



On the Radar

Issue 161
10 February 2014

On the Radar is a summary of some of the recent publications in the areas of safety and quality in health care. Inclusion in this document is not an endorsement or recommendation of any publication or provider.

Access to particular documents may depend on whether they are Open Access or not, and/or your individual or institutional access to subscription sites/services. Material that may require subscription is included as it is considered relevant.

On the Radar is available online, via email or as a PDF document from <http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/publications-resources/on-the-radar/>

If you would like to receive *On the Radar* via email, you can subscribe on our website <http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/> or by emailing us at mail@safetyandquality.gov.au. You can also send feedback and comments to mail@safetyandquality.gov.au.

For information about the Commission and its programs and publications, please visit <http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au>
You can also follow us on Twitter @ACSQHC.

On the Radar

Editor: Dr Niall Johnson niall.johnson@safetyandquality.gov.au
Contributors: Niall Johnson, Luke Slawomirski, Justine Marshall

Consultation on the Draft Clinical Care Standards

Consultation Now Open

In collaboration with consumers, clinicians, researchers and health organisations, the Commission has developed draft Clinical Care Standards for **Acute Coronary Syndrome** and **Antimicrobial Stewardship**.

A Clinical Care Standard provides a small number of quality statements that describe the clinical care that a patient should be offered for a specific condition.

The Commission is now inviting feedback on these draft Clinical Care Standards from healthcare professionals, peak healthcare and consumer organisations, consumers and any other interested parties. Feedback can be provided through completing a brief survey or by making a written submission. Further details on the consultation are available at www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/clinical-care-standards/consultation/

Consultation on the Draft National Consensus Statement on End-of-Life Care in Acute Hospitals

Consultation Now Open

As part of its work on improving the safety and quality of end-of-life care in acute hospitals, the Commission has developed the *Draft National Consensus Statement: Essential Elements for Safe and High-Quality End-of-Life Care in Acute Hospitals* (the Consensus Statement).

The draft Consensus Statement aims to provide guidance for health services to develop their own systems for delivering safe, timely and high quality end-of-life care in a way that is tailored to their population, resources and available personnel, whilst being in line with relevant jurisdictional or other programs.

The Commission is holding an open consultation process from 31 January to 31 March 2014. The Commission is accepting written submissions on the draft Consensus Statement and is conducting a series of workshops in each of Australia's capital cities during the consultation period. Interested parties are invited to provide feedback through completing a brief survey or by making a detailed written submission.

To download a copy of the draft Consensus Statement, and for more information on the consultation process, please visit www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/recognition-and-response-to-clinical-deterioration/end-of-life-care-in-acute-hospitals/consultation-on-draft-national-consensus-statement-on-end-of-life-care-in-acute-hospitals/

Reports

Service transformation: Lessons from mental health

Gilbert H, Peck E, Ashton B, Edwards N, Naylor C

London: The King's Fund, 2013

Notes	<p>UK mental health services have undergone radical transformation in the past 30 years. A community-based care model has largely replaced the acute and long-term care provided in large institutions. Similar change—from hospital to community-based alternatives—is a long-standing policy objective for physical health care in the United Kingdom.</p> <p>This paper examines the transformation of mental health services in England and the relevance to current policy. Drawing on workshops with those involved in the changes and a review of published literature, the paper explores the context and factors that enabled change to happen in mental health. It includes lessons for service transformation based on these experiences. The lessons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New models of care• The dangers of 're-institutionalisation'• The danger of system complexity• The need to understand professional resistance to change• The need to understand the complexities of partnership working• The need to engage primary care• Unpredictable developments and unintended consequences• The temptation to be overly optimistic• A lack of flexibility in implementation.
URL	http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/service-transformation

Report on Government Services 2014
Melbourne: Productivity Commission, 2014

Notes	The annual <i>Report on Government Services</i> (ROGS) provides information on the equity, effectiveness and efficiency of government services in Australia. Each year's report includes a volume on health. Included in that report is information on 'sentinel events' in public hospitals.
URL	http://www.pc.gov.au/gsp/rogs/health

Journal articles

Undetermined impact of patient decision support interventions on healthcare costs and savings: systematic review

