Example Case

• Friday 4PM, inpatient brain MRI showed acute stroke
• Report says: Findings were discussed with house staff at time of dictation
• Team says they were not aware of findings until Sunday morning
• Although no harm came to the patient, management would have been different had they been aware of the finding on Friday at time the study was interpreted

• Who is responsible?
• Does the phrase ‘discussed with house staff’ meet the standard of care?
Model for Improvement
Plan-Do-Study-Act cycles

Setting our aim
Joint Commission’s 2015 National Patient Safety Goal:
Improve staff communication: Get important test results to the right staff person on time
• Develop procedures to identify, manage, and evaluate the definition and recognition of critical results
  • By whom and to whom critical results are reported
  • Acceptable length of time between the availability and reporting of critical results

Our Aim: Complete documentation of reporting critical results to the licensed independent practitioner (LIP)

The Joint Commission. National Patient Safety Goals effective January 1 2015. Available at:
Intervention

While all changes do not lead to improvement, all improvement requires change

Understanding the current situation

Fishbone Analysis Diagram for 4P’s

- Understanding importance of documenting
- Which results are critical?
- What needs to be documented?
- What if a clinician cannot be reached?
- No standard for documenting
- Takes too long, slows down work flow
- Does not link to actual communication with the clinician

Critical Result Reporting

- People
  - Understanding importance of documenting
  - Time
  - Sense of responsibility

- Policies
  - Which results are critical?
  - What needs to be documented?
  - What if a clinician cannot be reached?

- Procedures
  - No standard for documenting
  - Takes too long, slows down work flow
  - Does not link to actual communication with the clinician

- Technology
  - Separate program to open
  - No way to record in current dictation system
  - Totally manual, nothing automated

4P’s

- Understanding the current situation

NYU School of Medicine
Our Aim: Complete documentation of reporting critical results to the LIP
1. Steps we can eliminate to make process easy so people use it
2. Steps we need to address to ensure COMPLETENESS of reporting

What results are critical?
- Critical Result Identified
- Inform the LIP
- Case is logged in critical results database
- Document in dictation system

What should this statement include?
- Case is logged in critical results database

The New Process
- Critical Result Identified
- Inform the LIP
- Add smart phrase to dictation
- Fill in information
- Case is logged in critical results database
The New Macro

A critical result of [pick list choices] was reported to [Licensed Practitioner] on [Date] at [Time]. Communicated results were read back.

Side bar menu of critical results*
Decided across the department.

1. What does this statement need to include?
2. Which results are critical?

Intervention

Create a macro or smart phrase to use within the voice dictation system

• **Improve work flow** by embedding in application already open
• **Improve efficiency** by including all required aspects (name, date/time, diagnosis, read back confirmation) in the phrase
• **Reduce error** by standardizing format
Measurement

• **Outcome measures** – Is there improved completeness of reporting?

• **Process measures** – How are radiologists documenting critical results reporting?

• **Balancing measures** – Are there trade offs being created? What work arounds are being used?

For first cycle: We will query our critical results database prior to and post implementation to assess **usage** and **completeness** of documentation.

---

**PDSA Cycle 1**

• **Objective** is to introduce the critical result macro to radiologists

• **We predict** documentation and completeness of critical result reporting will improve

• **Will query** database of critical results before and after macro introduced to assess for change
Objective is to introduce the critical result macro to radiologists.

We predict documentation and completeness of critical result reporting will improve.

Will query database of critical results before and after macro introduced to assess for change.

Macro debuts 12/15/2014

At leadership and staff meetings

Through department-wide email correspondence

• Analysis of Data
  • Most is as expected

Objective is to introduce the critical result macro to radiologists.

We predict documentation and completeness of critical result reporting will improve.

Will query database of critical results before and after macro introduced to assess for change.

Macro debuts 12/15/2014
Results

- 399 studies were logged before the macro
- 495 were logged after the macro
- Average of 45 critical test results/month after vs 27/month before (T-test p < .001)

Retrospective review of radiology reports submitted to the critical test result database from 10/1/2013 – 10/20/2015

- Macro was used most in chest and abdomen
- Average time to report did not change
- Complete reporting increased from 35% to 100% (p < .0001 overall and for each detail independently)
Objective is to introduce the critical result macro to radiologists

We predict documentation and completeness of critical result reporting will improve

Will query database of critical results before and after macro introduced to assess for change

Objective

Data Analysis: Most is as expected

Macro debuts 12/15/2014

PDSA Cycle 1

• Closer look at:
  • Low-use sections
  • Critical results reported but not captured in database

• Act

• Plan

• Study

• Do

Outcomes measures:

• Doing better but how many critical results are not getting captured? Of those, how many have complete critical result reporting?

Process measures:

• Has use of the macro been maintained?
• How do we create buy in?

Balance measures:

• What are barriers to use of the macro?
• Unique features to each section?

All critical results reported

Critical results captured in monitoring system
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