

**Data Analysis - What? How? – (Continued)**

Descriptive analysis was covered in [Issue 14](#) - check it out! We will cover trend analysis in this issue.

**Trend Analysis**—Trend analysis is the process of examining data over time to identify patterns, changes, or consistent movements. It helps you understand whether something is increasing, decreasing, or remaining stable, and can be used to make predictions or guide decisions. Below is an example.

**How To Do Trend Analysis?**

- ✓ Compare over time: Look at data across different time periods (e.g., months, quarters, years).
- ✓ Highlight direction and pace: Note whether performance is erratic, improving, declining, or staying flat.
- ✓ Explain what the data is telling you: Summarize the overall movement and its impact.

**Performance Measure:** Number and percentage of individuals with restrictive procedures where proper procedures were followed.

**Numerator:** Number of individuals with restrictive procedures where proper procedures were followed.

**Denominator:** Total number of unduplicated individuals with a restrictive procedure plan and those without a plan who had an improper procedure applied.

Q1: July - September 2025 Q2: October - December 2025	Waivers							
	Q1				Q2			
	A	B	C	TOTAL	A	B	C	TOTAL
<b>Numerator</b>	406	5	14	425	340	16	20	376
<b>Denominator</b>	427	6	14	447	375	20	20	415
<b>Compliance by Waiver and Region</b>	<b>95.1%</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>95.1%</b>	<b>90.6%</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>90.6%</b>

Compliance with proper restrictive procedures across Waivers A, B, and C showed notable variation between quarters. In Q1, overall compliance was strong at 95.1%, driven by Waiver A's high count and performance (406/427, 95.1%) and 100% compliance in Waiver C (14/14). Waiver B, however, showed weaker performance at 83.3% with a small count (5/6). In Q2, overall compliance dipped to 90.6%, with Waiver A dropping to 90.6% (340/375) and Waiver B declining further to 80%, but with an increased count (16/20). While Waiver B represents a small portion of total cases, its impact on overall compliance is significant due to the sensitivity of percentage calculations in small samples. Waiver C maintained 100% compliance (20/20), reinforcing its consistency despite a small count. The decline in Waiver A's performance between quarters had the greatest impact on the overall score due to its larger count and increased number of compliance issues from Q1 (21) to Q2 (35). These trends highlight the need for targeted focus on Waiver B and renewed focus on sustaining Waiver A's strong performance.

**Take a Deeper Dive to learn more** ➤ Who are the noncompliant entities? Are there any themes of noncompliance within and/or across entities? Did all incidents of noncompliance represent unique individuals? If more than 1 incident of noncompliance occurred with the same individual, what do you know about the circumstances? How many incidents of noncompliance were incidents where restrictive procedures were not included in the ISP, or were included in the ISP but not followed?