

**U.S. ARMY-BAYLOR UNIVERSITY PROGRAM IN HEALTH CARE
ADMINISTRATION**

**PROVIDER LEVEL SATISFACTION WITH SERVICE
LINE MANAGEMENT AT BLANCHFIELD ARMY
COMMUNITY HOSPITAL**

A GRADUATE MANAGEMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE ARMY-BAYLOR GRADUATE PROGRAM
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTERS IN HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

BY

CPT JEFFERY F. RIMMER

BLANCHFIELD ARMY COMMUNITY HOSPITAL
FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY
JUNE 1999

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE AUG 1999	2. REPORT TYPE Final	3. DATES COVERED Jul 1998 - Jul 1999	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Provider Level Satisfaction With Service Line Management At Blanchfield Army Community Hospital		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
		5b. GRANT NUMBER	
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) CPT Jeffery F. Rimmer, USA		5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
		5e. TASK NUMBER	
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Blanchfield Army Community Hospital Fort Campbell, KY 42223		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) US Army Medical Department Center and School Bldg 2841 MCCS-HRA (US Army-Baylor MHA Program) 3151 Scott Road, Suite 1412 Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-6135		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) 12-99	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited			
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The original document contains color images.			
14. ABSTRACT The introduction of the Prospective Payment System (PPS) in the early 1980s, capitated financing from managed care organizations (MCO), and reduced payments from traditional fee-for-service payers have created an increasingly competitive climate for civilian hospitals. Likewise, military hospitals must contend with an ever-decreasing budget, force structure reductions, and installation closures. These changes have forced hospitals to search for innovative ways to structure their organizations to remain viable. One method of structuring the hospital, which has gained popularity in the past 10 years, is to organize around products or services. This configuration is called product or service line management (PLM/SLM). This paper discusses PLM in hospitals, and it explores the applicability of implementing PLM in U.S. Army Medical Department Activities(USA MEDDACs). Finally, this paper evaluates provider level satisfaction with SLM and the implementation of that philosophy in a medium military medical treatment facility to support recommendations for sustainment and improvement where necessary.			
15. SUBJECT TERMS Product line management; provider satisfaction; healthcare quality; healthcare access			
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified	
			18. NUMBER OF PAGES 43
			19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Possibly acknowledging every contributor to this meager endeavor would be an insurmountable task. However, there are certainly many worth mentioning who are as much a part of this product as I have become over the past year. First and foremost, I would like to thank God for giving me the opportunity and perseverance to complete these past two years. I have learned that in the absence of the ever-present Baylor Faculty, He has been my greatest professor. I would like to thank LTC Brett Walker, Medical Service Corps, United States Army for his counsel, instruction, and patience as he sought this product you now hold in your hands.

I would like to thank Colonel Stephen P. Clouse, Deputy Commander for Administration, and Colonel Virgil T. Deal, Commander, Blanchfield Army Community Hospital. Their input, assistance, and encouragement helped keep me focused on the task at hand.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Kim and my daughter, Hannah. Their sacrifices have been sublime as I courted this all consuming mistress known as a Graduate Management Project. There is no greater expression of love and commitment than displayed by these two, and I will forever be grateful to both of them.

Abstract

The introduction of the Prospective Payment System (PPS) in the early 1980s, capitated financing from managed care organizations (MCO), and reduced payments from traditional fee-for-service payers have created an increasingly competitive climate for civilian hospitals. Likewise, military hospitals must contend with an ever-decreasing budget, force structure reductions, and installation closures. These changes have forced hospitals to search for innovative ways to structure their organizations to remain viable. One method of structuring the hospital, which has gained popularity in the past 10 years, is to organize around products or services. This configuration is called product or service line management (PLM/SLM). This paper discusses PLM in hospitals, and it explores the applicability of implementing PLM in U.S. Army Medical Department Activities (USA MEDDACs). Finally, this paper evaluates provider level satisfaction with SLM and the implementation of that philosophy in a medium military medical treatment facility to support recommendations for sustainment and improvement where necessary.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....2

Abstract.....3

Table of Contents.....4

List of Figures.....5

Introduction.....6

Conditions which Prompted the Study.....11

Statement of the Problem.....13

Literature Review.....13

Purpose.....27

Methods and Procedures.....27

Results.....29

Discussion.....34

Conclusion and Recommendations.....37

References.....39

Appendix A – Service Line Management Survey.....42

List of Figures

1. Service Line of Respondents.....29

2. Providers Present at BACH Prior to Implementation.....30

3. Years at BACH.....30

4. Provider Type.....30

5. Improve Access of Beneficiaries to Care.....31

6. Reduce Admin Burden of Health Care Providers.....31

7. Work Environment that Focuses on Customer Service.....32

8. Increase Quality of Care Provided to Beneficiaries.....32

9. Comparison of Organizational Structures in Healthcare.....33

10. Overall Satisfaction with Service Line Management.....33

11. Effect on TRICARE.....34

Introduction

A modern facility occupying four levels and over 484,000 square feet, the Colonel Florence A. Blanchfield Army Community Hospital (BACH) is the only Army hospital named for an Army nurse. The facility houses outpatient as well as inpatient services and is licensed for 241 beds, expandable during wartime. BACH is staffed with 460 active duty military and 664 civilian personnel who serve a population of over 82,760 beneficiaries in a 40-mile radius of the hospital. The population includes 24,334 active duty service members; 35,067 active duty family members; 6,505 retirees and 13,145 non-active duty family members under 65 years of age; and 8,709 beneficiaries over 65 years of age.

Business Concept

As a premier managed care operation, Blanchfield Army Community Hospital strives to provide high quality, accessible, and cost effective care for its beneficiaries. BACH's mission is to maintain a medically fit force, to deploy mission-ready medical soldiers, to manage the comprehensive health services for the Fort Campbell military community, and to transition to a wartime operational mode upon command. Its vision is to be the premier military community health care system. Current business strategies focus on the provision of services for those enrolled in TRICARE Prime . The facility is financed by a capitated budget for these individuals. Others who have an entitlement may use the services on a space available basis in accordance with Army Regulation 40-3 (AR 40-3). Comprehensive health care services are made available as needed to enrolled members. Primary service lines available at Blanchfield are consistent with the needs of

the demographic population it serves and includes primary care, maternal-child, surgical specialties, health promotion and mental health. Other specialty services for prime and non-prime members are provided in the facility, in the managed care contractor's network for Region 5, in the local community preferred provider network Health Services Region 4 & 5, or at a tertiary care military treatment facility. The decision to buy or make clinical services is based on a well founded business analysis that considers many factors including: identification and quantification of clinical needs, cost, access, transportation, patient convenience/desire, availability of quality care locally, current standards of care, and future planning. The business concept is based on Blanchfield's mission and vision. These are operationalized in the organizational strategic plan. There has been a deliberate attempt to link the goals and priorities of higher headquarters with the business plan. These higher headquarters include Forces Command (FORSCOM), Medical Command (MEDCOM), Southeast Health Regional Medical Command and Department of Defense Health Service Region (DoD HSR) 5 Lead Agent Office. Important priorities and themes on which the business is based includes combat-readiness, commitment to excellence, professionalism, accountability, patient-centered quality care, accessibility, cost containment, resource conservation, and modernization.

