






Clinical Question: Among adult patients admitted in the acute care setting, what are the models and strategies used to have a successful nurse-patient engagement compared to current practice for better care experience and outcomes?

The aim of this evidence review was to identify any models and strategies used by healthcare organizations that drive successful nurse patient engagement for better patient care experience and outcomes. To answer the clinical question, PubMed, CINAHL, Clinical Key Nursing, Cochrane Library, One Search, and Google Scholar databases were searched, in addition to having a Librarian independently searched for articles. Our search initially identified a respectable number of articles and reviewed 26 articles. Published experimental studies, systematic/scoping/literature reviews and quality improvement projects were included. In general, we found a total of 8 articles that met the inclusion criteria and could be used as evidence to promote nurse patient engagement. The evidence yielded **3** different categories including *models* (2), *tools* (5), and *strategies* (4) related to the clinical question. The evidence included in this review consisted of 2 experimental studies, 4 scoping/systematic reviews, 1 literature review, and 1 QI project. Two scoping/systematic reviews identified two *models* (Interactive Care Model and PC4 model) that support patient centered care and patient engagement. Both models present different potential actions and care practices that can be adapted to promote patient engagement and achieve a patient centered care. Different *validated tools* were examined in a scoping review and an experimental study that assessed various concepts and dimensions of patient engagement from both the patient and healthcare perspectives and three of these tools *involved patients in the development and validation of the tools*. Two of the evidence for *strategies* identified were focused on improving HCAPHS survey scores: use of standardized communication model and daily executive rounding. Both strategies implementation showed statistically significant improvement in the HCAPHS survey scores. Two other evidence for *strategies* emphasized patient involvement in care to promote patient engagement such as during bedside handover. AHRQ and ANA professional organizations feature some patient engagement related articles that are broad and nothing specific to its structures, processes, and outcomes. Other sources such as the Beryl Institute, Huron, Press Ganey, Quint Studer, and NRC groups did not provide any relevant evidence that specifically meets the criteria.

Models	Reference/ Article
<p>Promoting patient engagement: a scoping review of actions that align with the Interactive Care Model</p> <p>Tobiano et al did a scoping review to examine actions in the published scientific literature that align with the Interactive Care Model, in the context of nursing care of hospitalized patients. Forty-three studies were included in the review, 33 noninterventional and 10 interventional studies. Publications on the topic are increasing in number over time, with most conducted in Europe with patient or nurse participants. <i>Forty-two actions were found in the literature that aligned with the 'Interactive Care Model'.</i> The actions uncovered differed between intervention and noninterventional studies; in interventional</p>	<p>Tobiano, G., Jerofke-Owen, T., & Marshall, A. P. (2021). Promoting patient engagement: a scoping review of actions that align with the interactive care model. <i>Scandinavian journal of caring sciences</i>, 35(3), 722–741. https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12914</p> <p></p> <p>Tobiano, et al 2020_Marshall_Prom</p>

<p>studies actions were formalized. This review provides an <i>overview of actions that promote patient engagement</i> and could inform <i>implementation of the Interactive Care Model</i> and the design and testing of patient engagement interventions to support the model.</p> <p>A literature-based study of patient-centered care and communication in nurse-patient interactions: barriers, facilitators, and the way forward</p> <p>This systematic review by Kwame et al led to the formulation of the PC4 model of patient communication continuum. The authors proposed a person-centered care and communication continuum (PC4) as a guiding model to understand patient-centered communication, its pathways, and what communication and care practices healthcare professionals must implement to achieve person-centered care. They recommended further research to explore and evaluate the PC4 model.</p>	<p>Kwame, A., Petrucka, P.M. A literature-based study of patient-centered care and communication in nurse-patient interactions: barriers, facilitators, and the way forward. <i>BMC Nurs</i> 20, 158 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-021-00684-2</p>  <p>Kwame_Petrucka 2021_A literature basi</p>
Tools	Supporting Article and Reference
<p>Patient engagement in care: A scoping review of recently validated tools assessing patients' and healthcare professionals' preferences and experience</p> <p>Clavel et al did a <i>scoping review of 16 articles</i> on recently validated tools assessing various concepts and dimensions of patient engagement in care from both the patients and the healthcare professionals' perspectives and four stand out because they measure three major concepts of <i>patient engagement</i> in care (patient centeredness, empowerment, and shared decision making). Three of them and the most recently developed, have involved patients in their tool development and validation. Tool reliability range from moderate to excellent. The four scales that evaluate the three main concepts of patient engagement in care are: <i>Generic Person-Centered Care Questionnaire, Five</i></p>	<p>Clavel et al (2021). Patient engagement in care: A scoping review of recently validated tools assessing patients' healthcare professionals' preferences and experience. <i>Health Expectations</i>: 24, pp. 1924-1935 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/hex.13344</p>  <p>Clavel et al 2021_Patient engager</p>

