comprehensive and well-maintained database, system and team science, and a
101 focus on prediction rather than association (French et al., 2022). A consequence of using data to drive
102 decision-making is that such data can be used for more than just reporting or insurance reimbursement
103 but may help rehabilitation clinicians to actively alter their treatment plans and thus deliver more
104 optimal outcomes for a specific patient.

105 Use of common data elements allow creates the capacity to harness electronic health record
106 data to develop predictive models to support decision-making by clinical teams. While this is

107 acknowledged to be an important step for supporting comparison of post-acute rehabilitation settings,
108 and self-care and mobility data elements are required to be reported to CMS, they have measurement
109 limitations that may limit their utility to achieve precision rehabilitation objectives. Specifically, these
110 self-care and mobility functional items (and their predecessor, the FIM items) are ordinally scaled, which
111 accounts for neither the multidimensional nature of functional tasks nor the differing degrees of
112 difficulty of functional tasks (Merbitz, Morris, & Grip, 1989; Hobart, Cano, Zajicek, & Thompson, 2007;
113 Liddel & Kruschke, 2018).

114 We previously addressed these limitations through development of AbilityQuotient (AQ) metric
115 in the domains of self-care (Bodine et al., 2021), mobility (Deom et al., 2021), and cognitive-
116 communication (Carpenter et al., 2024) that are computed with functional item level data from
117 mobility/self-care IRF-PAI section GG (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2015) or cognitive
118 Functional Independence Measure (Granger, Hamilton, Keith, et al., 1986), as well as additional
119 standardized assessment data (all of these items are found in Supplemental Tables 1-3). Inclusion of the
120 additional standardized assessment data in the AQ allows for more precise measurement of patient
121 status and change in function, with improved sensitivity to detect change and improved measurement
122 for more and less severely impaired patients. This published work described selection and
123 standardization of assessment data from over 8,000 rehabilitation patients. Confirmatory factor analysis
124 (CFA) yielded models for each domain, thereby delineating assessment items that comprise self-care,
125 mobility, and cognitive-communication domains. Then, multidimensional item response theory (MIRT)
126 methods was used to create overall scores for each domain, as well as subscores for subcomponents of
127 function. For example, the AQ Self-Care assessment's measurement model can yield scores for overall
128 self-care in addition to balance, upper extremity function, and swallowing. These MIRT-derived scores
129 comprising the AbilityQuotient (AQ) have means of zero with scores spanning negative (below average

130 patient ability) and positive (above average) values which represent a continuous range of patient
131 function.

132 As an illustration of the shortcomings of ordinal scales used in QI and FIM, AQ scores can be
133 compared to these scales by computing the cut-points between ordinal scale rating categories over the
134 continuous range of ability. For example, as seen in Figure 1A, an AQ score of 0.0 would likely correspond
135 to a QI rating of 3 (partial/moderate assistance) on chair to bed transfers. Yet, the AQ demonstrates
136 superior psychometric properties in comparison to the FIM and QI scales as noted by its greater
137 sensitivity compared to traditional ordinal categories (Bodine et al. 2021, Deom et al. 2021). For
138 example, as seen in Figure 1B, a patient's chair/bed transfer score does not change intervals on the QI's
139 rating scale, while it does change from a -2.0 to -1.0 on the AQ. The AQ also has higher ceilings and
140 lower floors compared to the FIM or QI, which better captures change for less and more severely
141 impaired patients. Additionally, the AQ's MIRT scores reflect a continuous scale of ability, which
142 normalizes how change is captured. For example, the amount of improvement in mobility made by a
143 patient moving from a -2.0 to -1.0 or -1.0 to 0.0 on the AQ's metric is one point irrespective of initial
144 severity; in contrast, the amount of improvement made on the chair/bed transfer item's ordinal scale
145 depends heavily on initial severity (Fig. 1C). A more impaired patient progressing from -2.0 to -1.0 on
146 the AQ would not improve on this item, but a comparatively less impaired patient progressing from -1.0
147 to 0.0 could expect to proceed from category 1 (dependent) to category 3 (partial/moderate assistance).
148 A similar region of insensitivity can similarly be seen for patients towards the higher end of the metric as
149 well. In short, scoring over a standardized, continuous range of ability permits more precise and
150 sensitive assessment compared to current measures.

