MEDICATION SAFETY BOOTCAMP



102: Application of Medication Safety Basics

Heather Dossett, PharmD, MHA, BCPS, CPHQ

Medication Safety and Pharmacy Education Pharmacist Ascension – St. Vincent's Indianapolis Heather.dossett@ascension.org

Jessalynn Henney, PharmD

Network Medication Safety Director Community Health Network jkhenney@ecommunity.com

Housekeeping Tips

- 1. All participant lines will be muted.
- 2. For audio access, participants can either call into the conference line or listen through their computer. Please ensure your speakers are on and adjust the volume accordingly.
- 3. Use the Q&A button to submit questions throughout the webinar to the presenters.
- 4. Please provide us feedback, the evaluation will be launched in the browser after the end of this meeting.
- 5. This meeting will be recorded.



INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CME Learner Information

Accreditation Statement



In support of improving patient care, this activity has been planned and implemented by Indiana University School of Medicine and Indianapolis Coalition for Patient Safety, Inc. Indiana University School of Medicine is jointly accredited by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME), the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE), and the American Nurses Credentialing Center (ANCC), to provide continuing education for the healthcare team.

Nurses

Indiana University School of Medicine designates this activity for a maximum of 6.0 *ANCC contact hours*. Nurses should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Physicians

Indiana University School of Medicine designates this live activity for a maximum of 6.0 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credits*[™]. Physicians should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians

Indiana University School of Medicine designates this activity (ACPE UAN JA4008178-9999-21-007-L04-P and JA4008178-9999-21-007-L04-T) for 6.0 ACPE contact hours. Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians should only claim credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity. Credit will be provided to NABP CPE Monitor within 60 days after the activity completion.



INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Disclosure Summary

Indiana University School of Medicine (IUSM) policy ensures that those who have influenced the content of a CE activity (e.g. planners, faculty, authors, reviewers and others) disclose all relevant financial relationships with commercial entities so that IUSM may identify and resolve any conflicts of interest prior to the activity. All educational programs sponsored by Indiana University School of Medicine must demonstrate balance, independence, objectivity, and scientific rigor.

There are no relevant financial relationships with a commercial interest for anyone who was in control of the content of this activity.



INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Supplemental Packet



Yellow file folder located on the bottom right side indicates additional information available within supplement packet



Agenda

| Time | ltem | Time | ltem |
|---------|---|---------|--|
| 10 mins | Introductions Housekeeping Pre-Assessment | 25 mins | Section 2 What do I do now that I have data? How do I organize it and strategize solutions? |
| 45 mins | Overview/Introduction History, Literature, Data Just Culture/High Reliability | 30 mins | Section 3 How do I implement process improvements? |
| 30 mins | Section 1 How do I obtain medication safety information/data? | 30 mins | Question/Answer Group Therapy: Audience sharing and group problem solving |
| 5 mins | BREAK | 5 mins | Wrap-upHousekeepingPost-assessment |

Objectives

- Explain medication safety terminology and methodology for frontline staff, students, new and established practitioners as well as direct and non-direct patient caregivers.
- Recognize the importance and be able to incorporate an interdisciplinary approach to medication safety.
- Review opportunities to improve medication safety through the use of technology, process improvement, and implementing innovative or evidence based best practices.



Acronyms

Common acronyms utilized throughout this session include:

ACPE: Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education **ADC:** Automated Dispensing Cabinet **ADE:** Adverse Drug Event **AHRQ:** Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality **ME:** Medication Error **ASHP:** American Society of Health-System Pharmacists **COS:** Culture of Safety **ECRI:** Emergency Care Research Institute **FDA:** Food and Drug Administration **HAM:** High Alert Medication **HEAT:** Hypoglycemia Evaluation Analysis Tool

HRO: High Reliability Organization **ICPS:** Indianapolis Coalition for Patient Safety **IHI:** Institute for Healthcare Improvement **ISMP:** Institute for Safe Medication Practices **MSO:** Medication Safety Officer **NPSG:** National Patient Safety Goal **PSO:** Patient Safety Organization **SLAMS:** St. Louis Area Medication Safety **TJC:** The Joint Commission **USP:** United States Pharmacopeia



Overview/Introduction

History, Literature, Data Safety Culture/High Reliability

History^{1,2}



 "Safety" and "inherited human limitations" are not new ideas – Hippocratic Oath

- Focused work began in 1975
 45 years or less
 - Many safety concepts integrated within practice have been recently established





1910: Dr. Codman speaks up on the patient safety risks affiliated with the deplorable state of hospital records

1919: American College of Surgeons "Minimum Standards" document adopted 2005: From ISMP's advocacy, TJC reveals new 2006 NPSG requiring medication labeling 2014: ISMP recommended to lower dose of dabigatran (4 years after approval)

The Minimum Standard

I. That physicians and surgeons privileged to practice in the hospital be organized as a definite group or staff. Such organization has nothing to do with the question as to whether the hospital is "open" or "closed," nor need it affect the various existing types of staff organization. The word STAFF is here defined as the group of doctors who practice in the hospital inclusive of all groups such as the "regular staff," "the visiting staff," and the "associate staff."

2. That membership upon the staff be restricted to physicians and surgcons who are (a) full graduates of medicine in good standing and legally licensed to practice in their respective states or provinces; (b) competent in their respective fields and (c) worthy in character and in matters of professional ethics; that in this latter connection the practice of the division of fees, under any guise whatever, be prohibited.

3. That the staff initiate and, with the approval of the governing board of the hospital, adopt rules, regulations, and policies governing the professional work of the hospital; that these rules, regulations, and policies specifically provide:

(a) That staff meetings be held at least once each month. (In large hospitals the departments may choose to meet separately.)

(b) That the staff review and analyze at regular intervals their clinical experience in the various departments of the hospital, such as medicine, surgery, obstetrics, and the other specialties; the clinical records of patients, free and pay, to be the basis for such review and analyses.

4. That accurate and complete records be written for all patients and filed in an accessible manner in the hospital—a complete case record being one which includes identification data; complaint; personal and family history; history of present illness; physical examination; special examinations, such as consultations, clinical laboratory, X-ray and other examinations; provisional or working diagnosis; medical or surgical treatment; gross and microscopical pathological findings; progress notes; final diagnosis; condition on discharge; follow-up and, in case of death, autopsy findings.