Market

Although the Region 5 managed care contractor's preferred providers network is still developing, many influences, factors, and organizations fashion the local healthcare market. There are four acute care for-profit community hospitals within the Fort Campbell catchment area, two of which provide services not available at BACH such as cardiac catheterization, neonatology, perinatology and oncology services. There are two

fiercely competitive primary care/specialty groups located 30 miles north of Fort Campbell and in the city of Clarksville, Tennessee. In addition, a local medical group 20 miles to the north has contracted with the Nashville Department of Veterans' Affairs Medical Center to become the primary care manager for an enrolled population of veterans (many of which are dual eligible) to provide primary care and some specialty services with inpatient care at the VA.

Competitive Strategy

Previous competitive strategies have been successful in capturing the bulk of the market share for primary care, obstetric care, orthopedic surgery, general surgery, ambulatory surgery, pediatrics, urology and otolaryngology. Blanchfield is a very customer focused facility and listens to the voice of their customers in developing services. The transition to the primary care manager (PCM) concept was the first step in Blanchfield's conversion to managed care. A PCM manages all aspects of beneficiary care and serves as the gatekeeper for all beneficiary healthcare. Blanchfield has also augmented primary care clinics with mid-level providers, ancillary staff and Registered Nurses to implement demand management strategies to increase patient access to care and health information. Patient satisfaction has increased and access to care has been enhanced. The introduction of a Mother-Baby Unit, combined postpartum and newborn nursery, offers a family centered approach to childbirth. An Asthma Education Center was opened to offer education for asthmatic children and their parents/care givers. Areas of educational concentration include living with Asthma, medications, peak flow meters, and trigger identifiers with control. The goal of all these programs is to decrease

emergency room visits, lost school days and to improve quality of life and quality of care. Aggressive case management and utilization management ensure timely continuation of care and help ensure that the continuum of care is seamless by doing the right thing: the right patient, in the right place, at the right time, with the right resources to get the right outcome.

Major Initiatives

Multiple major initiatives have been implemented to make Blanchfield's competitive strategy a reality. The ability to use resources within the region has a great impact on fiscal outcomes. The following are some of the patient friendly, resource optimizing initiatives undertaken by Blanchfield:

Urgent Eagle Clinic is an after-hours, acute care clinic. Originally started as a "fast-track" for the Emergency Room, Urgent Eagle was developed into a separate clinic in August 1996. Generally staffed by two or three health care providers, the Urgent Eagle clinic is open Monday through Friday from 1500-2300, weekends and holidays from 0900-2100.

Night Clinic is for patients who prefer an evening appointment. The night clinic was started in February 1997. Offering routine and same-day appointments to enrolled members, the Night Clinic is an attractive alternative for those with work or child care concerns. The Night Clinic is staffed by three health care providers, who see patients from their respective clinics. Hours of operation are Monday through Friday from 1700-2000.

The Well Baby Clinic offers health services for routine well baby checks in an area completely separate from sick children. Physicians and Nurse Practitioners are not only able to render the appropriate health checks, but also offer valuable teaching to parents.

Central Triage is an alternative area where individuals seeking care without an appointment are evaluated by a Registered Nurse and dispositioned (triaged) to the most appropriate level or source of care. Each of the aforementioned clinics provide beneficiaries with a greater access to care. Blanchfield has also introduced several managed care concepts to provide the right care at the right time and at the appropriate level.

To ensure optimum use of resources, utilization review nurses employ pre-admission and discharge planning as well as education to admitting physicians and nursing managers in an inpatient setting. In addition, Blanchfield performs first level review on all specialty care requests which ensures patients referred outside the medical treatment facility are adequately tracked to ensure quality of care. This first level review also serves as an effective means to find appropriate MTF care alternatives in lieu of TRICARE or supplemental care. BACH has instituted a Referral Management Center to ensure optimization of MTF resources. The case management program is both fiscal and clinical. Case management oversees several of the areas within the MTF and focuses on disease management initiatives and the interface with our referral network to improve quality, cost, and continuity of care.

Marketing and customer relations are growing priorities for the survival of the military health care system at Fort Campbell. Customers include the beneficiaries, as well as internal and external suppliers of care. Likewise, the Fort Campbell and

surrounding area is a growing, dynamic community. Therefore, the Clarksville and Hopkinsville health care institutions have marketed and developed unique health care offerings for this geographic population. Their ability to meet the needs of our non-prime beneficiaries helps to support our overall healthcare mission. Also, military beneficiaries for trauma, invasive cardiology, complex maternity, and medical and surgical pediatric subspecialties use two major medical centers in Nashville. Blanchfield continues to develop the use of Telemedicine to improve local patient care by communicating with regional experts at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. A new Consolidated Troop Medical Clinic has been approved for Fort Campbell and operational start date is in the year 2000. With services in one large clinic, service redundancy will be eliminated and resources conserved. Telephone health care advice nurses aid the primary care managers in managing their enrollees. These tools allow beneficiaries to take a more active role and responsibility for their own care, increase beneficiary satisfaction, and reduce health care costs due to inappropriate use of services (DoD HSR5, 1998).

Conditions which Prompted the Study

Several military medical treatment facilities throughout the Army Medical Department have attempted to adopt the management philosophies of their civilian counterparts to keep pace with the dynamic environment in healthcare today. One management method introduced in several facilities is product line management (PLM).

Guidance from the U.S. Army Medical Command (MEDCOM) allows the hospital commander to use his/her discretion when establishing the internal structure of any military medical treatment facility (MEDCOM Regulation 10-1). The implications of this discretion can be as narrow as resource allocation in terms of personnel or money

within an individual department or as broad as the re-organization of an entire MTF structure. These decisions not only effect the internal relationships of the hospital staff, but they also effect the external review from corporate entities (i.e., Health Service Region 5 and the Southeast Regional Medical Command).

As previously mentioned, several Army MTFs have implemented a PLM approach to organizational management. These include Martin Army Community Hospital (MACH), Fort Benning, Georgia; Kenner Army Health Clinic, Fort Lee, Virginia; Dwight D. Eisenhower Medical Center (DDEMC), Fort Gordon, Georgia; and Blanchfield Army Community Hospital (BACH), Fort Campbell, Kentucky. As of this time, the only facility still operating under a PLM structure is Blanchfield Army Community Hospital.

