

Identifying features associated with higher-quality hospital care and shorter length of admission for people with dementia: a mixed-methods study

Rahil Sanatinia,^{1*} Mike J Crawford,^{1,2} Alan Quirk,² Chloe Hood,² Fabiana Gordon,³ Peter Crome,⁴ Sophie Staniszewska,⁵ Gemma Zafarani,¹ Sara Hammond,¹ Alistair Burns⁶ and Kate Seers⁵

¹Centre for Psychiatry, Imperial College London, London, UK

²College Centre for Quality Improvement, Royal College of Psychiatrists, London, UK

³Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

⁴Research Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London, London, UK

⁵Warwick Research in Nursing, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

⁶Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

*Corresponding author r.sanatinia@imperial.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: Mike Crawford is Director of the College Centre for Quality Improvement at the Royal College of Psychiatrists (2011 to present) and was a member of the National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment General Committee (2018–19). He also reports that Imperial College London has received other research grants from the National Institute for Health Research and other funding bodies. Alan Quirk and Chloe Hood work at the Royal College of Psychiatrists (London, UK) and oversee the National Audit of Dementia, since 2013 and 2008 respectively. Peter Crome is chairperson of the Steering Group for the National Audit of Dementia and has been on the Health Technology Assessment Primary Care, Community and Preventive Interventions Panel and Health Technology Assessment Prioritisation Committee A (Out of Hospital) (2014–19). He also reports that University College London has received other research grants from the National Institute for Health Research and other funding bodies. Sophie Staniszewska has been on the following committees: Health Services and Delivery Research Associate Board Members (2012–17); and Health Services and Delivery Research Researcher Led – Associate Board Members and INVOLVE Board (2005–12). She also reports that University of Warwick has received other research grants from the National Institute for Health Research and other funding bodies. Kate Seers was a member of the Health Services and Delivery Research Commissioning Board (Researcher Led) (2010–18). She also reports that University of Warwick has received other research grants from the National Institute for Health Research and other funding bodies.

Disclaimer: This report contains transcripts of interviews conducted in the course of the research and contains language that may offend some readers.

Published April 2020

DOI: 10.3310/hsdr08220

Scientific summary

Hospital care and stay for people with dementia

Health Services and Delivery Research 2020; Vol. 8: No. 22

DOI: 10.3310/hsdr08220

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Scientific summary

Background

The number of people with dementia who are admitted to acute hospitals is increasing. The unfamiliar environment and disruption to daily routines that people with dementia experience when they are admitted to hospital can cause emotional distress and exacerbate their condition. Compared with other inpatients, people with dementia spend more time in hospital and are more likely to be readmitted following their discharge.

Concerns have repeatedly been expressed about the quality of care that people with dementia receive when admitted to acute hospitals. National audits examining acute care for people with dementia have shown that many do not receive a comprehensive assessment of their needs during an admission to hospital. Family carers of people with dementia often report that they are not properly involved in preparations for discharge from hospital. These audits have also highlighted major differences in the quality of care that hospitals deliver for people with dementia. However, very little is known about why some acute hospitals can provide a higher quality of care to people with dementia than others.

Objectives

- To identify features of wards and hospitals that are associated with a higher quality of care and a shorter length of admission for people with dementia.
- To understand how aspects of the organisational form and function of hospital services can have an impact on the quality of care that people with dementia receive.
- To examine how contextual factors, including organisational culture, can support and/or impede the delivery of effective care.
- To make recommendations about the optimal organisation and delivery of acute hospital care for people with dementia.

Methods

This was a mixed-methods study comprising two work packages. In work package 1, we conducted a secondary analysis of data from the third National Audit of Dementia and the second national survey of liaison psychiatry services in England. In work package 2, we conducted qualitative interviews with senior managers, front-line staff and family carers, across six study sites in England. We selected these hospitals based on their performance in the National Audit of Dementia. Prior to the start of the study, we conducted a scoping literature review to ensure that the study built on the results of previous research in this field.

Work package 1

The National Audit of Dementia is designed to assess the quality of care delivered by all acute hospitals in England and Wales. The third round of audit collected data between April and November 2016. We used data from three components of the audit: (1) a hospital-level organisational checklist; (2) a retrospective case note audit, with a target of a minimum of 50 sets of patient notes of patients who had been given a clinical diagnosis of dementia and been admitted to hospital for ≥ 72 hours; and (3) a survey of carer experience of quality of care. The second national survey of liaison psychiatry services aimed to collect data on the provision of mental health liaison services at all acute hospitals in England that include an emergency department.

