



Longwoods Review

Volume 4, Number 1 • 2006

Editor-in-Chief

Peggy Leatt, PhD

Editorial Advisory Board

Philip Berman

Director, European Health Management Association, Dublin, Ireland

Michael Guerriere, MD, MBA

Managing Partner, Courtyard Group, Toronto, ON

Peggy Leatt, PhD

Professor and Chair, Department of Health Policy and Administration, School of Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC

Cam Mustard, ScD

Professor, Department of Public Health Sciences, University of Toronto Faculty of Medicine, President/Scientific Director, Institute for Work & Health, Toronto, ON

Dorothy Pringle, PhD

Professor and Dean Emeritus, Faculty of Nursing, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON

Enrique Ruelas, PhD

Senior Undersecretary, Mexico Health, Mexico City, Mexico

Eugene Schneller, PhD

Professor and Director, School of Health Administration & Policy, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

Executive Editor

Dianne Foster-Kent

E-mail: dkent@longwoods.com

Publisher

W. Anton Hart

E-mail: ahart@longwoods.com

Associate Publisher/Administration

Barbara Marshall

E-mail: bmarshall@longwoods.com

Associate Publisher/Media

Susan Hale

E-mail: shale@longwoods.com

Design and Production

Yvonne Koo

E-mail: ykoo@longwoods.com

Copy Editors

James Gladstone, Rodney Rawlings

Information contained in this publication has been compiled from sources believed to be reliable. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy and completeness, these are not guaranteed. The views and opinions expressed are those of the individual contributors and do not necessarily represent an official opinion of *Longwoods Review* or Longwoods Publishing Corporation. Readers are urged to consult their professional advisors prior to acting on the basis of material in this journal.

No liability for this journal's content shall be incurred by Longwoods Publishing Corporation, the editors, the editorial advisory board or any contributors.

Longwoods Review is published quarterly by Longwoods Publishing Corp., 260 Adelaide St. East, No. 8, Toronto, ON, Canada, M5A 1N1. Tel: 416-864-9667 Fax: 416-368-4443

ISSN 1708-0487

Canada Post Publications Agreement No. 40069375

© 2006

Towards Faster Treatment: Reducing Attendance and Waits at Emergency Departments

A Briefing Paper from the U.K. National Coordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organization Research and Development

ABSTRACT

Key messages based on a literature review which investigated the organisational factors that influence attendance and waiting times in emergency departments (EDs):

- Fast tracking systems in the ED can reduce waits.
- Case management for chronic disease and high service users can reduce demand, as can home support and specialist nurses.
- Point-of-care testing is faster than centralised laboratory testing.
- Seniority of staffing reduces delays.
- Triaging out of the ED can reduce usage but its safety is not known.
- Primary care gatekeeping can reduce attendance numbers.
- Patient education is of unproven advantage in reducing attendances.
- The benefits of diverting cases away from EDs by the ambulance service are not proven.
- There is a lack of evidence about bed management and delayed discharges.
- Priority should be given to further research on the role of paramedics and on diverting some 999 calls to advice lines since the impact of these innovations on patient safety is uncertain.

ACCESS TO CARE: TOWARDS FASTER TREATMENT

Reducing waits in EDs: a cross-system issue

Surveys over the last few years show that many people feel they wait too long if they have had to go to an emergency department (ED) (a term now preferred to Accident and Emergency or A&E). Patient surveys have consistently shown that delays in EDs are the most important area of improvement. Emergency admissions also occupy 65% of staffed beds in the NHS with a continuing rise in this percentage.

The NHS Plan (DOH, 2000) has set ambitious targets for reducing the length of time patients have to wait for treatment. This applies to all stages of their journey through the ED, including:

- the wait before being seen by a clinician
- the time from seeing a clinician until a decision is made to admit or discharge
- the wait from decision to admit to arrival on the ward.

Ninety-eight per cent of all patients attending EDs in England are now spending less than 4 hours from arrival until



Fonds

www.longwoods.com

they leave (either discharged, admitted to a ward or transferred elsewhere).