Blanchfield implemented PLM on 1 October 1997. The underlying goals supporting its implementation includes enhanced communication, empowerment of employees and managers, a sense of ownership, improved patient care focus, and incentives for innovative techniques. The introduction of PLM coupled with the implementation of TRICARE in May of 1998 has intensified the climate of change within BACH's organizational walls.

With an impending executive leadership changeover in the Spring of 1998, some question the timing of the introduction of this management philosophy. Others question the current structure's ability to adequately address and account for the needs and requirements for a hospital to operate in a managed care environment. Either way PLM is now a part of Blanchfield Army Community Hospital, and therefore, its implementation

must be periodically reviewed to determine if it is meeting the immediate needs of the customers and the strategic needs of Blanchfield as an organization.

Statement of the Problem

The introduction and implementation of Product Line Management as well as a number of critical characteristics for success is well documented in the business and healthcare industries. The following research will identify provider level satisfaction based on those critical characteristics. These findings can be used to benchmark Blanchfield's overall success or failure with respect to its implementation of SLM. Therefore, how satisfied are providers at Blanchfield Army Community Hospital with the implementation of Service Line Management based on these same critical characteristics.

Literature Review

Increased competition, changes in reimbursement methodologies (introduction of the Prospective Payment System in 1980s), capitated financing from managed care organizations, and a requirement to provide some services at discounts are some of the external pressures which have forced hospitals to become more cost efficient and business-like in the provision of healthcare products and services (Manning, 1987). In order to improve cost control measures and enhance internal management control, hospitals are turning to business and adopting some of their methods to increase efficiency and productivity. The idea of hospitals turning to business for managerial and financial advice is not a new concept. Hospitals have often looked outside the healthcare industry and towards business as a source of potential solutions to business problems (Bowers & Taylor, 1990).

One business practice being adopted by some hospitals is product line management (PLM). The concept of PLM requires the organization to organize itself around products or services. PLM is defined as "the organizational structure, management control system, and delivery strategies for healthcare services structured around case types of major clinical services" (Nackel & Kues, 1986). PLM is designed to increase efficiency by reducing costs and service duplication while improving communication and planning (Nackel & Kues, 1986).

While most management experts agree that PLM can be an effective management tool, there is disagreement about PLM being appropriate for the healthcare industry and hospitals in particular (Naidu, et al, 1993). Critics of PLM in healthcare are skeptical about its applicability because of the unique nature of healthcare. PLM depends on being able to define a customer. In healthcare, depending on how you define your product; patients, physicians, nurses, and employers are all customers. In addition, there is not a universally accepted definition of product lines (Naidu, et al, 1993). Advocates of PLM in healthcare believe it is effective and has numerous organizational benefits which include (a) focusing accountability for operations and results, (b) facilitating coordination among departments, (c) focusing on targeted specific client groups, (d) strengthening the relationship between strategy development and the budgets, and (e) promoting the evaluation of new and existing programs (Studnicki, 1991).

History of PLM

There are three commonly used organization structural models in manufacturing: (a) functional, (b) market management, and (c) PLM (Bowers & Taylor, 1990). In a functional organizational structure, the focus is placed on the performance of independent

job activities and not on the final product. No one person is given the responsibility for the quality of a final product. In market management, the emphasis is placed on the market, whether it is done with one or multiple product lines does not matter. The inherent weakness of both the functional and market management organizational structures is that a promising new product may be overlooked. PLM was introduced to correct this potential problem. PLM assigns managers (product line managers) to supervise and manage an individual product or products (Bowers & Taylor, 1990).

PLM has been used in manufacturing for over 50 years (Bowers & Taylor, 1990). Proctor and Gamble (P&G) is generally given credit for being the first major manufacturer to use PLM when, in 1928, they used PLM to market their new product, Lava soap (Yano-Fong, 1988). PLM experienced a boom during the 1960s with over 80% of the large manufacturing companies using PLM to compete in rapidly changing environments (Yano-Fong, 1988). During this time, most companies believed that PLM was simply more effective, resulting in the widespread replacement of the more traditional, centralized approach to management. PLM's acceptance was evidenced by many of the Fortune 500 companies adapted their organizational structures to accommodate the requirements of PLM (Naidu, et al, 1993).

The proliferation of PLM as an organizational structure model slowed in the 1970's because many of the large manufacturers (i.e. Pepsi, Purex, Eastman Kodak, and Levi Strauss) had become disenchanted with PLM and stopped using it (Bowers & Taylor, 1990). Reasons for disenchantment with PLM include: (a) conflict and frustration created by the product line managers' responsibilities surpassing their authority, (b) product line managers being required to make decisions requiring expertise

they do not have, (c) managers losing touch with their markets because they spend most of their time dealing with internal problems, and (d) PLM is a costly system (Bowers & Taylor, 1990).

According to Bowers & Taylor (1990), PLM is still being used in industry today but in a greatly modified form. For example, Proctor and Gamble, the innovator of PLM, has altered the concept of one individual being responsible for all aspects of a product to a team of specialized individuals (finance, research, engineering, sales, etc.) who answer to the product category manager. A similar modification includes making the individual product manager part of a product team.

PLM in Hospitals

Models of PLM in Hospitals

Patterson & Thompson (1987) identified three predominant models of PLM that have emerged in hospitals: (a) market management, (b) distribution management, and (c) strategic business units (SBU) management. In the market management mode, the emphasis is placed on closely observing the healthcare market for potential opportunities and then quickly capitalizing. An individual, usually a healthcare professional with a background in administration or nursing, is given the title of market manager and is responsible for projecting and obtaining market volume, determining the appropriate product characteristics to best serve the hospital's market, and advising top management. The market manager accomplishes these responsibilities by remaining in continuous interaction with the market.

The market management model is considered by Patterson & Thompson (1987) to be the least threatening to most current hospital organizational structures because it

causes the least restructuring of the three models. In this market management model, the market manager has only an advisory role. The decisions to act remain with the hospital's top management. The implementation of the market model often represents the first step towards organizational change. While the market management model focuses on a particular market segment of customers, the distribution model focuses on how those customers are managed throughout the entire continuum of care.

The distribution management model focuses on managing the referrals to the hospital from physicians and organizations such as health maintenance organizations (HMOs), preferred provider organizations (PPOs), etc. (Patterson & Thompson, 1987). In this model, a product line manager is selected to be the distribution manager and is given additional responsibilities of ensuring a steady stream of referrals for several product lines. Essentially, the distribution manager closely monitors existing patient referral sources for several product lines while attempting to create new product lines from a stream of different referrals. The primary measurement of success of the distribution manager is increased utilization.

