## **Deanship of Graduate Studies Al-Quds University**



## Assessment of the Effectiveness of Transition of Care Process in Gaza Governmental Hospitals

Rola S. Abu Dalfa

**MPH** thesis

**Gaza-Palestine** 

1441-2020

## Assessment of the Effectiveness of Transition of Care Process in Gaza Governmental Hospitals

## Submitted by: Rola S. Abu Dalfa

Bachelor of Pharmacy- Al –Azhar University
Gaza- Palestine

Supervisor: Motasem Hamdan, PhD

School of Public Health

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of Requirements for the Degree of Master of Public Health/Management branch School of Public Health- Al-Quds University

# Al-Quds University Deanship of Graduate Studies School of Public Health



#### Thesis Approval

## Assessment of the Effectiveness of Transition of Care Process in Gaza Governmental Hospitals

Prepared by: Rola S. Abu Dalfa

Registration No.: 21612183

Supervisor: Dr. Motasem Hamdan

Master thesis submitted and accepted. Date: / /
The names of signatures of the examining committee members are as follows:

1. Head of the committee: Dr. Motasem Hamdan

2. Internal examiner: Dr. Bassam Abu Hamad

3. External examiner: Dr. Sana Abu Daqqa

Signature..

Signature.... B.

Signature...Sano...

Jerusalem - Palestine

#### **Dedication**

I dedicate this work to the sake of Allah my Creator and my master.

To my Father and my Mother whose affection, love, encouragement and prays day and night make me able to get such success and honor.

To my dear husband, for his support and love.

To my sons, Mohammed, Ahmed and Zain Al-Deen

To my daughters Ola and Tala.

To my brothers Saleem and Osama.

To my sisters Roba, Reem, Reham and Merhan.

To all my friends.

To all patients in Palestine, who deseve the right of better care and life.

To everyone who contributed to getting this study a reality.

To all those beleived in me, thank you.

Rola Sami Abu Dalfa

#### **Declaration**

I certify that this thesis submitted for the master's degree is the result of my own research, except where otherwise acknowledged, and that this thesis or any of its parts has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution.

Signed:

Rola S. Abu Dalfa

Date:/..../

#### Acknowledgment

First and foremost, I thank Allah for helping me every moment and during my study.

There are no clear words to express my appreciation for Dr. Yehia Abed, Dr. Bassam Abu Hamad, and Dr. Khitam Abu Hamad for their, care, guidance and patience.

I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Motasem Hamdan for his inspiration, guidance, advices, and support.

A special thanks and deep love to my mother and my father for praying God to protect and encouragement me and their motivation and support, words cannot express how grateful I am, all of the sacrifices that you've made on my behalf. Your prayer for me was what sustained me thus far.

Deep appreciation to Dr. Magda Al Qishawy for her inspiration, leadership, help and motivation when I faced difficult times.

I am grateful for my colleagues at the pharmaceutical team Dr. Khaled Abu Leashed. Ahmed Al Khodary, Dr.Nael Skaik and Dr.Alaa Hellis for keep empowering me with their exceptional ideas and solutions and for their motivation.

My great thankfulness and respect to medical department manager Dr. Ahmed Shatat for his endless support during my research.

I would especially like to thank my second family "Al Dorra pharmacy team " for their cooperation and help all the time.

#### **Abstract**

Background: Transitions of care is an essential part of a patient's journey through a health care system. It refers to the movement of a patient during an acute or chronic illness between different settings and health care providers., results in different challenges in providing ongoing care, and the movement of patient to home, which means the start of a new round of management activities and /or self-management, so health systems must focus on patient education and training about self-management and engage the patient as an active partner. Ineffective transition of care is recognized as a critical issue threatens patient safety, resulting in poor clinical outcomes, increased readmission rates in hospitals and financial burdens on the patient and healthcare system.

**Objectives:** This study aimed to explore the standing condition, strengths and weakness points of the current care transition processes, in addition to recognizing the patients', health care providers' and decision makers' impressions about it, in order to highlight it and make recommendations for improvement and development.