151 While an AQ score in a given domain demonstrates a patient's composite score over time, such a
152 score can also be used to develop predictive models for groups of patients. Group-based predictions can
153 forecast probable performance over an episode of care for diagnostically-defined sets of patients, and

154 comparison of such a group-based prediction to a patient-specific individual curve can determine
155 whether an individual patient will or will not meet projected levels by a given discharge date. This type
156 of information allows the clinical team to link data to an individual's clinical course, review predictive
157 measures for a given patient, and monitor the course of recovery relative to prognosis in real time.
158 However, for outcomes data and predictive modeling to drive decision-making, clinicians and
159 interdisciplinary teams must be able to quickly visualize actionable data.

160 Consistent with the need to make rapid decisions based on high quality data, is the growing use
161 of dashboards in healthcare. Health care dashboards are typically employed to serve operational, quality,
162 safety, or practice improvement initiatives (Bucalon et al., 2022). They make use of structural, progress,
163 or outcomes related data at either generic or disease-specific levels. A dashboard for interdisciplinary
164 conference that uses patient-specific predictions has the potential to help teams make tailored
165 decisions.

166 We sought to align with precision rehabilitation objectives through the deployment of a
167 dashboard that visualizes scoring and predictive modeling results in inpatient interdisciplinary team
168 conference. More specifically, our aims were to 1) design a dashboard with clinical stakeholders that
169 incorporate the AQ metric and predictive models, 2) implement and assess the impact of the dashboard
170 on clinician perceptions and plan of care, and 3) evaluate the effect of dashboard implementation on
171 patient outcomes and length of stay as markers of value-based care.

172 **Methods**

173 *Design of AbilityQuotient (AQ) Dashboard*

174 The purpose of using a dashboard to display the AQ metric and predictive models was to provide
175 the interdisciplinary rehabilitation team with current data on patient progress and the ability to compare
176 score changes over time to a predictive model, fostering team discussion and plan of care decision-

177 making. Design of the dashboard was achieved by engaging a multi-stakeholder group, a beta-version
178 pilot used to gather clinical feedback, and integration of that clinical feedback into the final design.
179 Initially, a team composed of an inpatient rehabilitation physician, a clinical manager with a physical
180 therapy background, the hospital's chief medical officer, and a psychometrician met to discuss design
181 and deployment of a dashboard for clinical use. A prototype version was created using the Shiny package
182 (version 1.0.4) for the R programming language (Chang et al., 2017). It included specific features in (**
183 in Table 1) and was introduced to an interdisciplinary team consisting of physical and occupational
184 therapists, speech-language pathologists, nurses, and care managers to trial for team conference with
185 the aforementioned physician . After an introductory session to review the dashboard and models,
186 discipline-specific breakout groups met with trainers to discuss clinical cases and pilot team conference
187 communication with the use of the prototype. This pilot was informative to identify clinical training and
188 team conference communication needs, suggest modifications to graphics, and reduce the complexity of
189 the data displayed. After the pilot study dashboard introduction, teams noted shortcomings of a
190 diagnosis-focused predictive model since patients admitted at a higher or lower level of ability than
191 average for that diagnosis quickly outpaced or demonstrated limited ability to meet the diagnostic
192 prediction. The predictive model was re-envisioned as a set of nested piecewise hierarchical linear mixed
193 models (HLMs) with either random slopes and piecewise intercepts to provide patient-specific
194 predictions or only random slopes to provide an adjusted diagnosis prediction. Features were added to
195 the dashboard following the pilot (++ in Table 1).

196 Next, the development of the dashboard included additional rehabilitation team members,
197 leadership from the hospital Information Systems team, clinical directors, and consulting firms with
198 expertise in database administration, cloud systems engineering, and web development. A key
199 requirement for the AQ Dashboard was rapid integration of novel patient assessment data, and this need
200 was met through the development of automated data pipelines that transmitted data from an electronic

201 health record (EHR), through an enterprise data warehouse (EDW), and finally into a high-availability
202 application database on a daily basis. Once new data were loaded into the application database, R
203 programming language scripts were triggered to compute scores and either generate or update
204 predictions for the daily data import.

205 In addition to developing data systems and implementing design characteristics, this group
206 tested the logic of the AQ Dashboard using real patient data in a test environment to identify and rectify
207 issues. The next iterations of the AQ Dashboard, specifically Goal Tracker (Fig. 2) and Recovery Curve
208 Sections (Fig. 3) were developed. Importantly, because the AQ is composed of multiple clinical
209 assessments, the underlying basis for any change in the overall score can be “drilled down” with fairly
210 high granularity (Fig. 4). Certain features were ultimately removed from the Dashboard after a larger
211 rollout and feedback from interdisciplinary teams (labelled ^^ in Table 1). The Goal Line was ultimately
212 removed because it failed to provide a meaningful comparison point to the patient’s AQ score. This was
213 because the MIRT score associated with the Goal Line was derived solely from QI items, rather than all
214 items comprising the AQ score. The net result of the very large analytical effort on our patient data was
215 to create predictive models that were diagnosis and severity specific so that any patient’s individual AQ
216 scores (Fig. 5, black line) could be compared to a diagnostically similar group (Fig. 1, gray line).

