



Service Priorities and Programmes
Electronic Presentations

Convention ID: 656

Submitting author: Mr Chi Kin IP

Post title: Registered Nurse, Shatin Hospital, NTEC

Service review of a new means of communication on risk alertness within psychiatric department of PWH/SH – Psy Risk Alert

*Yip LS, Ho KT, Tam HMV, Yau YM, Wong SFF, Fung CM, Ip CK, Ng, K
Department of Psychiatry, PWH/SH*

Keywords:

Risk

communication

psychiatric department

Introduction

Risk is found elsewhere in clinical settings, nevertheless incident or near-missed situation. Increasing staff awareness is important to minimize risk happened. It was previously relied on the information disseminated by supervisors but more means of information delivery could further enhance communication and discussion among staff. Psy Risk Alert, with Chinese and English version, was so designed quarterly to emphasize learning points on different risk incident noted in psychiatric settings in Hong Kong. A service review has been performed on it.

Objectives

1. To understand awareness of it among staff 2. To recognize the perception on it over relevance, frequency and mode of delivery 3. To suggest for further improvement on it

Methodology

Both nursing and supporting staff were the target clients for this service review. A questionnaire was designed with English and Chinese version, focusing on their awareness and opinions over relevance, frequency and mode of delivery on Psy Risk Alert. The questionnaire was distributed to each ward in 1/2014 and all frontline staffs were invited to fill up anonymously and voluntarily.

Result

Among all received questionnaires, the respond rate was 29.4% and 30.8% for nursing staff and supporting staff respectively. For the awareness, 87.5% and 41.7% of nursing staff and supporting staff appreciated on the use of Psy Risk Alert for means of communication. Nursing staff rated 3.475 out of 5 over the relevance towards clinical management while 3.6 out of 5 were rated by supporting staff. For frequency of delivery, nursing staff rated 3.15 out of 5 while supporting staff rated 3.6 out of 5. For mode of delivery, nursing staff rated 3.2 out of 5 while supporting staff rated 3.4 out of 5 but 42.5% of nursing staff were misidentified on the ways of delivery as email while it was delivered in hard copy and iHospital. Written comments were received with highly appreciated on it over the enhancement of awareness. Improvement of acknowledgement of it towards staff, ways of delivery and the content

of it were suggested.