

Hospice Palliative Care Ontario's Indicators and Targets for the Volunteer Hospice Visiting Service

Hospice Palliative Care Ontario's Final Draft Indicators and Targets

Introduction

In an effort to ensure consistent quality care throughout the province, the Hospice Palliative Care Ontario (HPCO) and its members developed *Client Service Standards for the Volunteer Hospice Visiting Service*, March 1999. An October 2000 survey of HPCO members indicated that the majority of respondents are in varying stages of implementing the standards.

As a next step HPCO is developing indicators as a method to assist its member agencies to monitor how well they are implementing/meeting the standards and to identify areas for improvement.

Goal for the Project

The goal for the project is to develop indicators and targets to be used as a guide for HPCO member agencies in monitoring how well they are addressing the quality dimensions and meeting the standards in order to assist their quality improvement efforts.

The indicators have been developed based on HPCO's *Client Service Standards for the Volunteer Hospice Visiting Service*.

Criteria for Selection of Indicators

During the process HPCO has taken into account the two cautions received by the Panel on Accountability and Governance in the Voluntary Sector:

- excessively onerous regulations and reporting requirements must be avoided or the spirit of volunteerism itself could be undermined
- the considerable diversity within the sector must be respected and accommodated (e.g. size, budget, funding source)¹

Examples of criteria used in the selection of indicators are:

- ease in collecting data
- availability of required resources (reasonable cost and time)
- usefulness and relevancy of results
- ability of hospice to improve the situation if a target is not met

As with the development of the standards, HPCO has used an extensive process for the selection of the indicators and targets to ensure that HPCO member agencies agree with them and are able to use them. The steps in the process included:

¹ Panel on Accountability and Governance in the Voluntary Sector. *Building on Strength: Improving Governance and Accountability in Canada's Voluntary Sector.* February 1999, p.2-3.

1

- 1. Mary Davies of Mary Davies Consultants who facilitated the development of the Client Service Standards for the Volunteer Hospice Visiting Service developed draft indicators and targets.
- 2. Janet Napper, Executive Director HPCO and the consultant discussed draft indicators and targets.
- 3. Members of the Indicators Working Group suggested revisions to the draft indicators and targets. The members included:
 - Barbara Bowie, The Dorothy Ley Hospice
 - Keith Conrad, Hospice Wellington
 - Glenn Dudman, Program Supervisor Long Term Care Division, Central Region, Ministry of Health and Long Term Care
 - Beth Ellis, Dr. Bob Kemp Hospice Foundation
 - Cheryl McLeod, Hospice Durham
 - Janet Napper, Hospice Palliative Care Ontario
- 4. HPCO member agencies received a copy of the draft indicators and targets for input at regional meetings.
- 5. Mary Davies and Janet Napper attended five regional meetings to present the draft indicators and targets for feedback.
- 6. Consultant made revisions to the draft indicators and targets based on the feedback from the regional meetings.
- 7. HPCO member agencies received a copy of the revised draft indicators and targets for input at HPCO conference.
- 8. HPCO member agencies faxed/emailed to HPCO their responses to questions for HPCO conference's indicator presentation.
- 9. Mary Davies and Janet Napper presented the revised indicators and targets at the HPCO conference for final comment.
- 10. Consultant made revisions to the draft indicators and targets based on the feedback from HPCO conference.
- 11. HPCO member agencies received a copy of the final draft indicators and targets.

Sources of Information

The standards included in the document are from HPCO's *Client Service Standards for the Volunteer Hospice Visiting Service*. Some of the standards are directly quoted or adapted with permission from the Ontario Community Support Association's standards. These are identified throughout the document by an *.

The format and content for the indicators and targets are based on the work of others including:

- Benson, D. *Measuring Outcomes in Ambulatory Care*. Chicago: American Hospital Publishing Co., 1992.
- Halton-Peel District Health Council. *Guidebook for the Evaluation of the Quality of Services provide by Community-Based Long-Term Care Agencies*. Mississauga: Halton-Peel District Health Council, 1999.