Methodology: the study is mixed one, the quantitative part is descriptive, analytical and cross sectional, was done through organizing interviews with patients discharged from the hospitals to fill in face-to-face questionnaires with 383 patients from four hospitals (2 general hospitals and 2 specialized hospitals) and the qualitative part included interviews with ten key informants and five focus groups. Quantitative data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software and the qualitative data was analyzed by open coding thematic analysis method.

**Results:** As for the eight study domains, the percentage of these domains ranged from (56.7%) to (69.05%) means. The overall patients' perspective was moderate, the lowest for the continuity of care and the highest for the care coordination. The discharge planning domain was 66.5%, the preparation domain was (63.4%), the information exchange was (69%), medication reconciliation domain was 59%, health education domain was 56.24% and follow up domain was (64.5%). Health providers and key informants revealed that there are gaps and barriers impeding the effective transition of care process, there are no systematic transition of care processes at hospitals and there is a lake of knowledge, lack of understanding of discharge plans during hospitalization and lack of clarity in health care provider roles which tends to exacerbate already fragmented care responsibilities during transitions between settings and providers. And there is a serious lack of information addressing the problems the patient may face after discharge. The study showed poor provision of patient-centered care, patient and his family did not feel involved or informed about decisions in care, patient education is not a priority, it is about some instructions given before discharge. The study also revealed the fragmentation of the system in the provision of medicines to the patient, the medication reconciliation process is therefore not done. In addition to incomplete transfer of information, most patients receive oral instructions, patients don't understand written instructions and the discharge sheet is not informative for all information needed to the patient during care transition. There is a lack of teamwork, interdisciplinary work is dominated by individualism, and there is insufficient communication within a multidisciplinary team between the different specialties. There is poor coordination between hospitals and primary health care and community agencies which threaten continuity of care and results in readmission to hospitals.

**Recommendations:** The study recommended developing national transition of care policies to ensure continuity of care and integration of services, strengthening the role of primary care to reduce the burden on hospitals, working to develop a comprehensive health information system, encouragement of patient-centered services and developing medication reconciliation policy and procedures.

### **Table of Contents**

Dedication	1	
Declaration	n	i
Acknowled	dgment	ii
Abstract		iii
Table of C	ontents	iv
List of tabl	les	vii
List of Fig	ures	viii
_	nexes	
	breviations	
_	One Introduction:	
	ekground:	
1.2 Pro	blem statement:	3
1.3 Jus	tification	3
1.4 Air	n	5
1.5 Ob	jectives	5
1.6 Co	ntextntext	5
1.6.1	Demographic context	5
1.6.2	Socioeconomic characteristic	6
1.6.3	Health care system	7
1.6.4	Hospitals in GS	8
1.7 Def	finition of terms	9
1.7.1	Transition of care	9
1.7.2	Patient safety	9
1.7.3	Medication error	
1.7.4	Adverse event	9
Chapter T	Swo Literature Review & Conceptual Frame Work	10
2.1 Co	nceptual framework	10
2.1.1	Discharge planning	
2.1.2	Preparation for transition	
2.1.3	Information exchange	
2.1.4	Medication reconciliation:	
2.1.5	Patient education	
2.1.6	Follow up care	
2.1.7	Continuity of care	
2.1.8	Coordination of care	
2.1.9	Leadership support	
	Perception of patient and health care providers	