Attention often focuses on those factors within EDs associated with delays such as how they are staffed, resourced and run. Clearly, these are key to providing high quality timely care. But delays occurring elsewhere in the system, from the time someone first calls for help until they return home, can have a knock-on effect, making waits in the ED worse. Thus, changes in the wider system can also help to reduce waits for those being treated in the ED. Although some changes in ED processes will improve performance there, most changes are needed outside the ED.

What, then, is known about the evidence for changes that can reduce waits in emergency departments or the need for attendance, both directly and indirectly? And how can policy makers, practitioners and decision-makers use this knowledge to influence and improve the emergency care patients get? This paper summarises a review of research evidence on this topic (Cooke *et al.*, 2005).

PRACTICAL FINDINGS

A large number of studies has been published concerning the international problem of waits and delays in EDs. Most of these studies, however, describe the extent of, or people's opinions about, the causes of the problem. Most do not focus on innovations to reduce waits and attendances. However, it is important to remember that lack of evidence does not mean that the changes being implemented do not work or do not encourage innovation. But it is also important that innovations are analysed for their effectiveness and their impact on clinical care, cost and the care system as a whole. A related point is that where assessing innovations in EDs is concerned, applying methods used to evaluate other types of clinical treatment (e.g. randomised

controlled trials) may not always be practicable or appropriate.

Findings of the review are divided into 9 sections as follows.

1. Out of hospital care

This includes ambulance dispatch and prioritisation, diverting 999 calls to advice lines and not taking patients to EDs. Evidence in this area is generally poor and most refers to the US system, where ambulance staff receive different training.

- It is possible to divert some 999 calls to advice lines but the safety of such systems is still being evaluated.
- The role of paramedics in either discharging patients from the scene or deciding on appropriate destinations has not been adequately studied to confirm its safety and effectiveness in the UK.

2. Primary care

Ambulance crews often bring patients to ED by default. Alternatives may include taking patients to the nearest appropriate source of healthcare, including primary care centres, walk-in centres and minor injury units.

- Primary care gatekeeping can reduce ED attendance but its safety is unknown.
- Walk-in centres and NHS Direct have not been demonstrated to reduce attendances at EDs.
- There is no evidence about the effects on waiting times of general practitioners working in EDs.

3. Emergency department

Findings here relate to clinical, structural and procedural changes that have been introduced in EDs.

- Triage (i.e. a brief clinical assessment that determines the time and sequence in which patients should

be seen in the ED) is a risk management tool for busy periods. However, it may cause delays in care.

- Triaging out of the ED (whereby patients are redirected to an alternative source of care) can reduce numbers but more work is required to assess the safety of such systems.
- Co-payment systems (charging partial or full payment for non-urgent attendances at ED, and used in the USA) may reduce attendances but may equally reduce attendances by those requiring emergency care.
- Fast track systems for minor injuries have been proven to reduce waits. These systems work more effectively if they include senior staff.
- Attendance by the elderly, those with chronic disease and those who attend EDs on multiple occasions may be reduced by various interventions. Trials are needed in this area, including those evaluating the role of social workers.

4. Patient education

This includes education of patients, through awareness campaigns, leaflets, and so on, as to what types of condition are appropriate for the ED.

- Patient education is of unproven benefit in most areas except chronic disease management.
- Phoning for advice before going to the ED may reduce attendances.

5. Diagnostics

Waiting for results of tests is one of the commonest causes of patient delays.

- Point-of-care testing/satellite laboratories produces quicker results.
- Nurse ordering of X-rays may speed up processes where fast track (see 3 above) does not operate.
- ED staff undertaking ultrasounds may reduce delays for those having this procedure.
- Results delivery needs further inves-

tigation. There are suggestions that electronic reporting may delay results delivery.

6. Avoiding need for admission

Inappropriate or preventable admissions may account for 4.7–37% of hospital admissions, depending on the criteria used.

