Research Repository UCD

Title	How do nurses and midwives perceive their preparedness for quality improvement and patient safety in practice? A cross-sectional national study in Ireland
Authors(s)	Gallen, Anne, Kodate, Naonori, Casey, Dearbhla
Publication date	2019-05
Publication information	Gallen, Anne, Naonori Kodate, and Dearbhla Casey. "How Do Nurses and Midwives Perceive Their Preparedness for Quality Improvement and Patient Safety in Practice? A Cross-Sectional National Study in Ireland" 76 (May, 2019).
Publisher	Elsevier
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/12127
Publisher's statement	This is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Nurse Education Today. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Nurse Education Today (76, (2020)) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2019.01.025
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1016/j.nedt.2019.01.025

Downloaded 2023-04-07T10:52:29Z

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)

© Some rights reserved. For more information

**How prepared are nurses and midwives for quality improvement and patient safety?
A cross-sectional national study in Ireland**

Anne Gallen ^{1*}, Naonori Kodate ², Dearbhla Casey ³

¹ Nursing and Midwifery Planning & Development Unit, HSE West, Ballyshannon, Co. Donegal, Ireland

² School of Social Policy, Social Work and Social Justice, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland / Twitter: @NaoKody

³ Institute of Public Administration, Whitaker School of Government and Management, Dublin, Ireland

*Corresponding Author.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to:

Dr. Anne Gallen, Director, Nursing and Midwifery Planning & Development Unit, HSE West, An Clochar, College Street /Ballyshannon / Co. Donegal

Email: Anne.Gallen@hse.ie / Twitter: @AnneGallen3

Key words: Patient safety; Quality improvement; Nursing care; Education continuing; Health services research

ABSTRACT

Background: Although patient safety and quality are cornerstones of healthcare practice, little is known of the knowledge, skills and competence of nurses and midwives in Ireland.

Objectives: To investigate the perceptions of nurses and midwives regarding their continuing professional development-based preparedness for, and participation in quality and safety.

Design: A cross-sectional survey was undertaken across the Republic of Ireland in 2016 examining perceptions of preparedness in quality and safety methods and tools, competency domains from the Quality and Safety Education for Nurses (QSEN) framework (person-centred care, teamwork and collaboration, evidence-based practice, quality improvement, safety, and informatics), and participation related to access to data and engagement in the field.

Settings: 12 Health Service Executive (HSE) Centres of Nursing and Midwifery Education (CNMEs) in Ireland.

Participants: A total of 654 nurses and midwives working in acute hospitals and community healthcare organisations.

Methods: Participants were practising nurses and midwives, undertaking CPD education in the 12 HSE CNMEs at the time of data collection (March-April 2016). 1787 surveys were distributed. Data were analysed by IBM SPSS version 23.

Results: A response rate of 37% (n=654/1787) was achieved. Many respondents reported a lack of confidence in quality and safety methods and tools and QSEN framework competencies. Frontline staff nurses and midwives reported that they were less prepared than their mid and senior level colleagues and significant numbers indicated they were not engaged in quality and safety.

Conclusions: This first nationwide study in Ireland has discovered gaps in nurses' and midwives' knowledge, skills and competence in quality improvement and safety. To safeguard care, priority should be given to ensuring front-line staff are appropriately prepared to competently participate in the continuous improvement of patient care.

INTRODUCTION

Patient safety and the quality of care are global imperatives at the forefront of policy agendas in health and social care. In Ireland, findings from recent investigations into care and governance failures have highlighted the importance of a “safety first” culture, and the crucial requirement for education and training to improve the quality and safety of patient care.¹⁻⁷