2.1.11	Patient characteristic variables	13
	rature review	
2.2.1	Transition of care definition:	14
2.3 Tran	sition of care processes:	15
2.3.1	Discharge planning	15
2.3.2	Information Exchange	19
2.3.2	.1 Documentation	20
2.3.2	.2 Hand off between providers	20
2.3.2	.3 Discharge Summary	22
2.3.3	Medication reconciliation	24
2.3.4	Patient Education	27
2.3.4	.1 Patient and family engagement	27
2.3.4	.2 Discharge instructions	28
2.3.4	.3 The Teach-Back technique	30
2.3.5	Follow-up care	30
2.3.6	Continuity of Care	32
2.3.7	Coordination of Care	33
2.4 Lead	ler ship support	35
2.5 Perc	eption of patients	36
2.6 Perc	eption of healthcare providers	36
Chapter Tl	nree Methodology	38
_		
3.1 Stud		38
	y design	
3.2 Stud	y designy population	38
3.2 Stud 3.2.1	y design	38 38
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2	y design	38 38 39
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig	y design	38 38 39 39
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1	y design	38 38 39 39 39
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2	y design	38 39 39 39 39
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perio	y design	38 38 39 39 39 39
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Period 3.5 Sam	y design y population Quantitative Part Qualitative part ibility criteria Inclusion criteria Exclusion criteria od of the study	38 38 39 39 39 39
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perio 3.5 Sam 3.5.1	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 39
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perid 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1	y design	38 38 39 39 39 39 39 39
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perio 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.1	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 39 39
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perid 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.1	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 39 40 <b>41</b>
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perid 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.2 3.5.2	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 39 40 <b>41</b>
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perid 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 39 40 <b>41</b> 41
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perid 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.3	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 39 40 <b>41</b> 41 42
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perid 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.3	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 40 <b>41</b> 41 42 42
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perid 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.3 3.5.3	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 39 40 <b>41</b> 42 42 42
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perid 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.3 3.5.3 3.5.3 3.5.3	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 40 41 42 42 43
3.2 Stud 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Elig 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.4 Perid 3.5 Sam 3.5.1 3.5.1 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.2 3.5.3 3.5.3 3.5.3 3.5.3 3.5.3	y design	38 39 39 39 39 39 39 40 <b>41</b> 42 42 43 43

3.8 Scie	entific rigor	45
3.8.1	Quantitative part (questionnaire)	45
3.8.	1.1 Reliability	45
3.8.	1.2 Validity	45
3.8.2	Qualitative part (in-depth interviews)	46
3.9 Dat	a entry and analysis	46
3.9.1	Quantitative part	46
3.9.2	Qualitative part:	47
3.10 Lin	nitations of the study	47
Chapter 4	Results and Discussion	48
4.1 Des	criptive Statistics	48
4.1.1	Demographic characteristics of participants	48
4.1.2	Hospital Related Variables of the Study Participants	49
4.1.3	Patients perspectives about transition of care processes	51
4.1.	3.1 Discharge Planning	52
4.1.	3.2 Preparations for discharge	55
4.1.	3.3 Information exchange	57
4.1.	3.4 Medication reconciliation	62
4.1.	3.5 Patient and family education	66
	3.6 Follow up appointments	
4.1.	3.7 Continuity of care	72
4.1.	3.8 Care Coordination	76
4.2 Infe	erential Statistics	80
4.2.1	Relationship between care transition process and hospitals	81
4.2.2	Relationship between care transition domains and hospital departments	83
4.2.3	Relationship between care transition domains and gender	85
	Relationship between care transition domains and age	
4.2.5	Relationship between care transition domains and education level	87
4.2.6	Relationship between care transition domains and average LOS	89
4.2.7	Relationship between care transition domains and frequency of admission	91
Chapter F	ive Conclusion and recommendations	92
5.1 Cor	nclusion	92
5.2 Rec	commendations	95
5.3 Sug	gestions for further research	97
Reference	S	98
Annovos		106

#### **List of Tables**

Table (2.1): Population and sample size for each hospital	40
Table (2.2): explains qualitative part participants	41
Table (2.3): Reliability estimates for the survey domains	45
Table (4.1): Distribution of the study participants by demographic characteristics	48
Table (4.2): Distribution of the study participants according to hospital related variables	S
(N=383)	49
Table (4.3): Distribution of the study participants according to their responses about	
discharge planning	52
Table (4.4): Distribution of the study participants according to their responses about	
preparations for discharge from hospital	55
Table (4.5): Distribution of the study participants according to their responses about	
information exchange between medical staff and patient	57
Table (4.6): Distribution of the study participants according to their responses about	
Medication reconciliation	62
Table (4.7): Distribution of the study participants according to their responses about	
patient and family education	66
Table (4.8): Distribution of the study participants according to their responses about	
follow-up appointments	69
Table (4.9): Distribution of the study participants according to their responses about	
continuity of care	72
Table (4.10): Distribution of the study participants according to their responses about	
coordination of care	76
Table (4.11): Differences between care transition domain scores by hospitals	81
Table (4.12): Differences between care transition domain scores by hospital department	ts
	83
Table (4.13): Differences in care transition domains scores by participant gender	85
Table (4.14): Differences in care transition domains scores by participant age	86
Table (4.15): Differences in care transition domains scores by participant education le	vel
	88
Table (4.16): Differences in care transition domains scores by participant average LOS	
<b>Table (4.17):</b> Differences in care transition domains scores by participant frequency of	
Admission	91

