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Objectives:

• Discuss the mission and activities of the EMS for Children Program as they intersect with NASEMSO

• Discuss the National Pediatric Readiness Project and its importance to the EMS community.
Intersecting Missions

**HRSA** - ensuring quality of health care for all.

**EMSC** - ensuring all children and adolescents receive appropriate emergency medical care

**NASEMSO** - seamless nationwide network of coordinated and accountable state, regional and local EMS and emergency care systems. The systems use public health principles, data and evidence as a basis for safe and effective care in day-to-day operations as well as during catastrophic events.
NASEMSO GOALS

• To promote the orderly development of coordinated EMS systems across the nation.
• To promote uniformly high quality care of acutely ill and injured patients.
• To facilitate interstate cooperation in such areas as patient transfer, communications and reciprocity of EMS personnel.
• To maintain ongoing and effective liaison with state and national governments, professional organizations, and other appropriate public and private entities.
• To improve the quality and efficiency of state EMS program administration.
• To enhance the professional knowledge, skill and abilities of state EMS officials and staff.
• To encourage research and evaluation in all areas of EMS.
• **State Partnership Grants**
  Focus on EMS-C initiatives to accomplish the EMS-C performance measures

• **State Regionalization of Care Demonstration Grants**
  Develop innovative models of improving pediatric emergency care in rural, tribal and territorial communities. (AK, AZ, CA, MT, NM, PA)

• **Targeted Issue Grants**
  Demonstration projects addressing EMS-C Program priorities and resulting in projects that are applicable across state boarders

• **Pediatric Emergency Care Applied Research (PECARN)**
  Research Nodes (6) that coordinate research in 18 Hospital Emergency Departments. Network represents 1.2 million pediatric visits annually.
EMS for Children

• **EMSC Resource Centers**
  - EMSC National Resource Center
  - EMSC Data Coordinating Center
    - National Emergency Data Analysis Resource Center (NEDARC)
    - PECARN-DCC

• **Interagency Agreements with Federal Partners**
  - IHS – supports full time EMSC Coordinator
  - NHTSA-Supports the Office of EMS to ensure integration of pediatric policies and procedures
  - AHRQ-support analysis of administrative data to measure pediatric health outcomes
Benchmarking the quality of pediatric emergency care

Prehospital:
Access to online and offline medical direction
Appropriate pediatric equipment
Appropriate pediatric training

Hospital:
Designation for pediatric trauma or medical care
Processes for transfer to a higher level of care

Permanence measures (sustainability):
Institutionalization pediatric emergency care within the larger system
• Data collected from EMS agencies
  • Over 6,300 agencies surveyed
  • Overall survey response rate was 82%

• Data collected from hospitals
  • 2,644 hospitals surveyed
  • Overall survey response rate was 79%

• More information available at www.nedarc.org
Data for Alaska

Alaska Action Steps

- Identify missing pediatric equipment needs.
- EMSC supplement grant application submitted - $13,000.
- Missing equipment purchased for services in need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Alaska Data</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLS on line Med. Direction</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS on line Med. Direction</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLS off line Med. Direction</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS off line Med. Direction</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLS Equipment</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS Equipment</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLS Peds CEU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS Peds CEU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From EMS Preparedness....

To ED Preparedness
Pediatric readiness is the capability of an emergency department to provide the right resources and the right care at the right time to an ill or injured child.
Background

• In 2002 and 2003, two separate national surveys revealed less than ideal % of ED’s had all of the appropriate supplies and equipment to care for pediatric patients.
• Both surveys were paper based
• Both surveys received a 30% response rate
What we learned...

• The majority of children are seen in community hospitals (non-children’s hospital)
• 50% of the nation’s EDs see fewer than 10 pediatric patients per day
# Pediatric Preparedness of US Emergency Departments: A 2003 Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency Department Configuration</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric and adult patients seen in main ED</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric patients seen in separate area of main ED</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric patients seen in separate peds ED, non-children’s hospital</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric patients seen in children’s hospital</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pediatric Preparedness of ED: 2003 Survey

- Percent of hospitals with Physician or Nurse Coordinators:
  - Physician Coordinator 18%
  - Nursing Coordinator 12%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>No Coordinator</th>
<th>RN and MD Coordinator</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standby</td>
<td>57 [51-69]</td>
<td>81 [71-85]</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>68 [58-76]</td>
<td>80 [69-83]</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>72 [63-81]</td>
<td>84 [74-87]</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>79 [68-85]</td>
<td>87 [81-92]</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we learned...