217 *Clinical Implementation and Assessment of Clinician Perspective*

218 Implementation of the AQ dashboard into team conference required a shift in interdisciplinary
219 communication and workflow. Typical inpatient conferences prior to use of the AQ Dashboard involved
220 discussion patient current status and goals in GG or FIM scales, identification of factors limiting progress,
221 interdisciplinary management needs, discharge planning. Using the AQ Dashboard in team conference
222 required interpretation of data and incorporation of that data into team-based treatment decisions and

223 planning. Consequently, it necessitated an organized and structured initiative to train physicians, nurses,
224 and allied health staff.

225 Our inpatient rehabilitation hospital has seven inpatient floors (three treating stroke, brain
226 injury, other neurologic diagnoses; two treating spinal cord injury; and two treating general
227 rehabilitation diagnoses) for a total of 262 beds. From June 2020 to November 2020, education was
228 implemented sequentially by unit and began with unit leadership including attending physicians and
229 therapy managers. Standardized training included clinical interpretation of the AQ dashboard, shaping
230 team conference communication using the dashboard, and implementing workflow and practice
231 changes. Based on feedback from the pilot, scaffolded training sessions and objectives were conducted
232 for physical therapists, occupational therapists, and speech-language pathologists. They participated in
233 an 8-session series that involved practice and feedback; The training schedule and progressive session
234 learning objectives were structured (Table 2). Sessions were either discipline-specific or team-based,
235 with integration of the AQ Dashboard into live team conferences halfway through the training. To ensure
236 translation of practiced knowledge and skills into team conference, trainers completed regular audits,
237 which fostered specific, real-time feedback for managers and clinicians. Finally, to sustain these training
238 efforts within an evolving workforce, on-demand training content was created to support staff learning
239 about the AQ dashboard and how to incorporate its data into team conference communication.
240 Additionally, Innovation Center (inpatient) allied health clinical educators provide ongoing support for
241 interpretation and guidance for team conference.

242 After this initial training phase, teams participated in two additional sessions in March and April
243 2021 that used a decision-tree to support interpreting the AQ dashboard for clinical decision-making
244 related to the plan of care (Fig. 6). Finally, after audit of team conferences SCI and NMB teams were
245 identified for additional sessions, specifically focused on physician involvement in team conference and

246 interdisciplinary communication to balance interpretation of the dashboard as well as discharge planning
247 needs.

248 Clinician perspectives on use of the AQ Dashboard were gathered via survey to the
249 interdisciplinary teams. At 21 months post-implementation, a survey of all disciplines was conducted to
250 evaluate acceptance and assess the AQ Dashboard's impact on clinical practice. Survey questions were
251 divided into six categories, including the perceived value of incorporating the AQ into team conference,
252 its influence on team communication and plan of care, overall value, feasibility of integrating assessment
253 tools into practice, and an overall summative evaluation. Survey questions were rated on a 5-point Likert
254 scale using the ratings Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

255 Survey creation, administration, and data collection were performed using Redcap (Harris et al.,
256 2009; Harris et al., 2019). Clinicians were permitted one month to respond and sent reminders, after
257 which the data were extracted from Redcap and prepared for analysis using the R programming
258 language. In total, 115 responses (35 PTs, 23 OTs, 13 SLPs, 12 care managers, 5 therapy managers, 15
259 physicians, and 14 nurses) were recorded for the 18-item survey. Survey rating scale data were converted
260 to an integer value of -2 (Strongly Disagree) to 2 (Strongly Agree) for the sake of computing comparable
261 average item ratings such that negative values suggest negative affect, positive values reflect positive
262 affect, and averages near 0 imply neutrality or indifference.

