Evaluating the social health of pediatric patients using PROMIS Peer Relationships: Social work intervention thresholds
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Routine PRO collection adopted as part of strategic plan, 2015

PROMIS instruments selected:
• Lower extremity mobility
• Pain Interference
• Upper Extremity function
• Peer relationships
Why??

- Assess the support system of adolescent patients
- Identify episodes of bullying
- Evaluate the impact of treatment, cognitive delays, and functional impairment on social health
Poor peer relationship score intervention policy

- Poor score defined as two standard deviations below the mean (≤29.99)
- Poor scores communicated to appropriate staff
  - Physician
  - Psychologist
  - Social worker
  - Care manager
- Follow up in clinic, if possible.
- Telephone follow up within 72 hours, following individual state laws regarding phone counseling
How many children are reporting poor scores?
How many encounters identified needed resources?
Is there a relationship between poor scores and cognitive delay?
How many encounters are due to child/guardian misunderstanding the assessment?
Are there children scoring just above a poor score who could benefit from a social work intervention?
Methods

- Expand notification threshold to a PROMIS score of <35
- Social work notes reviewed and assigned a category level of intervention
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 0-Low value</td>
<td>• Child/proxy misunderstood the questions/Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Child had no interactions with peers over the past 7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Child cognitively delayed but well-connected with resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1-Value</td>
<td>• Child/family experiencing social/mental health issues; assessments and guidance in clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Child is cognitively delayed; assessment performed and resources recommended in clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2-High value</td>
<td>• Child/family experiencing issues requiring referrals and follow-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How many children are reporting poor peer relationships scores?

Self assessments
n=1907
mean age=12

- Poor (≤29.99), 31, 2%
- Fair to poor (30-≤34.99), 54, 3%
- Fair to excellent (≥35), 1822, 95%
How many children are reporting poor peer relationships scores?

Proxy assessments

- n=506
- mean age=9

Categories:
- Fair to excellent (>35), 459, 91%
- Fair to poor (30-≤34.99), 27, 5%
- Poor (≤29.99), 20, 4%
Is there a relationship between low scores and cognitive delay/autism/ADHD?

Self assessment with scores ≤34.99 (n=85)

- No cognitive delays, 60, 71%
- With CP/cognitive delays/autism, 25, 29%

Proxy assessments with scores ≤34.99 (n=47)

- No cognitive delays, 10, 21%
- With CP/cognitive delays/autism, 37, 79%
How many encounters are Level 0? How many encounters identify needed resources?

Types of social work encounters, self assessments (n=47)
- Level 0, 17, 36%
- Level 1, 15, 32%
- Level 2, 15, 32%

Types of social work encounters, proxy assessments (n=22)
- Level 0, 8, 36%
- Level 1, 10, 46%
- Level 2, 4, 18%
Effect of cognitive delay on level of intervention

**Self assessments**
(n=47 LCSW encounters)

- Level 0: 10
- Level 1: 11
- Level 2: 10

**Proxy assessments**
(n=22 LCSW encounters)

- Level 0: 6
- Level 1: 12
- Level 2: 2
Are there children scoring just above a poor score who could benefit from social work support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned social work encounter level</th>
<th>15.00</th>
<th>17.00</th>
<th>19.00</th>
<th>21.00</th>
<th>23.00</th>
<th>25.00</th>
<th>27.00</th>
<th>29.00</th>
<th>31.00</th>
<th>33.00</th>
<th>35.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 encounters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 encounters

23 encounters

18 encounters
Conclusions

- Children who have scores ≤34.9 are a small percentage of the overall population.
- Children who self-assess are less likely to have cognitive delays.
- A higher percentage of children who self-reported had a level 2 encounter.
Policy revision

- All scores ≤29.9 reported to social workers
- Scores ≤34.9 reported to social workers if:
  - Child is 10 or older
  - Self-assessed
Thank you!