<p><i>Dimension Patient-Centered Innovation Questionnaire, Patient Engagement in Healthcare Questionnaire, and the WeCares survey.</i></p> <p>Mixed Methods Study of Nurse Assessment of Patient Preferences for Engagement During Hospitalization</p> <p>This is a mixed methods study by Jerofke et al which answers the PICO question; pre and post implementation quasi experimental, non-blinded study with a focus group to evaluate of implementation of the Patient Preferences for Engagement Tool-13 item short form (PPET13) during hospitalization on <i>patient and nurse experience on engagement</i>. Results showed there was a significant improvement in Patient Experience Engagement Survey (PEES) scores during the implementation phase. The PEES score was a significant predictor of ED visits, but not 3-day readmissions. Nurses were not always certain how to best integrate patient preferences for engagement into their care delivery and suggested integrating the PPET13 into the EHR to assist with streamlining the assessment and communicating preferences across the care team. This study demonstrated the result of implementing the structured assessment of patient preferences for engagement, but not the intervening mechanism (processes) that contributed to the outcomes.</p>	<p>Jerofke-Owen, Teresa A., Zielinski, Alexandria, & Brown, Roger L. (2021). Mixed Methods Study of Nurse Assessment of Patient Preferences for Engagement During Hospitalization. <i>Nursing Research</i> 70(5):p 366-375 DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/NNR.0000000000000526</p>  <p>Jerofke et al 2021 _Mixed Methods Stud</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Strategies</p> <p>Engaging patients to improve quality of care: a systematic review</p> <p>This is a systematic review conducted by Bombard et al to identify the strategies and contextual factors that enable optimal engagement of patients in the design, delivery, and evaluation of health services. The systematic review outcome supported the practice of <i>patient engagement</i> can inform patient and provider education and policies, as well as enhance service delivery and governance. The authors recommended that</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reference/Article</p> <p>Bombard, Y., Baker, G. R., Orlando, E., Fancott, C., Bhatia, P., Casalino, S., Onate, K., Denis, J. L., & Pomey, M. P. (2018). Engaging patients to improve quality of care: a systematic review. <i>Implementation science : IS</i>, 13(1), 98. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-018-0784-z</p>  <p>Bombard et al, 2019_Engaging patie</p>

further evidence is needed to understand patients' experiences of the engagement process and whether these outcomes translate into improved quality of care.

STRATEGIES for Patient Engagement were thematically grouped as techniques to enhance (1) design, (2) recruitment, (3) involvement, (4) creating a receptive context, and (5) leadership actions.

Evidence-Based Communication Strategies to Improve Patient Satisfaction: A Quality Improvement Project

Antonio et al did a QI project with pre-and post -intervention design to identify the effect of a *standardized communication model* on patient satisfaction scores on HCAHPS survey. *Statistically significant improvement in HCAHPS* occurred in the communication with nurses' domain top box scores ($t [1.89] = p = .02$) and rate the hospital 0-10 ($t [2.86] = p = .002$). Postintervention patient satisfaction survey qualitative data reflected an increase in positive patient comments from 40.9% to 60.7%. The strongest driver of the hospital rating was within the *domain of communication with nurses*, which included the following elements: *nurses listen carefully to you, nurses treat with courtesy and respect, nurses explain in a way you understand, and friendliness and courtesy of the nurses*.