There has been increasing debate on the educational preparedness of healthcare professionals in quality and safety.⁸⁻¹⁵ A particular focus of this debate is whether they possess the knowledge, skills, competence and motivation required to safeguard and improve patient care.^{9,12} A lack of knowledge and skills among clinicians and managers has been identified as a significant barrier to improving the quality of care;¹⁶⁻¹⁹ and more recent evidence suggests that healthcare personnel may not be sufficiently skilled, or they may not have received the necessary training

in quality improvement and patient safety.¹² Concerns have also been expressed in the literature regarding the quality and safety competence of nursing and other clinical professional graduates, suggesting they are not adequately prepared to safely enter the clinical setting;²⁰⁻²¹ and that current healthcare practitioners and managers lack basic skills in assessing evidence, measuring care, planning improvements, managing change projects and analysing data.¹⁹

Ireland is acknowledged as having a highly trained professional healthcare workforce.²² However like many other countries across the globe, it is faced with challenges relating to unsafe practices, non-compliance with care standards, and errors in diagnosis and treatments.^{1-7, 23-25} The contribution of nurses and midwives to care quality and patient safety is frequently cited in the literature,²⁶⁻³⁰ and their professional development in quality improvement and safety is advocated as the bridge to safer care.³¹⁻³³

Quality improvement and safety education has an important role to play to achieve safe patient care. Globally, compared to other high-risk industries, the healthcare sector has been relatively slow to embrace and embed knowledge and competence in the theory and practice of safety science and this may account for why quality and safety initiatives and the key principles are often misunderstood.³⁴⁻³⁷ Although the WHO (2011) developed a Patient Safety Curriculum Guide, evidence is limited on the adoption of this guide by healthcare professional educators,⁹ and of its visibility in the continuing professional development of nurses and midwives.⁴² Empirical evidence on the quality and safety preparation given to nurses and midwives is limited.³⁸⁻³⁹ In Ireland, while a few studies offer useful data concerning nurses and midwives,^{30, 40} a gap remains in the literature when it comes to the profile of nurses and midwives,³⁰ and in particular their own perceptions of their quality improvement and safety knowledge.

This study therefore aims to examine the perceptions of practicing nurses and midwives in the Health Service Executive (HSE), the provider of public health services in Ireland, with regard to their preparedness for, and participation in quality improvement and patient safety. The study explores preparedness in policy, regulation and practice-related quality and safety best practice guidance, implementation methods and tools, and in the competency-related variables of QSEN (Quality and Safety Education for Nurses) framework. Participation is conceptualised as nurses' and midwives' views of their involvement and opportunities to engage in quality and safety practice, and on their access to quality and patient safety data.

DATA AND METHODS

Given the focus of this study, a cross-sectional survey design was employed, and the data were collated and analysed between March 2016 and February 2017.

Survey questionnaire

The survey questionnaire emanated from research conducted in the United States.⁴² A validated survey tool was used to examine newly graduated nurses', employed in acute hospitals, views of their quality improvement education and their engagement in this field in their clinical practice environments. The survey examined their knowledge and skills in quality and safety methods and tools and in the QSEN competency domains. The authors of the survey tool were contacted, and permission was granted to adapt it to the Irish context. An expert panel was convened to establish face validity of the questionnaire and to enable pilot testing. A total of 35 nurses and midwives were recruited, and participated in the pilot. The final version of the modified questionnaire resulted in a 30-item survey. Seven questions captured demographic information, nine questions related to quality and safety preparedness, eleven questions related to participation, two questions related to enablers/barriers and one question facilitated participants to add any additional comments.

Study setting

Practising nurses and midwives were accessed through the 12 HSE Centres for Nursing and Midwifery Education (CNMEs) across Ireland. The HSE CNMEs provide nurses and midwives with CPD education. The field of work of the study participants was classified as either acute hospital care (includes midwifery) (AHC), or within a community healthcare organisation (CHO). Nurses employed in CHOs provide patient care in areas such as community hospitals for older people, intellectual disability services, mental health services, and public health and community nursing services.

Sampling technique

The sampling frame was based on the average annual footfall of nurses and midwives in attendance in the 12 HSE CNMEs. The total cohorts of practising nurses and midwives in attendance over a designated time period of 4 weeks were invited to participate in the study. A power analysis was conducted prior to the commencement of the study to ensure statistical significance of the sample and the likelihood of the effect on the full population. With a 95%

confidence level, and a confidence interval of 5%, a sample size of 376 was required to ensure statistical significance.

