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Background

Nursing home quality and safety

Delegation

Nursing home care models - team nursing
  RNs, LPN/LVNs
  Unlicensed assistants (UAP), medication aides
Delegation Practice Gaps in Nursing Homes

Quality of care
- Hydration, nutrition, pain mgmt, end of life

Director of nursing

Work environment challenges
- Lack of role clarity, RN-LPN/LVN differentiation
- Inadequate nurse preparation/training
- Ineffective nurse-UAP communication, work relations
- Heavy workloads, high turnover
Study Purpose

Develop and test DON Delegation Guidelines as a resource for the implementation and oversight of nursing home delegation practices in accordance with state regulations.
Guiding Principles

- Flexibility to account for state regulatory variations
- Advance the translation of regulations into safe, effective practice
- Flow charts/decision trees, checklists, assessment tools, resources
Cross sectional, mixed-methods (n=100)

Phase 1: Item development
- Document review
- Semi-structured interviews (n=29)

Phase 2a: Pilot testing (n=71)
- Interviews
- Surveys

Phase 2b: (pending)

Expert Advisory Panel
Phase 1: Item development

Document Review

Roles/responsibilities of nursing leaders & DONs

- NCSBN National Guidelines for Nurse Delegation
- 7 distinct responsibilities of employers/nurse leaders in delegation

State agency/BON regulations for delegation

- Expanded to include scope of practice, supervision
Initial item development

Locate/interpret your state agency/Bd of Nursing (BON) regulations for scope of practice, delegation, supervision

✓ RN-LPN/VN differences (allowed, disallowed)

✓ Assignment

✓ Training, experience requirements

✓ UAP classifications in your state: roles, training
## Initial item development

### Semi-structured telephone interviews

**State agency/BON representatives** (n=10) across 8 states

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in current position, n=9</td>
<td>8.4 yrs (2-20 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in current agency/bd, n=7</td>
<td>9.7 yrs (2-20 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest education, n=9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondary item development

(1) Current practices: in compliance, conflict with state agency/BON regulations for scope of practice, delegation, supervisions

(2) Nursing home work environment factors that facilitate or hinder scope of practice, delegation, supervisions

(3) DON strategies and tactics to implement improvement plans
Secondary item development

Semi-structured telephone interviews

Current/previous DONs, NH leaders (n=19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as a DON, n=18</th>
<th>9.2 yrs (&lt;1-25 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in NH mgmt, any position, n=15</td>
<td>15 yrs (2-27 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Module 1: Locate, interpret state agency/BON regulations for scope of practice, delegation, and supervision

Develop At-a-Glance resource
- RN-LPN/VN differences (what is allowed, not allowed)
- Assignment
- Training requirements
- UAP classifications, training requirements
Module 2: Areas of nursing practice in organization that are currently in compliance or in conflict

Use At-a-Glance resource
- Align nursing staff job descriptions, policies and procedures, and practices
- Align staffing model
- Tips: working with administration, staff
Draft Guidelines

Module 3: Apply state agency/BON regulations to improve the quality, safety of professional nursing practice in your organization

At-a-Glance resource

➢ Conduct root-cause analyses: are quality, safety issues related to professional nursing practice?

Module 4: DON Self-assessment; Resources
### Phase 2a: Pilot Testing: Interviews

Current/previous DONs, NH leaders (n=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yrs as a DON, n=5</td>
<td>8.6 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in NH mgmt, any position</td>
<td>17.4 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Education, n=7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 2a: Pilot Testing

Surveys
- Electronic surveys: representatives of state agency/BONs across 16 states (n=19)
- Paper surveys: current/previous DONs and NH leaders (n=42)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DONs, NL (n=42)</th>
<th>SBON (n=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest education, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma, Associates</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>17 (43%)</td>
<td>9 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>10 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>5 (13%)</td>
<td>7 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#of DON positions</td>
<td>2.8 (1 - 10)*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs as DON</td>
<td>11.7 yrs (&lt;1 - 29 yrs)*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in NH management</td>
<td>18.2 yrs (2 - 48 yrs)*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in current position</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.2 (&lt;1 - 13 yrs)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*mean (range)
# Phase 2a: Pilot Testing: Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBON representatives (n=19)*</th>
<th>DONs, NH Leaders (n=42)*</th>
<th>(n=61)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>12.8% 89.1%</td>
<td>5.5% 85.6%</td>
<td>5.2% 86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>12.7% 93.7%</td>
<td>3.4% 89.1%</td>
<td>2.9% 90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>12.7% 95.3%</td>
<td>3.7% 89.2%</td>
<td>2.9% 91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td>12.7% 86.1%</td>
<td>4.7% 79.8%</td>
<td>5.7% 84.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*range in response rates
I liked it, I mean I think it’s really great. I think that for me, yes, ... I was trying to figure out ... why I would tell my Administrator that I’m investing time into analyzing all this ... Because I’d have to explain -- I mean this would take me some time and it would be a big project
Usability

..we're not talking that these individuals are really gonna sit down at home ... and spend a lot of time. They're gonna be doing it at their desk ... [you need something] to draw them in because like you, you're practical, you want to know ... ‘what's in it for me.’
Cross sectional, mixed-methods (n=100)

Phase 1: Item development
- Document review
- Semi-structured interviews (n=29)

Phase 2a: Pilot testing (n=71)
- Interviews
- Surveys

Phase 2b: (pending)

Expert Advisory Panel
Next Steps

Phase 2b: *(proposal revision in process):*

Translate Guidelines into a set of continuing education modules

- Free-standing, self-paced
- Learning activities
- Evaluation activities
- Plan for digital format
- Face, content validity