Rethinking medical ward quality

For quality to improve, we need to embrace the complexities of general medical inpatient care, say Samuel Pannick and colleagues
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Medical wards deliver the majority of acute inpatient care in health systems worldwide. This care is expensive, costing the NHS around £5bn (€5.5bn; $6.2bn) a year, a quarter of its inpatient expenditure. Improving the performance of medical wards is an international priority, not only because of the scale of care that they deliver. Their core workload—treating complex, increasingly frail patients in a time pressurised setting—represents the broader challenges facing healthcare. Yet major gaps remain in our understanding of how wards perform.

Safety and quality interventions have been most effective in improving standardised clinical tasks in the operating theatre and intensive care unit, such as the insertion of central venous catheters. The processes of ward care require a more nuanced approach to improvement. Medical patients’ clinical syndromes often fall between traditional diagnostic categories, and specific organisational challenges exist for the teams that care for them. We discuss the unique properties of medical wards and the problems they face, before setting out a vision for ward improvement that embraces the complexity of ward care.

The medical ward is a different animal

Important differences exist between medical wards and other clinical settings, from haemodialysis units to operating theatres. Medical ward teams care for a particularly heterogeneous group of patients, with no single best pathway for diagnosis or treatment. Staff are skilled in the management of a diverse range of conditions, from pyelonephritis to gastrointestinal bleeding and terminal cancer. Many patients arrive without a diagnosis; indeed, empirical treatment can be concluded with no definitive diagnosis ever established. This sets medical wards apart from other hospital settings, which typically manage more narrowly defined patient populations with more predictable care trajectories. With such heterogeneity, medical ward teams may struggle to articulate their clinical and business aims and are better defined by their interpersonal networks and the flow of information within them.

Episodes of medical ward care can be long, involving large, dynamic, multidisciplinary teams. Team members are often dispersed throughout the hospital; physicians and allied health professionals are rarely located together on one unit with nurses and their patients. Frequent handovers are made more difficult by the absence of a central procedure around which a structured care narrative can be formed.

Errors are common and often serious—medical ward patients have the same risks of preventable and fatal adverse events as those in intensive care, and preventable hospital deaths are disproportionately caused by failures in general ward care. Crucially, ward failures are different from the procedural misadventures of the operating theatre or intensive care unit, resulting instead from the accumulation of missed opportunities to provide needed care. As a result, medical ward care may be 10-100 times more hazardous than elective surgery or low risk anaesthesia, crossing a perceived threshold into “unsafe” care.

Even with this risk profile, medical wards struggle to attract the resources they need to improve. Senior decision makers may be less motivated to combat errors of omission on the ward, judging them more leniently than equally harmful errors of action. Responsibility for ward harms is spread diffusely, and the number of possible improvement targets may be overwhelming. Operating theatres, intensive care units, and specialty services draw more organisational attention, owing to their higher status and concentrated focus.

Improvement strategies devised for more structured clinical settings—namely, the intensive care unit and operating theatre—undergo little further testing on medical wards, even though their implementation faces different challenges (table...
Variations in ward care are ignored

More variation—in adverse event rates, safety and teamwork climates, job satisfaction, and perceptions of management—is found within hospitals than between them. Pronovost and Sexton cautioned against a falsely unified view of each hospital’s practice, and public inquiries have found islands of excellence alongside wards with egregious deficiencies. Improvement efforts have accentuated this trend: within-hospital differences remain high. Data analysis should target wards more intensively, providing a better understanding of variations in care that would enable the selection and tailoring of appropriate improvement interventions. Monitoring data from the ward is also typically needed for successful implementation.

Instead, most published measures of healthcare quality—mortality, readmissions, and patient experience, for example—evaluate entire hospitals, not individual units. On both sides of the Atlantic, governments, regulators, and consumer organisations prioritise grades based on hospital aggregated data. Overlooking variations in ward performance results in blanket hospital grades that are unreliable and aggregated hospital outcomes that are not accurate indicators of quality of care. Aggregate measures obscure the need for greater investment in ward specific datasets. Without them, major policy decisions—on the adequacy of resources for safe staffing, for example—will be based on incorrect inferences drawn from averaged, hospital-wide data.

Quality metrics for medical wards should embrace complexity of care

Patients on medical wards primarily come to harm through suboptimal clinical monitoring, diagnostic errors, and inadequate drug or fluid management. These reflect the fundamental challenges of ward care, which is a dynamic, evolving, team process of assessment and reassessment. Quality metrics should reflect this complexity, but more commonly impose a reductive concept of care, where evidence based treatments are either delivered or not. The quality of medical inpatient care in the US is represented by a set of common “tracer” conditions: myocardial infarction, pneumonia, congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, stroke, and venous thromboembolism. Treating these conditions in a timely and effective manner is an understandable concern: they represent a significant burden of disease. Nonetheless, their prioritisation—with a national mandate to publicly report relevant process measures and outcomes—may be ineffective and has opportunity costs. Disease specific quality metrics do little to incentivise robust systems of care that protect complex medical patients from harm. Rather, they imply that high quality care in this setting is best achieved by focusing on individual pathologies, one at a time.