- Specialist nurse care in heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and deep vein thrombosis (DVT) can reduce hospital admissions.
- Home support (medical and social) can reduce hospital admissions.
- Observation wards may reduce length of stay and avoid admission.

7. Bed management

Good bed management in hospitals can help solve overcrowding in the ED. However, the review found no trials of different bed management strategies.

- There is thus a lack of evidence of innovations in bed management.
- Allowing ED staff to admit to wards will reduce delays.

8. Delayed discharge

Research in this area is hampered by the lack of an objective measure of “inappropriate delay.”

- There is thus a lack of evidence about innovations to reduce delayed discharges from hospital.
- Most evidence looks at the causes of delays rather than solutions.

9. Staffing

Matching the number and skills of staff to cases arriving at the ED is key to ensuring that a queue does not form. There are very few studies looking at the impact of differing staffing levels, skill mix or systems of work. Work looking at increased use of senior medical staff suggests they may reduce

admissions and decrease delay, particularly if they have the right to admit patients to wards.

- Teams of staff available for unpredictable surges in activity may reduce delays.
- Having a system that allocates patients to ED staff may be better at reducing waits than allowing ED staff to determine allocation.
- Availability of senior staff may reduce admissions and delays.
- Nurse practitioners are safe and effective but their effect on waits is unknown.
- The role of other health care professionals in ED care needs evaluation.

FURTHER RESEARCH: AGENDAS FOR ACTION

The review highlighted the extent to which evidence currently exists to support specific innovations in organisation and delivery. The review also identified gaps and weaknesses in the literature which could be addressed by further research, including in relation to innovations in EDs and patient safety. Taken together, these findings and observations can be used to build up agendas for further research and/or action as follows.

Research/action for policy makers Initiatives not supported by good evidence of reducing attendances at EDs include:

- NHS Walk-in Centres
- NHS Direct
- patient education.

Absence of evidence does not, however, mean that these initiatives are not effective. They have also been shown to have other advantages and benefits to patient care and the NHS.

Good evidence exists to support the following policies:

- fast track systems for minor injury patients.
- chronic disease case management, home support and specialist nurse care to reduce emergency admissions.

Policy areas with a lack of evidence but supported by expert opinion include:

- bed management
- reducing delayed discharges
- reorganisation of emergency primary care.

Research/action for local decision makers

Initiatives that are appropriate for local development include:

- senior staff seeing patients in ED at an earlier stage
- ED staff having the right to admit to wards.

Research/action on innovations and patient safety

In some areas innovations are being undertaken where the safety has not been assessed. It is therefore vital that assessment is made before they are widely adopted. The first two listed below are being widely introduced in the UK and should be prioritised for safety assessment.

1. *The role of paramedics* in discharging patients from the scene or deciding on appropriate destinations. Some US studies suggest an unacceptably high critical incident rate but these studies are not directly applicable to the UK.
2. The safety of *diverting some 999 calls to advice lines*, such as NHS Direct, is still being evaluated.
3. *Primary care gatekeeping*.
4. *Triaging out and co-payment systems*.

ABOUT THE STUDY

The aim of the literature review was to establish the evidence for innovations

designed to reduce waiting times in and attendance at emergency departments to identify priorities for further research.

The review sought to answer the following questions:

- What initiatives in emergency departments have been demonstrated to reduce waiting times and attendances?
- What initiatives outside emergency departments have been shown to reduce waiting times and attendances?
- What evidence is there of the clinical and cost effectiveness of such interventions?

The review was designed to meet the following objectives:

- to inform policy makers and health and social care providers of evidence-based initiatives
- to assist providers by providing vignettes of good practice and contact details
- to highlight areas where further research should be commissioned.

The review examined and summarised evidence from published and unpublished literature (both UK and international). Searches were made of key electronic databases and the Internet. Other search strategies included hand searching and contacting key researchers in the field via adverts placed in journals and on internet mailing lists. The initial number of references generated in the searches was over 60,000. Following the initial sift, titles and abstracts of 3,178 were reviewed and of these 334 were fully reviewed. A total of 109 studies met the selection criteria.