5. That diagnostic and therapeutic facilities under competent supervision be available for the study, diagnosis, and treatment of patients, these to include, at least (a) a clinical laboratory providing chemical, bacteriological, serological, and pathological services; (b) an X-ray department providing radiographic and fluoroscopic services.

Literature⁸

We all know medication safety is important, but why are we in the beginning of this journey?

- Difficult to assess problem scope
 - Death certificates can only include ICD 10 codes as the reason the patient expired
 - Medical error is not one of these items
- Several methods exist to help estimate impact of medication errors
 - Lack of document standardization provides difficultly to fully understand the magnitude and impact
 - Wide variety of data noted within publications





Estimations Published⁸

Number of Patients (per every 1,000)



Number of Patients (per every 1,000)



*Medicare Beneficiaries only

Medication Safety Acute Care⁹



Midwest Medication Safety Symposium

- Observational study over 7 months revealed
- 26 (2.2%) of all of errors discovered were classified as potentially life-threating
 - Detected by routine pharmacist verification:
 24 events
 - NOT detected (i.e., identified through study intervention): 2 events

| Distribution Process | Process Error Percentage |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cart Fills | 6% |
| ADCs | 4.2% |
| First Dose Fills | 2.9% |
| Controlled Substances | 0.94% |

Medication Safety Ambulatory Care¹⁰⁻¹²

More than 4.5 million ambulatory care visits occur every year due to ADEs; Patients with these characteristics are more like to experience an ADE

- 65 years or older
- Taking 6 or more medications
- Primary physician practices

Dispensing error rate within community pharmacies has been estimated as 1.5%

ECRI Institute PSO examined more than 4,300 ambulatory care patient safety events from December 2017 to November 2018

- Diagnostic testing errors (47%)
- Medication safety events (27%)
- Patient falls (14%)





Incorporating Safety¹³

- While everyone focuses on safety, **HOW** this is incorporated into practice may be accomplished differently
- COS of an organization influences practice

 Factor needs to be taken into consideration



- Is a subset of the overall organization's culture
- It is a set of shared values, attitudes and behaviors consistently adopted and applied throughout an organization that are designed to prevent harm when caring for patients
- It's the way we do things around here



Error Management Techniques¹³

Punitive (Blame and Train)

Believed <u>perfect</u> human performance to be achieved through education

- Punitive
- Event outcomes focused
- Reckless behavior not addressed with no adverse outcomes
- "Perfect performance" to avoid errors

Counter productive to reporting, learning, and safety advancement No Accountability (Blame-free Environment)

Believed latent failures will always be present in the system

- Blame-free; Non-punitive
- Human fallibility recognized as a patient safety risk
- Focused on the system/processes
- Solutions directed to systems' latent failures

Confusion with how to manage reckless behavior, disregarding safety procedures, and malicious intent

Error Management Techniques^{13,14}

Just Culture

Human behaviors are distinguished and appropriately addressed

- Model asking WHAT, not who, is responsible
- Embraces and supports those who are caught in faulty processes
- Recognizes both latent failures and active failures contribute to errors
- Incorporates accountability

Understands punishment for most active failures (unsafe acts or honest mistakes) is counter-productive to advancement of safety Recognizes majority of errors are not due to individual failures, but arise as a result of **flawed processes** that create an environment of risk



Maintains individual accountability by establishing zero tolerance for reckless behavior, and focuses on identifying and addressing systems issues that lead people to partake in unsafe behaviors

What will be observed in a "Just Culture" environment?¹³



Staff, patients, and caretakers are treated **fairly**, with empathy and consideration



Questioning attitude is promoted; Resistance to complacency or status quo

Behaviors are **distinguished** and **addressed**, regardless of the event severity Reported events are blame free and utilized as a learning opportunity



Commitment to excellence; Changing processes to prevent unsafe behaviors, while not tolerating reckless behavior



While different actions may result in unsafe acts, not all these warrant disciplinary action

Three categories established to help distinguish and address human behaviors^{13,14}



- Choosing an action with knowledge and conscious disregard of the risk of harm
- Person takes a risk (i.e., ignoring required safety step) knowing harm would probably result





- General agreement that the person should have done other than what they did as an inadvertently outcomes was caused (or could have been caused)
- Inadvertent action: slip, lapse, mistake

Reckless vs At Risk Behaviors¹³

Key to differentiating between unacceptable and acceptable behaviors



Individual <u>conscious</u> disregarded to what they <u>knew</u> to be a substantial and unjustifiable risk

| | Reckless Behavior | At Risk Behavior |
|------------|---|---|
| Disregards | Known risk within a practice | Policy, procedure, or "safe guard" (Note: Most at-risk behaviors are caused by system failures requiring workarounds) |
| Perception | Unsafe action chosen even though risk was recognized AND understood to be substantial and not justified Knows behavior is not the norm | Person does not see the risk OR mistakenly believes the risk is insignificant or justified Behavior is considered norm |
| Motivation | Behavioral choice is often self-centered (i.e., puts own needs ahead of others) | Desire to help others (i.e., patient, team, organization) |

Human Error: Failure of a planned action to achieve desired outcome¹⁵





Errors can occur in both the **planning and action** stages of a task

- Plans can be adequate or inadequate
- Actions can be intentional (i.e., align with developed plan) or unintentional

Skill-based (automatic)¹⁵



- Generally when these errors occur, the individual has the right knowledge and experience to do the task properly
 - Tend to occur during high routine activities and when attention is diverted (either by thoughts or external factors)
 - Task has probably been performed correctly many times before
- Even the most skilled and experienced people are susceptible to this type of error
 - As tasks become more routine and less novel, they can be performed with less conscious attention (making it easier for the mind to wander)
 - Re-training and disciplinary action are not appropriate responses to this type of error

| Activity Type | Performing routine, familiar tasks | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| | Allows for multitasking | |
| Error Type | Slips: Action was not carried out as planned; Attention failures | |
| Спогтуре | Lapses: Forgotten action; Memory failures | |
| Error Prevention Theme | Self-checking (stop and think before acting) | |
| Error Probability | 1:1000 | |