The future ward: four strategies to manage complexity

We envisage four broad categories of ward intervention to tackle complexity. The first two aim to reduce unnecessary variation, standardising and simplifying how predictable challenges are handled. The last two make better use of existing resources to optimise how complex care is managed (fig 1).

Standardise predictable care tasks to reduce specific harms

Interventions to improve the delivery of disease specific care are useful—they standardise common, predictable care tasks by establishing clear technical standards and introducing the socioadaptive changes necessary to embed them. Efforts to reduce central line associated infections and catheter associated urinary tract infections in this way have been notable successes. But staff may tire of numerous single issue, best practice campaigns. Each new initiative risks diluting attention to existing commitments and adds to the growing burden of costly performance data reporting. Standardisation efforts should be selected strategically, mindful of the organisation’s capacity to implement them.

Simplify the care environment and the systems that support care delivery

The ward environment is rarely a focus for national initiatives. Excess noise, poorly designed supply chains, convoluted communication pathways, and inaccessible information force frontline staff to develop arduous workarounds. These complicate predictable tasks and reduce the time available for direct clinical care.

Interventions to improve the clinical environment and its support structures can reduce these unnecessary burdens and are likely to be cost effective. Current intervention targets for patient safety organisations and researchers include standardised alarm parameters for devices; electronic communication channels between ward teams and the specialists who provide them with intermittent advice; accessible decision support incorporating multimorbidity appropriate guidance; and internal supply chains. Together, these would reduce unwarranted sensory inputs and information overload, streamline information exchange, reliably deliver useful clinical prompts, and increase time spent with patients.

Optimise effectiveness of interdisciplinary teams

Highly performing teams are needed to manage complex tasks, and optimising the effectiveness of interdisciplinary teams requires appropriate team structures. Many ongoing ward initiatives share common themes: unit based teams, located with their patients; physician and nurse co-leadership; structured interdisciplinary rounds; and ward level performance feedback. These act as useful “scaffolds,” binding physicians, nurses, and allied health professionals together with collective accountability and a sense of belonging, even with fluid team membership. Their impact remains uncertain and few high quality studies have reported whether they reduce adverse events or complications of care. Refining these interdisciplinary team structures remains a key challenge. Some authors have called for them to be incentivised, seeing them as vital for the rapid translation of evidence into ward practice.
Patient engagement in transitions of care

With patients largely stabilised rather than “cured” by inpatient care, the distinction between hospital and home care has become blurred. Transition between the two involves complex interactions between patients and multiple healthcare providers, who are poorly coordinated. Patients struggle to understand their post-discharge plan, and self management at home is not well supported. As a result, 27% of medical readmissions are still preventable.1, 71

Higher quality, patient centred discharge documentation would help patients to self manage, but this will be insufficient to bridge the gap between health settings. We need more expansive care delivery changes.7 Novel care models could integrate inpatient and outpatient management for high risk patients, reducing care discontinuity.3 Patients might be best supported by community “health agents” to facilitate the move from one care setting to the next.4 These programmes are still being evaluated, but they offer an alternative to hospital focused readmission prevention schemes, which may not be financially sustainable.72

Conclusion

High quality care on medical wards is easy, but its inherent complexity makes it difficult to improve.1 Targeted resources, data collection, quality metrics, and ward improvement strategies that facilitate the management of complexity hold promise for our ageing inpatient population.

**Key messages**

Data analysis and quality metrics do not take into account the inherent complexity of medical ward care

Organisational grades and scores mask important ward variation

Ward improvement strategies should be focused on complex decision making, not just the management of specific diseases

Ward based teams, physician and nurse co-leadership, structured interdisciplinary rounds, and ward level performance feedback may improve care
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## Table

### Table 1 | Improvement strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Factors underpinning success in structured clinical settings</th>
<th>Challenges for medical wards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety checklists</td>
<td>Adaptation to specific patient group or workflow</td>
<td>Heterogeneity of patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent leadership and accountability</td>
<td>Teams are fluid and dispersed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility divided between multiple teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific harm reduction programmes</td>
<td>Strong evidence base for technical interventions to reduce hospital acquired harms, such as central line associated infections</td>
<td>Weakere evidence base for technical interventions to reduce common ward harms, such as pressure ulcers and falls&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation efforts tackle a limited set of products and critical events, occurring primarily in closely monitored settings&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Successful implementation requires constant vigilance throughout long admissions with collaboration between teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment of clinical priorities, national patient safety initiatives, and influence of regulators/payers</td>
<td>Frontline perspectives on ward care are not prioritised in national initiatives&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes monitoring and feedback</td>
<td>Defined surgical outcomes directly reflect quality of inpatient care&lt;sup&gt;23,24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Many outcomes for medical patients are determined by socioeconomic status and illness severity and are less representative of quality of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single episode of care on which performance is reliably assessed</td>
<td>Diffuse episodes of care with shared responsibility, with multiple opportunities to judge performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure

Fig 1 Categories of ward intervention to manage complex medical ward care