The Impact of Daily Executive Rounding on Patient Satisfaction Scores

This was a prospective, 2-group comparative design study to identify the effect of daily interdisciplinary executive rounding on Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS) ratings. Results showed that patients *mean HCAHPS scores were higher in 8 items compared to those who did not receive rounding*. Members of the executive team, administrative and clinical leaders used an electronic web-based software application to

D'Antonio, I., Stephens, K., Swanson-Bierman, B., Whiteman, K. (2022). Evidence-based communication strategies to improve patient satisfaction: A quality improvement project. *Nurse Leader*, 20(6), 560-564.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mnl.2022.08.004>



D'Antonio et al (2022)
Evidence-Based Comr


Kline, M., & McNett, M. (2019). The impact of daily executive rounding on patient satisfaction scores. *Nurse Leader*, 17(5), 440-444.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mnl.2018.12.018>



Kline and McNett
(2019) Impact Daily E:

DeCelle, I. (2020). Patient participation strategies: The nursing bedside handover. *Patient Experience Journal*, 7,(3), pp. 119-127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.35680/2372-0247.1426>

<p>perform daily executive rounds on all new admissions. <i>Engagement of executives in rounding models the importance of this intervention and may hardwire hourly rounding by clinic staff.</i></p> <p>Patient participation strategies: The nursing bedside handover</p> <p>This was a literature review of 8 studies by De Celie to discuss the historical and theoretical background surrounding the concept of patient participation in healthcare and specifically to examine patient participation strategies which have been reported to be on influence when employed during the <i>nurse to nurse</i> and <i>patient to nurse activities encompassed in the bedside handover</i>. 4 themes were identified: 1) acknowledging patients, 2) amending inaccuracies, 3) passive engagement, and 4) handover as interaction. Qualitative studies revealed that by Kerr et al., Lupieri et al. and Bruton et al. patients preferred being involved, informed, and having opportunity to clarify inaccurate information during nursing bedside handover. Patient perceived that others needed to be directly encouraged to participate by the nursing staff. <i>Patients achieved a sense of satisfaction when invited to interact and ask questions during bedside handover.</i></p>	 <p>DeCelie 2020 Patient participation strategies</p>
Professional Organizations	Link/Reference
<p>AHRQ website highlights a <i>Guide to Patient and Family Engagement in Hospital Quality and Safety</i> (2013): Best Practices intended for Hospital Leaders that align with hospitals mission and vision statements to support patient and family engagement.</p> <p>ANA website features an article on <i>Engagement Tip: Connecting the Dots on Engagement</i> (2014) which enumerates the unique role of the professional nurse in advocating for the concerns, hopes, and</p>	<p>Guide to Patient and Family Engagement in Hospital Quality and Safety Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (ahrq.gov)</p> <p>Connecting the Dots on Engagement ANA Enterprise (nursingworld.org)</p>