• Ontario Community Support. *Standards and Indicators for Community Support Services: the Guide to Quality Care*. Toronto: Ontario Community Support Association, 1999.

Definitions of Terms

Criteria: They are steps taken to promote the achievement of a standard.²

Indicator: For this project, it is defined as a measurement tool used as a guide to monitor how well a hospice agency has addressed the quality dimensions and met the HPCO standards in order to improve the quality of the Volunteer Hospice Visiting Service.³

Quality Dimensions: They are measurable components of the service examined to determine if the agency is providing a quality service. HPCO standards have been grouped according to the following quality dimensions: 5

Accessibility: the community being knowledgeable about the service and the service being accessible to all major groups within the community.

Client Perspective: clients and caregivers being involved in the decision making concerning their care and being satisfied with the care they received.

Competence: the volunteers having the appropriate knowledge and skill level to provide the hospice palliative care.

Continuity: the service being coordinated with other service providers.

Safety: the service to the client/caregiver being provided in a "safe" manner.

Standard: It is the desired and achievable level of performance against which actual performance can be compared.⁶

_

² Canadian Council on Health Services Accreditation. *Standards for Home Care Organizations: A Client-centred Approach*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Health Services Accreditation, 1997, p.31.

³ Based on Halton-Peel District Health Council's *Guidebook for the Evaluation of the Quality of Services Provided by Community-Based Long-Term Care Agencies*. Mississauga: Halton-Peel District Health Council, April 1999, G-1 and Canadian Council on Health Services Accreditation. *Indicators and the AIM Accreditation Program*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Health Services Accreditation, 2001, p.1.

⁴ Based on the work of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations. *Primer on Indicator Development and Application*. Oakbrook Terrace: Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, 1990, p.8.

⁵ Except for competence, these are some of the dimensions of quality adapted from the Ministry of Health's *Provincial Requirements for the Request for Proposal Process for the Provision of In-Home Services, Supplies and Equipment.* May 1996 which sources Donabedian, A. *The role of outcomes in quality assessment and assurance.* Quality Review Bulletin 1992: 18(ii), 356-60 and Macdonald, M. and Boulianne, R. *Governance for quality, getting to the heart of it.* Healthcare Management Forum 1995, 8 (iii), 46.

Target: It is an achievable goal that a hospice aims to reach. It is compatible with current knowledge and provides a stretch for the hospice to accomplish. The target can be increased once the original target is achieved.⁷

Use of the Indicator Chart

An indicator chart has been designed to assist a hospice in its quality improvement process. Unless otherwise stated, the charts are to be completed yearly.

Each chart includes the following completed information

- 1. Quality Dimension being examined
- 2. Standard and if applicable criterion being monitored
- 3. Indicator being used to monitor how well the standard and if applicable criterion is being met
- 4. Target setting the goal the hospice is trying to achieve

Suggestions are provided for:

- 1. Methods to collect information
- 2. Methods for analysis

A hospice may decide to use other methods to collect information or to analyze the results.

Each hospice will need to complete:

- 1. Result. This box shows the result a specific hospice achieved based on its analysis. This will vary by hospice.
- 2. Factors affecting achievement of target. If a hospice does not achieve a specific target, this box provides an opportunity for the hospice to list the reasons. This is beneficial for a number of reasons including identification of key areas for improvement, and/or information to provide for additional funding requests.
- 3. Quality improvement strategies. The ultimate reason for creating indicators and targets is to identify areas for improvement. If a specific target is not achieved, the hospice should outline approaches it will use to achieve the target.

Indicators have not been developed for all standards. As noted at the bottom of the charts, some indicators also relate to other quality dimensions and standards.

Next Steps

⁶ Canadian Council on Health Services Accreditation. Standards for Home Care Organizations: A Clientcentred Approach. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Health Services Accreditation, 1997, p.41.

⁷ Based on work of Benson, D. *Measuring Outcomes in Ambulatory Care*. Chicago: American Hospital Publishing Co., 1992.