Walsh T, Barr PJ, Thompson R, Ozanne E, O'Neill C, Elwyn G
BMJ 2014;348

Notes	<p>Support for shared decision making often draws upon evidence of benefit to patients and the wider health system. Patient-level benefits include increased knowledge, more accurate expectations, and treatment choices more in line with individual preferences and values. At a health system level, some research has sought to extrapolate from engaged and informed patients making more conservative treatment choices to potential financial savings for the healthcare system.</p> <p>This concise review of seven studies with quantitative economic data relating to the use of patient decision support interventions (e.g. patient decision aids) examines their predicted savings and risk of bias. The review found that "three of the four analyses that had the lowest scores for risk of bias found no significant savings," but that "none of the studies found increased spending associated with the use of patient decision support interventions."</p> <p>It is worth noting that this review sought to isolate the effect of decision support interventions alone, and so excluded data relating to the effects of other shared decision making interventions, such as patient decision coaching or interviews, even if the interventions were delivered together.</p> <p>The authors conclude that there is insufficient evidence at present to predict system level savings from more conservative individual patient choices, however, "the absence of evidence for savings does not mean we have evidence of an absence of savings." The authors emphasise the "strong ethical imperative" to share decisions with patients.</p>
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g188

For information about the Commission's work on shared decision making, see <http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/shared-decision-making/>

A systems-based partnership learning model for strengthening primary healthcare

Bailie R, Matthews V, Brands J, Schierhout G

Implementation Science 2013;8:143.

Notes	The (Australian-based) authors of this paper argue that enhancing and "[s]trengthening primary healthcare systems is vital to improving health outcomes and reducing inequity" and that in order to achieve this they have developed and advocate a learning model .
-------	---

	The model draws on concepts of comprehensive primary health care, integrated quality improvement (IQI) methods, system-based research networks, and system-based participatory action research. The model has evolved within the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander primary healthcare context and the authors describe successes and challenges in its application. One of the interesting features of this evolution is how a model that has developed in what is widely seen as one of the more difficult contexts for primary care, has been seen to enhance care in that context can also be ‘mainstreamed’ and be used to improve the primary care sector more generally.
URL	http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-8-143

A governance model for integrated primary/secondary care for the health-reforming first world - results of a systematic review

Nicholson C, Jackson C, Marley J

BMC Health Services Research 2013;13(1):528.

Notes	This systematic review of the literature on integration of primary and secondary health care and integrated healthcare governance (published in English during 2006–2012) come to focus on 21 studies. The authors report that their thematic analysis “identified elements needed for integrated primary/secondary health care governance across a regional setting including: joint planning; integrated information communication technology; change management; shared clinical priorities; incentives; population focus; measurement using data as a quality improvement tool; continuing professional development supporting joint working; patient/community engagement; and, innovation. ”
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-528

Challenges and opportunities for integration in health systems: an Australian perspective

Petrich M, Ramamurthy VL, Hendrie D, Robinson S

Journal of Integrated Care 2013;21(6):347-359.

Notes	In this paper, also on integration and improving integration, the authors sought to examine the Australian context, including “identifying some key Australian challenges to integration, policy responses to enhance integration and potential insights from these for international policy makers, researchers and practitioners.” Here they argue that recognising the more local and the “inherent system-based barriers” are important early steps. They also suggest that “ political will to move in this direction is a necessary dynamic to energise the system through appropriate funding, incentives and governance structures.” It could be argued that this may seem a somewhat fatalistic approach that focuses the power to initiate and drive change away from the local and the frontline.
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JICA-09-2013-0037

Health Affairs

Vol. 33, No. 2, February 2014

Notes	This issue of <i>Health Affairs</i> has the theme ‘Early Evidence, Future Promise Of Connected Health’. Articles in this issue include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connected Health And The Rise Of The Patient-Consumer (W H Frist) • Connected Health: A Review Of Technologies And Strategies To Improve Patient Care With Telemedicine And Telehealth (Joseph Kvedar, Molly Joel Coye, and Wendy Everett)
-------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telehealth: Seven Strategies To Successfully Implement Disruptive Technology And Transform Health Care (Lee H. Schwamm) • Lessons From Tele-Emergency: Improving Care Quality And Health Outcomes By Expanding Support For Rural Care Systems (Keith . Mueller, Andrew J Potter, A Clinton MacKinney, and Marcia M Ward) • Distributing Medical Expertise: The Evolution And Impact Of Telemedicine In Arkansas (Curtis L Lowery, Janet M Bronstein, Tina L Benton, and David A Fletcher) • THE CARE SPAN: Use Of Telemedicine Can Reduce Hospitalizations Of Nursing Home Residents And Generate Savings For Medicare (David C Grabowski and A James O'Malley) • Kaiser Permanente Northern California: Current Experiences With Internet, Mobile, And Video Technologies (Robert Pearl) • Mobile Phone Diabetes Project Led To Improved Glycemic Control And Net Savings For Chicago Plan Participants (Shantanu Nundy, Jonathan J Dick, Chia-Hung Chou, Robert S Nocon, M H Chin, and M E Peek)
URL	http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/current