<p>dreams of our patients using different strategies.</p> <p>ANA website has a specific section that talks about Nurse staffing and how appropriate nurse staffing contributes to improved patient outcomes and better satisfaction for both patients and nurses.</p> <p>ANF introduces Cobots (collaborative robots) and created a Robotics Logic Model to drive nursing outcomes. The model highlights the different strategies, expected outcome measures within 3-10 years of deploying Cobots.</p>	<p>Safe Nurse Staffing and Patient Outcomes ANA (nursingworld.org)</p> <p>Driving Nursing Outcomes through Robotics Logic Model ANA (nursingworld.org)</p>
Other Sources	Link/Reference
<p>Beryl Institute features an article “An evidence-based tool (PE for PS) for healthcare managers to assess patient engagement for patient safety in healthcare organizations (2021). Aho-Gele et al did a 3-phase study to develop a tool for managers to assess patient engagement strategies to enhance patient safety. across healthcare systems in Canda and France. This is the first tool that assesses patient engagement in patient safety at the organizational and system level. However, the tool is only available currently in French language.</p> <p>HURON features different Studer Group webinars related to patient engagement. Some of the webinars are free but the majority are exclusive to their partners only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement is about what happens when nobody’s watching (2017). This article summarizes the highlights from The Engagement Conference in 2017 with an Engagement Model and practical tactics to engage every stakeholder at every level: patients, clinicians, leaders, and employees. Commitment to Excellence: Driving Patient Satisfaction Through 	<p>Engagement is About What Happens When Nobody’s Watching Huron (huronlearninglab.com)</p> <p>Healthcare Improvement Webinars Huron (huronlearninglab.com)</p>

<p>Employee Satisfaction & Engagement by Mike Schafer (CEO) of Spooner Health System.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why Patient Engagement Matters (2016). This article discusses the importance and benefits of patient engagement and <i>how to create a patient engagement-friendly environment</i>. <p>National Research Corporation (NRC) features a topic entitled “Let Patients Help: ePatient Dave shares the missing components to extraordinary patient engagement” which advertises Dave deBrokart upcoming presentation at the NRC Health’s 28th Annual Symposium in August 2024 where he will talk about “The Patient as an Active Partner.” No other related articles were found.</p> <p>Press Ganey has no related articles but rather, offers patient experience management tools that require subscription.</p> <p>Quint Studer website has an article that talks about employee engagement, but nothing related to nurse patient engagement.</p>	<p>Why Patient Engagement Matters Huron (huronlearninglab.com)</p> <p>Let Patients Help: ePatient Dave shares the missing components to extraordinary patient engagement - NRC Health</p>
--	---

Evidence Search Strategies: An evidence review on the selected clinical question was executed on February 22 to March 5, 2024. The objective of the search was to examine any evidence for models and strategies to have a successful nurse patient engagement for better patient care experience and outcomes. Search terms were broad which included: models OR strategies AND (“nurse patient engagement” [MeSH] OR “care experience” OR “patient satisfaction” OR “satisfaction score”, [MeSH] AND ((y-2019-2024[Filter]) AND (humans[Filter]) AND (English[Filter])))” OR “care experience models AND nurse patient engagement AND satisfaction”, OR “inpatient care experience models AND nurse patient engagement AND satisfaction”, OR “inpatient care experience strategies AND nurse patient engagement and satisfaction” and included electronic databases included PubMed, Clinical Nursing Key, OneSearch, CINAHL, Cochrane Libraries, and Google Scholar. Searches were individualized for each database. Additionally, articles from professional organizations such as ANA and AHRQ were included in the search. Specific healthcare service organizations such as Huron, Beryl Institute, Press Ganey, Quint Studer, and NRC were also searched. After evaluation for inclusion criteria, and relevance to the question, 8 articles were identified that answer the clinical question and could be utilized as evidence.

Searchable Question
Key Search Terms: models, strategies, nurse-patient engagement, care experience, patient satisfaction,
Inclusion Criteria: Adult patients in the hospital setting
Exclusion Criteria: Pediatrics, Psych, Ambulatory, home care, community
Limitors (Open year or year ranges, age ranges, and language, etc.): 5 Years, English only studies, US studies/setting only, inpatient
Databases: PubMed , CINAHL, Clinical Nursing Key, OneSearch, Cochrane Library, Google Scholar
Professional Organizations: AHRQ, ANA
Other sources: Huron, Beryl Institute, Press Ganey, Quint Studer, National Research Corporation

Respectfully submitted,

Veronica Timple, PhD, RN, CCRN-K
Regional Nurse Scientist

Lina Najib Kavar, PhD, RNRM, RN, CNS
Regional Director, SCAL/HI Nursing Research/EBP Program

