

Title: The use of process mapping in healthcare quality improvement projects.

Short title: Process mapping in healthcare practice.

Type of Paper: Original primary research.

Abstract:

Introduction: Process Mapping (PM), provides insight into systems and processes in which improvement interventions are introduced and is seen as useful in healthcare Quality Improvement (QI) projects. There is little empirical evidence on the use of PM in healthcare practice. This study advances understanding of the benefits and success factors of PM within projects.

Methods: Eight QI projects were purposively selected from different healthcare settings within the UK's National Health Service. Data was gathered from multiple data-sources, including interviews exploring participants' experience of using PM in their projects and perceptions of benefits and challenges related to its use. These were analysed using inductive analysis.

Results: Eight key benefits related to PM use were reported by participants (gathering a shared understanding of the reality; identifying improvement opportunities; engaging stakeholders in the project; defining project's objectives; monitoring project progress; learning; increased empathy; simplicity of the method) and five factors related to successful PM exercises (simple and appropriate visual representation, information gathered from multiple stakeholders, facilitator's experience and soft skills, basic training, iterative use of PM throughout the project). .

Conclusions: Findings highlight benefits and versatility of PM and provide practical suggestions to improve its use in practice.

Keywords: process mapping, quality improvement, system, process, method, qualitative analysis

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

The use of process mapping in healthcare quality improvement projects.

Abstract:

Introduction: Process Mapping (PM), provides insight into systems and processes in which improvement interventions are introduced and is seen as useful in healthcare Quality Improvement (QI) projects. There is little empirical evidence on the use of PM in healthcare practice. This study advances understanding of the benefits and success factors of PM within QI projects.

Methods: Eight QI projects were purposively selected from different healthcare settings within the UK's National Health Service. Data was gathered from multiple data-sources, including interviews exploring participants' experience of using PM in their projects and perceptions of benefits and challenges related to its use. These were analysed using inductive analysis.

Results: Eight key benefits related to PM use were reported by participants (gathering a shared understanding of the reality; identifying improvement opportunities; engaging stakeholders in the project; defining project's objectives; monitoring project progress; learning; increased empathy; simplicity of the method) and five factors related to successful PM exercises (simple and appropriate visual representation, information gathered from multiple stakeholders, facilitator's experience and soft skills, basic training, iterative use of PM throughout the project).

Conclusions: Findings highlight benefits and versatility of PM and provide practical suggestions to improve its use in practice.

1 1. INTRODUCTION

2 Improving the quality of care in a context of increased complexity and reduced resources is a
3 significant global challenge. Recent evidence shows that most of quality and safety problems
4 in healthcare are caused by operational and systems criticalities.¹⁻⁵ System redesign and the
5 adoption of process-oriented management practices are therefore crucial to improve patients'
6 outcomes and efficiency of care delivery.⁵⁻¹⁰ Over the last 15 years healthcare systems have
7 drawn on tools and methods from industrial engineering to improve quality and safety.¹¹⁻¹⁵
8 One such method, Process Mapping (PM) - also commonly referred to as *Process Modelling*
9 -, focuses on the systems and processes into which new interventions are introduced. Within
10 Quality Improvement (QI) projects, PM might be used in conjunction with Visual
11 Management (VM) tools or other tools typical of industrial engineering to gain a better
12 understanding of current practice and to design enhanced processes.¹⁶

13 Since it was first introduced, the term PM has been used to designate a number of approaches
14 and techniques. In the present study the term refers to the "entire approach that leads to a
15 holistic understanding of the process under review".¹⁶ By reviewing methodological literature
16 on PM, we found that this approach includes the following five phases: PM organization and
17 process identification, information gathering, map generation, process analysis and taking
18 improvement forward.^{7,16-20} This concept of PM goes beyond the technical aspects related to
19 the generation of the Process Map (visual representation of the process under analysis)¹⁶ and
20 embraces the social aspects involved in the PM process, such as interactions between
21 participants.

22 Focusing on this definition of PM, we have conducted a review of empirical literature
23 describing the use of PM in healthcare, which aimed to improve current knowledge on
24 context of use, benefits and quality of reported use of PM in healthcare. This study has fed
25 into a protocol for a full systematic review which is now under way²¹.

