

Implementing the PIE programme to improve person-centred care for people with dementia on hospital wards.

Ann Skingley,

Principal Research Fellow, Canterbury Christ Church University

Joy Marshall

Lead Dementia Specialist Nurse, East Kent Hospitals

Implementing PIE - background

- 40% older people admitted to hospital likely to have dementia (NAO, 2007)
- RCP (2011) found little evidence of person-centred culture on most wards
- PIE programme of improvement devised and introduced to improve care focusing on Person, Interaction and Environment
- Evaluation funded by NIHR on 10 wards in 3 regions

Implementing PIE - background

- Aims:
 - To provide an account of how staff engaged with PIE
 - To test out a theory of change
- Methods: Mixed methods design, incorporating multiple case studies, in 3 regions
- Data collection:
 - Observation of PIE action planning meetings
 - Interviews with staff
 - Documentation
- Analysis: grounded theory approach, drawing on NPT

Implementing PIE – variation across sites

Full Implementers		Partial Implementers		Non Implementers					
Seaford Trust		City Trust	Ironbridge Trust	Central Trust			City Trust	Valley Trust	
Poplar Orthopaedic ward	Crane Frailty ward	Rivermead Step-down rehab ward	Netherton Acute medical ward for pts with dementia	Beech Older people/ orthopaedic ward	Rose Stroke unit	Denton Enhanced recovery ward for pts with dementia	Cedar Orthopaedic ward	Ambridge Care of older people	Oak Orthopaedic ward

Implementing PIE – accounting for variation: readiness criteria

- Criteria all fulfilled at recruitment
 - Interest from senior hospital management
 - Agreement of senior ward staff
 - Commitment from practice development lead
- Implementers
 - Clinical/divisional matrons attended workshops
 - Ward managers facilitated
 - PD leads and specialist dementia team initiated
- Partial implementers
 - Senior staff/facilitators often absorbed with restructuring & staff shortages
- Non-implementers
 - PD lead left and not replaced

Implementing PIE – accounting for variation: Normalisation Process Theory 1

- Coherence – seen as meaningful
 - Implementers: ‘they see it as supporting them’
 - Partial & non-implementers: Initial enthusiasm, esp. after workshops.
- Cognitive participation – worth committing time & effort to
 - Implementers: ‘It’s allowed us to step back’
 - Partial: observations but little action
 - Non: engagement not seen as feasible

Implementing PIE – accounting for variation: Normalisation Process Theory 2

Collective action – implementers

Meal times as a social event

Observations noted patients not eating well

Plan: Patients sit at table for lunch as at home

Increased mobilisation, conversation and nutrition



Music as a purposeful activity

Observations noted continual noise from radio

Plan: Select calming music and introduce other musical activities e.g. carols at Christmas, volunteer musician

Patients calmer, staff engaged



Implementing PIE – accounting for variation: Normalisation Process Theory 3

- Collective action – partial implementers
 - Lack of resources to meet action plans
 - Ceiling effect?
- Collective action – non-implementers
 - Organisational turbulence
 - Staff shortages
 - CQC diverting attention
 - Ward closures

Implementing PIE – accounting for variation: Normalisation Process Theory 4

- Reflexive monitoring – reflection and review
 - Periodic meetings held opportunistically
 - Review of previous plans & recent observations and set new actions
 - Plan for further observations
 - Problems arranging times/venues/staff availability
 - Changes noted: staff using opportunities to chat to patients; ward calmer; staff better at eliciting patient need from behaviour

Implementing PIE – reflections and looking forward

- NPT fails to fully account for variation in implementation – contextual issues important
- PIE not implemented exactly as anticipated
- Principles retained, procedures adapted to allow expansion to other wards in trust
- Conclusion: PIE has the potential to improve person-centred care for people with dementia, however, success is dependent on certain local conditions and readiness criteria.

Thank you

Ann Skingley

[\(ann.skingley@canterbury.ac.uk\)](mailto:ann.skingley@canterbury.ac.uk)

Joy Marshall

[\(joymarshall2@nhs.net\)](mailto:joymarshall2@nhs.net)