Following a review of extant literature and consultation with stakeholders, we selected process measures from those collected by the audit and examined associations between these measures and the three study outcomes: (1) length of stay, (2) carer-rated quality of care and (3) quality of assessment of patient needs. As part of the audit, a paid or family carer was asked to rate the quality of care that each patient received using a validated measure of carer experience. We used the hospital scores for the single-item question, 'overall, how would you rate the care received by the person you look after during the hospital stay?', on this measure. The scores were calculated per hospital based on the individual score and the total number of carer respondents. The measure generated a total score on a continuous scale from 0 (low carer-rated quality of care) to 100 (high carer-rated quality of care). Data from clinical records were used to assess the quality of assessment that each patient received. Each patient received a score from 0 to 7, according to whether or not they had documented evidence of having been assessed for mobility, nutritional status, pressure ulcer risk, continence needs, presence of any pain, functioning and delirium.

We explored the relationship between dependent variables (carer-rated quality of care, quality of assessment and average length of stay) and patient-level (age, gender, ethnicity, presenting complaint), ward-level (type of ward) and hospital-level (access to liaison mental health services, deployment of specialist dementia nurses, involvement of the trust board, etc.) predictor variables, using multivariate analysis. Given the nested structure of the data (patients within hospitals), the final analysis was carried out using hierarchical models. Unlike length of stay and quality of assessment, which were measured at the patient level, carer-rated quality of care was measured at the hospital level. All variables needed to be aggregated at hospital level for this analysis. We obtained patient-level data on demographic and clinical characteristics of patients, together with information about the type of ward(s) in which the patient was treated. We obtained hospital-level data on aspects of the organisation and delivery of care that may influence the quality of care that people receive.

Work package 2

Work package 2 consisted of six comparative case studies of dementia care in acute hospitals. We selected our study sites based on their performance and governance infrastructure scores in the National Audit of Dementia, to compare pairs of hospitals that organise and deliver care in a similar way but achieve different outcomes. To optimise the contribution of work package 2 to the study, we designed and implemented a 'twin-track' approach to theory development: track A – qualitative exploration of factors associated with patient outcomes in work package 1; and track B – theory testing and refinement (realist evaluation).

We used purposive sampling to interview a diverse range of staff, from a range of professional backgrounds and seniority, with and without managerial responsibilities. With the help of staff, we also identified and interviewed several family carers. We developed separate topic guides for staff and carers, and shared them with members of the Project Advisory Group for their comments. The topic guides were designed to be used flexibly to allow researchers to be responsive to issues raised by participants. With consent, interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed. Interview transcripts were coded in NVivo Pro 11 (QSR International, Warrington, UK), using a coding scheme developed by the study team.

We used a thematic analysis approach to analyse the qualitative data. In track A, we explored some of the associations found in work package 1. For example, we found that initiation of discharge planning within the first 24 hours of admission was associated with shorter length of stay, so we were interested in finding out how and why that might be the case. In track B, we used a realist approach to refute and refine programme theories that we developed at the outset of our fieldwork. A decision was made to focus reporting of context–mechanism–outcome configurations for two main areas of interest: (1) staff dementia training and (2) carer involvement.

Results

Results of our scoping review of the literature identified seven key themes that influence the quality of acute care for people with dementia: (1) care environment, (2) cultures of care, (3) attitudes, (4) challenges for people with dementia as an acute patient, (5) challenges for carers, (6) challenges for staff and (7) service models. These results informed our decisions about which predictor variables to include in our analysis of audit data. They were also used to help draft the content of the topic guides for qualitative interviews in work package 2.

Work package 1

Two hundred (98.5%) of 203 acute hospitals in England and Wales took part in the audit. All 200 hospitals submitted an organisational checklist. Data from the clinical records of 10,106 patients were also submitted and 4688 carer questionnaires were received. Data on provision of mental health services were obtained on 176 (88%) of the 200 hospitals that took part in the audit.

The median length of stay was 12 days. The median length of stay varied between different hospitals and ranged from 5 to 39 days. In the multivariate analyses, ethnicity of the patient, presenting condition and ward type were associated with length of stay. Black, Asian and minority ethnic patients had shorter length of stay, patients presenting with respiratory conditions had shorter admissions than patients with other conditions, and patients on care of the elderly wards had a higher average length of stay than those on general medical and surgical wards. Patients had a longer average length of stay when discussions with carers were recorded in case notes. Patients had shorter average lengths of stay when there was documented evidence that discharge planning had been initiated within 24 hours of admission. In hospitals in which the liaison teams included an old age consultant psychiatrist, shorter lengths of stay were found in the records of patients when there had not been a discussion with the responsible consultant. There was a non-statistically significant trend towards patients having shorter average lengths of stay in hospitals for which trust boards regularly reviewed delayed discharges.

Regarding carer-rated quality of care, we found that hospitals that had a carer strategy in place had lower levels of carer satisfaction. There was a non-statistically significant trend towards hospitals that had greater availability of personal information about patients on wards having higher levels of carer-rated quality of care. This association was statistically significant in hospitals with higher proportions of patients and carers from black, Asian and minority ethnic communities.