263 Additionally, to understand how clinicians changed their plan of care after AQ Dashboard
264 implementation, we measured the frequency at which clinician's changed their GG item level long term
265 goals during the clinical encounter as well as attainment of those goals pre- and post-AQ dashboard
266 implementation. *Assessment of Patient Outcomes and Value Based Care*

267 To determine the impact of dashboard implementation on patient outcome measure
268 performance, changes in IRF-PAI Form GG self-care and mobility subscores were extracted from the

269 electronic health record. Form GG performance was used as the comparative measure due to 1)
270 therapists having access to Form GG scores for their patients prior to the dashboard's roll-out, 2) greater
271 recognition of the IRF-PAI within the field of physical rehabilitation, and 3) the availability of national
272 Form GG averages from industry registries and outcomes systems like eRehabData. "Transitionary"
273 patients present at the hospital during the June 2020-November 2020 clinician training period were
274 excluded from the sample if their episode of care overlapped with their clinician's training phase.

275 To reduce the impact of extraneous factors on the analytical results, age, biological sex, length of
276 stay, and admission Form GG scores were used as covariates in a series of regression analyses
277 investigating year-over-year changes in Form GG performance improvement using estimated marginal
278 means (EMMs) with the Bonferroni adjustment (Draper and Smith, 1981). These results used length of
279 stay, Form GG self-care change, and Form GG mobility change as dependent variables. EMM
280 comparisons for the provider-specific results were further computed over the margin of provider.

281 In addition to the results described above, yearly reports detailing facility and national Form GG averages
282 from the years 2019 through 2023 were extracted from eRehabData (eRehabData, 2024). Although these
283 tables do not contain mean comparisons due to the lack of standard deviation or standard errors within
284 the reports, the pattern of means comparing Form GG gains over time could still be used to identify
285 instances in which clinical dashboard usage appeared to offer advantages compared to other facilities.

286 **Results**

287 *Clinician Perspectives and Long Term Goals*

288 Most positive responses were seen for several surveyed areas as defined by an average item
289 rating greater than .30 (Table 3). These included a positive impressions of the AQ Dashboard regarding
290 its influence on setting or adjusting goals (.49), completion of measures in order to track patient progress
291 (.43), tracking the progress at the domain level to summarize progress (.41), ease of interpretation (.36),

292 reinforcing outcome measure use (.35), and use of the predictive models to help understand if a
293 patient's progress is on track (.30). Clinicians also had a positive impression regarding whether the
294 measure that comprise the patient's AQ score were feasible to complete during their rehabilitation stay
295 (.46).

296 Most negative responses as defined by negative average values were seen for items regarding
297 the AQ Dashboard's influence on making clinical decisions (-.03), its ability to highlight key information
298 during conference (-.07), its ability to facilitate a better outcome for patients (-.13), impact on
299 conference efficiency (-.17), influence on goal achievement (-.21), improvement compared to previous
300 team conference format (-.029), and ability to identify and address barriers to discharge (-.43).

301 Neutral responses were provided as defined by averages between .3 and 0.0 for items regarding
302 the AQ Dashboards focusing of conference on outcomes (.17), facilitating thinking about goals and
303 progress (.15), informing the discharge date (.13), and whether completing outcomes is important to the
304 treatment plan (.13).

305 Clinicians changed their long term goals for GG items more frequently in the post-
306 implementation sample. They modified their goals six- and nine-times more frequently in self-care and
307 mobility, respectively. Goal attainment rates after AQ implementation for GG item long term goals in the
308 self-care and mobility domains also increased by 19 and 21%, respectively.

309 *Clinical Outcomes and Value Based Care*

310 Over the course of the five-year window, length of stay decreased by an average of 2.29 days,
311 Form GG self-care subscores improved by 1.98 points, and Form GG mobility scores improved by 7.18
312 points (Table 4). While the pattern of significance does not indicate consistent year-over-year
313 improvements, all three outcome metrics suggest more favorable results for the most recent year
314 compared to 2019.

315 We further investigated whether significant changes across length of stay, self-care functional
316 scores, and mobility functional scores were present for patients insured by either Medicare or
317 commercial providers (Table 5). The results suggest that both types of payor saw significant decreases in
318 length of stay (Medicare: -1.98 days; Commercial: -2.44 days) and significant increases in IRF-PAI form GG
319 scores (Medicare, self-care: +1.98 points; Medicare, mobility: +6.67 points; Commercial, self-care: +2.11
320 points; Commercial, mobility: +7.01 points) between 2019 and 2023.

321 The eRehabData-derived metrics for the local facility were compared to national weighted
322 averages (Table 6). Because these results were pulled directly from an eRehabData report and were not
323 adjusted using the same covariates as the facility-specific year-over-year results described above, there
324 is no expectation that the results in Table 5 would match those in Table 4. The “overall” results suggest
325 that between 2019 and 2023, the facility using the clinical dashboard saw a greater reduction in length
326 of stay (by 1.77 days) while enjoying larger gains in self-care (by 0.78 points) and mobility (by 3.19
327 points).