Emma Aquino-Maneja, DNP, M.Ed, RN, CCRN
Clinical Consultant V, Patient Care Services

Mayu Yamamoto, DNP, RN
Senior Consultant

Kristyn M. Gonnerman, MLS
Supervisor, Library Services for San Gabriel and Orange County

Quincyann Tsai, MSN, RN
Regional Nursing Research and EBP Practice Specialist

LEGAL NOTICE

*This summary document (referred to generally as an “Evidence Review”) was created and is presented by Kaiser Foundation Hospitals Nursing Research, on behalf of the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program. **The following notices and provisions apply to all use of this Evidence Review for any purpose.***

Purpose/intended Audience

Because we want everyone in our communities to have the healthiest lives possible, we are making our Evidence Reviews available to the communities we serve to help Californians and others lead healthier lives. Evidence Reviews (also called “integrative reviews” and “evidence summaries”) may include any and all of the following methodologies: integrative, scoping, systematic, rapid and literature reviews.

Evidence Reviews are provided as a community service for reference purposes only and are presented for use solely as specified in this disclaimer. The information presented is intended and designed for review by trained clinicians with experience in assessing and managing healthcare conditions. The information contained in the evidence reviews is not intended to constitute the practice of medicine or nursing, including telemedicine or advice nursing.

Limitations On Use

These documents have been developed to assist clinicians by providing an analytical framework for the effective evaluation and treatment of selected common problems encountered in patients. These documents are not intended to establish a protocol for all patients with a particular condition. While Evidence Reviews provide one approach to evaluating a problem, clinical conditions may vary significantly from individual to individual. Therefore, clinicians must exercise independent professional judgment and make decisions based upon the situation presented.

Kaiser Permanente's documents were created using an evidence-based process; however, the strength of the evidence supporting these documents differs. Because there may be differing yet reasonable interpretations of the same evidence, it is likely that more than one viewpoint on any given healthcare condition exists. Many reviews will include a range of recommendations consistent with the existing state of the evidence.

All of the Evidence Reviews were developed from published research and non-research evidence and do not necessarily represent the views of all clinicians who practice on behalf of the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program. These Evidence Reviews also may include recommendations that could differ from certain federal or state health care regulations or recommendation.

Intellectual Property Rights

Unless stated otherwise, the Evidence Reviews are protected by copyright and should not be reproduced or altered without express written permission from Kaiser Foundation Hospitals Nursing Research. Permission is granted to view and use these documents on single personal computers for private use within your hospital or hospital system. No portion of these materials in any form may be distributed, licensed, sold or otherwise transferred to others.

Kaiser Foundation Hospitals retains all worldwide rights, title and interest in and to the documents provided (including, but not limited to, ownership of all copyrights and other intellectual property rights therein), as well as all rights, title and interest in and to its trademarks, service marks and trade names worldwide associated with any entity of the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program, including any goodwill associated therewith.

No Endorsement or Promotional Use

Any reference in these documents to a specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, or manufacturer, does not constitute or imply an endorsement or recommendation by Kaiser Foundation Hospitals or any other entity of the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program. The views and opinions expressed in these documents may not be used for any advertising, promotional, or product endorsement purposes.

Disclaimer of All Warranties and Liabilities

Finally, specific recommendations presented in Evidence Reviews derive from combining the best available evidence. Although Kaiser Foundation Hospitals has sought to ensure that its Evidence Reviews accurately and fully reflect its view of the appropriate combination of evidence at the time of initial publication, Kaiser Foundation Hospitals cannot anticipate changes and take no responsibility or assume any legal liability for the continued currency of the information or for the manner in which any person who references them may apply them to any particular patient. Neither Kaiser Foundation Hospitals nor any entity of the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program, assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the completeness, clinical efficacy or value of any apparatus, product, or process described or referenced in the documents. The entities of the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program make no warranties regarding errors or omissions and assume no responsibility or liability for loss or damage resulting from the use of these documents.