HPCO is developing a proposal for funding to further test and implement the draft indicators. This will assist in:

- developing province wide tools (e.g. satisfaction surveys, incident and complaint forms and an indicator audit tool for client and volunteer records)
- further refining the indicators and targets
- analyzing and presenting the province-wide and region-wide results for each indicator
- identifying difficulties in data collection
- identifying areas where HPCO member agencies might require further assistance

Expectations of the Agencies with the Indicators and Targets

Once the testing is completed, it is expected that the agencies will strive to use the indicators and targets in order to monitor how well they are meeting the standards and quality dimensions and to assist them in identifying where improvements can be made in their Volunteer Hospice Visiting Service.

Final Draft Indicators and Targets

| Quality Dimension: Ac | cessibility - the community | being knowledgeable about | the service and the service being | g accessible to all |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| ma | ajor groups within the com | munity. | | |
| Standard 1.1: The | ne hospice has an ongoing | process for informing the pub | olic and other service providers of | of its service. |
| Criteria: A | ll (see standards document | c, p.5-6) | | |
| Indicator 1. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Number of referrals | Annual increases, amount varies with hospice | Review data base | Count of number of referrals | |
| Factors affecting achie | evement of target: | | | |
| Quality improvement s | strategies: | | | · |

| Standard 1.1: The h | r groups within the com- nospice has an ongoing p (see standards document | rocess for informing the public | and other service providers of | its service. |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|--------------|
| Indicator 2. | Target | Methods to Collect Information | Analysis | Results |
| Number of referrals by source | Referrals from at least three different sources (e.g. CCAC, hospital, physician, self-referral, previous clients/caregivers) | Review sources of referral annually | Count of total referrals from each source | |
| Factors affecting achieve | ement of target: | | | |

| | or groups within the combospice has an ongoing p | · | lic and other service providers of | its service. |
|-----------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Criteria: All | (see standards documen | t p.5-6) | - | |
| Indicator 3. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of clients | Varies with | Review of data base | Example for gender: | |
| served by: | individual hospice | | | |
| a) Age group | _ | | # of females x100 | |
| b) Gender | | | total # of clients | |
| c) Geographic area | | | | |
| d) Diagnosis | | | | |
| e) Language | | | | |

Quality improvement strategies:

Note:

- 1. Age group categories are:
 - 0 to 19
 - 20 to 49
 - 50 to 74
 - 75+
- 2. Geographic area refers to areas specified/identified by individual hospices
- 3. Diagnosis includes the following categories:
 - cancer
 - AIDS
 - circulatory system diseases
 - diseases of the respiratory system
 - other
- 4. Language refers to primary/first language spoken at home

| _ • | ssibility - the commun | ity being knowledgeable about the ommunity. | service and the service being a | ccessible to all |
|---|---|--|--|------------------|
| Standard 1.2: The h | ospice provides servic | es based upon the client's/caregiver | r's needs and the parameters of | the service.* |
| Criterion D: The s | service is initiated in a | timely manner. | | |
| Indicator 4. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Number of days before client receives contact concerning assessment or service | 80% receive contact within 2 working days | Audit a minimum of 50 client records (or 50% of the total depending which is the smaller number) | # of clients contacted within 2 working days x100 50 | |
| Factors affecting achieven | nent of target: | | | |
| Quality improvement strat | tegies: | | | |

| v | or groups within the | · · | | -£41 |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------|
| | | vices based upon the client's/caregiver | r's needs and the parameters | of the service.* |
| | specific one. | | T | |
| Indicator 5. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of primary | 90% satisfied | Survey of a minimum of 50 | # satisfied x100 | |
| caregivers satisfied with | | primary caregivers of deceased | # of respondents | |
| service client received | | clients (or 50% of the total | | |
| | | depending which is the smaller | | |
| | | number) | | |
| Factors affecting achieve | ment of target: | • | • | |
| S | O | | | |
| Quality improvement stra | ntegies: | | | L |

Note: Primary caregiver is defined as the person who provides the majority of care to the client such as a family member, friend, or neighbor. The person does not include paid staff and hospice volunteers.

Primary caregivers to be surveyed between three and six months after client died.