The strategic business unit (SPU) management model represents the most significant change to the organization structure (Patterson & Thompson, 1987). In the SBU model, the hospital develops four to eight distinct business lines organized around clinical, operational or market similarities without regard for whether the service is provided in a hospital or an ambulatory setting. Managers assume full responsibility and authority for the product.

Cole & Brown (1988) added a fourth model called the coordinated care model. In this model, the organization creates a new staff position which focuses on case

management, integrates the hospital's many programs and activities into a common theme (similar to a product line), and measures success by increased volume.

Problems

While the basic motives for initiating PLM in healthcare (improving the hospitals competitive position and increasing profitability) are undisputed, the effectiveness has been questioned (Patterson & Thompson, 1987). The primary reason for questioning the effectiveness centers around the problem that there is no clear definition of a product line or product line management in healthcare (Manning, 1987). In fact, the term product line management has become a catchword for so many different organizational approaches that the term is in danger of trivialization (Zelman & Parham, 1990).

The introduction of the prospective payment system (PPS) and diagnostic related groups (DRGs) was initially thought to provide an adequate basis for a universally defined product line, but this proved unworkable because there are approximately 428 different DRGs in most hospitals (Manning, 1987). The next step was to combine similar DRGs, but this contributed to the universally defined problem as each hospital had their own interpretation as to what DRGs should be combined together.

In addition to the problem defining product lines, Manning (1987) also believes that the healthcare industry is significantly different than the manufacturing industry, making the principles of PLM ineffective. Manning states that healthcare is service oriented and the services provided must be described in terms of a continuum, instead of discrete events as in manufacturing. Variations in the "production" of healthcare services due to epidemiological factors can only be crudely compared to variations in the manufacturing environment, such as spoilage (Manning, 1987). Additionally, hospitals

have an ethical, operational, image, and licensure requirement to provide a core of basic services regardless of their profitability, while the manufacturing industry is free to stop making unprofitable items (Manning, 1987).

Fottler & Repasky (1988) support Manning's views that PLM is difficult to implement because of healthcare's unique nature. They state that healthcare is simply different than manufacturing and the major barrier to the adoption of PLM in hospitals is what they consider to be "the humanistic conception of service." This conception includes a strong ethical presumption that the physician should be left alone to treat the patient without regard to the bottom line.

Studnicki (1991) states that internal management can be another source of problems in implementing PLM in hospitals. These problems include resistance to change and complacency, additional operating expenses required for another administrative level, and difficulty in developing information and cost reporting systems to support PLM.

Defining a Product Line

A product line consists of a group of related products or services a patient may purchase. For example, oncology may be a product line consisting of several services such as bone marrow transplant, radiation therapy, pain management and counseling (France & Glover 1992). The primary objective of implementing PLM should be to identify segments of the hospital's business that are strategically and economically significant (Manning, 1987).

MacStravic (1986) stated that a product is defined by a market. A product is whatever physicians, patients, or other people see as answering their demand. A product

in health services can be thought of as activities and/or experiences that are offered and consumed by an identifiable set of people in ways that are different from other sets. In a hospital the best approach would be to think of product lines as specific programs or service categories (pediatrics, obstetrics, oncology, etc...).

O'Malley, et al (1991) developed several criteria for identifying product lines. Their criteria are: (a) be identifiable to the market (primary care, OB/GYN), (b) have a specific market in mind (young couples, women), (c) contribute significantly to hospital long range planning and daily operation, (d) be an identifiable diagnostic category, (e) have unique or dedicated production facilities, staff, and technology, (f) be recognized as a unique or special program, (g) be an administratively manageable unit, and (h) be linked to treatment patterns of medical staff.

Implementing Product Line Management in Hospitals

In order to adequately implement Product Line Management, two distinct planning factors should be considered. First, an organization should look at how the reorganization will take place, and finally, there should be a well established methodology for implementation.

Nackel & Kues (1986), believe that hospital management should consider the following when contemplating reorganization according to product lines: (a) the product line should be based on the clinical delivery structure of the organization, (b) span of control at each level should not exceed eight to ten functions, (c) staff services such as information systems should be a corporate objective, and (d) staff activities such as personnel and finance should work closely with department heads/service line chiefs but answer to the chief executive officer (CEO).

Studnicki (1991) references a management methodology for implementing PLM created by a suburban Baltimore hospital. The six steps include: (a) define the service line (they grouped all DRGs into 35 service lines), (b) determine the contribution of each service line to total inpatient volume, (c) determine trends in product line volumes, (d) derive a useful comparison group (competing hospitals), (e) review multiple time frames, and (f) summarize and analyze the long and short term performance.

Keys to Success

Just as in any other major organizational change, success is determined in part by the commitment of the executive management (O'Malley, et al, 1991). Convincing the physicians and getting their support is vital to success. In the healthcare industry, it is simply a fact of life that physicians have more control and influence on the process than anyone else (Manning, 1987).

In addition to physician acceptance, Zelman & McLaughlin (1990) believe that there are some basic preparations which lead to successful implementation of product line management in organizations. They are: (a) get people in the organization to think about possible roles and organizational structures and unfreeze their thinking about how services could be organized under various market structures, (b) familiarize the staff and administration with the true role of the product line manager, (c) select and train potential individuals who possess the attributes required to be effective product line managers, and (d) experiment with new product line organizations within subunits of the hospital before making significant organizational structure changes.

Similarly, Nackel & Kues (1986) consider the keys to successful implementation of PLM to be: (a) the willingness of corporate officers to delegate decision making

authority, (b) the assumption of responsibility from the product line managers, (c) the acceptance and support of the nursing staff, (d) the development of management and financial information systems to support decentralization, and (e) effective communication between product line managers and the central administrative units as being keys to successful implementation of PLM.

Required Components

According to Patterson & Thompson (1987), in order for PLM to be successful there are some required components which must be present in the health care organization. Some of these components are not PLM specific but are still important for successful implementation. The components and a brief description follows:

(a) Skills and attitude. Do employees and board members have the skills and attitude necessary to deal with the change? Are they flexible enough to vary their organizational structure?

(b) Decision/control systems. Do appropriate information systems exist to support a new organizational model? In order to be effective, managers must be able to measure their efforts.

(c) Organizational structure. Are accountabilities assigned to the right people? Are managers held responsible for operations outside their chain of control? Is there a clear span of authority and responsibility?

(d) Values and beliefs. Are the decision making and day to day operating requirements of PLM compatible with the organization's management style or culture? Does the organization have heroes it can call upon in times of change to encourage cooperation across traditional clinical and hierarchical lines?