Examples

- Missing a step in an isolation sequence
- Pressing the wrong button or pulling the wrong lever
- Loosening a valve when intending to tighten it
- Transposing digits when copying numbers (e.g. writing 0.31 instead of 0.13)

Rule-based (intuitive)¹⁵



- Mistakes are failures of planning, where a plan is expected to achieve the desired outcome, however due to inexperience or poor information the plan is not appropriate
 - People with less knowledge and experience may be more likely to experience
 - Disciplinary action is an inappropriate response as these are not committed "on purpose"
- There are two different types of mistakes
 - Rule-based errors: Refer to situations where the use or disregard of a particular rule or set of rules results in an undesired outcome
 - Knowledge-based errors: insufficient knowledge about how to perform a task results in the development of a solution that is incorrectly expected to work

| Activity Type | Conditions of current problem are matched with past problems If then do | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Error Type | Wrong rule Misapplication of a rule Non-compliance with rule | |
| Error Prevention Theme | Wrong rule: Educate Misapplication: Think a second time Non-compliance: Reduce burden, increase risk awareness, improve coaching culture | |
| Error Probability 1:100 | | |
| Examples | | |

- Utilizing a vancomycin protocol from a different institution
- Ordering monitoring labs at an incorrect frequency than policy states

Knowledge-based (analytical)¹⁵



- Mistakes are failures of planning, where a plan is expected to achieve the desired outcome, however due to inexperience or poor information the plan is not appropriate
 - People with less knowledge and experience may be more likely to experience
 - Disciplinary action is an inappropriate response as these are not committed "on purpose"
- There are two different types of mistakes
 - **Rule-based errors:** Refer to situations where the use or disregard of a particular rule or set of rules results in an undesired outcome
 - Knowledge-based errors: insufficient knowledge about how to perform a task results in the development of a solution that is incorrectly expected to work

| Activity Type | Problem solving in new, unfamiliar situation for which the individual knows no rules | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | Requires action plan to be formulated | |
| Error Type | Formulation of incorrect response "Trial and Error" | |
| Error Prevention Theme | Stop and find an expert Provide education | |
| Error Probability | 3:10 to 6:10 | |

Examples

- Performing tasks in an unfamiliar clinical area that requires special/additional training (i.e., oncology)
- Verifying an unfamiliar medication (i.e., new to formulary, different clinical area, new to market)

Addressing Behaviors¹³

| Reckless Behavior | At-Risk Behavior | Human Error |
|---|--|--|
| Choosing an action with knowledge and conscious disregard of the risk of harm | Consciously choosing an action without realizing the level of risk of an unintended outcome | Inadvertent action: slip, lapse, mistake |
| <u>PUNISH</u> | <u>COACH</u> | <u>CONSOLE</u> |
| Disciplinary action | Counsel/explain why the behavior is risky; Focus process improvements on preventing people from partaking in this behavior | Support person involved with error; Alter system to prevent from occurring again |





Moving through each phase...

Focus must shift from PEOPLE to SYSTEMS Closer to becoming a high reliability organization



HRO may be thought of as a very complex organization at high risk for catastrophic accidents, yet has been very successful at maintaining a high level of safety over a long period of time

POLL

What phase do you think your DEPARTMENT displays?

Generative

(TRUE safety culture)

Proactive

(safety culture with potential for improvement)

Calculative

(common to large organizations; not a safety culture)

Reactive

(not a safety culture)

Pathological

(not a safety culture)
POLL

What phase do you think your ORGANIZATION displays?

Generative

(TRUE safety culture)

Proactive

(safety culture with potential for improvement)

Calculative

(common to large organizations; not a safety culture)

Reactive

(not a safety culture)

Pathological

(not a safety culture)



Fostering Culture

- Perception can vary between organizations, departments, and roles
- Regardless of where the department or organization is within their journey, **YOUR** actions can influence (positively or negatively)
- What can you do in your everyday practice to enhance COS...
 - Lead by example
 - Ask questions
 - Create a learning environment
 - Stay process focused
 - Do not blame others
 - Support second victims
 - Understand processes from other disciplines
 - Encourage reporting
 - Don't turn a blind eye to safety even when you are behind schedule and under pressure
 - Start each meeting/interaction with a safety stories/message
 - Conduct safety rounds



Putting it all together!

Reported Event

Patient experienced Acute Kidney Injury while on vancomycin. First trough level (45 mcg/mL) was not scheduled for appropriate time based on renal function. When reviewing this event, we must understand WHY the level was not scheduled for the appropriate time.

- ✓ Did the protocol CLEARLY state when to schedule levels?
- ✓ Did the person understand how to execute the protocol?
- ✓ Did the person know how to find all of the information needed in the chart?
- ✓ Did the person know how to enter/schedule the level?
- ✓ Did the environment (i.e., noise, distractions, etc.) contribute to this event?

Putting it all together!

What type of behavior did the resident display?

- a) Human Error
- b) At Risk
- c) Reckless
- d) Doesn't matter Resident will fail

After discussing with the resident that scheduled the vancomycin lab, the following information is discovered:

- Successfully able to explain how to perform the vancomycin protocol including how to schedule the lab for the correct time
- ✓ When calculating the renal function, the resident used a SCr lab value from 2013
- ✓ This was the first time the resident was involved with an error



Putting it all together!

How would we appropriately address the resident regarding this situation?