Hospitals with higher level of readiness had these characteristics:

• urban
• high pediatric volume
• separate care area for pediatric patients
• physician and nursing coordinator for the ED
What we learned

- It will cost less than five million dollars to ensure every ED in the US has appropriate pediatric equipment; or 18 cents per pediatric visit.
• Guidelines for Care of Children in the Emergency Department published in October issue of *Pediatrics*

• Collaborators include AAP, ACEP, and ENA

PEDIATRICS Vol. 124 No. 4 October 2009, pp. 1233-1243
Why another national assessment?

- Opportunity to assess the nation’s ED capacity based on the Guidelines
- Opportunity to make this an ongoing quality improvement project that lives beyond the first assessment
• EMS-C convened a working group to serve as an expert panel on the national project.
• Electronic assessment developed
• Pilot assessment in California
• Over 330 EDs were assessed with 90% response rate
• Pediatric readiness improved from 2002
  • [median score 55; IQR 46-64]
Preliminary Results

- Median overall readiness score: 69.3 [IQR 57.7-85.9]
- 9 (3%) hospitals with a perfect readiness score
- Results by hospital pediatric ED volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pediatric ED Volume</th>
<th>Median ED Readiness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (&lt; 3700)</td>
<td>64.3 [IQR 52.8-74]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med (3700-6999)</td>
<td>71 [IQR 57.9-85.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (&gt; 7000)</td>
<td>79 [IQR 65.1-92.8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.0001
Preliminary Results

- EDAPs* in Los Angeles vs Non-EDAPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDAP (n=43)</th>
<th>Non-EDAP (n=29)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91.8 [IQR 88.1-95.7]</td>
<td>68.3 [IQR 49.2-73.5]</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Emergency Departments Approved for Pediatrics (pediatric medical recognition system)
Barriers to Guidelines Implementation

- Cost of personnel 38%
- Cost of training 53%
- Lack of educational resources 46%
- Lack of trained MDs 32%
- Lack of trained RNs 42%
- Lack of Admin support 21%
- Lack of policies in peds emergency care 39%
- Lack of peds QI plan 47%
- Lack of disaster plan for children 54%
- Lack of interest in meeting guidelines 13%
- Other 3%
A collaborative quality improvement initiative to ensure that emergency departments are ready to care for children
A Collaborative Effort

• **Key Partners**
  - EMS for Children Program
  - American Academy of Pediatricians (AAP)
  - American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP)
  - Emergency Nurses Association (ENA)

• **Supporting Organizations**
  - Joint Commission
  - Hospital Corporation of America
Project Leadership

- Project Champion Marianne Gausche-Hill, MD
- Federal EMS for Children Program
- Emergency Medical Services for Children National Resource Center (NRC)
- National EMSC Data Analysis Resource Center (NEDARC)
Peds Ready Project Elements

- 2009 Guidelines
- National assessment
- Assessment feedback
- Quality improvement resources
Incentives for Participation

- **Immediate** Pediatric Readiness score based on key focus areas in the assessment
- Online report with further analysis of key areas
- Benchmark against hospitals with similar pediatric ED volume
- Link to a **free web-based tool kit** for performance improvement
- One year on-line subscription to PEMSSoft
Assessment Implementation

• Staggered rollout
  • January – July 2013
• 10 States/Territory per group
• Secure web based assessment
• 3 Months to complete
• Goal: 80 percent assessment response rate
National Pediatric Readiness Assessment Cohorts and Deployment Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Deployment Dates</th>
<th>January - March</th>
<th>February - April</th>
<th>March - May</th>
<th>April-June</th>
<th>May-July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort 1</strong></td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>Cohort 4</td>
<td>Cohort 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNMI</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Represent mixture of small, medium and large emergency departments
Each cohort with a cross-regional sampling
Components of Assessment

- Maximum score: 100
- Highlights performance
  - Physician Coordination & Administration
  - Nurse Administration & Coordination
  - Personnel
  - Quality Improvement
  - Patient Safety
  - Policies and Procedures
  - Equipment and Supplies
- Other information
  - ED infrastructure
  - Barriers to implementation

Developed through Delphi Process
Hospital Name: Some Sample Hospital
Hospital Volume: 5,041 Pediatric Patients Last Year
Date of Report: 6/21/2012

This score represents the essential components needed to establish a foundation for pediatric readiness. Not all of the questions on the assessment are scored. The score is in no way inclusive of all the components recommended for pediatric readiness; it represents a suggested starting point for hospitals. The scoring criteria was developed by a group of clinical experts thru a modified-delphi process.