In addition to these components, corporate commitment is one of the most important required components to make PLM work, closely followed by the need to educate the staff in the organization on the principles of PLM. The education should focus on team building, developing marketing strategies, and effective management techniques when using PLM (Simpson & Clayton, 1991).

Action Plan

Closely related to the required components for successful implementation of PLM in hospitals is the development of the action plan. Nackel & Kues (1986) developed an action plan for implementing product line management in hospitals from a detailed analysis of how product line management was implemented at the Johns-Hopkins Hospital. Although the Johns-Hopkins Hospital is a unique, large teaching hospital, the action plan developed is broad enough to fit any type of hospital considering implementation of PLM. They determined that the key activities in developing PLM in hospitals are: (a) inform top management of the PLM philosophy and get their support, (b) determine the product lines (business units) around which the organization will be structured, (c) identify organizational responsibilities, (d) develop a planning and budget process around the new product lines, (e) communicate the organizational structure from the top through middle management and (f) reassess the product line organization on a periodic basis.

Key Attributes of a PLM Manager

If all the required components to the successful implementation of PLM are present, the you still need a competent PLM manager. The characteristics of a PLM manager are similar to that of a successful entrepreneur. In fact, one of the advantages of

PLM is it creates a sense of autonomy and an entrepreneurial attitude among its managers. Verespej (1988) considers PLM managers to be like miniature chief executive officers (CEOs) of discrete profit centers.

Having technical expertise is an essential attribute of successful PLM managers. In fact, Baylor University Medical Center in Dallas, which implemented PLM in the 1980s hires only experienced technical experts to manage their product lines and expects them "to hit the ground running" (Ruffner, 1986). Technical expertise was further defined by O'Malley, et al (1991), when they summarized the additional required qualities of PLM managers as needing: (a) strong analytical skills, (b) expert interpersonal skills, (c) propensity for risk taking, and (d) an ability to establish effective work relationships with all stakeholders (physicians, administrators, patients, employers, and third party payers).

PLM Study

Nackel & Kues (1986) studied the implementation of PLM at The Johns-Hopkins Hospital. They concluded that PLM success is highly dependent on how the product lines are defined and how many product lines are present in the organization. Another interesting point involves their thoughts on PLM management which they believe to be as much an art as a science, alluding to the political nature of consensus building that PLM requires to be effective. Their final point relates to communication. Based on their study, they believe that a move to PLM requires increased communication between the PLM managers and the ancillary support staff.

Fottler & Repasky (1988) conducted a study involving 24 hospitals in Alabama, Florida and Georgia who had not implemented PLM. The hospitals included in the study

were both not-for-profit and for-profit, ranging from 52 to 871 beds. The hospitals' top management was sent an information packet explaining PLM and was asked to respond to a questionnaire. Although 67 percent of the hospitals felt that PLM was applicable to hospitals, 33 percent felt that PLM's applicability was limited to large hospitals (200+ beds). Fifty-eight percent thought it was likely that their hospital would adopt PLM, while 29 percent believed it unlikely, and 12 percent were unsure.

In another study, Bowers & Taylor (1990) presented a case where a modified version of PLM is in place. The modified version of PLM is similar to what is more likely to be seen if PLM is implemented in a USAMEDDAC. In this study, two of the five hospitals using PLM had a modified form of PLM in place. The first hospital modified PLM to make the product line manager responsible for coordinating the activities of a product team but not individually responsible for the product or its profitability. Another hospital which had a history of strong relationships between medical and administrative staff, modified PLM to just a formalization of the relationship instead of the large scale reorganization usually associated with PLM.

PLM in USA MEDDACs

Whether PLM is a good fit for USA MEDDACs is undetermined. There is a void in the literature about the effectiveness of PLM in USA MEDDACs. While anecdotal evidence supports the view that most of the problems identified in civilian hospital attempting to use PLM would also apply to a USA MEDDAC, the USA MEDDAC may also have unique problems with PLM because it is a military organization with a strict rank structure. For example, Nackel & Kues (1986) state that a benefit of PLM is that the new management structure creates a management philosophy that encourages a

productive creative tension between top management and the general managers. While this is a sound point, its applicability to USA MEDDACs is questionable. The creative tension created by PLM may not be applicable to an Army organization (USA MEDDAC) that bases authority and responsibility not on ability but on rank and seniority.

One potential advantage the USA MEDDAC has over the civilian industry is that the military rank structure can be used to provide more control over the actions of the physician. Fackelmann (1985) states that physicians can make PLM difficult because they may have a hard time accepting the fact that they have to report to a general manager who may or may not be a physician. The USA MEDDAC's advantage is weak because the military rank structure does not always prevent overt physician resistance.

With the lack of studies proving the effectiveness of PLM in USA MEDDACs, a possible explanation of why the senior management of a USA MEDDAC would make a decision to implement PLM can be provided by one finding of the study conducted by Bowers & Taylor (1990). In the study, Bowers & Taylor found most of the administrators who decided to implement PLM did so not because they simply wanted to "shake-up" the organization but because they were anticipating change and a more competitive future. The administrators did not want to get caught unaware and saw PLM as a method of improving management of their institutions and become more patient focused. With the anticipated implementation of enrollment based capitation and hospital "report cards" in the Military Health System (MHS), any hospital management technique or reorganization plan, concept or structure prominent in the literature will probably be considered.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to review the history and garner a thorough understanding of PLM and its implementation. Then, to identify key characteristics of successful PLM implementation and survey the level of satisfaction of providers at Blanchfield Army Community Hospital.

Methods and Procedures

This descriptive study of qualitative data collected from the responses of in-house providers was obtained by a survey created and executed within the hospital. The survey consists of two parts. The first part is demographic data, which will help managers identify critical areas where problems need to be addressed and corrected. The second part consists of a body of questions broken in to seven separate areas of categorical information. The final survey was reviewed by the Deputy Commanders for Clinical Services, Administration, and Nursing and approved by the Commander for implementation. The survey is two pages long and consists of 35 questions under seven topical areas. All providers (i.e. physicians, nurse practitioners, CRNAs, Nurse Midwives, and physician assistants) were asked to complete all the questions regarding the impact of PLM on Blanchfield Army Community Hospital. During this initial survey, only providers were asked to respond since they interact with the customer and all other services provided by the hospital. The responses were then evaluated for content and statistical significance. The survey answers were measured on a five-point Likert Scale (see attached survey).

Part 1 - Demographics

In order to assess whether or not PLM is an adequate management system in USA MEDDACs, demographic data is used to as a means to differentiate problems with the concept of PLM versus internal management problems associated with any one particular service line or directorate. Confidentiality of the respondents was ensured by not requiring any specific information about the survey takers. The survey was given after a visit by the Joint Commission for the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO) to attempt to control for any biased feelings of PLM due to the stress of an impending survey.