Data collection

Ethical approval was gained from the research institute in University College Dublin and the HSE. Data were collated between March and April 2016. In order to ensure a systematic collection of the nationwide questionnaires, directors of nursing and midwifery in the 12 CNME locations were informed of the research study taking place and that their staff would be invited to participate. The 12 directors of CNME provided their commitment to disseminate and collect the surveys from the practising nurses and midwives whilst they were in attendance in the educational centres.

Analysis

The IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 23 was used to process and analyse the data. The environmental variable of field of work, and the professional profile variables of years in practice and grade were examined. Years in practice were defined in three categories: - up to 10 years, 10–20 years, and 20+ years; and grade was defined in three categories – frontline, mid-level and senior level.

As the impact of missing data is a serious consideration that can lead to biased estimations, misleading results and weakened generalizability of the findings,⁴¹ for this study Missing Completely at Random test was undertaken on the full dataset. Calculation of the 74 variables for each case found random distribution of missing data ($\chi^2 = 21.639$, $df = 21,007$, $p < 0.001$). Three bands were created to explore the degree of missing data: 10% signified 7–8 missing variables; 20% signified 14–15 missing variables, and 30% signified 20–22 missing variables. A dataset based on a 20% missing data value was adopted.

RESULTS

Demographic profile of respondents

A total of 1,787 surveys were distributed, and a response rate of 42% ($n = 744$) was achieved. The elimination of missing data resulted in a final dataset of 654, which equated to a response rate of 37%, further reducing the margin of error and giving greater certainty of the accuracy of the calculations. Ninety-two per cent of the sample were female (602) and the largest group

of respondents were aged between 41-50 years. Almost half of the respondents (49%) had 20+ years of practice experience and this pattern of response was consistent across the HSE CNME locations. Respondents' field of work indicated that just less than half (n=304, 47%) were from AHC, with the slightly larger response (n=350, 53%) from CHO.

Table 1 below outlines the grade distribution which demonstrates the largest group of respondents was front-line staff-nurses and midwives and this finding was noted across the 12 HSE CNME locations.

Table 1 Nursing and midwifery: Grade distribution

Front-line Staff nurses and midwives	Mid-level CNM/CMM 1, 2, 3, and CNS/CMS	Senior level ANP/AMP, ADON/M, DON/M, Other	Total
344 (52.5%)	195 (29.9%)	115 (17.6%)	654

Abbreviations: CNM/CMM=Clinical nurse/Midwife manager; CN/MS=Clinical nurse/Midwife specialist; ANP/AMP=Advanced nurse/midwife practitioner; ADON/M=Assistant director of nursing/midwifery; DON/DOM=Director of nursing/midwifery; Other=Respondents currently not working in the above clinical roles, but aligned to these pay scales (CNMEs/NMPDs/Education).

Preparedness in quality and safety

Over three quarters of respondents (77%) identified themselves as being either “reasonably well” or “very well” prepared through CPD education in quality and safety methods and tools. Further exploration of this theme sought to elicit more detailed information of their perception of the CPD educational preparedness, specifically related to seven quality improvement and safety methods and tools frequently cited in the literature (Figure 1);⁹ PDSA cycles (Plan, Do, Study, Act); Six Sigma (Define, Measure, Analyse, Improve, Control); Root Cause Analysis; Key Performance Indicators/Metrics; Data Measurement, Monitoring and Analysis; Run Charts and Safety Cross; and Organisational Reporting Systems for error, near miss or adverse event reporting (e.g. National Incident Management System).

Figure 1 Percentage frequency responses to quality improvement and safety methods & tools

In contrast to the earlier positive responses about preparedness in the methods and tools for quality and safety, when asked more specifically, the findings revealed in five of the seven areas, greater numbers of respondents indicated they perceived themselves to be unprepared, as opposed to prepared.