The research team also benefited from the advice of members of an Expert Advisory Group, representing all organisations allied to emergency care.

References

Cooke, M., Fisher, J., Dale, J., McLeod, E., Szczepura, A., Walley, P. and Wilson, S. (2005) *Reducing Attendances and Waits in Emergency Departments: A Systematic Review of Present Innovations*. A report to the NHS Service Delivery and Organisation R&D Programme. SDO: London.

Department of Health (DOH) (2000) *The NHS Plan*. London: Stationery Office. Available at: www.nhsia.nhs.uk/nhsplan.

Further Information about the Study

The full report, this briefing paper and details of current SDO research in the field can be downloaded at: www.sdo.lshtm.ac.uk/access.htm.

The report and related material can also be accessed at the Emergency Care and Rehabilitation page on the University of Warwick website at: www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/med/healthcom/emergencycare.

For further information about the case studies included in the report contact Professor Matthew Cooke, Professor in Emergency Care, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick and Co-Director, Warwick Emergency Care and Rehabilitation: m.w.cooke@warwick.ac.uk.

About the SDO Programme

The SDO R&D Programme is a national research programme managed by the National Co-ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organisation Research and Development (NCCSDO) under contract from the Department of Health's R&D Division.

For further information about the NCCSDO or the SDO Programme visit our website at www.sdo.lshtm.ac.uk or contact:

NCCSDO
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
99 Gower Street, London WC1E 6AZ

Tel: +44 (0)20 7612 7980
Fax: +44 (0)20 7612 7979
Email: sdo@lshtm.ac.uk

INNOVATIONS THAT WORK

Streaming to primary care

Patients attending one ED were assessed at the point of triage and a decision made as to whether their needs were most appropriately met by an ED medical practitioner or nurse or a member of the primary health care team. An experienced member of the nursing team helped patients to access services needed, provided nursing care or treatment, or directed patients to self-care. Audit showed that nurses were practising safely and making correct judgements. Waiting times for minor injuries rarely exceeded 2 hours and patients treated by nursing staff were seen within minutes rather than hours.

Eliminating triage

By eliminating triage one ED ensured that minor conditions were seen by the first available professional (nurse or doctor) within 15–30 minutes of arrival. The nurse and/or doctor would then treat the patient in line with own ability. This could include discharge, referral, assessment, ordering investigations (X-ray, bloods, etc.) or the administering of analgesia if required. Doctors were trained in basic dressings, dispensing medicines, applying slings, and so on. An extra nurse was allocated as a coordinator for improving patient flow and encouraging the new ways of working between 8 am and 4 pm.

Avoiding admissions

In one locality Clinical Decisions Units (CDUs) were introduced into two large EDs. CDUs were nurse-led and driven by protocols and their aims were rapid diagnosis, short-term treatment and/or observation of selected emergency patients. After their introduction there was a 17% reduction in unscheduled admissions. Patient satisfaction with the service was found to be excellent.

Source: Cooke *et al.* (2005)

a journal with a distinguished history

WORLD HEALTH & POPULATION

provides a forum for researchers and policy makers worldwide to publish original research, reviews and opinions on health and population related topics. The journal encourages the conduct and dissemination of applied research and policy analysis from diverse international settings. Its stated goal is to explore ideas, share best practices and enable excellence in healthcare worldwide through publishing contributions by researchers, policy makers and practitioners.

worldhealthandpopulation.com

Editor-in-Chief
John E. Paul, PhD
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Founding Editor-in-Chief
Sagar Jain, PhD
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Editorial Advisory Board

Peggy Leatt, PhD
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Karen B. Allen, MA, MSc, PhD
UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office

François Béland, PhD
Université de Montréal,

Adelsteinn Brown, DPhil
University of Toronto

Francois Champagne PhD
Université de Montréal

Wen Chen, Ph.D., M.D.,
Fudan University

Jean-Louis Denis, PhD
Université de Montréal,

William H. Dow, PhD
University of California, Berkeley

Daniel L. Goetz
RTI

Amir A. Khaliq, PhD
University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center

Sandra G. Leggat, PhD
La Trobe University

Lutchmie Narine, PhD
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Bernardo Ramirez, MD
INTECH

Amal C. Sjaaf, MD, DrPH
University of Indonesia

Sattar Yoosuf, MD
World Health Organization, South East Region

David Zakus, BSc, MES, MSc, PhD
Global Health Education Consortium

Themes Have Universal Relevance

Howard Waldner
President and CEO, Vancouver Island Health

Ensuring responsive and timely access within an emergency department is likely one of the most common “hot button” issues facing all of us involved in socialized medicine. There are many variables at play here, and discussed in this featured article. As reported, there has been relatively little research and evaluation to assess the most effective way to drive system-performance improvement. Experience in both the NHS and in Western Canada leads me to believe that many of the themes and strategies discussed here have some universal relevance and “currency” on both sides of the “pond.” We should absolutely look at these learnings; however, there are some fundamental issues and differences between our health systems that need to be recognized and addressed before some of these could be optimized in Canada.

The issues of system alignment, role demarcation and the way in which doctors and other health professionals are paid, to my mind, remain major stumbling blocks to effecting and sustaining transformational service redesign and improvement. A good example of this is the capacity of primary healthcare to deal effectively with the tidal wave of chronic disease in the community. Given the constraints

of the fee-for-service reimbursement models in most Canadian jurisdictions and the lack of access to interdisciplinary group practice models/clinical support tools, all too often, patient care defaults to an episodic emergency visit, rather than being dealt with “upstream” as part of a focused prevention and shared care model. Such models do exist, of course, but sadly are not the norm. Interdisciplinary primary healthcare is well developed in the UK. This is not the case in many parts of Canada. Here, the emergency department often remains the one-stop shop, with all of the associated capacity and congestion issues that that brings. Fast track/minor injury centres are commonplace in Canada with good evidence to support their use.

I agree with the expert opinion expressed in the paper supporting the need for improved bed management. To my mind this remains the key challenge of managing outflow from the emergency department once a decision to admit or discharge is made. Here, the debilitating impact of “blocked” acute beds and the lack of rapid access to appropriate community care options, to my mind, remain the most significant challenges to be addressed. There are a number of Canadian-based examples of

a successful application of patient flow/bed management technology such as Strata Health’s Pathways and Care-First products. Evaluation of the use of these systems in Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver Island Health systems have demonstrated the significant benefits of focused bed management and patient transition across the continuum. This is one area where Canadian experience and innovation is leading the way, with adoption of this model now moving forward on three continents around the world.

In Canada, we have made some great strides to redesign and reengineer our systems, but rarely do we formally evaluate the perceived and real benefits of our efforts, let alone publish and share these learnings as an industry. I believe that there is an opportunity to learn from the findings and conclusions of this work in the NHS, but we also need to look carefully and critically within our own systems – to identify and share what works well, and what does not.

There are no magic bullets for success in healthcare, and, as an industry, we need to be more open to critically reviewing and sharing our experiences in areas where we share such common challenges.

Research. Evidence. Dissemination.
www.healthcarepolicy.net



Set Clear Goals and Fund Them

Jeff Lozon

President and CEO, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto

The NHS is to be congratulated on its successful initiative to lower ER waits, and there is much that Canadian decision-makers can learn from the experience. By setting clear goals and then funding them, decision-makers at the macro level are validated. Institutionally, ERs benefit from best of breed approaches and learning from successes.

But it is a classically good news/bad news scenario.

The good news is that the vital ER services that are often seen as synonymous with a high-performing system are demonstrating that the system can and does achieve major service improvements. No doubt this turnaround is part of a larger NHS overhaul that is bringing more benefits to patients at many levels and generating a type of enthusiasm and excitement in a renewed NHS.