Also relates to:

Quality Dimension: Client Perspective

Standard: 2.1

| - • | ressibility - the committee groups within the | unity being knowledgeable about the | service and the service being | ng accessible to all |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| | , , , | vices based upon the client's/caregive | r's needs and the narameter | s of the service * |
| | specific one. | vices based upon the elients/earegive. | s needs and the parameter | s of the service. |
| Indicator 6. | Target | Methods to Collect Information | Analysis | Results |
| Percentage of primary caregivers satisfied with service they received | 90% satisfied | Survey of a minimum of 50 primary caregivers of deceased clients (or 50% of the total depending which is the smaller number) | # satisfied x100 # of respondents | |
| Factors affecting achieve | ement of target: | | | |
| Quality improvement stra | ategies: | | | l |

Note: Primary caregiver is defined as the person who provides the majority of care to the client such as a family member, friend, or neighbour. The person does not include paid staff and hospice volunteers.

Primary caregivers to be surveyed between three and six months after client died.

Also relates to:

Quality Dimension: Client Perspective

Standard: 2.1

| Quality Dimension 2: Clie | nt Perspective - client | s and caregivers being involved in the | ne decision making concerning th | neir care and |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|
| Beir | ng satisfied with the ca | are they receive. | | |
| Standard 2.1: An | individualized assessn | nent is completed to determine the c | lient's/caregiver's specific needs. | * |
| Criterion A: See | standards document, | p. 8-9 | | |
| Indicator 7. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of client records with documented individualized assessment | 100% of client records with documented individualized assessment | Audit a minimum of 50 client records (or 50% of the total depending which is the smaller number) | # of client records with individualized assessment x100 50 | |
| Factors affecting achieven | nent of target: | | | |
| Quality improvement stra | tegies: | | , | |

Also relates to:

Quality Dimension: Accessibility

Standard: 1.4

| Ovality Dimongian 2. Clica | 4 Danamastina alianta | and associuses bains involved in th | as desision malting concerning | thair agra and |
|--|--|---|---|----------------|
| - • | g satisfied with the car | and caregivers being involved in the they receive | the decision making concerning | men care and |
| Standard 2.2: Clien | ts and caregivers are r | respected as individuals and involved by a qualified coordinator at the | | |
| Criterion: No s | pecific one. | | | |
| Indicator 8. | Target | Methods to Collect Information | Analysis | Results |
| Percentage of caregivers who report being involved in deciding service received e.g. • emotional support (i.e. anticipatory grief, bereavement support) • relief from caregiving • referral resource information (e.g. power of attorney, wills, funeral arrangements, other resources) • advocacy | 80% report being involved in deciding service received | Survey a minimum of 50 caregivers (or 50% of the total depending which is the smaller number) | # reporting being involved in deciding service received x100 # of respondents | |
| Factors affecting achievem | ent of target: | | | |
| Ovality improvement street | | | | |
| Quality improvement strat | egies: | | | |

| Quality Dimension 3: Safet | y - the service to the cli | ient/caregiver being provided in a " | 'safe" manner. | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Standard 3.1: A qua | alified coordinator con | ducts ongoing intensive screening of | of all volunteers who visit clien | ts/caregivers.* |
| Criterion C: Each | volunteer must submit | a current (i.e. dated no earlier than | the date of the volunteer's inte | rview with the |
| qualif | fied coordinator) police | e records check report, which the vo | olunteer should seek from the p | olice service in |
| whose | e jurisdiction the volun | teer currently resides. (If the perso | on has moved in the last five ye | ears, the |
| | | is fact to the police service when a | | |
| region | ns, the police will make | e a request of other police services | for information from local reco | ords). ⁸ |
| Indicator 9. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of volunteers | 100% of the | Audit a minimum of 50 | # of completed forms x100 | |
| who have submitted an | volunteers have | volunteer records (or 50% of | 50 | |
| acceptable current police | submitted an | the total depending which is the | | |
| records check report prior | acceptable current | smaller number) | | |
| to client contact | police records | | | |
| | check report prior | | | |
| | to client contact | | | |
| Factors affecting achievem | ent of target: | | | |
| | | | | |
| Quality improvement strat | egies: | | | |
| | | | | |