328 **Discussion**

329 In this quality improvement project, we implemented a patient-specific predictive model and
330 outcomes dashboard in interdisciplinary inpatient team conferences and evaluated its effects. Clinician
331 survey impressions were variable, yet favored certain key features introduced by the dashboard.
332 Implementation of the AQ Dashboard also resulted in a large increase in changing the rehabilitation
333 plan, as defined by long-term goal setting in self-care and mobility domains. Patients also met long-term
334 goals in these domains more frequently after implementation of the AQ Dashboard. Post-
335 implementation analysis of LOS and changes in GG scores also indicates improvements in clinical
336 outcomes – improved change scores in a shorter period of time – as a result of use of the AQ Dashboard.
337 Notably, these changes in outcomes surpassed nationally reported change scores and were consistent

338 across different insurance types. Such significant improvements in change scores, coupled with reduced
339 length of stay (a proxy of cost), demonstrates the potential of the AQ Dashboard to enhance value-based
340 care.

341 Clinician responses favored the AQ Dashboards influence on setting and adjusting goals, tracking
342 patient progress at the domain level, and using predictive models to understand if the patient is on
343 target. These impressions align with several components of precision rehabilitation – specifically that
344 the plan of care for a patient is adjusted based on their progress and prediction to individualize
345 rehabilitation. Likewise, clinicians then adjusted those goals much more frequently and patients
346 attained those goals more often post implementation. Interestingly, clinicians had more negative
347 impressions on the AQ Dashboard’s influence on clinical decisions, facilitating better outcomes for
348 patients, or enhancing goal achievement.

349 Survey responses also highlighted limitations of the AQ Dashboard regarding its ability to
350 highlight key information for discussion during team conference and identify and address barriers to
351 discharge. The dashboard itself lacks these details - such as, the reason a patient may not be
352 progressing or discharge considerations based on available caregiver support. Such aspects of
353 interdisciplinary team conference must be preserved along with using the AQ Dashboard. Teams also did
354 not agree that it was more efficient to use the AQ Dashboard in team conference.

355 Determining the specific impacts of the AQ Dashboard on outcomes and LOS is complex and
356 beyond the scope of this project. Recently, Zuang et al. (2022) introduced a framework for evaluating
357 healthcare dashboards, offering clearer guidance on assessing factors influencing interaction
358 effectiveness, user experience, and system efficacy. To ensure the continued effectiveness and scalability
359 of the AQ Dashboard, further evaluation of these factors is necessary to refine its design components.

360 Teams underwent extensive training to understand and utilize the AQ Dashboard effectively. This
361 training included restructuring team conferences to focus on comparing actual progress with predicted
362 outcomes, identifying specific areas for personalized treatment, and using the predictive model to
363 inform decisions about care plans and length of stay. Scaling this level of training across different
364 institutions would be challenging without dedicated organizational support. Moreover, integrating EHR
365 data into the dashboard requires robust information technology and data science infrastructure.

366 Another limitation is that our evaluation of the AQ Dashboard was not completed in a controlled
367 environment and did not control for other variables that could affect length of stay, clinical outcomes, or
368 clinician perspective. Future work could evaluate the comparative outcomes of different teams using
369 such a dashboard.

370 The AQ Metrics address the psychometric flaws of current assessment tools used to document
371 functional progress by accounting for the varying degrees of difficulty and the multidimensionality of
372 assessed functional items. As a continuous scale, it can identify improvement before changes are
373 observable on current assessment tools and provides an avenue for comparison of outcomes between
374 post-acute settings. In contrast to deciphering the many rehabilitation outcome measures that could be
375 used in practice, this composite rehabilitation score is suitable for predictive modeling and relatively
376 easy interpretation by clinical teams.

377 **Conclusion**

378 We developed, piloted, and measured the impact of a clinical dashboard that incorporated a
379 composite rehabilitation outcome score (cROS), the AbilityQuotient, and group- and patient-specific
380 predictive modeling. Our results demonstrated that such an analytical approach combined with a
381 clinician-friendly dashboard can result in improved patient outcomes and is a step toward precision
382 rehabilitation.

