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Objectives

• Describe the relationship self-care had with the components of Relationship Based Care (RBC)
• Specify correlates of self-care identified and refined within the RBC initiative
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Background

- St. Joseph’s Regional Medical Center
  - Founded 1868
  - A 651-bed academic tertiary medical center
  - State designated Trauma Center
  - 13th Magnet hospital in the country
  - 2010, Magnet hospital of the year
  - 2011, in top 100 healthcare facilities considered as a good place to work
Background

- Wayne campus
  - Part of St. Joseph’s Regional Medical Center as of 2001
  - A 229-bed acute-care community hospital in Northern New Jersey
Background
Background

• Relationship Based Care (RBC) concepts were a primary focus, alongside caring theories.
• Unit practice councils, a dimension of RBC, were the primary contact for action planning for refinement and change.
Methods

- Qualitative and quantitative data used
- Psychometrically tested measures
  - Healthcare Environment survey (HES)
  - Caring Factor Survey
  - Caring Factor Survey – Care Provider Version
  - Caring Factor Survey – Caring for Self
Procedures

- IRB approval was obtained for study
- Electronic surveys were sent to employees via email
- Employees used a kiosk with a computer and survey link if they did not have hospital email
- Hard copy surveys were distributed to patients by the charge nurse upon discharge from unit
Variables Measured by HES

- Professional patient care
- Job satisfaction
- Professional growth
- Autonomy
- Relationships with Physicians, Nurses, Coworkers
- Participative management (unit management)
- Executive leadership
- Organizational commitment
- Staffing/scheduling
- Distributive justice
- Workload
## Results

### HES Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Campus Total</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson Campus Total</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Wayne and Paterson)</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Grouping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritionist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathologist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>758</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Satisfaction
Pride in the Organization
Participative Management
Professional Patient Care
Relationship w/Coworkers
Relationship w/Nurses
Professional Growth
Executive Leadership
Relationship w/Physicians
HES Total Score
Staffing/ Scheduling
Autonomy
Intent to Stay
Distributive Justice
Workload

Mean (average) Score
(higher scores indicate greater satisfaction)

Results, HES
Results, HES

Environmental Variable

- Job Satisfaction *
- Relationship w/Coworkers *
- Participative Management
- Pride in the Organization *
- Professional Patient Care *
- Relationship w/Nurses *
- Executive Leadership
- Intent to Stay *
- HES Total Score
- Relationship w/Physicians *
- Autonomy *
- Staffing/Scheduling
- Professional Growth
- Distributive Justice *
- Workload *

Mean (average) Score
(higher scores indicate greater satisfaction)

* Statistically significant at .05
Results, HES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Variable</th>
<th>Ambulatory Care</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Patient Care Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in the Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Patient Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship w/Coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship w/Nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship w/Physicians</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Stay</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the .05 level

(higher scores indicate greater satisfaction)
Results, HES

- Why employees stay
- Reason employees leave
- What creates stress
- Enjoyable aspect of job

Count

Theme

- Coworkers
- Workload
- Patient
- Nothing
- Miscellaneous
- Work itself
- Management
- Hours/Shift
- Pay/Benefits
- Sense of accomplishment
- Attitudes
- Professional growth
- Recognition
- Materials for job
- Stress
- Environment
- Floating
- Location for job
- Autonomy
- Job security
- Reputation of organization
Caring Factor Survey (CFS)

• Caritas Process #1: Loving Kindness
• Caritas Process #2: Instill Faith and Hope
• Caritas Process #3: Support spiritual beliefs/practices
• Caritas Process #4: Helping-trusting relationship
• Caritas Process #5: Promote feelings, both positive and negative
Caring Factor Survey (CFS)

- **Caritas Process #6**: Creatively problem solve
- **Caritas Process #7**: Effective teaching
- **Caritas Process #8**: Create healing environment
- **Caritas Process #9**: Tending to Basic Needs (holistic care)
- **Caritas Process #10**: Allows belief in miracles
A total 455 surveys were distributed to patients and 419 were returned, a 92.1% response rate.

Thirty-four of the 36 who did not respond provided their reason.
Caring Factor Survey (CFS)

- Helping/trusting relationship had the highest mean score of 6.41
- Spiritual support had the lowest mean score of 5.80.
- All scores were above 6.0 except perception of support spiritual belief.
Helping and Trusting Relationship
- Mean (average) Score: Higher scores indicate greater perception of caring.
Caring Factor Survey, by unit

Mean (average) CFS Score

- IRCU
- 7th Floor Acute Rehab (Wayne Campus)
- Endo (Wayne Campus)
- ICU
- X2B
- OHRR
- Endo
- R4N
- R2, Infusion
- ICU (Wayne Campus)
- NICU
- Main ED
- Nursery
- R6S
- L&D
- Same Day OR
- R2, Psych
- PACU (Wayne Campus)
- 4 East (Wayne Campus)
- R3S
- Medical Surgica
- Emergency Depar
- 275
- CCU
- 5 West (Wayne Campus)
- PICU
- Pediatrics ED
- 4 West (Wayne Campus)
- Interm. Nursery
- R5N
- Fast Track
- Seton 3 – High Risk OB
- Seton 4 Pediatrics
• There were 382 staff of the 3,790 staff who responded to the CFS-CPV, a 10.1% response rate
CFS – Care Provider Version

Mean (average) Score
(higher scores indicate perception of more caring)
Comparing campuses

- 305 employees from the Paterson campus and
- 77 from the Wayne campus.
- No differences found that were statistically significant using an alpha of .05.
• Comparing roles
  – Trend that nurses reported the highest score for all factors within CFS-CPV, except for perception of problem solving.
  – Problem solving is repeatedly found to be the lowest ranked factor in repeated studies
• Differences between role
• Only problem solving was statistically significant with difference existing between leaders and support staff
CFS – CARE PROVIDER VERSION

Mean (average) Score

* Statistically significant difference using an alpha of .05
Results: CFS – Caring for Self

- There were 427 employees of the 3,790 who responded to the Caring Factor Survey – Caring for Self (CFS-CS) which represents a 11.3% response rate
CFS – Caring for Self

Mean (average) Score
(higher scores indicate perception of more caring)
CFS – Caring for Self

Differences between service lines

- loving kindness,
- decision making, and
- holistic care.
CFS – Caring for Self

Differences between units
- loving kindness,
- decision making,
- holistic care,
- healing environment,
- promoting feeling,
- allowing to believe in miracles, and
- the total CFS-CS score.
Correlations between Measures

- Employee Perception of Caring for Others (CFS-CPV) and the Work Environment
  - Relationship with physicians ($r = .137$, $p = .035$).
  - Hours worked ($r = .134$, $p = .022$).
  - Total HES score ($r = .161$, $p = .027$).
Correlations between Measures

- Caring for Self and the Work Environment
  - positive relationship between self care and
    - relationship with nurses (r = .142, p .024)
    - relationships with physicians (r = .125, p .046).
Interventions

- Holistic Care Program for employees and patients
  - Pranic healing
  - Guided imagery
  - Massage and aroma therapy
  - Hospital renovation designed around self-care
Next Steps

• Remeasure September, 2012
• Prior to remeasure, identify outcomes specified by staff and process (e.g. space/architecture for self care)
• Use more complex statistical procedures to bring the conversation deeper (e.g. within subject evaluation and path analysis between variables)
Thank you!