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Introduction

• Purpose: to create and pilot-test a tool to assess the effectiveness of quality improvement (QI) team meetings.
• Addresses an important research gap
Purpose of Tool

MOAT can be used to track

- Frequency and efficacy of skills/tools taught by facilitating change, meeting facilitation training and RPI© quality improvement training
- Basic teamwork behaviors
- Patient/family engagement and contributions to QI teams
Methods

• Created with inspiration from several sources
  • Training curriculums
  • Internal QI project “tollgate”
  • Team Science and Patient Safety experts
• Measured items using Likert scales, yes/no, observational comments
• Piloted usability via other QI teams
• Modified to improve questions and answer choices
Methods

• Observer attended QI team meetings with MOAT data collection form

• Informal interrater reliability conducted with new observers to achieve 80% concurrence

• Observed 80 meetings with 3 QI teams since April 2017
Meeting Facilitation

**Example Content**

1. Meeting started on time
2. Meeting ended on time
3. Agenda made
4. Minutes taken/distributed
5. Clear leader of meeting and/or facilitator of the meeting
6. Action items from previous meeting completed
# Teamwork Behaviors and QI Curriculum

## Example Content

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Team members speaking up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Participation in decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Tasks volunteered for and/or delegated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Colleague cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>List of tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Proficiency of tool use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Mentor coaching of tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Team member cooperation with mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parent representative presence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parent representative contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parent opinions sought by team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consideration of parent views/perceptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Support from unit leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reviewer reflections – high level impressions, notes about context, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Preliminary Results

MOAT Findings

- Agenda Made/Discussed?
  - Team 1: 17%
  - Team 2: 17%
  - Team 3: 20%

- All/some action items from last meeting completed
  - Team 1: 71%
  - Team 2: 47%
  - Team 3: 46%

- Team always handles input from colleagues well
  - Team 1: 69%
  - Team 2: 63%
  - Team 3: 93%

- Parent representative present
  - Team 1: 25%
  - Team 2: 10%
  - Team 3: 7%
Selected Preliminary Results

RPI Tool Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Tools Used</th>
<th>Tools used</th>
<th>Tools discussed/mentioned/suggested, but never used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tools used by different teams.

Team 1: 10 tools used, 6 tools discussed/mentioned/suggested, but never used.
Team 2: 7 tools discussed/mentioned/suggested, but never used.
Team 3: 4 tools discussed/mentioned/suggested, but never used.
Conclusions

• Implications: Results seem promising but MOAT needs more testing on additional QI teams

• Next steps
  • Linking MOAT results with project outcomes
  • Creating self-assessment tool
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