_

⁸ Each police service determines what it will and will not include in a police records check, and how and to whom it will release police records check information, whether to the individual applicant or to the organization seeking the information. The agency should check with its local or regional police service or the OPP where it provides regional police services, to understand what its police records check includes and does not include (See Appendix A of HPCO's *Client Service Standards for the Volunteer Hospice Visiting Service*, March 1999 for further information).

| • | | ent/caregiver being provided in a " | | |
|---|--|---|---|------------------|
| Standard 3.1: A qua | alified coordinator cond | ducts ongoing intensive screening | of all volunteers who visit clier | nts/caregivers.* |
| Criterion: No s | pecific one | | | |
| Indicator 10. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of volunteers who have documentation of ongoing supervisory contact | 100% have ongoing supervisory contact documented | Varies with individual hospice's methods of documentation e.g. volunteer record, client record. Audit a minimum of 50 records (or 50% of the total depending which is the smaller number) | # of volunteers with documentation of ongoing supervisory contact x100 50 | |
| Factors affecting achievem | ent of target: | | | |
| Quality improvement strate | egies: | | | <u> </u> |

Quality Dimension 3: Safety - the service to the client/caregiver being provided in a "safe" manner. The hospice has a process for informing volunteers of their roles and limitations. Standard 3.2: **Criterion A:** The agency has written policies and procedures known to the volunteers outlining: - assistance with medications and medical equipment e.g. oxygen - provision of transportation to clients - prevention and reduction of risk - response to emergency situations - response to abuse/harassment - acceptance of gifts or gratuities - lines of communication e.g. who to contact, when and what type of information to provide - report of unusual incidents e.g. theft, client fall - conflict of interest - do not resuscitate orders - extent of physical care e.g. emptying urine bag - response to an unexpected change in the client's condition or an unexpected death of a client Indicator 11. **Methods to Collect** Results **Target Analysis Information** Percentage of volunteers 80% Survey minimum of 50 # a) comfortable with b) aware of their roles and a) comfortable with volunteers (or 50% of the total limitations b) aware of depending which is the smaller x100 # respondents their roles and limitations number) concerning their a) comfort level b) awareness of their roles and limitations Factors affecting achievement of target: **Quality improvement strategies:**

| Criterion: No Indicator 12. | specific one Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|---------|
| Percentage of volunteers satisfied with support received | 90% satisfied with support received | Information Survey a minimum of 50 volunteers (or 50% of the total depending which is the smaller number) | # volunteers satisfied with support receivedx100 # respondents | |
| Factors affecting achieve | ment of target: | , | | |

| Standard 3.5: The h | nospice has a risk m | anagement process. | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Criteria: All | • | | | |
| Indicator 13. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of reported | 0.1% unusual | Count of number of unusual | # of unusual incidents x100 | |
| unusual incidents involving | incidents | incidents reported for six month | Total # of hours | |
| clients as a result of the | | period | | |
| Hospice Volunteer Visiting | | | | |
| Service | | | | |
| Factors affecting achieven | ent of target: | · | | |
| <u> </u> | C | | | |
| Quality improvement strat | egies: | | | l |

Note: Unusual incident is defined as any event which can result in actual or potential harm to a client. Examples include injuries to clients; abuse of client; and breach of confidentiality.⁹

⁹ Adapted from definition of VON Ontario, 1990.

18

| Standard 3.5: The h | ospice has a risk m | anagement process. | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Criteria: All | | | | |
| Indicator 14. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of reported | 0.1% unusual | Count of number of unusual | # of unusual incidents x100 | |
| unusual incidents involving | incidents | incidents reported for six month | total # of hours | |
| volunteers while they | | period | | |
| provide Hospice Volunteer | | | | |
| Visiting Service | | | | |
| Factors affecting achieven | ent of target: | | | |
| 8 | 8 | | | |
| Quality improvement strat | egies: | | | |