Your state participates in a pediatric recognition program for hospitals. We encourage you to contact your State EMSC Program Manager, NAME, at CONTACT INFO to learn more about this program.

ANALYSIS OF YOUR SCORE:

Guidelines for Administration and Coordination of the ED for the Care of Children

YOUR SCORE: 9.5 out of 19

You indicated that your hospital DOES NOT have a nurse coordinator who has been assigned the responsibility of coordinating the administrative aspects of pediatric emergency care in the emergency department? (This person may have additional administrative roles in the ED.)

IMPORTANCE: This individual is important to........

IMPROVEMENT: For information on how to setup a nurse coordinator for your hospital please refer to the "Nurse Administration/Coordination" section on pediatricreadiness.org.

Guidelines for Physician and Other Practitioners Staffing the ED

YOUR SCORE: 5 out of 10

You indicated that your hospital DOES NOT require specific competency evaluations of physicians staffing the ED (e.g., sedation and analgesia).

IMPORTANCE: Competency evaluations ensure........

IMPROVEMENT: For information on how other hospitals have setup competency evaluations for.......
Quality Improvement Resources

- Dedicated website www.pediatricreadiness.org
- Web-based toolkit to align with the 2009 Guidelines
- Resources are designed to help EDs address areas of weakness
Assessment Implementation

- Staggered rollout
  - January – July 2013
- 10 States/Territory per group
- Secure web based assessment
- 3 Months to complete
- Goal: 80 percent assessment response rate
Steps to improve a facility’s readiness

- Take the assessment
- Access the free online resources
- Develop an ED performance improvement plan based on the online gap analysis
Steps to improve a facility’s readiness

• Prioritize implementing key areas of the Guidelines
  • **Staff** - designate a nurse and physician coordinator to oversee ED pediatric quality improvement, patient safety, and clinical care activities
  • **Policies** – implement child friendly policies and procedures
  • **Equipment** - ensure that all recommended equipment, supplies, medication for children of all ages are available
Benefits of Pediatric Readiness

- **Globally**: reduces the unevenness of pediatric emergency care by creating a foundation for all EDs
- **State level**: Disaster Preparedness
  - Day-to-day readiness of an ED increases the likelihood that it will be prepared for a disaster
  - Provides an opportunity for children to be better integrated into overall state disaster plans
  - The assessment will ask if the facility’s disaster plan addresses issues specific to the care of children
  - Online toolkit will have example ED disaster preparedness policies that incorporate the needs of children
Benefits of Pediatric Readiness

• **State level: Patient Safety**
  • Creates consistency among all EDs with obtaining and documenting weights of children in the ED
  • Provides education on the use of different systems (i.e. length based tape or software) to ensure proper sizing of resuscitation equipment and dosing of medications
  • Provides standards for inter-facility transfer agreements and guidelines by incorporating the components of the EMS for Children performance measure into the assessment
Benefits of Pediatric Readiness

- Direct linkage to the prehospital setting
- EMS agencies can appoint a coordinator focused on pediatric emergency competency, quality improvement, patient safety, etc.
- Ultimate goal-EMS can transport a child to an ED regardless of geographic location knowing that it will have baseline readiness with medications, equipment, policies, and training to provide effective emergency care to stabilize a child
- Ultimate goal-Facilities that cannot care for critical pediatric patients will be linked to a broader regional system.
Identifying Key Stakeholders

- Regional Organizations
  - Local EMS Agencies
  - EMS Administrators and EMS Medical Directors
- State and Local Chapters of National Organizations
  - ENA, ACEP, AAP
- National Organizations
  - EMSC, AAP, ACEP, ENA, Indian Health Services, the Joint Commission
- Healthcare corporate systems
- Others.....
Next steps

- EMS for Children State Manager will be the state champion
- EMS-C program will have aggregate data to prioritize efforts
- Hospitals to reach out to EMS-C and partners to improve local quality improvement
Advantages of Project

• Support from multiple national organizations
• Weighted assessment tailored to quality improvement
• **Will be the largest ED readiness project to date**
  • CA pilot has exceeded largest current survey
• Will provide a national assessment ED readiness to direct future resources
• Leverages previous success with EMSC performance measure data collection efforts