

Background

- How do you create a Magnet culture of shared leadership and decision making with continuous improvement?
- How do we promote staff participation in strategic goals of quality and safety, patient centered care and efficiency?

Enter Engagement Metrics!

Purpose

- Quarterly tracking allows for assessment, progress and top performer sharing .
- The intent is to identify where the opportunity for improvement falls, make adjustments to council structure, and reassess if changes improved engagement in subsequent quarters.

Process

- Members of Steering Committee and Practice Council encapsulated engagement in 5 domains for measurement.
- Specialty practice teams (unit councils) and Councils (house wide) self assess, measure and report quarterly metrics to identify opportunities for continuous improvement and to promote sharing of best practices.
- All members of the councils/teams are encouraged to participate in the self assessment during scheduled meetings before metrics are uploaded allowing for transparency and collaboration.

5 Domains of Engagement



Scoring

Within each domain are 2 quantitative metrics, each of the 10 metrics can receive a score between 0 and 2 allowing for total engagement scores to range from zero to 20.

Target goal is set at 18!

Results

5 quarters (October 2016-December 2017) reporting reveals a continuous trend of improved average composite scores:

- SPTs from a baseline of 10 to 13
- Councils from a baseline of 12.5 to 14.5

Conclusion

By developing a standard process for measuring engagement, we collaboratively hold one another accountable to and assist one another in achieving excellence and optimal patient outcomes.

Next Steps:

- Restructuring of shared leadership has allowed time for SPT Training Lab and Best Practice Sharing which provides a venue for collaboration.
- Metric Tracking has highlighted areas for improvement among the SPTs and Councils specifically around replication and recognition.
- Opportunities for improvement on the engagement tracker itself are always made open to staff who participate.

As we continuously improve we recognize that metrics will need to adjust to include sustainment and to reach higher targets.

Special Thanks To

Salem Health Steering Committee, Department SPTs and Councils for their collective work on this progressive work.

Questions?

Please contact authors:

Jessica Reese

Jessica.Reese@salemhealth.org

Nancy Dunn

Nancy.Dunn@salemhealth.org

Subscale	Metric(s)	Low Score	Mid Score	High Score	FY '17 Q2 Council Averages	FY '17 Q3 Council Averages	FY '17 Q4 Council Averages	FY '18 Q1 Council Averages	FY '18 Q2 Council Averages
PARTICIPATION	• Attendance (target ≥80%)	0-40% members	41-79% members	≥80% members	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.5
	• Paid time to attend (target ≥80%)	0-40% members	41-79% members	≥80% members	1.8	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.0
SHARED LEADERSHIP KNOWLEDGE	• Number of members with knowledge of Charter and standard work to achieve Charter (target ≥80%)	0-40% members	41-79% members	≥80% members	1.5	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.8
	• Number of members that share new knowledge obtained from professional development activities (target ≥80%)	0-40% members	41-79% members	≥80% members	0.8	0.8	2.0	1.2	1.8
PRODUCTION QUALITY and SUSTAINMENT	• Number of improvement initiatives completed to target set (target ≥3)	0	1	>1	1.7	1.8	1.5	1.5	2.0
	• Number of completed projects sustained after 90 days (target ≥2)	Not met	Met	Sustained (> 3 mos.)	1.7	1.0	2.0	1.2	1.8
RECOGNITION	• Number of times staff completing improvement projects (under production) are recognized	0	1-2	≥3	2	2.0	1.5	1.2	1.0
	• Number of routine recognitions of members (target ≥2)	0	1-2	≥3	1	0.8	0.5	1.0	0.8
COMMUNICATION/SPREAD (projects and/or best practice models)	• Number of projects/best practice models SPT/Council shares with others (SL or otherwise) (target ≥3 SL groups)	0	1-2	≥3	1.3	1.5	1.5	0.7	1.3
	• # applicable replications (you replicate or your work is replicated) (target ≥1)	0	1	>1	0.3	0.3	1.0	0.6	0.8
Total Score		RANGE = 0 - 20			12.5	13.0	14.0	14.5	14.5

Subscale	Metric(s)	Low Score	Mid Score	High Score	FY '17 Q2 SPT Averages	FY '17 Q3 SPT Averages	FY '17 Q4 SPT Averages	FY '18 Q1 SPT Averages	FY '18 Q2 SPT Averages
PARTICIPATION	• Attendance (target ≥80%)	0-40% members	41-79% members	≥80% members	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7
	• Paid time to attend (target ≥80%)	0-40% members	41-79% members	≥80% members	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.8	2.0
SHARED LEADERSHIP KNOWLEDGE	• Number of SPT members with knowledge of Charter and standard work to achieve Charter (target ≥80%)	0-40% members	41-79% members	≥80% members	1.1	1.3	1.7	1.7	1.6
	• Number of members that share new knowledge obtained from professional development activities (target ≥80%)	0-40% members	41-79% members	≥80% members	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.2	1.1
PRODUCTION QUALITY and SUSTAINMENT	• Number of improvement initiatives completed to target set (target ≥3)	0	1	>1	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5
	• Number of completed projects sustained after 90 days (target ≥2)	Not met	Met	Sustained (> 3 mos.)	1.1	1.1	1.5	1.4	1.5
RECOGNITION	• Number of times staff completing improvement projects (under production) are recognized	0	1-2	≥3	1	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.2
	• Number of routine recognitions of members (target ≥2)	0	1-2	≥3	0.7	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.0
COMMUNICATION/SPREAD (projects and/or best practice models)	• Number of projects/best practice models SPT/Council shares with others (SL or otherwise) (target ≥3 SL groups)	0	1-2	≥3	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.9
	• # applicable replications (you replicate or your work is replicated) (target ≥1)	0	1	>1	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5
Total Score		RANGE = 0 - 20			10	11.1	12.3	12.8	13.0