Regarding the six QSEN competency domains (patient-centred care, teamwork and collaboration, quality improvement, evidence-based practice, safety and informatics), as Figure 2 suggests, quality improvement (67.1%) and informatics (42.6%) received the lowest rating in relation to perceived preparedness. Respondents also scored these two QSEN competency domains highly in the field of “neither unprepared nor prepared” at 23% and 35% respectively, indicating they were unsure of their preparedness in these areas. Across the entire suite of QSEN competency areas, greater than 50% of respondents’ outlined their perception was that they had not received any CPD in these areas in the previous two years.

Figure 2 QSEN competency domains

Preparedness and field of work

Nurses and midwives in AHC settings identified higher levels of perceived preparedness in the quality improvement and safety methods and tools of PDSA and key performance indicators/metrics whereas respondents' from CHO settings indicated higher levels of perceived preparedness in the QSEN competency domain of person-centred care (Table 2).

Table 2 χ^2 tests for preparedness variables

Preparedness Variables	Title	Pearson's chi-squared value	df	p – value
Field of work				
Quality & Safety Methods & Tools	PDSA	15.980	4	.003
	Key performance indicators / metrics	22.427	4	.000
QSEN	Patient/person-centred care	17.421	1	.000
Years in Practice				
Quality and Safety Methods and Tools	PDSA	21.064	8	.007
	Root Cause Analysis	18.241	8	.019
	KPIs / Metrics	21.524	8	.006

QSEN	Quality improvement	27.737	8	.001
	Informatics	18.946	8	.015
Grade				
Quality and Safety Methods and Tools	PDSA	27.783	8	.001
	Root Cause Analysis	28.493	8	.000
	KPIs / Metrics	54.715	8	.000
QSEN	Person-centred care	21.968	8	.005
	Teamwork and collaboration	19.460	8	.013
	Evidence-based practice	18.280	8	.019
	Quality improvement	19.155	8	.014

Preparedness and years of practice

Cross-tabulation of preparedness and years in practice demonstrated statistical significance in a range of quality and safety methods and tools and in the QSEN competency domains, as shown in Table 2. Prior to analysis of the research data, it was anticipated that as nurses' and midwives' years of practice experience increased, their preparedness capability would also increase. This form of upward trend was noted in relation to PDSA, Root Cause Analysis and Key Performance Indicators/Metrics. For the QSEN competency-related variables of Quality Improvement and Informatics, the pattern of response revealed a decreasing level of preparedness from 20+ years which would suggest nurses' and midwives with greater years of practice experience were less confident in these areas.

Preparedness and grade

Cross-tabulation of quality and safety CPD preparedness and grade identified frontline staff nurses and midwives as the professional grade whose perception of preparedness capability was lower than both their mid-level and senior-level colleagues. This finding was noted in both AHC and CHO settings. This indicates that the largest proportion of the workforce, frontline staff nurses and midwives in both fields of work perceive they have a lower level of CPD preparedness in the quality and safety methods and tools of PDSA, root-cause analysis and KPIs/metrics, and in the competency-based QSEN domains of person-centred care, teamwork and collaboration, evidence-based practice and quality improvement.

Participation in quality and safety

Participation in quality and safety practice was measured from the perspective of respondent's perceived involvement in quality and safety within their organisational work area, and their access to data on errors, near misses and adverse events, and to data on healthcare associated infections specific to their practice area.

Two thirds of the total sample (n=409) indicated they were not currently involved in any quality improvement or safety initiative. In relation to access to data to enable them to participate in safety improvement within their clinical practice areas, 51% indicated they had never received information on errors, near misses or adverse events; and 42 % indicated they had never received information on healthcare associated infections. Respondents were also asked regarding their awareness of a reporting system for errors, near misses and adverse events and 42% confirmed they were unaware or did not know if such a reporting system existed.