Part II - Categorical Information

Seven categories of questions were developed to address perceived reasons for implementing PLM as a internal management strategy over military medical treatment structures outlined in MEDCOM Reg 10-1. These categories were:

1. Improve access of beneficiaries to care. Access is one of the cornerstones to healthcare delivery in the nineties.
2. Address the administrative burden placed on providers during the delivery of care.
3. Whether or not the “Environment of Care” focuses on customer service.
4. Quality of care issues are addressed in the fourth category of questions.
5. Personal preference of traditional organizational structures versus product line management.
6. Satisfaction with the product line management philosophy.
7. TRICARE’s implementation on product line management.


Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity was established by pre-testing the survey instrument . Validity during the survey process will be established by using the same survey on those being asked to render responses. Content validity of the survey is based on current literature on product line management. Face validity is established by a review of the survey instrument by seven BACH key management personnel.

Results


The intent of this research is to provide the management staff of Blanchfield Army Community Hospital a pool of data broken out by category to facilitate any future decisions regarding the direction of this organization. Since there are already tools in place to monitor the satisfaction of patients, it is paramount that healthcare facilities identify internal problems and praises that exist within an organization.

The first four questions provided demographic information about each of the providers that responded to the survey. As illustrated in Figure 1, 37 percent of those




responding were from Perioperative Services; 27 percent were from Primary Care; Women’s Health and Ancillary services comprised 16 and 10 percent respectively; 6 percent of Other providers in the facility were represented; and 4 percent of responses came from Behavioral Science.

The second question addressed whether or not the providers that responded were at Blanchfield prior to the implementation of Service Line




Management. As depicted by Figure 2, an overwhelming 67 percent were not present prior to the SLM implementation. Thirty percent, however, were present prior to its full implementation, and only three percent failed to respond.

Providers identified the number of years that they have been working at BACH in the third question of the demographics. Only 10 percent of the providers have remained at their current



duty station for over five years. Twenty percent were here between three and five years. The largest time period on station was one to two years with 40 percent, and those providers with less than one year was equal to 30 percent of the surveyed population.

The final demographic question dealt with the provider type responding to the survey. Seventy percent of respondents were physicians. Nine percent of nurse practitioners responded to



the survey. Nurse midwives and certified nurse anesthetists made up seven and six

percent of respondents respectively, and both physician assistants and other providers were equally represented with four percent of the surveyed population.

Access to care was the first category of questions posed to providers. Thirty percent of the providers felt that access to care has improved with the introduction of service line management. Neither response regarding access to care were found to be statistically significant at greater than the .05 level. However, 30 percent of respondents felt that SLM has enhanced access to care (Figure 5).

	Response				Significance
	+/-	Negative	Central	Positive	
Enhanced by SLM	+	17%	53%	30%	0.085
Increased for beneficiaries previous	-	10%	60%	23%	0.117

Figure 5 Improve Access of Beneficiaries to Care

One of the key elements to the successful implementation of SLM is to reduce the administrative burden on providers. Of the six questions asked, only one had a statistical significance of .0001. Forty four percent of providers felt that the number of levels of responsibility has been greatly reduced.

	Response				Significance
	+/-	Negative	Central	Positive	
Span of Control (<8)	+	4%	49%	44%	0.0001
Info/Admin Systems Support	+	23%	41%	34%	0.911
Supports Administrative Needs	+	23%	46%	32%	1
Have Skills to Manage	+	20%	47%	33%	0.116
Creates Obstacles	-	30%	37%	33%	0.506
Enhances Communication	+	27%	47%	26%	0.795

Figure 6 Reduce Admin Burden on Health Care Providers

Customer service is another important factor to organizational efficiency. All eight questions answered by providers were significant at greater than the .02 level. Fifty-

six percent felt they controlled the entire clinical delivery of care. Forty-six percent felt they worked well with administrative offices. Thirty-seven percent felt that the SLM transition was implemented to increase customer service. Forty-nine percent stated that metrics were available to support their managerial needs, and fifty-three percent felt they could make informed decisions within the SLM concept. Sixty percent said that the structure enhances job performance. Eighty two percent stated that they were aware of their chain of command, and forty-four percent stated they were not seeing too many patients as a result of SLM.

	Response				Significance
	+/-	Negative	Central	Positive	
Clinical Delivery of Care	+	16%	29%	56%	0.0005
Work Well with RM/Personnel	+	10%	44%	46%	0.0005
Transitioned to Increase Cust/Svc	+	10%	53%	37%	0.02
Metrics Available to Measure	+	13%	39%	49%	0.0005
Informed of Decisions within SLM	+	19%	29%	53%	0.003
Structure Enhances Job Perform	+	22%	17%	60%	0.001
Aware of Chain of Command	+	7%	11%	82%	0.0005
See too Many Patients with SLM	-	44%	49%	7%	0.0005

Figure 7 Work Environment that Focuses on Customer Service
Quality of care remained unchanged. In each of the questions none were found to

be statistically significant, and the percentage of positive to negative responses appear similar with regard to total numbers.

	Response				Significance
	+/-	Negative	Central	Positive	
More Productive with SLM	+	26%	51%	23%	0.297
SLM Enhances Qual of Care	+	26%	46%	29%	0.699
Quality Care Easier to Deliver	+	24%	53%	21%	0.791

Figure 8 Increase Quality of Care Provided to Beneficiary
In comparing the previous organizational design to the current, there were no

statistically significant responses to command relationships, decision making, or design efficiency of either managerial style. However, a statistically significant 36% felt that modifications or improvements must be made to the current organizational structure.

	Response			Significance	
	+/-	Negative	Central		Positive
Command Works as Team	+	26%	43%	31%	0.435
Decision Making Better with SLM	+	20%	63%	17%	0.726
Prefer SLM over Other Designs	+	31%	46%	23%	0.194
BACH Should Change to Other	-	19%	59%	23%	0.389
Modify/Improve Current Struct	-	11%	53%	36%	0.026

Figure 9 Comparison of Organizational Structures in Healthcare

Overall satisfaction with SLM showed a statistically significant response to two questions in particular. Forty-three percent of those surveyed said they were allowed to think “outside the box” in order to better their work environment. Fifty-four percent said they felt responsible for the success of SLM.