We found that ward type, age of patients and length of stay all influenced the quality of assessment that patients received, with more comprehensive assessments being documented for older patients, for those who were in hospital for longer and for those admitted to care of the elderly wards. Among patients who had longer admissions, higher-quality assessments were recorded for patients in hospitals that deployed greater numbers of dementia specialist nurses.

Work package 2

In total, we conducted 63 interviews across six study sites, comprising seven carers and 56 staff. Staff working in acute hospitals told us that, although early discharge planning is important to decrease admission length, factors such as complexity of patient needs impede the effectiveness of discharge planning within the first 24 hours of admission. Staff mentioned systems in place for escalating concerns when obstacles to discharge arise, including holding daily multidisciplinary team meetings and named staff taking responsibility for co-ordinating the person's discharge. Staff confirmed that when trust boards review delayed discharges, they can identify recurring problems and work with local authorities and commissioners to try to resolve them.

Staff believed that family carers play an important role in supporting the provision of high-quality care for patients with dementia. The presence of family carers allows patients to settle, as carers are better able to make patients feel at home by following the routines that patients are used to. Lack of family

carers also means that hospitals are required to organise more social care on discharge, which means that patients might stay longer in hospital than they need to. However, involving family carers might lead to dissatisfaction in situations when they have unrealistic expectations about what hospitals can provide and/or when detailed information about personal preferences of patients are collected by staff, but care is not delivered in accordance. Disagreements about the time and plan of discharge can give rise to further contentions, which potentially leads to longer hospital stays. Clear communication with and involving family carers from early stages means that they are more likely to form realistic views about what acute hospitals can and cannot provide.

Staff from a range of professional backgrounds and seniority told us that dementia-specific training plays an important role in ensuring that patients with dementia receive high-quality care. Staff also made comments about how and why dementia training would lead to better outcomes. Factors associated with better outcomes include mandatory dementia training for existing and new staff members, in-house training delivery and an internal audit system to evaluate the effectiveness of training. The presence of educators on the wards, who can role model best practice, helps staff to make a better sense of theoretical taught materials. When training material includes simulation sessions, it helps staff to empathise with what a patient with dementia might feel, which leads to more humane care.

The culture of the hospital and attitude of senior staff have a great bearing on the quality of care that patients receive. In hospitals in which staff feel valued, supported and empowered to exercise a certain level of autonomy, patients receive more humane and person-centred care. In these hospitals, task-oriented practice is discouraged, and staff are encouraged to ask questions and share the challenges that they face.

Conclusions

It is important that hospitals make greater efforts to ensure that discharge planning is initiated within 24 hours of admission for all patients with dementia. Steps could be taken to increase the availability of personal documents on all wards in which people with dementia are treated. If front-line staff communicate with carers early on, they can ensure that concerns are identified and help carers develop realistic expectations about what can be achieved during the admission.

We recommend that future research be undertaken to identify policies and practices that reduce inpatient admissions among people with dementia, by providing high-quality acute care in the community. Methods for enhancing carer involvement by co-producing optimal care packages and co-delivering dementia training for staff, could also benefit from further research. Future research could explore our unexpected finding of differences in the quality of care and length of stay for patients with dementia from black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds. We could not fully explore the negative association between hospitals having a carer strategy and carer satisfaction. It would be helpful if future research explored this further, with a focus on the relationship between intention, execution and organisational culture.

Funding

This project was funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Services and Delivery Research programme and will be published in full in *Health Services and Delivery Research*; Vol. 8, No. 22. See the NIHR Journals Library website for further project information.

Health Services and Delivery Research

ISSN 2050-4349 (Print)

ISSN 2050-4357 (Online)

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HS&DR archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hsdr. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Services and Delivery Research* journal

Reports are published in *Health Services and Delivery Research* (HS&DR) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HS&DR programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

HS&DR programme

The HS&DR programme funds research to produce evidence to impact on the quality, accessibility and organisation of health and social care services. This includes evaluations of how the NHS and social care might improve delivery of services.

For more information about the HS&DR programme please visit the website at <https://www.nihr.ac.uk/explore-nihr/funding-programmes/health-services-and-delivery-research.htm>

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HS&DR programme or one of its preceding programmes as project number 14/154/09. The contractual start date was in July 2016. The final report began editorial review in July 2019 and was accepted for publication in January 2020. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HS&DR editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Sanatinia *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Editor-in-Chief of *Health Services and Delivery Research* and NIHR Journals Library

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor John Powell Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of HTA and EME journals. Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Senior Clinical Researcher, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Consultant Advisor, Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Director, NIHR Dissemination Centre, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk