

# Is Perception Reality? Nurses' Expectations of Smart Pump-EHR Interoperability

Sarah Johnston<sup>1</sup>, Catherine Schuster<sup>2</sup>, Rachel R. Vitoux<sup>1</sup>, Diane Bartos<sup>2</sup>, Christopher R. Curtin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>B. Braun Medical Inc, <sup>2</sup>Independent Consultants | American Nursing Informatics Association May 2023



## Background

Smart pump-EHR interoperability can offer significant benefits including improved patient safety, enhanced nursing efficiencies and increased charge capture.<sup>1</sup> Interoperability, however, requires significant change to clinical workflows, and this impact on the nursing experience has not been well documented. This study explored the perceptions of ICU and MedSurg (MS) nurses throughout a smart pump-EHR implementation.

<sup>1</sup>Bartos D, Vitoux RR, Schuster C, Curtin CR. Outcomes from a smart infusion pump and electronic health record integration: Improved patient safety, nursing efficiency and return on investment. *J Inform Nurs.* 2022;7(3):13-19.

#### Method

Non-randomized, exploratory data collection study at a 172-bed acute care hospital in upstate New York. ICU (n=81) & MS nurses (n=139) completed a 30item survey (5 demographic items) on interoperability expectations, programming confidence and estimated programming time during 4 study periods: 1 month preand 1-, 4-, & 6-months post-implementation. Data for each period were compared using an analysis of variance (ANOVA).

#### Lessons Learned

- Set realistic expectations of interoperability & impact on workflows
- Consider different clinical environments, room layout, technology placement
- Continue training after go-live with sustained engagement of unit super users
- Consider impact of 3<sup>rd</sup> party interface on workflow & documentation
- Establish measurable goals and a process for tracking & reporting performance

### Conclusion

This study illustrated the change in interoperability perceptions over time. Nurses started with very high expectations, leaving little room for improvement and when it came to incorporating interoperability into clinical practice, expectations were reduced. ICU room layout (e.g. having pumps and computer on opposite sides of the bed) impacted time & efficiency and underscored the need to adapt workflows to each clinical unit. Even though time/efficiency expectations decreased, nurses thought integration improved safety and was easy to learn. While programming time improved, programming confidence did not, suggesting the need for continued support long after implementation.

The organization's nurse informaticist is critical to help drive change, manage expectations and measure performance, enlisting super users to address workflow issues in real-time and build confidence. Interoperability is a dynamic, continuous quality improvement project that requires constant vigilance, ongoing support, and a plan for sustaining success.

Table 1: Interoperability Expectations Questions	ICU Baseline (Mean±SD)	1month (Mean±SD)	4month (Mean±SD)	6month (Mean±SD)	p-Value	<b>MS</b> Baseline (Mean±SD)	1month (Mean±SD)	4month (Mean±SD)	6month (Mean±SD)	p-Value	At baseline, interoperability expectations (Table 1) were
Accomplish programming quicker	5.6±1.2	2.8±1.5	2.7±1.4	2.9±1.5	<.001	5.5±1.3	4.2±1.7	4.7±1.6	4.6±1.6	<.001	very high for both groups (ICU
Improve quality of patient care	5.8±1.2	3.7±1.8	3.4±1.6	3.8±1.6	<.001	5.7±1.1	4.9±1.3	4.9±1.6	4.7±1.4	<.001	mean = 90.2/112, MS mean =
Improve safety of patient care	6.0±1.2	4.6±1.5	4.3±1.7	4.4±1.6	<.001	6.0±1.2	5.6±1.4	5.6±1.5	5.4±1.6	0.054	90.0/112) and decreased
Increase effectiveness in caring for patient	5.7±1.3	3.3±1.6	3.2±1.7	3.4±1.7	<.001	5.6±1.3	4.8±1.5	4.8±1.4	4.5±1.5	<.001	(p<.001) at subsequent study
Made documentation easier	5.6±1.3	2.9±1.6	2.7±1.6	3.1±1.8	<.001	5.6±1.3	4.6±1.6	4.9±1.7	4.7±1.7	<.001	periods. All nurses agreed that
Decrease time spent on documentation	5.5±1.4	2.7±1.7	2.2±1.2	2.8±1.7	<.001	5.6±1.4	4.2±1.8	4.3±1.8	4.3±1.9	<.001	interoperability improved
Easy to learn	5.6±1.2	4.8±1.5	4.8±1.3	5.0±1.5	0.040	5.4±1.2	5.0±1.6	5.2±1.5	5.2±1.4	0.368	patient safety and was easy to
Reduce programming steps	5.4±1.4	2.7±1.7	2.4±1.5	2.9±1.7	<.001	5.3±1.5	4.0±1.9	4.5±1.7	4.4±1.9	<.001	use (green highlights). The
Reduce need to manually enter info	5.8±1.2	4.1±1.4	3.6±1.8	3.9±1.8	<.001	5.8±1.3	5.1±1.7	5.1±1.8	4.8±1.8	0.003	most pronounced unmet
Reduce time to program	5.6±1.5	2.9±1.8	2.5±1.3	2.8±1.6	<.001	5.5±1.5	4.3±1.6	4.5±1.7	4.3±1.8	<.001	expectations related to time &
Made interdisciplinary communication easier	5.6±1.3	4.0±1.4	3.4±1.5	3.6±1.7	<.001	5.7±1.2	4.5±1.3	4.6±1.1	4.7±1.2	<.001	efficiency (purple highlights),
Allow more time for other care activities	5.4±1.4	2.7±1.6	2.4±1.2	2.9±1.5	<.001	5.3±1.4	4.1±1.4	4.4±1.4	4.1±1.4	<.001	more so for ICU nurses (e.g.,
Help improve DL compliance	5.8±1.1	4.4±1.7	4.5±1.6	4.2±1.7	<.001	5.9±1.2	5.1±1.5	5.2±1.5	5.2±1.6	0.008	decreased time spent on
Decrease medication events	5.8±1.3	4.3±1.5	4.1±1.5	4.2±1.7	<.001	5.8±1.1	5.0±1.5	5.2±1.4	5.1±1.5	0.003	documentation and more time
Align well with work flow	5.7±1.4	2.8±1.6	2.7±1.5	2.9±1.6	<.001	5.7±1.2	4.3±1.5	4.6±1.5	4.5±1.7	<.001	for patient care.)
Function as expected	5.5±1.3	3.5±1.6	2.4±1.5	3.2±1.6	<.001	5.6±1.3	4.5±1.7	4.5±1.6	4.3±1.7	<.001	

Results

**Programming confidence** (Figure 1) dropped post-integration for both groups (p>.05) and while there were some improvements at 4 months, they remained lower than baseline at 6 months.



**Estimated programming time** (Figure 2) improved at 4 months for both groups. The percentage of ICU nurses that estimated they could program a primary (IV fluid) in less than 30 seconds increased from 55% at baseline to 64%, secondary (IV piggyback) from 45% to 55%, and critical drip from 31% to 50%. The percentage of MS nurses that estimated they could program a primary infusion in less than 30 seconds increased from 46% at baseline to 51%, secondary from 44% to 53%, and critical drip from 13% to 24%.



Figure 2: Estimated Programming Time