	Response			Significance	
	+/-	Negative	Central		Positive
Think Outside the Box	+	20%	37%	43%	0.031
Understand Concepts of SLM	+	31%	20%	49%	0.267
Received Brief on SLM	+	44%	30%	26%	0.025
Previous Structure Inefficient	+	16%	74%	10%	0.349
SLM Transition Successful	+	10%	64%	26%	0.086
Participate in Leadership Decision	+	23%	50%	27%	1
More Effective in Primary Mission	+	19%	51%	30%	0.139
SLM Increased Efficiency	+	24%	61%	14%	0.101
Satisfied with SLM Structure	+	29%	40%	31%	0.551
Empowered to affect Change	+	21%	39%	40%	0.161
Responsible for Success in SLM	+	11%	34%	54%	0.0005
Sense of Ownership within Service	+	23%	44%	33%	0.553
Mission unaffected by SLM	+	19%	60%	21%	0.871

Figure 10 Overall Satisfaction with Service Line Management

Finally, thirty-seven percent felt that SLM was needed to actually implement the cumbersome elements of TRICARE. Fifty six percent of the respondents stated that the leadership of the hospital supports the TRICARE effort, and 20 percent responded that SLM was not been positively influenced by the introduction of TRICARE. Ironically, a

question that had nothing to do with the SLM management style shows that 56 percent of providers feel that TRICARE is not meeting the needs of our beneficiary population.

	Response			Significance	
	+/-	Negative	Central		Positive
TRICARE Positive with SLM	+	20%	64%	16%	0.45
TRICARE Meets Needs of Bene's	+	56%	36%	9%	0.0005
Leadership Supports TRICARE	+	4%	40%	56%	0.0005
TRICARE Required Intro of SLM	+	14%	49%	37%	0.008

Figure 11 Effect on TRICARE

These findings will serve as an organizational compass to guide and direct strategic improvements. The hope for this information is to show that a complete overhaul is not necessary to improve the overall effectiveness of the organization; rather, that a focused approach to critical areas will eventually lead to a more efficient, customer oriented operation.

Discussion

The purpose of this research process was to identify provider level satisfaction with Service Line Management implementation based on critical characteristics introduced in the literature. Blanchfield should use these findings to identify problem areas that may need closer attention. The following discussion will focus on responses by providers that were statistically significant and, of course, realistically addressable.

Based on the results furnished in the previous paragraph, a larger percentage of respondents felt that access to care has been enhanced by the introduction of SLM as opposed to the previous organizational design. This result is based on the historical

knowledge of the providers and their perception as to the increase in access for beneficiaries.

Providers must have a reduction in the administrative burden associated with providing care to influence the quality and access of care provided to customers. Only one response provided by providers was found to be statistically significant. Providers felt that their “span of control” or levels of responsibility had been greatly reduced. The distribution of answers with regard to information and administration systems, administrative support, skills possessed to manage SLM, minimized obstacles, and enhanced communication seem normally distributed across the survey responses. This reduction in the administrative burden of providers must ultimately impact the focus on customer service.

Each of the responses to creating a work environment that focuses on customer service was found to be statistically significant. A greater portion of respondents felt that they controlled the entire clinical delivery of care, they worked well with administrative personnel in support of their service line, and the transition to SLM took place to increase patient care. Likewise, providers felt that adequate metrics are available to measure productivity, they are informed of decisions within the SLM structure, SLM enhances job performance, and the chain of command is accessible. Ironically, this increase in customer service has not appeared to greatly increase the number of patients seen by the providers. A large percentage of providers felt that SLM has not forced them to see too many patients. With a perceived increase in customer service and access to care, quality of care must naturally follow along the same course.

However, that assumption must not be made with regard to quality. This set of questions focused on the perceived quality of care for beneficiaries under SLM and under a traditional military structure. No significant responses were identified, however the underlying theme to the responses seems to be that quality of care is consistent regardless of the management philosophy. So, if quality of care seems unhindered by management philosophy, then what other characteristics of the two structures can be compared to evaluate their effectiveness.

Again, only one question had responses that were statistically significant regarding the comparison of organizational structures. More providers felt that SLM should make modifications or improvements to its structure, but that statement could be relevant to any organization using any organizational management idea. More respondents than not felt that the command works as a team but also felt that BACH should change back or to another structure, which may influence the providers overall satisfaction with SLM.

In the evaluation of overall satisfaction, three responses were found to be statistically significant. Respondents felt that they were allowed to think outside the box and they were responsible for the overall success of SLMs implementation. However, a majority of respondents stated that they had never received a briefing on SLM.

Finally, four questions were posed to evaluate the effect of SLM on the implementation of TRICARE. Each of the questions were statistically significant, and half of the four responses had expected results. A majority felt that the leadership supports the TRICARE efforts and a little over a third stated that SLM implementation was required for the start of TRICARE. These responses show that the providers feel that

the organization is attempting to make TRICARE work and that the implementation of SLM was needed to meet the demands of a complex change to military healthcare like TRICARE. Again, a majority feel that the needs of beneficiaries are not being met by TRICARE, and that more providers feel that SLM has not contributed positively to that program.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This research process has identified provider level satisfaction with Service Line Management within Blanchfield Army Community Hospital. Based on this descriptive study of qualitative data collected from the responses of in-house providers, three major recommendations are made to improve the perceptions and effectiveness of an SLM implementation. First, continue to educate the staff on SLM concepts and structures. An underlying theme throughout the responses shows a relative ignorance of how the hospital operates as a whole. Incorporate an SLM briefing during the bi-monthly hospital orientation given to all staff. With the introduction of a new process or methodology, resistance to change is the first hurdle to overcome. Service Line Management offers a different approach to mission accomplishment. Therefore, the staff must constantly be informed on the continuous quality improvement efforts exercised to improve this new philosophy. Finally, show how the efforts of SLM through TRICARE are meeting the needs of our beneficiary population. The effectiveness of an organizations ability to meet the demands of its customer must be broadcasted by the very workers that attempt to bring this service to the patient.

Since it has taken 10-20 years for the implementation of PLM to become widespread in manufacturing, it can be expected that PLM in health care will take as long

to fully mature (Manning, 1987). Overcoming the problems associated with defining product lines in health care will occur with time. The logic of having a product line manager coordinating disparate inputs and ensuring the consistent and quality delivery of products appears to fit in healthcare. PLM was found to enhance patient care by integrating health care services and formalizing the advocacy of the patient (Manning, 1987). PLM can be successful because it allows hospitals to respond to changes faster by pushing decision making further down the hierarchical chain and encouraging participative decision making (Bowers & Taylor, 1990).

Predicting whether PLM will be successful in USA MEDDACs is difficult to determine without a more representative study. Although USA MEDDACs are similar to non-profit, utilization maximizing hospitals, there still may be enough of a difference to limit comparisons or inferences. Therefore, the success or failure of implementing PLM in USA MEDDACs will be largely dependent on the ability of corporate/executive decision makers to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses based on customer and employee feedback.

REFERENCES

Andrew, C.G. (1996). The Peopeware Paradigm. Hospital Materiel Management Quarterly 18(1), 47-60.