Cross tabulation of participation, grade and field of work revealed front-line staff nurses and midwives in both AHCs and CHOs as the professional grade whose perception of their participation in quality and safety was lower than their mid and senior level colleagues.

DISCUSSION

The empirical evidence presented in this study is based on the perceptions of the respondents (n=654) who were practising nurses and midwives, mainly of a middle age group, highly trained academically, and employed in public sector HSE acute hospitals and CHOs across Ireland.

The findings provide original information on a subject never previously examined in an Irish context. The evidence from the study sheds light on a nursing and midwifery workforce, particularly front-line staff nurses and midwives with perceived preparedness gaps in their quality and safety knowledge, skills and competence; and also in their participation in this field within their clinical practice environments. The evidence indicated CPD educational preparedness gaps in the methods and tools to undertake quality and safety improvement, gaps in their CPD-based preparedness in the QSEN competency areas of quality improvement and informatics, and gaps in their participation in quality and safety aligned to access to data, and their active involvement in this field within clinical practice locations.

In the examination of preparedness, the results are consistent with other studies that suggested healthcare professionals have a knowledge gap relating to quality and safety.^{8, 10-12, 14, 16, 45-46, 48, 53-54} The literature suggests that few clinicians in healthcare have a mastery of the theory and practice of improvement science, and few can recognise or utilise process control charts or Plan/Do/Study/Act (PDSA) cycles as systematic tools for the continuous improvement of patient care.^{44, 47}

Competence-related quality and safety variables were explored in this study using the QSEN framework. Evidence of the success and widespread dissemination of quality and safety competency frameworks is limited.³⁹ However within the United States it would appear QSEN has made some traction to become embedded in undergraduate and post-graduate education.^{31, 49} The findings here reveal that nursing and midwifery in Ireland has much work to do to develop knowledge in the QSEN domains, as the perception of more than 50% of respondents indicated they had not received any CPD education in any of these domains in the previous 2 years.

Moving to the examination of perceptions of participation, this study revealed a significant proportion of respondents who reported they were not currently engaged in quality and safety initiatives, nor were they provided by their organisation with the appropriate information or data to enable them to lead and participate in quality and safety practice improvement. These findings highlight an implementation gap between quality and safety policy and the reality of frontline clinical practice. Recently in Ireland, the HSE commenced a national initiative to make quality and safety data more accessible to nurses and midwives, entitled Quality Care-Metrics.⁵⁰ However, as well as requiring access to data, nurses and midwives need the ability to understand and interpret the data. This can only be achieved through effective leadership and governance, education, time and resources.⁵¹

In addition, the finding that two thirds of the total sample perceive themselves as not currently involved in any quality improvement or safety initiative raises questions with regard to their interpretation of quality and safety and whether they perceive it as separate to their role. The Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics for Registered Nurses and Midwives, outlines Quality of Practice as one of the key principles for conduct.⁴⁴ From a corporate HSE perspective therefore, consideration should be given to how

a critical mass of nursing and midwifery safety improvers can be established at the sharp end of clinical practice, in those whose roles are with patients twenty-four seven, and who are well positioned to influence change for safer patient care.

CONCLUSIONS

Although this study has generated important findings regarding the quality and safety preparedness and participation perceptions of nurses and midwives in Ireland, there were some limitations. Firstly, this study only focused on what nurses and midwives described as their perceptions of preparedness for, and participation in, quality and safety practice. Future research should consider an ethnographic study to observe participation in quality and safety practice, and a more in-depth analysis to explore quality and safety preparedness from the perspective of educational providers at undergraduate, postgraduate and CPD levels. The second limitation relates to nurses and midwives that were not included in this study due to access challenges, those employed in voluntary sector healthcare organisations. Future research should explore their perceptions of quality and safety preparedness and participation to examine the degree of similarity or variance from these findings.

The findings from this study are of significant value, and provide important baseline evidence never previously available in an Irish context. For those responsible for the development of healthcare quality and safety at both policy and regulatory level, a review from the perspective of effectiveness should be considered. The findings suggest the translation of knowledge has not taken place in many parts and the causes for this should be identified and rectified. For healthcare organisations and managers, it is crucial to reconsider the conditions under which quality and safety knowledge, skills and competence of nurses and midwives can be enhanced and distilled. Finally, for educationalists, the findings provide rich evidence of the work yet to be done to find new and innovative educational solutions that will support the HSE to build a critical mass of nursing and midwifery quality and safety improvers at the front-line of practice.

REFERENCES

1. Health Information and Quality Authority. Investigation into the safety, quality and standards of services provided to patients, including pregnant women, at risk of clinical deterioration including those provided by University Hospital Galway and as reflected in the care and treatment of Savita Halappanavar. Dublin: HIQA, 2013.
2. Health Information and Quality Authority. Report of the investigation into the safety, quality and standard of services provided by the Health Service Executive to patients in the Midland Regional Hospital, Portlaoise. Dublin: HIQA, 2015.
3. Health Service Executive. Report on progress in implementing recommendations arising from the report of the HIQA investigation into the quality and safety of services and supporting arrangements provided by the Health Service Executive at the Mid-Western Regional Hospital, Ennis. Dublin: HSE, 2010. <http://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/hospitals/hiqaprogressreports2010.pdf> / (accessed 10 Jan 2016).
4. Health Service Executive. Report on progress in implementing recommendations arising from the report of the HIQA investigation into the provision of services to Ms A by the Health Service Executive at University Hospital Galway in relation to her symptomatic breast disease, and provision of pathology and symptomatic breast disease services by the Executive at the hospital. Dublin: HSE, 2010. <http://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/hospitals/hiqaprogressreports2010.pdf> / (accessed 10 Jan 2016).
5. Health Service Executive. Report on progress in implementing recommendations arising from the report of the HIQA investigation into the circumstances surrounding the provision of care to Rebecca O'Malley, in relation to her symptomatic breast disease, the pathology services at Cork University Hospital and symptomatic breast disease services at the Mid-Western Regional Hospital, Limerick. Dublin: HSE, 2010. <http://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/hospitals/hiqaprogressreports2010.pdf> / (accessed 10 Jan 2016).
6. Health Service Executive. Investigation of Incident 50278 from time of patient's self-referral to hospital on 21st of October 2012 to the patient's death on 28th October, 2012: Final report. Dublin: HSE, 2013.
7. Health Service Executive. What matters most? Report of the Aras Attracta Swinford Review Group. Dublin, HSE, 2016.
8. Boaden R, Harvey G, Moxham C, et al. Quality improvement: Theory and practice in healthcare. NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement. <http://www.trove.nla.gov.au/version/35323555> (accessed 10 Jan 2016), 2008.
9. Health Foundation. Evidence scan: Quality improvement training for healthcare professionals. London: The Health Foundation, 2012.
10. deSilva D. What's getting in the way? Barriers to improvement in the NHS. London: The Health Foundation, 2015.
11. Ranjbar H, Emami Zeydi A. Patient safety: An important yet neglected issue in nursing education. *Journal of Patient Safety*. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26241616> (accessed 10 Jan 2015), 2016.
12. Vincent C, Amalberti R. *Safer Healthcare: Strategies for the Real World*. London: Springer Open, 2016.
13. Lukewich J, Edge DS, Tranmer J, Raymond J, Miron J, Ginsburg L, VanDenKerkhof E. Undergraduate baccalaureate nursing students' self-reported

- confidence in learning about patient safety in the classroom and clinical settings: an annual cross-sectional study (2010-2013). *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 2015, 52(5):930-8.
14. Usher K, Woods C, Parmenter G, Hutchinson M, Mannix J, Power T, Chaboyer W, Latimer S, Mills J, Sieglhoff L, Jackson D. Self-reported confidence in patient safety knowledge among Australian undergraduate nursing students: A multi-site cross-sectional survey study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 2015, 71:89-96.
 15. VanDenKerkhof E, Sears N, Edge DS, Tregunno D, Ginsburg L. Patient safety in practical nurses' education: A cross-sectional survey of newly registered practical nurses in Canada. *Nurse Education Today*, 2017; 51: 48-56.
 16. Devitt N, Murphy J. Murphy A survey of the information management and technology training needs of doctors in an acute NHS trust in the United Kingdom. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 2004; 21(3):164-172.
 17. Neale G, Vincent C, Darzi A. The problems of engaging hospital doctors in promoting safety and quality in clinical care. *Journal of the Royal Society for the Promotion of Health*, 2007; 127(2): 87-94.
 18. Ham C. *Learning from the best: What the NHS needs to do to implement high quality care for all*. NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement. <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/publicatons> (Accessed 10 Jan 2015), 2009
 19. Ham C, Berwick D, Dixon J. Improving quality in the English NHS: A strategy for action. London: King's Fund, 2016.
 20. Steven A, Magnusson C, Smith P, et al. Patient safety in nursing education: Contexts, tensions and feeling safe to learn. *Nurse Education Today*, 2013; 34: 277-284.
 21. Tregunno D, Ginsburg L, Clarke B, et al. Integrating patient safety into health professionals' curricula: A qualitative study of medical, nursing and pharmacy faculty perspectives. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 2014; 23: 257-264.
 22. Behan J, Condon C, Milicevic I, Shally C, et al. A Quantitative Tool for Workforce Planning in Healthcare: Example Simulations. *Report by the Skills and Labour Market Research Unit, FAS on behalf of the Expert Group on Future Skills Needs*. Dublin: FAS, 2009.
 23. Campbell H. Report of the Independent Review of Symptomatic Breast Care Services at Barrington Hospital, Limerick: September 2003-August 2007. Department of Health and Children: Dublin. 2008. http://www.dohc.ie/publications/pdf/breast_care_servoces-barringtons.pdf (accessed 10 January 2015).
 24. Department of Health and Children. Building a Culture of Patient Safety: Report of the Commission on Patient Safety and Quality Assurance. Dublin: The Stationary Office, 2008.
 25. Health Information and Quality Authority. Report of the investigation into the quality, safety and governance of the care provided by the Adelaide and Meath Hospital, Dublin, incorporating the National Children's Hospital (AMNCH) for patients who require acute admission. Dublin: HIQA, 2012.
 26. Aiken LH, Cimotti J, Sloane D, et al. The effects of nurse staffing and nurse education on patient deaths in hospitals with different work environments. *Medical Care*, 2011; 49: 1047-1053.
 27. Aiken LH, Sermeus W, Van den Heede K, et al (2012) Patient safety, satisfaction, and quality of hospital care: Cross sectional surveys of nurses and patients in 12 countries in Europe and the United States. *BMJ*, 2012; 344: e1717.

28. Aiken LH, Sloane D, Bruyneel L, et al. Nurse staffing and education and hospital mortality in nine European countries: A retrospective observational study. *The Lancet*, 2014; 383(9931): 1824-1830.
29. Aiken LH, Sloane D, Griffiths P, et al. Nursing skill mix in European-hospitals: cross sectional study of the association with mortality, patient ratings, and quality of care. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. *BMJ Qual Saf*, 2017; 26: 559–568.
30. Scott PA, Kirwin M, Matthews A, et al. Report of the Irish RN4CAST Study 2009–2011: A nursing workforce under strain. <https://www.dcu.ie/sites/default/files/snhs/pdfs/RN4CAST%20FINAL%20report%2018%20April%202013.pdf> (accessed 10 January 2015), 2013.
31. Sherwood G, Barnsteiner J. Quality and Safety in Nursing: A Competency Approach to Improving Outcomes. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell. www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-EHEP002777.html (accessed 10 January 2015), 2012.
32. Dixon-Woods M, Martin G, Tarrant C, et al. Safer Clinical Systems: Evaluation Findings. London: Health Foundation, 2014.
33. Illingworth J. Continuous improvement for patient safety: The case for change in the NHS. London: The Health Foundation, 2015.
34. Batalden P, Davidoff F. What s “quality improvement” and how can it transform healthcare? *BMJ Quality & Safety*, <https://www.qualityandsafety.bmj.com/content/16/1/2.extract> (accessed 10 January 2016), 2007.
35. Walshe K. Pseudo innovation: The development and spread of healthcare quality improvement methodologies, *International Journal of Quality Healthcare*, 2009; 21(3): 153-159.
36. Taylor MJ, McNicholas C, Nicolay C, Darzi A, Bell D, Reed JE. Systematic review of the application of the Plan-Do-Study-Act method to improve quality in healthcare. *BMJ Quality and Safety*, 2013; 23(4): 290-298.
37. Staines A, Thor, J, Robert G. Sustaining improvement? The 20-year Jonkoping quality improvement programme revisited. *Quality Management in Healthcare*, 2015; 24(1): 21-37.
38. Kovner C, Brewer C, Yingrengreung S, et al. New nurses’ views of quality improvement education. *Joint Commission Journal of Quality and Patient Safety*, 2010; 36(1): 29-35.
39. Tella S. Learning about patient safety in pre-registration nursing education: Comparing Finnish and British nursing students’ evaluations. University of Eastern Finland Dissertation in Health Sciences Number 303. https://www.epublications.uef.fi/pub/urn_isbn_97 (accessed 10 January 2015), 2014.
40. Kirwan M, Matthews A, Scott PA. The impact of the work environment of nurses on patient safety outcomes: A multi-level modelling approach. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 2013; 50: 253-263.
41. Dong Y, Peng C. Principled missing data methods for researchers. SpringerPlus, 2013; 2(222): 1-17.
42. Benton DC. Keeping pace with an ever-changing world: A policy imperative. *Journal of Nursing Regulation*, 2015; 6(1): 20-24.
43. Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland. Code of professional conduct and ethics for registered nurses and registered midwives. Dublin: NMBI, 2014.
44. Berwick D. Era 3 for medicine and healthcare. *JAMA*, 2016; 315(13): 1329-1330.

45. Mansour M, Current assessment of patient safety education. *British Journal of Nursing*, 2012; 21(9): 536-543.
46. Tregunna D, Ginsburg L, Clarke B, Norten P. Integrating patient safety into healthcare professionals' curricula. A quantitative study of medical, nursing and pharmacy faculty perspectives. *BMJ Quality & Safety*; 23: 257-264.
47. Scoville R, Little K, Rakover J, et al. Sustaining Improvement: IHI White Paper, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Healthcare Improvement, 2016.
48. Hussey P, Kennedy MA. Instantiating informatics in nursing practice for integrated patient centred holistic models of care: A discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 2016; 72(5): 1030-41.
49. Lyle-Edrosolo G, Waxman KT. Aligning healthcare safety and quality competencies: Quality and Safety Education for Nurses (QSEN), The Joint Commission, and the American Nurse Credentialing Centre (ANCC) Magnet standards crosswalk. *Nurse Leader*, 2016; 14(1): 70-75.
50. Gallen A. Quality care in nursing and midwifery. *World of Irish Nursing & Midwifery: INMO*, 2015; 23(9): 61-62.
51. Needleman J. Nurse staffing: The knowns and unknowns. *Nursing Economics*, 2015; 33(1): 5-7.
52. Rycroft-Malone J, Harvey G, Seers K, et al. An exploration of the factors that influence the implementation of evidence into practice. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 2004; 13: 913-924.
53. Wong B, Etchells E, Kuper A, et al. Teaching quality improvement and patient safety to trainees: A systematic review. *Academic Medicine*, 2010; 85(9):1425-1439.
54. Wilkinson J, Powell A, Davies H. *Are clinicians engaged in quality improvement?* London: Health Foundation, 2011.