

Understanding the role of context in healthcare quality and safety initiatives: Adopting an institutional perspective

Clara Weisshaar, Simon Bailey, Adam Brisley, Tom Blakeman

Presented at the 33rd EGOS Colloquium “The Good Organisation”, July 6-8 2017 Copenhagen

Figure 1 Hospital Institutional Features in the context of Quality Improvement, using Scott’s Institutional Framework (2008)

Pillars/ Carriers	HOSPITAL SETTING “X”			HOSPITAL SETTING “Y”		
	REGULATIVE	NORMATIVE	CULTURAL- COGNITIVE	REGULATIVE	NORMATIVE	CULTURAL- COGNITIVE
Symbolic systems	<p>Locally agreed CQUIN criteria, worth 0.5million</p> <p>NCEPOD report (2009) on ‘poor management’ of AKI in UK</p> <p>Organisation Acronym as a standard and code-for practice for ‘good AKI care’</p> <p>Simultaneous cost-cutting initiative</p>	<p>Managerial value and norm of ‘collaboration’ and strong feedback loops</p> <p>Managerial targets on strict financial and operational measures</p> <p>Expectation on staff engagement ‘AKI is everybody’s business’</p>	<p>Organisation-wide established “Quality Improvement” culture</p>	<p>Trust involvement in NCEPOD report (2009-2014)</p> <p>AKI Bundle, 10 point checklist</p>	<p>Managerial expectation of evidence base and pilot studies</p> <p>Managerial norm and expectation of ‘over-identification’ with 110% AKI alert accuracy</p> <p>Improvement Project as “empowerment” of doctors and medical teams</p> <p>Achieve objective of providing ‘equity of care’ across the organisation</p>	<p>“zero mistake” tolerance/“fool-proof” system</p>
Relational systems	<p>Dedicated QI team to set priorities and monitor performance</p> <p>Key Performance Indicators (KPI)</p>	<p>‘softly softly’ managerial approach to gain commitment</p> <p>Micro-management practice monitoring through audits</p>	<p>Organisation identity as ‘unique’ and ‘distinct’ in use of QI approaches</p>	<p>Board support and approval provided dedicated resource. AKI nurse walk-around to establish and maintain engagement and commitment</p> <p>Newly Appointed Consultants Development & Leadership Programme</p>	<p>Hierarchical decision-making structure</p> <p>Human resource enabled - alongside alert system</p> <p>AKI nurses as monitoring tools for good practice</p> <p>Ad-hoc and case-by-case education of staff</p>	<p>Organisation image as ‘individual’ and ‘distinct’ IT system approach</p>
Routines	<p>Regular learning and catch up sessions to monitor and feedback</p> <p>Berwick review sessions to review local strategy against national guidelines</p>	<p>Collaborative and voluntary approach – buying hearts and minds</p> <p>Safety-huddles – routine shift handover practice</p>	<p>Managerial vs. clinical working routines</p>	<p>Monthly and quarterly submission of AKI data to Trust and CQC</p> <p>Newly Appointed Development & Leadership Programme (NACDP)</p>	<p>Routine morning and afternoon ward-rounds to visit AKI patients and monitor care</p> <p>High value placed on job roles and expertise of AKI nurses</p>	<p>AKI nurse working routine</p> <p>Clinical working routines</p>
Artefacts	<p>Implemented national AKI alerts</p>	<p>Test of change – PDSA cycles. Electronic patient record with banners and decision prompts</p>	<p>Symbolic to good AKI care: stickers, Posters, badges. QI mythology</p>	<p>Locally devised AKI alert system</p>	<p>AKI Priority Care Checklist ‘PCC’ as self-monitoring tool and good practice checklist</p>	<p>AKI nurses as “face of AKI”</p>