Note: Unusual incident is defined as any event which can result in actual or potential harm to a volunteer. Examples include injuries to volunteer and/or abuse of volunteer. ¹⁰

Adapted from definition of VON Ontario, 1990.

| Quality Dimension 3: Safet | y - the service to the | client/caregiver being provided in a ' | 'safe" manner. | |
|--|-------------------------|--|---------------------------|---------|
| Standard 3.6: The s | service has a records i | nanagement process. | | |
| Criterion A: Adapted from Criterion A | | | | |
| Indicator 15. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of | a) 100% exist | b) Check a minimum of 50 | a) # of client records | |
| a) clients who have a client | | names on client list with | which exist x100 | |
| record | b) 100% contain | existence of records (or 50% of | 50 | |
| b) client records that | information | the total depending which is the | | |
| include the following key | | smaller number) | | |
| information: | | b) Audit contents | # of client records which | |
| - assessment | | | contain key info x100 | |
| - program plan | | | 50 | |
| - consent for release of | | | | |
| information | | | | |
| - relevant information | | | | |
| from visits (e.g. | | | | |
| implementation and | | | | |
| evaluation of program | | | | |
| plan) | | | | |
| - emergency contact | | | | |
| numbers | | | | |
| Factors affecting achievement of target: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Quality improvement strat | egies: | | | |
| _ | | | | |

| | service has a records i | <u> </u> | | |
|--|---|---|--|---------|
| | pted from Criterion B | | , | |
| Indicator 16. | Target | Methods to Collect Information | Analysis | Results |
| Percentage of: a) volunteers who have a volunteer record b) volunteer records which include the following key information: - application form - training received - results of ongoing screening process - signed confidentiality form | a) 100% exist b) 100% contain information | a) Check a minimum of 50 names on volunteer list with existence of records (or 50% of the total depending which is the smaller number) b) Audit contents | a) # of volunteer records which exist x100 50 # of volunteer_records which contain key info x100 50 | |
| Factors affecting achievement of target: | | | | |
| 8 | 3 | | | |

Also relates to:

Quality Dimension: Safety

Standard: 3.7

| <u> </u> | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | ne client/caregiver being provided in a | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|---------|
| Standard 3.7: The | hospice has a proce | ess to maintain confidentiality of inforr | nation. | |
| Criterion: All | | | | |
| Indicator 17. | Target | Methods to Collect Information | Analysis | Results |
| Number of validated complaints from clients/caregivers, other service providers concerning breach of confidentiality | 0 | Collection of validated complaints received in 6 month period | Count of validated complaints received in 6 month period | |
| Factors affecting achievement of target: | | | | |
| Quality improvement stra | ategies: | | | , |

| Standard 4.1: T | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| | | or the ongoing education/training of | f the volunteers who provide | e hospice palliativ |
| C | eare to clients.* | | | |
| Criterion E: I | t is mandatory that all volu | inteers have completed the HPCO r | modules. | |
| Indicator 18. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of volunteers | 100% of volunteers | Audit a minimum of 50 | # completing approved | |
| who have completed the | have completed the | volunteer records (or 50% | modules x100 | |
| HPCO approved module | es HPCO approved | of the total depending which | 50 | |
| 11 | modules | is the smaller number) | | |
| | | Review of attendance at | | |
| | | training sessions | | |
| Factors affecting achie | vement of target: | | | |
| O | S | | | |

| • | | ng coordinated with other service p | | |
|--|--|--|---|---------|
| Standard 5.1: Th | The Volunteer Hospice Visiting Service provides the client and caregiver with consistent volunteer/volunteer | | | |
| car | re team members in order | r to promote continuity of care. | | |
| Criterion: No | specific one | | | |
| Indicator 19. | Target | Methods to Collect | Analysis | Results |
| | | Information | | |
| Percentage of clients with same volunteer/ volunteer care team | 80% of clients have the same volunteer/ volunteer care team | Audit a minimum of 50 client records (or 50% of the total depending which is the smaller number) | # of clients with same volunteer /volunteer care team x100 50 | |
| Factors affecting achievement of target: | | | | |
| Quality improvement strategies: | | | | |