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**Background**

- Cardiac/respiratory arrests outside the ICU result in significant morbidity and mortality.
- Many of these events are likely preventable, and could represent missed clinical deterioration.
- Improved situation awareness and communication amongst bedside team results in better clinical outcomes.
- Three components to situation awareness: detection, comprehension, and projection.
- We adapted a situation awareness (SA) tool previously published from Cincinnati, which combines elements of a huddle and a checklist. We sought to trial the process on a single unit, prior to spreading hospital-wide.

**Objective/Aim**

To decrease code blues outside the ICU from 0.5 per 1,000pt-days to 0.1 per 1,000pt-days by December 31, 2017 on the pilot unit.

**Methods**

- Setting – general inpatient unit at a tertiary children’s hospital (28 beds, primarily 2 resident teams)
- Inclusion criteria – all medical-surgical patients admitted to the unit during the study period
- Multidisciplinary team/input – hospitalists, critical care, nurses (frontline, QI trained, directors), respiratory therapists, chief residents, family advisory board, sub-specialists
- Interventions – see Figure 1; continued modifications to the tool itself; repeated education, feedback, and data sharing; workshops with stakeholders; incorporation into unit and hospital-wide tiered huddles; monthly dashboard to share progress

**Measures/Results**

- Outcome measure – code blues outside the ICU
  - Decreased from 0.495 to 0.090 codes per 1,000pt-days
- Process measures (some key ones) –
  - % triggered by high PEWS/HFNC: 57.2% average
  - % completed on interventions, expected outcomes, and reassessment: 93%, 86% and 78% average respectively
- Balancing measure – low acuity ICU transfers (patients transferred to ICU with no significant interventions given) – result pending

**Conclusions**

- Improvement was seen earlier than expected with initial period without a code reaching 415 days.
- Subsequent codes may not have been preventable (other causes that may not have been impacted by SA process).
- General feedback thus far has been positive, surveys pending.
- Spread to all 8 medical/surgical units through phased improvement workshops to promote adoption of process; input from subspecialists and leaders from each unit to help buy-in.
- Next steps: incorporating into EMR; collaboration with High Flow Nasal Cannula/sepsis groups; simulation; supporting telemedicine.