## **List of Figures**

<b>Figure (2.1):</b>	Study conceptual framework	11
<b>Figure (4.1):</b>	Overall patient perspectives about transition of care process	80

### **List of Annexes**

Annex (1): Sample size calculation.	106
Annex (2): Questionnaire in Arabic	107
Annex (3): Questionnair	115
Annex (4): FGD and KII questions	122
Annex (5): Helsinki permission.	124
Annex (6): General Directorates of Hospitals permissions	125
Annex (7): List of arbitrators	126
Annex (8): Map of services at Governmental Hospitals	127

#### **List of Abbreviations**

**ADL** Activities of Daily Living

**AE** Adverse Event

**AHRQ** Agency for Health Research and Quality

**AMA** Against medical advice

**ANOVA** One-way Analysis of Variance **BPMH** Best possible medication history

BSc Bachelor of Science ED Emergency Department

**EMRO** Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean

FGD Focus Group Discussion
GDP Gross Domestic Product
GGs Gaza Governorates
GP General Practitioner

**GS** Gaza Strip

**IOM** Institute of Medicine

JCI Joint commission International KII Key Informant Interviews

Km KilometerLOS Length of stayM.P Multiple professions

MANOVA Multivariate analysis of variance

**MD** Median

**MOH** Ministry of Health

N Number

NCDs Non communicable diseases
NGOs Non-governmental Organizations

**OECD** Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

**PCBS** Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics

PCC Patient-centered care
PHC Primary Health Care

**SBAR** Situation, background assessment and recommendations

**SPH** School of Public Health

**SPSS** Statistical Package for Social Sciences

**Sq** Square

StdStandard DeviationTOCTransition of careUKUnited Kingdom

**UNRWA** United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in

the Near East

USA United States of America
USD United State Dollars

WB West Bank

WHO World Health Organization

**WM** Weighted mean

#### **Chapter One**

#### Introduction

#### 1.1 Background

Transitions of Care (TOC) refers to the various points where a patient moves to, or returns from, a particular physical location or makes contact with a health care professional for the purposes of receiving health care, this includes transitions between home, hospital and consultations with different health care providers, it is an essential part of a patient's journey through a health care system at many different times and places (WHO, 2016).

Care transition necessarily involves several health care providers in and between settings, all contributing to one individual's responsibility for care. This, however, results in different challenges in providing ongoing care. Unfortunately, care transition is often discontinuous and poorly coordinated, leading to poor quality of care, compromised patient safety and adverse events (Naylor et al., 2017).

World Health Organization (WHO) Defines quality as "the extent to which health care services provided to individuals and patient populations improve desired health outcomes. In order to achieve this, health care must be safe, effective, timely, efficient, equitable and people-centered." (WHO, 2006: 9) Patient safety has long been seen as a key factor in improving the quality of care and safe care can be seen as a barometer of healthcare systems' success in improving quality (Syed et al., 2018). Therefore, care transition is a handover encircled by risk, dangers and hazards due to latent factors that are system failures, or active failures who are health care providers'. Such failures can threaten patient safety and lead to medical errors, rehospitalization and even death (Greenwald, Denham, & Jack, 2007). Risk can be caused by a number of factors, including fragmentation of the healthcare system, poor communication, lack of coordination among healthcare providers, lack of or inefficient discharge planning, inadequate monitoring and continuity of care and care transition gaps lead to unnecessary readmissions which increase health system costs and life-threatening to patients (Hesselink, et al., 2014)

Many readmissions are due to confusing discharge arrangements, unclear instructions from various providers, drug mistakes, including dangerous interactions between drugs