- b) Coach
- c) Punish

After investigating, it is recognized the default setting in the system includes ALL lab values regardless of encounter or time frame

Telling the resident "you should have looked better" puts blame onto them, but with this system design it could have happened to anyone

- Providing knowledge can still occur when consoling, but blame should not be placed on the resident
- Appropriate follow up includes:
 - Consoling resident
 - Submitting an event into your risk system (remember: Risk systems are NOT punitive)
 - Sharing event with team to increase risk awareness
 - Having key stakeholders (i.e., those completing the work on a daily basis) partake in system/process redesign



Midwest Medication Safety Symposium

Detecting Medication Incidents

Section 1



Detecting Medication Incidents^{13,17,18}

| | Direct Observation | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Collect information through various patient cases to retrieve particular data for discovery | Any intervention that a caregiver has initiated with a patient that has improved the quality of treatment/ patient care | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | patient cases to retrieve particular data | | | | |

| Claims and Litigation | Intervention Reporting | Incident Reporting |
|--|---|---|
| Disputes that arise between the organization and third parities (e.g., patients, insurance companies, family, other facilities) | Any intervention that a caregiver has initiated with a patient that has improved the quality of treatment/ patient care | Any intervention that a caregiver has initiated with a patient that has improved the quality of treatment/ patient care |

ADE Trigger Tool

• To use successfully within practice

- Complete understanding of report build
- Reviewer to ensure false negatives are removed
- Standardize patient review/deep dive form
- Information shared with key stakeholders to ensure process improvements occur
- IHI provides many different examples¹⁹

| International Normalized Ratio (INR) Greater than 6 | Glucose Less than 50 mg/dL | Naloxone (Narcan [®]) Administration | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Look for evidence of bleeding to determine if an adverse event has occurred. An elevated INR in itself is not an ADE. | Review for symptoms such as lethargy and shakiness documented in nursing notes, and the administration of glucose, orange juice, or other intervention. If symptoms are present, look for associated use of insulin or oral hypoglycemics. | Naloxone is a powerful narcotic antagonist. Usage likely represents an AE except in cases of drug abuse or self-inflicted overdose. | |

Example: Hypoglycemia²⁰ ADE Trigger Tool Root causes reviewed; ٠ Additional responses Documentation of root • included causes start Standardized patient ٠ Standardized Increase data review occurs utilizing documentation of root transparency with one HEAT tool centralized location causes Jan 2019 Dec 2016 Jun 2017 Sep 2016 Jan 2018 Jan 2020 Jan 2017 • Reports reviewed to • ADE committees Root causes modified Root causes align with definitions, from original HEAT tool established reviewed/updated criteria, and scope Past data changed to • documented align with changes

- Patient specific data shared with key
 - stakeholders



- Additional information
- Data display • enhancement

ADE Trigger Tool

Example: Hypoglycemia

MSO

Generates report; Filters appropriate locations; Places data on G drive

Site Designee

Reviews patients to ensure criteria met;

Completes deep dive (HEAT tool);

Documents on G drive

MSO

Reviews G drive documentation from site designees; Ensures network excel sheet set up correctly

Site Specific Activities

Outcome data provided to Network; Data reviewed/ Information distributed; Processes improved



| YTD Data | Results | Percentage |
|-------------|---------|------------|
| 2017 | 562 | 3.43% |
| 2018 | 416 | 2.43% |
| 2019 | 378 | 1.89% |

Hypoglycemia Root Causes



| Root Causes | Jan 2020 | Feb 2020 | Mar 2020 | Apr 2020 | May 2020 | Jun 2020 | Jul 2020 | Aug 2020 | Sep 2020 | Oct 2020 | Nov 2020 | Dec 2020 | Total | Percentage |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|------------|
| Prescribing | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11.4% |
| PRESCRIBING: Glucose < 100 without regimen modification | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0% |
| PRESCRIBING: Glucose < 70 without regimen modification | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 4.5% |
| PRESCRIBING:Patient not receiving basal insulin | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0% |
| PRESCRIBING: Patient on Sliding Scale Insulin alone | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0% |
| PRESCRIBING: Incorrect dose prescribed | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | 3 | 6.8% |
| Nutrition | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9.1% |
| NUTRITION: No regimen modiciation after diet change ordered (i.e. sudden NPO, loss of | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| parenteral glucose, clear liquid diet) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0% |
| NUTRITION: No snack given | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2.3% |
| NUTRITION: Sudden patient loss of appetite (includes nausea, vomiting, etc) | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 4.5% |
| NUTRITION: Tube feed held/wrong tube feed | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2.3% |
| Monitoring | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11.4% |
| MONITORING: BG obtained > 30 minutes from treatment | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 6.8% |
| MONITORING: Monitoring protocol not completed correctly | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 4.5% |
| Administration | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11.4% |
| ADMINISTRATION: Gave sliding scale without eating | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0% |
| ADMINISTRATION: Orderset not followed | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 4.5% |
| ADMINISTRATION: Stacking (bolus or basal) | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 2 | 4.5% |
| ADMINISTRATION: Intentional patient behavior | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0% |
| ADMINISTRATION: Lack of meal-insulin coordination | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2.3% |
| Med Rec/Transitions of Care (TOC) | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 36.4% |
| TOC: Patient stated taking differently than indicated in med history | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0% |
| TOC: Increase in home insulin (NOT basal) | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 2.3% |
| TOC: Increase in BASAL home dose | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 4 | 9.1% |
| TOC: Decrease in BASAL home dose | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0% |
| TOC: Outpatient to Inpatient Treatment changed (ex: utilizes pump at home but not inpatient; | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | 7 | 15.9% |
| Inpatient treatment different than home) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOC: Home insulin regimen continued on admission without apppropriate | | | 3 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 4 | 9.1% |
| modification/reduction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 20.5% |
| OTHER: Unknown | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 4 | 9.1% |
| OTHER: Unknown - Documentation Not Available | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0% |
| OTHER: Lack of documentation (see comments: hypoglycemia treatment, snacks, meals) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2.3% |
| OTHER: Cause Not Listed (see comments) | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | | 4 | 9.1% |
| Total Number of Day of the state | - | | 47 | | 10 | | | | _ | | | 0 | | |
| Total Number of Root Causes for Month | 6 | 8 | 17 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | |
| Total patients for month | 3 | 4 | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 29 | |
| Average Number of Root Causes Identified per Patient | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 1.5 | |

| Treatment Utilized/Type | Jan 2020 | Feb 2020 | Mar 2020 | Apr 2020 | May 2020 | Jun 2020 | Jul 2020 | Aug 2020 | Sep 2020 | Oct 2020 | Nov 2020 | Dec 2020 | Total | Pt Percentage |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|---------------|
| N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Hyperkalemia treatment | | | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | | 3 | 10% |
| Insulin pump utilized | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 3% |
| Insulin drip prescribed | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 3% |
| U500 insulin prescriibed | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| Additional insulin type ordered (see comments) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17.2% |
| Patient Percentage | 0% | 0% | 18.2% | 0% | 43% | 0% | 0% | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 17.2% | |