1 Reviewed studies have demonstrated that within QI projects, PM is used in a variety of
2 healthcare settings and applications, as a stand-alone methodology or as part of techniques
3 such as Lean Manufacturing, Six Sigma, Failure Mode Effects Analysis (FMEA), or costing
4 approaches (e.g. TDABC - Time-Driven Activity-Based Costing).¹¹⁻¹⁴

5 Studies have also highlighted that PM is particularly useful for mapping complex healthcare
6 processes as it provides improvement teams with insight into “work as is” rather than “work
7 as imagined”.²²⁻²⁶ Similarly to VM tools, typical of Lean interventions, PM can be seen as a
8 communication tool supporting engagement and collaboration of healthcare professionals
9 within improvement projects.^{27,28} However, in contrast to other techniques, PM plays a
10 unique role within change processes in providing a shared understanding of complex systems
11 in a way which is readily understandable by a wide range of stakeholders.

12 Although the informed and systematic use of PM in healthcare is advocated by researchers
13 and practitioners,²⁹⁻³² it is not routinely used in improvement approaches within healthcare
14 organizations.³¹⁻³⁴ Early findings from our systematic literature review²¹ show that, despite
15 the number of studies reporting on the use of PM in healthcare increasing during the last 10
16 years, there are still few examples of documented use of this tool in the healthcare sector.

17 The application in the healthcare setting of tools and approaches which are well-established
18 in other industries, such as PDSA, Statistical Process Control or Lean, is often difficult.³⁵
19 This is partly due to the environment, culture and requirements of healthcare, which greatly
20 differ from other service and manufacturing sectors.³¹ Healthcare processes are highly
21 complex, variable and dynamic. The complexity of these processes is increased by the fact
22 that they usually take place across different medical departments or even different
23 organizations,^{36,37} thus involving a variety of stakeholders, from patients to highly specialized
24 professional groups, each with diverse backgrounds and motivations.

1 The wide range of stakeholders involved and the discretionary nature of clinical decision
2 making, make the success of a QI initiative heavily dependent on the engagement of all the
3 participants of the process of care and their effective communication.^{8,32,38-40}

4 Research findings show that to embrace the complexity characterizing healthcare systems, it
5 is important to unpack the “black box” of QI approaches in order to understand how they
6 work in reality and how context factors such as local culture, leadership styles, and team
7 experience of QI can influence their effective use in practice.^{35,41}

8 To address this issue, Kaplan et al. (2012) have developed the MUSIQ (Model for
9 Understanding Success in Quality) framework analysing context factors influencing
10 healthcare QI projects and their relationships.⁴¹ However, there is little empirical research on
11 how these context factors may influence the use of PM within healthcare improvement
12 initiatives.

13 Previous literature describes only isolated empirical implementations of PM in healthcare and
14 the analysis of articles reviewed in our systematic literature review²¹ shows that in most of
15 these studies, the way in which PM exercises are conducted is poorly documented.^{42,43} A few
16 papers in the healthcare literature provide suggestions on how to conduct a PM exercise.¹⁸⁻²⁰

17 Detailed practical guidelines for PM both in the healthcare⁷ and non-healthcare^{16,17} field
18 have also been developed by experts and practitioners. However, these studies assume a
19 specific perspective and do not explicitly take into account the context in which improvement
20 interventions are introduced.

21 Only one study has derived PM success factors from empirical research on real projects,
22 drawing on case-studies of nine PM projects in three Australian organizations.⁴⁴ However this
23 study was outside healthcare and the perspectives analysed by the researchers were limited to
24 modellers and project sponsors.

1 The lack of knowledge of QI methods and their applicability in healthcare is an obstacle to
2 their adoption and embedding into practice.⁴⁵

3 Improved empirical understanding of the use of PM within QI projects is therefore required
4 to ensure that people working in the healthcare environment are aware of the opportunities
5 and benefits offered by the adoption of this versatile and simple technique. Such research can
6 raise awareness on the value of PM as QI method and inform its practical implementation.

7 To date no exploratory study on the use of PM in healthcare based on a systematic analysis of
8 practice has been conducted. There is therefore a need to explore the evidence of benefits and
9 challenges of PM use in order to support its adoption in healthcare.

10 In this study we investigated the use of PM in a sample of QI projects conducted by
11 improvement teams in the UK's National Health Service (NHS) to understand the main
12 benefits achieved by the use of PM in healthcare practice as well as the main success factors
13 of PM within QI projects.

14

15

16 **2. METHODS**

17 We designed the study in the form of inductive qualitative methods. We used an iterative
18 study design characterized by cycles of simultaneous data collection and analysis.⁴⁶

19

20 **2.1 Setting**

21 This work was conducted within the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)
22 Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care Northwest London
23 programme (CLAHRC NWL). This aims to improve the quality of care and patients
24 outcomes by supporting the effective translation of research evidence into practice in the
25 NHS and social care^{47,48}.