384 **Figure Legends**

385 **Figure 1.** A): Comparison of functional ratings on the ordinally-scaled IRF-PAI Form GG item “Chair to Bed
386 Transfer” to the continuous MIRT scoring scale for the mobility domain. B): Demonstration of MIRT score
387 change not being captured by functional scale. C): Demonstration of equally-sized increases on
388 continuous MIRT scale suggesting different amounts of functional gain on the ordinal rating scale

389 **Figure 2.** Goal Tracker section of the AQ Dashboard displaying current status and long term goals for GG
390 or FIM items

391 **Figure 3.** Recovery Curve section of the AQ Dashboard displaying AQ score, adjusted diagnosis
392 prediction, and individual prediction

393 **Figure 4.** Recovery Curve section of the AQ Dashboard displaying subcomponents of function in the
394 Mobility Domain

395 **Figure 5.** Recovery Curve section of the AQ Dashboard displaying all predictive models (diagnosis
396 prediction, adjusted diagnosis prediction, and individual prediction)

397 **Figure 6.** Decision-tree for decision-making with use of the AQ Dashboard

398

399

400 **Literature References**

- 401 1) Bodine AJ, Heinemann AW, Carpenter J, Taylor SM, Hansen P, Lieber RL, Sliwa J. Development of
402 a multidimensional, multigroup measure of self -care for inpatient rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med*
403 *Rehabil* 2021;102: 92-105
- 404 2) Deom CE, Carpenter J, Bodine AJ, Taylor SM, Heinemann AW, Lieber RL, Sliwa JA. A mobility
405 measure for inpatient rehabilitation using multigroup, multidimensional methods. *Journal of*
406 *Neurologic Physical Therapy* 2021; 45 (2) :101-111
- 407 3) Carpenter J, Deom CE, Bodine A, Sliwa J, Heinemann AW. Development of a multidimensional,
408 multigroup measure of cognitive-communication for inpatient rehabilitation. [preprint]
- 409 4) Porter ME. What is value in health care. *N Engl J Med* 2010; 363(26) : 2477-81
- 410 5) Butzer JF, Kozlowski AJ, Virva R. Measuring value in post-acute care. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*
411 2019; 100: 990-94.
- 412 6) French MA, Roemmich RT, Daley K, Beier M, Penttinens S, Raghavan P , et al. Precision
413 Rehabilitation: Optimizing function, adding value to health care. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2022;
414 103: 1233-9.
- 415 7) Bucalon, B., Shaw, T., Brown, K., & Kay, J. (2022). State-of-the-art dashboards on clinical indicator
416 data to support reflection on practice: scoping review. *JMIR Medical Informatics*, 10(2), e32695.
- 417 8) Zhuang, M., Concannon, D., & Manley, E. (2022). A framework for evaluating dashboards in
418 healthcare. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 28(4), 1715-1731.
- 419 9) Merbitz, C., Morris, J., & Grip, J. C. (1989). Ordinal scales and foundations of misinference. *Archives*
420 *of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 70(4), 308-312.
- 421 10) Hobart, J. C., Cano, S. J., Zajicek, J. P., & Thompson, A. J. (2007). Rating scales as outcome
422 measures for clinical trials in neurology: problems, solutions, and recommendations. *The Lancet*
423 *Neurology*, 6(12), 1094-1105.

- 424 11) Liddell, T. M., & Kruschke, J. K. (2018). Analyzing ordinal data with metric models: What could
425 possibly go wrong? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 79, 328-348.
- 426 12) Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services . *Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Patient Assessment*
427 *Instrument (IRF-PAI)*. 2015.
- 428 13) Granger, C. V., Hamilton, B. B., Keith, R. A., Zielezny, M., & Sherwin, F. S. (1986). Advances in
429 functional assessment for medical rehabilitation. *Topics in Geriatric Rehabilitation*, 1(3), 59-74.
- 430 14) Chang, W., Cheng, J., Allaire, JJ, Xie, J., McPherson, J. (2017). *shiny: Web Application Framework*
431 *for R. R package (version 1.0.4)*. CRAN archive. [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/shiny/index.html)
432 [project.org/web/packages/shiny/index.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/shiny/index.html)
- 433 15) eRehabData. Welcome to eRehabData.com. Available at:
434 <https://erehabdata.com/erehabdata/index.jsp>. Accessed July 22, 2024.
- 435 16) Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Thielke, R., Payne, J., Gonzalez, N., Conde, J. G. (2009). Research electronic
436 data capture (REDCap) – A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
437 translational research informatics support, *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 42(2). 377-81.
- 438 17) Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Minor, B. L., Elliott, V., Fernandez, M., O’Neal, L., McLeod, L., Delacqua, G.,
439 Delacqua, F., Kirby, J., Duda, S. N. (2019). The REDCap consortium: Building an international
440 community of software partners, *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 95.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208>
- 442 18) Draper N.R., Smith H. *Applied regression analysis*. John Wiley & Sons; 1981.