Direct Observation

Interviewing Questions²¹

- Focus: Look at the event from the perspective of those involved to understand WHY they behaved the way they did at that moment
- **Goal:** Gain a better idea of "why things made sense" at the time to those involved in the event
 - **Example:** All information appears to have been available during the event, but after discussions it is recognized:
 - Information is displayed only one piece at a time
 - Screen does not have information prominently viewed
 - Presented information was not viewed as significant to those involved

Direct Observation

Interviewing Questions

Starting conversation

- Include discussion purpose (i.e., event involvement)
- Share OBJECTIVE, high level overview to help those involved remember event

Open ended questions

- "In your words, could you please share what occurred? What do you remember was going on at this time?"
- Suggested questions (next slide) do not need to be asked specifically, but try to listen for this information

Ending discussion

- "What recommendations or process changes do you think we could implement to prevent from occurring again?"
- Thank them for the information
- Any next steps required or will occur

Direct Observation

Interviewing Questions²¹

- 1) What was your understanding of the process/situation at this time?
- 2) What information or data was available to you at this point?
- 3) What did that information mean to you at this time?
- 4) What was the process/system doing at this time?
- 5) What changes in the process/situation required you to change your behavior?
- 6) What were other people doing at that moment?
- 7) What were you trying to achieve or accomplish at that point?
- 8) What assumptions were you making?
- 9) What options or alternatives did you have?
- 10) What were you focusing on?
- 11) What did you expect to happen?
- 12) At what point did you realize that the situation was different from what you believed it to be previously?

Claims and Litigation

- Often an unmined source of rich information
- Fully investigated liability claim will include the following:
 - Allegations of primary and secondary causes of the claim
 - e.g., medication-related, diagnostic, surgical/procedural
 - Patient health and demographic information
 - Injury severity
 - Physician specialty
 - Risk management issues
 - e.g., clinical systems, clinical judgment, documentation
 - Location of the alleged error
 - e.g., office/clinic, room/bed, surgery, ED/urgent care
 - Human and financial costs
- Trends can be utilized to identify signals and opportunity to help providers avoid potential lawsuits

Claims and Litigation

Study Data²²

LEADING CAUSES OF CLAIMS

Medication-related errors and liability are cited as the fourth most common root cause of claims, after diagnostic, surgical/procedural, and medical management issues, and ahead of obstetrics-related issues.



Percentage of medication errors ...

- Occurring in an office or clinic setting: 42%
- Related to inadequate monitoring: 31%
- Cases ultimately involving a patient death: 38%



TOP RISKS THAT TRIGGERED MEDICATION-RELATED CLAIMS

Source: Coverys Claims Data, Closed Claims 2012-2016

Incident Reporting

Reporting System: Design and Features²³

To have a successful reporting system:

- Supportive environment protecting staff privacy
- Structure mechanism for reviewing reports and developing action plans

Process

- Timely dissemination of reported event summaries
- Barriers must be identified and addressed

• Events are too trivial"

- Perception
- Information not used to improve process
- Fear of blame/managerial scrutiny/legal penalties

- Lack of knowledge
- Forgot to report
- Form confusing or time consuming
- Unsure who should report
- Inadequate feedback



Incident Reporting

Reporting System: Design and Features^{13,24}

Controversy Features

Anonymous vs Reporter Name

- Reduces the real or perceived risk to the reporter
- Potential to increase reporting

• No mechanism to follow-up with those most closely involved with the event

Voluntary vs Mandatory

- Main purpose is to hold hospitals accountable for taking actions to improve safety
- Policies and procedures usually state that all errors "will" be reported, but in reality, they are not
- Subject to bias due to voluntary nature
- Only capture a fraction of events and may not reliably identify serious events
- Spectrum of reported events is limited due to types of caregivers (i.e. pharmacists, nursing, etc.) more likely to utilize the system to report versus those who do not

Collecting Data Tips

Ensure you know HOW the report was built

Create a standardized form to collect data • Reduces bias between reviewers

Utilize a variety of data sources

Involve key stakeholder to determine

- Scope
- Important points of interest
- Expected results





POLL Which of these data sources will you start incorporating into your practice?



- Problem has been identified
- Data has been collected have a better understanding of the process and identified problem

... And now what?





Midwest Medication Safety Symposium

Overall Process



External Reporting^{13,25}

Each event report can be communicated through established and informal systems existing

- Within an organization (i.e. internal reporting)
- Outside the organizations (i.e. external reporting)

| | 0 | • | USP-ISMP Medication Error Reporting |
|-------------------|-----|---|--|
| | | | Program |
| | | • | MedMARx |
| | ram | • | FDA |
| à | | | Sentinel Event Reporting |
| | | | MedWatch Database |
| vtarnal Ranarting | | • | State mandatory reporting |
| | | • | Patient safety organizations (example: |

ICPS site sharing)

Ľ

- Allows health professionals to serve the public health beyond their organization by alerting other health professionals of problems
 - Others can learn from these experiences (aligns with ISMP Best Practice #14)
 - Can help to prevent future injury to other patients
 - Serves an early warning detection for potential hazards

Literature Search 13,25,26

- FDA MedWatch FAERS Database
- ISMP Newsletters
- Guidelines: ISMP, AHRQ
- ISMP Best Practices/Gap Assessments
- Other discipline resources
- Utilize different keywords
 - ADR, ADE, Medication Error, Error
- Compare against outside organizations



Process Analyses



Root Cause Analysis¹³

- Systematic process for identifying WHY an event occurred
 - Prevents "band-aid" placing and treating symptoms seen on the surface of the problem
 - Identifies true, underlying system
 problems to ensure mitigation strategies
 (i.e. fixes or process improvements) are
 appropriately placed





BA and ACA^{26,27}

Barrier Analysis

- Definition: Barrier analysis defines the hazards, targets, and the pathways through which hazards affect targets, and identifies barriers and controls that would block the pathway, and maintain the target within the specified range or set of conditions.
 - Target: person, equipment, set of data
 - Hazard: any adverse event, anything that moves target outside of range conditions
 - Barrier: passive construct between a hazard and a target