The bad news is that, to improve ERs, there needs to be a coordinated system response and a sustained approach that we too often do not see in healthcare.

ERs are a classic example of how the ills of one part of the system can be seen as a symbol of overall system malaise. Indeed, in a broad health system, one of the key measures has to be how rapidly and effectively true emergencies are handled. But to improve this element of the broader system, attention must be paid to many parts of the acute care continuum.

Pre-hospital care needs to be strengthened, the service in the ER itself restructured and, importantly, within the hospital setting, the ER needs to be re-prioritized. And, finally, the overall hospital must be geared up to receive the patients who need admission rapidly and smoothly.

It remains to be seen how the system will respond to the multiple new measures that are being asked of it. Shorten ER waits. Reduce wait times for selected services. Improve patient safety. Balance budgets, and apply the latest and best technologies. All these are important and worthy goals, and they will need to be supported by resources and effective change-management systems.

Still, we should all learn from the experiences of the NHS in their efforts to improve this one element of the overall system. They have delivered results, and in so doing they have shown that broad system improvement is possible to the betterment of all.

Emergency Room Waiting: Not Really Necessary

David Levine

President and CEO, Montreal Regional Health and Social Service Authority

The review of wait-time issues in our emergency rooms is both timely and pertinent. Each of the nine solution elements for reducing wait times is a component of the overall solution to a greater or lesser degree. I would suggest regarding the solutions in two categories: avoiding emergency room visits and managing emergency room visits.

The Montreal Regional Health Authority has been particularly concerned with this issue, as emergency wait times are the barometer by which the work of ministers of health are measured by the population. Avoiding emergency room visits is the real solution, and to this end, Quebec is implementing a reform in healthcare that I hope will revolutionize the way

healthcare is delivered.

Quebec has been divided into 95 territorial organizations, each containing a hospital, nursing home, rehab centre, home care and primary care services with a mandate to manage the healthcare of their population. This is a population-based managed care model relying on multidisciplinary primary healthcare teams registering a given

population and managing their care and treatment. This model, used by the Kaiser foundation in California, has reduced by half the number of visits per capita to the emergency room. Ensuring accessibility 12 hours a day, seven days a week with on-call night coverage is the key to this reduction, as well as the registering and direct management of all chronically ill patients. The Montreal targets are to reduce emergency room visits by 50% within five years.


The second approach is to manage the functioning of the emergency rooms, and six of the nine solutions reviewed refer to this approach. The regional management of emergency room functioning is another factor that is key to reducing waiting times. The Montreal Regional Health Authority has a team that monitors the 15 emergency

rooms on the Island of Montreal. A report is submitted twice a day giving the occupancy rates, number of ambulances, patients awaiting hospitalization, patients waiting more than 48 hours and other pertinent data.

As the emergency rooms become more crowded, the agency can redirect ambulances, open more nursing home or rehab beds, provide more intensive home care coverage if required and prioritize admissions to nursing homes from overcrowded hospitals. These measures alleviate pressure points and smooth out the system. Each of Montreal's 12 territories has a home care specialist discharge planner in the hospital emergency room coordinating the movement of each patient. This close link to alternative solutions to hospitalization and discharge has allowed for a much more controlled

emergency room environment. It enables all the emergency rooms to be connected and provides a level of security to emergency room managers.

These two approaches integrate the nine solution elements in the paper and provide a way to implement them in the broader context of a populational responsibility. Quebec produced a guide to better management of emergency rooms, and after many hours of training and reorganization, it became clear that the real secret to emergency room management is a change in culture of hospital medical staff, led by a dedicated, passionate physician in charge of the emergency room with full, unconditional CEO and board support. The hardest changes to implement are cultural ones, but with the right vision they are possible.



Published for the Canadian Patient Safety Institute and the Ontario Hospital Association and

made available **free** to our readers

www.patientsafetypapers.com