Bowers, M. & Taylor, J. (1990). Product Line Management in Hospitals: An Exploratory Study of Managing Change. Hospitals & Health Services Administration, 35(3), 365-375.

Cole, G. & Brown, C. (1988). Product-Line Management: Concept to Reality. Topics in Health Care Financing, 14(3), 62-75.

Fackelmann, K. (1985). Cover Story: Cleveland Hospital on the Road to Product Line Management. Modern Healthcare, 11(2), 70-77.

Fottler, M. & Repasky, L. (1988). Attitude of Hospital Executives Towards Product Line Management: A Pilot Survey. Health Care Management Review, 13(3), 15-22.

Gold, M. & Hurley, R. (1997). The Role of Managed Care "Products" in Managed Care "Plans". Inquiry 34, 29-37.

Hoke, L. (1996). OR Management. Journal of Healthcare Resource Management 14(4), 23-26.

Horsfall, G.A. (1996). Accountability: The Force Behind Empowerment. Hospital Materiel Management Quarterly 18(2), 26-31.

Imershein, A. & Estes, C. (1996). From Health Services to Medical Markets: The Commodity Transformation of Medical Production and the Nonprofit Sector. International Journal of Health Services, 26(2), 221-238.

MacStravic, R. (1986). Product-Line Administration in Hospitals. Health Care Management Review, 11(2), 35-43.

Manning, M. (1987). Product Line Management: Will it Work in Health Care? Healthcare Financial Management, 41, 23-32.

Nackel, J. & Kues, W. (1986). Product-Line Management: Systems and Strategies. Hospital & Health Services Administration, 109-123.

Naidu, G., Kleimenhagen, A., & Pillari, G. (1993). Is Product-Line Management Appropriate for Your Health Care Facility? Journal of Health Care Marketing, 6-17.

O'Malley, J., Cummings, S., & Serpico, D. (1991). Pragmatic Strategies for Product-Line Management. Nursing Administration Quarterly, 15, 9-15.

Patterson, D., & Thompson, K. (1987). Product Line Management: Organization Makes the Difference. Healthcare Financial Management, 41, 66-72.

Rizkalla, E. & Crawley, A.J. (1996). Decision Making by Committee. Journal of Healthcare Resource Management 14(7), 37-39.

Robinson, J. (1996). The Dynamics and Limits of Corporate Growth in Health Care. Health Affairs 15(2), 155-169.

Ruffner, J. (1986). Product Line Management: How Six Healthcare Institutions Make it Work. Healthcare Forum, 11-14.

Simpson, R., & Clayton, K. (1991). Automation: The Key to Successful Product Line Management. Nursing Administration Quarterly, 15, 33-38.

Studnicki, J. (1991). Measuring Service Line Competitive Position: A Systematic Methodology for Hospitals. Health Progress, 11(2), 68-72.

Verespej, M. (1988). Put the Customer First. Industry Week, 20.

Whitney, J. (1996). Strategic Renewal for Business Units. Harvard Business Review, July-August, 84-98.

Yano-Fong, D. (1988). Advantage and Disadvantages of Product Line Management. Nursing Management, 19(5), 27-31.

Zelman, W., & McLaughlin, C. (1990). Product Lines in a Complex Market place: Matching Organizational Strategy to Buyer Behavior. Health Care Management Review, 15(2), 9-14.

Zelman, W., & Parham, D. (1990). Strategic Operational, and Marketing Concerns of Product-Line Management in Health Care. Health Care Management Review, 15(1), 29-35.

Appendix A -- Service Line Management (SLM) Survey

- Product Line: Women's Health Primary Care
 Pharm/Lab/X-Ray Administrative Staff
 Perioperative Behavioral Science
 Other

Were you at BACH prior to SLM Implementation? Yes No

Years assigned to BACH: Less than 1 Year 1 to 2 Years
 3-5 Years Over 5 Years

Type of Provider:
 Physician Nurse Phys Asst Other
 Nurse Pract CRNA Nurse Midwife

1= Strongly Agree 2= Agree 3= Neutral 4= Disagree 5= Strongly Disagree

Improve Access of Beneficiaries to Care

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Access to Care is enhanced by our current team/group concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Access to Care for beneficiaries was better under previous design. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Reduce Administrative Burden on Health Care Providers

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. My span of control is less than eight(8) levels in depth | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. I feel current information/admin systems support decentralization. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. SLM supports my administrative needs. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. I have the required skills to be an effective SLM administrator. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. SLM creates unnecessary obstacles to efficient/effective healthcare. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. SLM enhances communication between/among service lines. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Create a Work Environment that Focuses on Customer Service

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. My service line is based on the entire clinical delivery of care. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. I have a good working relationship with Res Mgt & Personnel. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. BACH transitioned to SLM to increase customer service. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. I have useful methods to measure my product line's productivity. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. I am made aware of decisions affecting me in a timely manner. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. The structure of BACH enables me to adequately perform my job. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. I know my chain of command & where to address issues as they arise. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. SLM has forced me to see too many patients. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please Continue Survey on Back Page

1= Strongly Agree 2= Agree 3= Neutral 4= Disagree 5= Strongly Disagree

Increase Quality of Care Provided to Beneficiaries

1 2 3 4 5

- 1. My service line is more productive and efficient because of SLM.
- 2. The SLM organizational structure enhances the quality of care.
- 3. Quality patient care is easier to deliver under BACH's SLM structure.

Comparison of Organizational Structures in Healthcare

- 1. SLM ensures that this command works together as a team.
- 2. Decision making with SLM vs previous structure is better than before.
- 3. I like the BACH SLM structure over other organizational structures.
- 4. BACH should change to a traditional organizational structure.
- 5. BACH should modify and improve current SLM structure.

Overall satisfaction with Product Line Management

- 1. I'm allowed to think "outside the box" to improve my service line.
- 2. I understand the concepts of SLM.
- 3. I received a briefing on SLM during required educational classes.
- 4. The previous BACH organizational structure was inefficient.
- 5. BACH has successfully and efficiently transitioned to SLM.
- 6. I am better able to participate in leadership decisions.
- 7. I am more effective in my primary mission.
- 8. SLM has increased my overall efficiency.
- 9. I am satisfied with the current SLM structure.
- 10. I feel empowered to affect change within my workspace.
- 11. I feel responsible for the success of my service line.
- 12. SLM has created a sense of ownership within my service line.
- 13. SLM has resulted in no change to BACH's healthcare mission.

Effect on Tri-Care

- 1. SLM has positive contributions to the implementation of TRICARE.
- 2. TRICARE meets the needs of our beneficiary population.
- 3. My leadership supports the efforts of TRICARE.
- 4. **The change to TRICARE required the structure of BACH to reorganize.**