Apparent Cause Analysis

- Definition: straightforward analytical approach used to identify obvious causes based on the facts pertaining to the incident / finding.
- Not in-depth as RCA
- Addresses circumstance not causes

- FMEA is a structured approach to:
 - Identify the ways in which a product or process can fail
 - Estimating risk associated with specific causes
 - Prioritizing the actions that should be taken to reduce risk
- When to conduct an FMEA:
 - PROACTIVE approach
 - Early in the process improvement investigation
 - When new systems, products, and processes are being designed
 - When existing designs or processes are being changes
 - When carry-over designs are used in new applications
 - After system, product, or process functions are defined, but before specific hardware is selected or released to implement





| Step in Process | Failure Mode | Causes | Effects | Occurrence | Detection | Severity | Risk Profile Number (RPN) | Actions to Reduce Failure Mode |
|--------------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| State step | State all manners processes and systems may fail | State all reasons each failure mode could occur | State effects that would occur if failure mode was to occur | State how likely this is to occur (Scale 1-10) | State how likely this failure will be detected (Scale 1- 10) | State severity of patient consequence if failure mode was to occur (Scale 1-10) | Multiply the score from likelihood, severity, and probability | Develop action plan to prevent failure more from occurring |

Quality improvement tool to **PROACTIVELY** determine points of potential failure and predict their effects



• Likelihood of occurrence:

- Frequency with which a given cause occurs and creates failure modes (obtain from past data if possible)
 - How likely is it that this failure mode will occur?

• Likelihood of detection:

- The ability of the current control scheme to detect (then prevent) a given cause (may be difficult to estimate early in the process operations)
 - If this failure mode occurs, how likely is it that the failure will be detected?
- Severity:
 - Impact on patient care or importance of the effect on customer requirements
 - If this failure mode occurs, how likely is it that harm will occur?


Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA)¹³

- Rating Scales
 - Occurrence:
 - Assign a score between 1 and 10, with 1 meaning "Not Likely" and 10 meaning "Very Likely":
 - Detection:
 - Assign a score between 1 and 10, with 1 meaning "Easy to Detect" and 10 meaning "Not Easy to Detect."
 - Severity:
 - Assign a score between 1 and 10, with 1 meaning "Not Severe" and 10 meaning "Very Severe."
- Risk Priority Number (RPN)
 - RPN is the product of the severity, occurrence, and detection scores







Process Improvements

To make sustainable solutions we need to think about the following concepts:





Benefits of Applying Human Factors

- Improve the safety culture of teams and organizations
- Enhance teamwork and improve communication between healthcare staff
- Improve the design of healthcare systems and equipment
- Identify what went wrong and predict what <u>could</u> go wrong

Human Factors^{13,29}

- Examines the relationship/interaction between people and systems
 - Brings an understanding of WHY people make errors
- Goal: accommodate the system for all users
 - Meaning the same task can be accomplished by both



- Make it easier to complete the task the correct way
- Design the system to fit people instead of having the person fit the system

Various Reasons Errors Occur³⁰

| Root Cause Types | Causal Factors/Root Cause Details |
|---|---|
| Communication Factors | Communication breakdown between and among teams, staff, and providers Communication during handoff/transitions of care Language or literacy Information availability Misinterpretation of information Presentation of information |
| Environmental Factors | Noise, lighting, flooring conditions, etc. Space availability, design locations, storage Maintenance, housekeeping |
| Equipment/Device/Supply/ Health IT Factors | Equipment, device, or product supplies problems or availability Health information technology issues such as display/interface issues (including display of information), system interoperability Information availability Malfunction, incorrect selection, misconnection Labeling instructions missing Alarms silenced, disabled, overridden |

Various Reasons Errors Occur³⁰

| Root Cause Types | Causal Factors/Root Cause Details | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Task/Process Factors | Lack of process redundancies, interruptions, or lack of decision support Lack of error recovery Workflow inefficient or complex | | | | | | |
| Staff Performance Factors | Fatigue, inattention, distraction or workload Staff knowledge deficit or competency Criminal or intentionally unsafe act | | | | | | |
| Team Factors | Lack of speaking up, disruptive behaviors, lack of shared mental model Lack of empowerment Failure to engage patient | | | | | | |
| Management/Supervisory/ Workforce Factors | Disruptive or intimidating behaviors Staff training Appropriate rules/policies/procedure or lack thereof Failure to provide appropriate staff or correct a known problem Failure to provide necessary information | | | | | | |
| Organizational Culture/ Leadership | Organizational-level failure to correct a known problem and/or provide resource support including staffing Workplace climate/institutional culture Leadership commitment to patient safety | | | | | | |

Process Design³¹

Factors leading to non compliance

| Fac | tors that lead to non-compliance with policies and procedures |
|-----|--|
| 1. | Perceived low likelihood of detection |
| 2. | Lack of awareness/understanding of policies and procedures |
| З. | Misperception or lack of recognition of risk |
| 4. | Self-perceived authority to violate (ignore the rules) |
| 5. | Time pressure/pressure to get the job done |
| 6. | Copying behaviour (i.e. learn to do the procedure from a colleague who is non-compliant) |
| 7. | Lack of leadership |
| 8. | Lack of end-user engagement when policies and procedures are written. |
| 9. | Policy and procedure overload (for example, confusion over which procedure applies when) |
| 10. | Ambiguous or conflicting messages in the policy/procedure |
| 11. | Lack of training and reinforcement of key policy messages over time. |
| 12. | No sanctions imposed for non-compliance |
| 13. | Lack of monitoring systems to check procedural compliance |
| 14. | Policies and procedures are inaccessible |
| 15. | Out of date procedures/policies |
| 16. | Mismatch between the policy/procedure and how the job is actually done. |
| | |



© 2019 Institute for Safe Medication Practices (ISMP)

High-leverage Strategies

- Most effective as they focus on the system and 'design out' hazards
 - Can eliminate the risk of errors and associated harm
 - They do not rely heavily on individual human attention and vigilance
- May involve complex implementation plans because they often require system redesign