Australian Health Review
Vol. 38, No. 1, February 2014

Notes	<p>The latest issue of <i>Australian Health Review</i> has been published. Articles in this issue include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research priorities in suicide prevention: an examination of Australian-based research 2007–11 (Jo Robinson and Jane Pirkis) • Relationship between frailty and discharge outcomes in subacute care (Melanie N Haley, Yvonne D Wells and Anne E Holland) • Should diagnosis codes from emergency department data be used for case selection for emergency department key performance indicators? (Stuart C Howell, Rachael A Wills and Trisha C Johnston) • Depression in palliative care patients: a survey of assessment and treatment practices of Australian and New Zealand palliative care specialists (Kay Porche, Liz Reymond, John O' Callaghan and M Charles) • Hospital admissions caused by adverse drug events: an Australian prospective study (Alexandra L Phillips, Olimpia Nigro, Karen A Macolino, Kirsty C Scarborough, Christopher J Doecke, M T Angley and S Shakib) • Emergency department waiting times: do the raw data tell the whole story? (Janette Green, James Dawber, Malcolm Masso and Kathy Eagar) • Estimating treatment rates for mental disorders in Australia (Harvey A Whiteford, William J Buckingham, Meredith G Harris, Philip M Burgess, Jane E Pirkis, Jan J Barendregt and Wayne D Hall) • Lessons for the Australian healthcare system from the Berwick report (Lesley Russell and Paresh Dawda) • Healthcare professional perspectives on quality and safety in New Zealand public hospitals: findings from a national survey (Robin Gauld and Simon Horsburgh) • Preparing a 21st century workforce: is it time to consider clinically based, competency-based training of health practitioners? (Susan A Nancarrow, Anna M Moran and Iain Graham)
URL	http://www.publish.csiro.au/nid/270/currentissueflag/1.htm

BMJ Quality and Safety online first articles

Notes	<p><i>BMJ Quality and Safety</i> has published a number of ‘online first’ articles, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Surgical Safety Checklist and Teamwork Coaching Tools: a study of inter-rater reliability (Lyen C Huang, Dante Conley, Stu Lipsitz, Christopher C Wright, Thomas W Diller, Lizabeth Edmondson, W R Berry, S J Singer) • Team-training in healthcare: a narrative synthesis of the literature (Sallie J Weaver, Sydney M Dy, Michael A Rosen) • The experiences of professionals with using information from patient-reported outcome measures to improve the quality of healthcare: a systematic review of qualitative research (Maria B Boyce, John P Browne, Joanne Greenhalgh) • We need to talk: an observational study of the impact of electronic medical record implementation on hospital communication (Stephanie Parks Taylor, Robert Ledford, Victoria Palmer, Erika Abel) • Collaborative pharmaceutical care in an Irish hospital: uncontrolled before-after study (Tamasine C Grimes, Evelyn Deasy, Ann Allen, John O’Byrne, Tim Delaney, John Barragry, Niall Breslin, Eddie Moloney, Catherine Wall) • A just culture after Mid Staffordshire (Sidney W A Dekker, Thomas B Hugh) • The cystic fibrosis improvement story: we count our successes in lives (Brent C James) • A multicentre cohort study assessing day of week effect and outcome from emergency appendicectomy (Henry JM Ferguson, Nigel J Hall, Aneel Bhangu, on behalf of the National Surgical Research Collaborative) • Relationship between patient reported experience (PREMs) and patient reported outcomes (PROMs) in elective surgery (Nick Black, Mira Varaganum, Andrew Hutchings)
URL	http://qualitysafety.bmj.com/content/early/recent

International Journal for Quality in Health Care online first articles

Notes	<p><i>International Journal for Quality in Health Care</i> has published a number of ‘online first’ articles, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The association of hospital quality ratings with adverse events (Joel S Weissman, L López, E C Schneider, A M Epstein, S Lipsitz, and S N Weingart) • The use of modern quality improvement approaches to strengthen African health systems: a 5-year agenda (James Heiby)
URL	http://intqhc.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/recent?papetoc

Disclaimer

On the Radar is an information resource of the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. The Commission is not responsible for the content of, nor does it endorse, any articles or sites listed. The Commission accepts no liability for the information or advice provided by these external links. Links are provided on the basis that users make their own decisions about the accuracy, currency and reliability of the information contained therein. Any opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care.