Table 1. Ability Quotient Dashboard Features.

**Beta-version features. ++Features added following pilot of Beta-Version. ^Features removed after use by interdisciplinary teams

Name	Description	Purpose	How Derived
**Demographic Information	Patient name, DOB, medical service, room number, admission and discharge dates	Ensures accurate clinician recognition of patient for displayed data; draw attention to discharge date	Routine entry of information into the electronic health record
**Goal Tracker by Domain	Current GG or FIM status of the patient Discharge GG or FIM goal for the patient ^^Expected current performance	Rapid comparison of current status and discharge goals; determine if goals need modification due to progress/lack of progress	Routine entry of information into the electronic health record
**Recovery Curve by Domain	AQ Score, Subcomponent Scores, Predictive Models	Assessment of progress or lack of progress; comparison to predicted performance and prediction by	Predictions computed from hierarchical linear mixed models hosted on cloud server

		discharge	
**Domains of Mobility, Self-Care, And Cognitive-Communication	Each domains contains an associated Goal Tracker and Recovery Curve	Reduce visual burden of data from all domains	NA
**AQ Score	Single metric of progress per domain	Rapid interpretation of progress without need for interdisciplinary team members to understand outcomes of other disciplines	IRT scores computed using the AQ's 3 domain-specific multigroup MIRT models hosted on cloud server
**Subcomponent AQ Scores	Scores derived from measures that comprise the skill (e.g. balance, swallowing, memory)	Identification of particular skill areas in need of modification to plan of care	IRT scores computed using the AQ's 3 domain-specific multigroup MIRT models hosted on cloud server
**Diagnosis Prediction	Predictive model based on patients in the same medical service group (e.g. stroke, brain injury)	Comparison of patient to patients with same diagnosis	Predictions computed from hierarchical linear mixed models hosted on cloud server
++Adjusted	Predictive model based on	Comparison to patients with same	Predictions computed from hierarchical

Diagnosis Prediction	patients in the same medical service group, adjusted by initial assessment performance (ability/severity at admission)	diagnosis and ability level	linear mixed models hosted on cloud server
++Individual Prediction	Predictive model based on patients in the same group and updated given new outcomes data	Comparison of patient's prediction for discharge with adjusted diagnosis prediction	Predictions computed from hierarchical linear mixed models hosted on cloud server
++Prediction Intervals			
^^Goal Line	Composite of GG or FIM long term goals to provide marker of goal attainment	Comparison of patient's current and predicted performance to clinician-specified goals	
**Length of Stay Toggle	Continuous toggle or write-in for estimated length of stay	Team adjusts LOS Toggle to determine when patient performance may meet the goal line or adjusted diagnosis prediction for discharge	Defaults to medical record data, may be changed to view impact on AQ score and predictions

**Patient Traits	Domain-specific grouping variables	Specifying which item sets and domain scores most closely match the patient's diagnosis and status	Current level of balance (self-care), discharge mode of locomotion goal (mobility) and cognitive diagnosis (cog-comm) either automatically derived from medical record, but may be altered using a drop-down menu on the dashboard
------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

Table 2. Training Sessions for Physical Therapists, Occupational Therapists, and Speech-Language Pathologists