Medium-leverage Strategies

- Do not eliminate hazards, but reduce the likelihood of errors or minimize harm
 - Highly dependent on the behavior of people using the system
- Relatively easy to implement but may need periodic updating and reinforcement to maintain knowledge and the currency of the process or product

Low-leverage Strategies

- Often easy and quick to implement but need constant updating and reinforcement to maintain knowledge and currency
- They aim to improve human performance and are more effective when combined with other medium- or high leverage strategies

Reference 32

Choosing Strategies

- How to choose a strategy will depend on many different factors one is how this affects others steps (both before and downstream) within that process of both your department and other disciplines
 - Want higher leverage strategies that will prevent human factors from occurring ...
 - Process design/solution chosen needs to focus towards ... minimizing the likelihood of an error occurring again, increase detectability, take into account how PEOPLE will interact with system, Implementing effective mitigation strategies that align with root causes, Reducing impact severity when they occur



Project Management³³

- Leadership buy-in
- All meetings need to have WWWs completed

 WHO does WHAT by WHEN?
- Downstream Processes
- Create implementation checklist

 New formulary products
- RACI





| R | Responsible |
|---|-------------|
| А | Accountable |
| С | Consulted |
| 1 | Informed |

RACI matrix.

| Project tasks | Product Owner | Business Analyst | Financial Lead | Design Director | Design Lead | CRM Lead | Head of CRM | Senior Stakeholders* | Senior Stakeholders** | AGENCY |
|----------------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------|
| 1. Research | | | | | | | | | | |
| Econometric model | с | с | А | 1 | E. | С | 1 | С | 1 | R |
| Strategic framework | А | с | с | 1 | T | с | 1 | с | 1 | R |
| 2. Define | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product concept | A | С | 1 | С | ľ | С | с | С | 1 | R |
| User testing | А | с | 1 | 1 | L. | С | 1 | 1 | 1 | R |
| User journey | A | с | 1 | 1 | ľ | С | 1 | С | 1 | R |
| Design framework | С | с | 1 | R | A | 1 | 1 | С | 1 | R |
| Technology recommendations | C | A | 1 | I | I. | - 1 | 1 | с | | R |
| Measurement framework | R | с | A | 1 | I. | с | 1 | с | 1 | 8 |
| Product backlog | A | R | 1 | С | I. | С | 1 | С | 1 | С |
| Delivery roadmap | А | R | | R | с | с | 1 | с | с | R |

*Senior Stakeholder 1, Senior Stakeholder 2, Senior Stakeholder 3, Senior Stakeholder 4 ** Senior Stakeholder 5, Senior Stakeholder 6, Senior Stakeholder 7, Senior Stakeholder 8

Stepwise Project Planning

Steps in Project Planning

Step 0 : Select project

Step 1 : Identify project scope and objectives

Step 2 : Identify project infrastructure

Step 3 : Analyze project characteristics

Step 4 : Identify project products and activities

Step 5: Estimate effort for each activity

Step 6 : Identify activity risks

Step 7 : Allocate resources

Step 8: Review / Publicize plan

Step 9 & 10 : Execute plan / lower level of planning

3

Organizational Factors

- Navigating politics
- Communication/Transparency is KEY
- Utilize other existing committees (product lines, operational, clinical)
- Timing of other initiatives
 - People can only handle a maximum amount of change
 - Resource allocation (IT build support, financial, meeting time, etc.)



The journey is never ending. There's always gonna be growth, improvement, adversity; you just gotta take it all in and do what's right, continue to grow, continue to live in the moment.

let

e enemy

a m

-Antonio Brown

Group Therapy

Poll everywhere

Enjoy the journey and try to get better every day. And don't lose the passion and the love for what you do. -Nadia Comaneci

Kick off Group Therapy ...

- It may be difficult to balance/prioritize the many responsibilities that fall within this role...
- Here are some suggestions from ICPS and SLAMS
 - Focus on potential level of harm
 - Remember prioritizing can be difficult because everyone sees/values things differently
 - Importance of having leadership buy-in
 - Items discovered through incident reporting
 - Reporter dedicated time to report, which means it was perceived as a concern
 - Events are directly affiliated with patient care processes
 - Do not forget about politics
 - Items may be deprioritized from others in the organization
 - Ensure you have a platform to drive transparency

Group Discussion

- What other tips/tricks do you have to help balance/prioritize?
- What platforms do you utilize to help drive transparency?

What questions do you have for the group?

CME Learner Information

Accreditation Statement



In support of improving patient care, this activity has been planned and implemented by Indiana University School of Medicine and Indianapolis Coalition for Patient Safety, Inc. Indiana University School of Medicine is jointly accredited by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME), the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE), and the American Nurses Credentialing Center (ANCC), to provide continuing education for the healthcare team.

Nurses

Indiana University School of Medicine designates this activity for a maximum of 6.0 *ANCC contact hours*. Nurses should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Physicians

Indiana University School of Medicine designates this live activity for a maximum of 6.0 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credits*[™]. Physicians should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians

Indiana University School of Medicine designates this activity (ACPE UAN JA4008178-9999-21-007-L04-P and JA4008178-9999-21-007-L04-T) for 6.0 ACPE contact hours. Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians should only claim credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity. Credit will be provided to NABP CPE Monitor within 60 days after the activity completion.



INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

MEDICATION SAFETY BOOTCAMP



102: Application of Medication Safety Basics

Heather Dossett, PharmD, MHA, BCPS, CPHQ

Medication Safety and Pharmacy Education Pharmacist Ascension – St. Vincent's Indianapolis Heather.dossett@ascension.org

Jessalynn Henney, PharmD

Network Medication Safety Director Community Health Network jkhenney@ecommunity.com

References

- 1. National Library of Medicine. Greek Medicine: "I Swear by Apollo Physician ...": Greek Medicine from the Gods to Galen. National Institutes of Health. Available at: https://www.nlm.nih.gov/hmd/greek/greek_oath.html. Accessed September 9, 2020.
- 2. ISMP. Historical Timeline. Available at: https://forms.ismp.org/about/timeline.aspx Accessed on August 20th, 2020.
- 3. Horn JR , Hansten PD . Sources of Error in Drug Interactions: The Swiss Cheese Model. *Pharmacy Times*. New Drugs of 2003; 53-54: 2008.
- 4. The Growing Role of the Patient Safety Officer: Implications for Risk Managers. Chicago, IL: American Society for Healthcare Risk Management of the American Hospital Association; 2004.
- 5. Benchmark Research & Safety. What is Human Factors and Ergonomics?. Available at: http://benchmarkrs.com/main/human-factors/what.aspx. Accessed on August 20th, 2019.
- 6. American College of Surgeons. Most Hospitals Fail to Meet Minimum Standards of College Hospital Standardization Program. Available at: http://timeline.facs.org/1913.html. Accessed on August 20th, 2019.
- 7. The "Minimum Standard" Document. American College of Surgeons Inspiring Quality: Highest Standards, Better Outcomes. Available at: https://www.facs.org/about%20acs/archives/pasthighlights/ minimumhighlight. Access September 9, 2020.
- 8. Makary M and Daniel M. Medical Error The Third Leading Cause of Death in the US. BMJ 2016;353:i2139. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i2139
- 9. Cina J, Gandhi T, Churchill W, et al. How many hospital pharmacy medication dispensing errors go undetected? Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety . 2006;32(2): 73-79.
- 10. Sarkar U, López A, Maselli JH, Gonzales R. Adverse drug events in U.S. adult ambulatory medical care. Health Serv Res. 2011;46:1517-1533.
- 11. Campbell PJ, Patel M, Martin JR, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of community pharmacy error rates in the USA: 1993-2015. BMJ Open Quality . 2018: 1-7. doi: 10.1136/bmjoq-2017-000193.
- 12. Cheney C. Analysis: 4 Top Patient Safety Risks in Ambulatory Care. HealthLeaders. Available at: https://www.healthleadersmedia.com/clinical-care/4-top-patient-safety-risks-ambulatory-care. Accessed on September 9, 2020.
- 13. Saine D and Larson C. (2013). Medication Safety Officer's Handbook. Bethesda, MD. American Society of Health-System Pharmacists.



References

- 14. Patient Safety Network. Culture of Safety. Available at: https://psnet.ahrq.gov/primers/primer/5/culture-of-safety. Accessed on September 9, 2020
- 15. NOPSEMA. Human Error. Available at: https://www.nopsema.gov.au/resources/human-factors/human-error. Accessed September 9, 2020.
- 16. Bachy Soletanche Australia Pty Ltd. Safety Culture Ladder. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cU-VvvsUDDg . Accessed September 9, 2020.
- 17. Aronson JK. Medication errors: definitions and classification. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2009; 67(6): 599-604.
- 18. Montesi G and Lechi A. Prevention of Medication Errors: Detection and Audit. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2009; 67(6): 651-655.
- 19. Griffin FA, Resar RK. *IHI Global Trigger Tool for Measuring Adverse Events (Second Edition)*. IHI Innovation Series white paper. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Healthcare Improvement; 2009.
- 20. Milligan P et al. Multifaced Approach to Reducing Occurrence of Severe Hypoglycemia in a Large Healthcare System. Am J Health Syst Pharm. 2015; 1631-41.
- 21. Human Factors 101. Twelve Questions to ask in an investigation. https://humanfactors101.files. wordpress.com/2017/06/twelve-questions-to-ask-in-an-investigation.pdf. Accessed June 1, 2020
- 22. R. Hanscorn, M. Small, and A. Lambrecht. A Dose of Insight: A Data-Drive Review of the State of Medication-Related Errors & Liability in American Healthcare. Coverys. 2017. Available at: https://coverys.com/PDFs/Coverys_White_Paper-A_Dose_of_Insight.aspx. Accessed on August 13, 2020.
- 23. Patient Safety Network. Patient Safety Primer: Reporting Patient Safety Events. Available at: https://psnet.ahrq.gov/primers/primer/13/voluntary-patient-safety-event-reporting-incident-reporting. Accessed on August 18th, 2018.
- 24. World Health Organization. Reporting and Learning Systems for Medication Errors: The Role of Pharmacovigilance Centres. 2014. Available at http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/documents/ s21625en/s21625en.pdf. Accessed August 20th, 2020.
- 25. Institute for Safe Medication Practices (ISMP). ISMP Targeted Medication Safety Best Practices for Hospitals; 2020. https://www.ismp.org/guidelines/best-practices-hospitals. Accessed on September 9, 2020.
- 26. FDA. FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS) Public Dashboard. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/drugs/questions-and-answers-fdas-adverse-event-reporting-system-faers/fda-adverse-event-reporting-system-faers-public-dashboard. Accessed on September 9, 2020.



References

- 27. Nayab, N. A review of barrier analysis. Available at: https://www.brighthubpm.com/risk-management/117775-an-understanding-of-what-barrier-analysis-is-with-examples/. Accessed September 9, 2020.
- 28. Apparent cause analysis. Emory. Available at: https://med.emory.edu/education/gme/files/Adverse_Events_Resources/ACA%20template_2018_2_1b.pdf. Accessed September 9, 2020.
- 29. Patient Safety Network. Patient Safety Primer: Medication Errors and Adverse Drug Events. Available at: https://psnet.ahrq.gov/primers/primer/23. Accessed on August 20th, 2020.
- 30. The Joint Commission. Framework for Root Cause Analysis and Corrective Actions. Available at: https://www.jointcommission.org/-/media/tjc/documents/resources/patient-safety-topics/sentinelevent/rca_framework_101017.pdf?db=web&hash=B2B439317A20C3D1982F9FBB94E1724B. Accessed September 9, 2020.
- 31. Welch D. Human factors in the health care facility. Biomed Instrum Technol. 1998; 32(3):311-6.
- 32. International Medication Safety Network. IMSN Global Targeted Medication Safety Best Practices. Available at: https://www.intmedsafe.net/imsn-global-targeted-medication-safety-best-practices/ Accessed on August 20, 2020.
- 33. RACI Charts. The RACI Model. Available at: https://racichart.org/the-raci-model/. Accessed on September 9, 2020.