Session	Duration/Type	Objectives
#1 Introduction	18 minutes On-Demand E-Learning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss clinical rationale for development of the AQ metric and Dashboard 2. Define basic components of the AQ Dashboard 3. Describe intended uses of the AQ Dashboard 4. Outline training plan for allied health clinicians
#2 Discipline Specific Overview	45 minutes Live	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. List the measures that contribute to the AQ for their discipline 2. Identify two primary components of the AQ Dashboard: Goal Tracker and Recovery Curve 3. Identify parameters during modeling of AQ team conference 4. Explore AQ Dashboard domains, Goal Tracker, and Recovery Curve
#3 Discipline Specific Practice Cases	1 hour, 45 minutes Live	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe impact of Patient Traits on the AQ 2. State appropriate uses of “If-then” vs. Lock-In features on AQ Dashboard 3. Following a model, interpret the Goal Tracker and Recovery Curve for a given patient for initial and interim conferences 4. Evaluate timing of team conference communication
Team Begins Use of AQ Dashboard in Team Conference		
#4 Discipline Specific Cases from Current Caseload	1 hour, 45 minutes Live	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Verbalize non-AQ patient considerations for team conference 2. Appropriately review the Goal Tracker, Recovery Curve, and non-AQ considerations for a given patient (initial and interim as available) 3. Write AQ team conference coverage for a sample patient 4. Discuss decision-making considerations given data presented on Dashboard
#5 Team Practice Cases	45 minutes Live	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interpret the Goal Tracker for your team (initial and interim) 2. Interpret the Recovery Curve by domain for team audience (initial and interim) 3. Address non-AQ patient considerations as a team
#6 Discipline Specific Cases from Caseload	45 minutes Live	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe impact of QI/FIM and assessment scores on Recovery Curve trends 2. Efficiently interpret the Goal Tracker, Recovery Curve, address non-AQ patient considerations
#7 Team Feedback	45 minutes Live	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Self-assess/compare current performance with targeted performance for reporting during AQ conference
#8 Discipline Specific Question and Answer	45 minutes Live	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resolve outstanding questions 2. Evaluate own adherence to team conference parameters and additional learning needs

Table 3. Average item rating of survey responses after conversion of Likert Scale to -2 to 2

Item	Overall
Setting or adjusting goals	0.49
Completing the repeated measures that comprise the patient's AQ score is feasible to do throughout the patient's IP rehabilitation stay	0.46
Completing the AQ outcome measures is important to track patient progress	0.43
Tracking progress at the domain level (Self-care, Mobility, Cognitive-Communication) facilitates summarizing progress	0.41
The visual format and metrics in the AQ Dashboard are easy to interpret	0.36
Knowing that data will be discussed in team conference reinforces my use of outcome measures in routine practice	0.35
Using predictive models helps me understand if my patient's progress is on target	0.30
Makes team conference outcomes focused	0.17
Facilitates my thinking about setting patient goals and patient progress	0.15
Informing discharge date	0.13
Completing the AQ outcome measures is important to inform my treatment plan	0.13
<hr/>	
Making Clinical decisions	-0.03
Highlights key information for discussion during team conference	-0.07
Facilitates a better outcome for patients	-0.13
Use of the AQ Dashboard enhances the efficiency of team conference	-0.17
Enhances goal achievement because it allows the team to prioritize and change the dosing of therapeutic interventions	-0.21
When compared to team conference prior to its use, the AQ has improved team conference	-0.29
Identifying and addressing barriers to discharge	-0.43

Table 4. Year-by-year length of stay and change scores for self-care and mobility domains

Year	N	LoS	Δ Self-Care	Δ Mobility
2019	2,500	21.27	12.67	26.96
2020	2,566	19.91*	14.03*	32.37*
2021	2,739	19.54*	14.26*	32.86*
2022	2,732	19.79*	14.55*	32.94*
2023	2,860	18.98*	14.76*	34.14*

* = Significantly different from 2019 value

Table 5: Changes in length of stay, IRF-PAI Form GG Self-Care, and IRF-PAI Form GG Mobility during the study period, separated by provider (Medicare or commercial)

Year	Provider	N	LoS	Δ Self-Care	Δ Mobility
2019	Medicare	1,293	20.05	12.22	26.15
2020	Medicare	1,198	19.33	13.51*	31.19*
2021	Medicare	1,260	18.67*	13.67*	31.59*
2022	Medicare	1,189	18.79*	13.97*	31.81*
2023	Medicare	1,261	18.07*	14.20*	32.91*
2019	Commercial	1,831	21.49	12.64	27.19
2020	Commercial	1,943	19.90*	14.21*	32.90*
2021	Commercial	2,038	19.64*	14.38*	33.39*
2022	Commercial	2,075	19.70*	14.65*	33.35*
2023	Commercial	2,038	19.05*	14.75*	34.20*

Table 6. Facility vs. Weighted National Average (eRehabData) length of stay and change scores for self-care and mobility domains

Year	Facility			Weighted National Average		
	LoS	Δ Self-Care	Δ Mobility	LoS	Δ Self-Care	Δ Mobility
2019	22.38	10.10	21.15	15.48	9.80	23.08
2020	22.46	11.17	24.82	16.10	10.52	23.93
2021	21.80	11.68	25.63	15.63	10.83	24.65
2022	21.28	11.80	25.85	15.27	10.79	25.10
2023	20.61	12.03	26.99	14.87	10.95	25.73

Figure 1




Figure 2.




Figure 3




Figure 4.



Figure 5




Figure 6