1 **2.2 Ethics**

2 The study was reviewed and approved by the NHS Health Research Authority (IRAS project
3 ID 188851). All respondents gave their informed consent to participate in the interviews.
4 Participation was voluntarily and confidentiality protected. Participants were identified by
5 peer nomination and recruited through email.

6

7 **2.3 Sampling**

8 Data were collected by purposively sampling QI projects and interviews' participants on
9 theoretical grounds.^{49,50}

10 The sampling strategy aimed to maximize the variation between QI projects and interviews'
11 participants.⁵¹

12 Sampling and analysis continued until data saturation was reached.^{46,52}

13 Observations of PM workshops conducted during the sampled QI projects were also
14 performed when the project team agreed.

15

16 *QI Projects sampling*

17 QI projects were selected from a pool of 22 CLAHRC NWL QI projects, which last 20
18 months and cover a range of healthcare interventions (*Appendix*).

19 Eight QI projects adopting PM techniques were selected to represent different care settings
20 (primary, secondary, community or a combination) and levels of complexity of the process
21 under investigation (*Appendix*). We used the process complexity as criterion for our sampling
22 because as mentioned in *Par. 1.1 Introduction* the level of complexity may influence the

1 benefits of PM perceived by team members and the challenges that they may encounter
 2 during a QI project. The level of complexity was assessed according to two dimensions:⁵³ (i)
 3 the number of organizational units involved in the process being mapped (e.g. different
 4 hospital departments); (ii) the number of different professional groups involved in the process
 5 being mapped. The resulting classification of QI projects was agreed among the research
 6 team and verified by key informants, including project leaders and QI experts from
 7 CLAHRC, project managers, clinical leaders and other team members.

8

9 *Interviews' participants and PM exercises' observations sampling*

10 Sampling from team was performed to provide a broad range of relevant perspectives and to
 11 increase generalizability of findings.⁵¹

12 Key informants were asked to identify QI team members for interview with different roles in
 13 the QI project and different backgrounds (e.g. project managers, physicians, patients), as well
 14 as their experience of PM (*Table 1*).

15

		People interviewed	Code	Previous Experience with PM
P1	1	Project Officer	<i>P1, PR. OFFICER</i>	yes
	2	Service User	<i>P1, SERV. USER</i>	yes
	3	Data Analyst	<i>P1, ANALYST</i>	yes
	4	QI Expert	<i>P1, QI EXPERT</i>	yes
	5	PM Facilitator	<i>P1, FACILITATOR</i>	yes
P2	6	Project Manager	<i>P2, PR. MANAGER</i>	yes
	7	Clinical Leader	<i>P2, CLIN. LEADI</i>	yes

	8	QI Researcher	<i>P2, RESEARCHER</i>	yes
	9	Clinical Leader	<i>P2, CLIN. LEAD2</i>	no
	10	Nurse	<i>P2, NURSE</i>	no
P3	11	Clinical Leader	<i>P3, CLIN. LEAD</i>	yes
	12	Service User	<i>P3, SERV. USER</i>	no
	13	PM Facilitator	<i>P3, FACILITATOR</i>	yes
	14	QI Expert	<i>P3, QI EXPERT</i>	no
P4	15	Service User	<i>P4, SERV. USER</i>	no
	16	Pharmacist	<i>P4, PHARMACIST</i>	yes
	17	Clinical Leader	<i>P4, CLIN. LEAD</i>	yes
P5	18	Project Manager	<i>P5, PR. MANAGER1</i>	yes
	19	Project Manager	<i>P5, PR. MANAGER2</i>	yes
P6	20	PM Facilitator	<i>P6, FACILITATOR1</i>	yes
	21	PM Facilitator	<i>P6, FACILITATOR2</i>	yes
P7	22	Project Manager	<i>P7, PR. MANAGER</i>	yes
P8	23	Project Manager	<i>P8, PR. MANAGER</i>	no

1 *Table 1: Interviewees*

2

3

4 **2.4 Data collection**

5 Data were collected by two authors (GA, LL) between March 2016 and October 2016 from
6 multiple sources, including interviews, project documents (project application forms, process
7 maps, project review minutes and notes, project progress and final reports, project
8 presentations), observations, and focus groups. The timeline of QI projects and data
9 collection is represented in the *Appendix*.

10 At the start of the research, informal conversations and two focus groups were held to
11 identify the main issues that the QI teams were experiencing with PM, clarify the study

1 research questions, identify project characteristics required for theoretical sampling and
2 developing the interview guide. The latter was also informed by literature and progressively
3 refined during the study.

4 Twenty-three semi-structured interviews were conducted by two interviewers. Interviews
5 took about 45-60 minutes each and were conducted primarily in person (2 telephone and 2
6 Skype). The themes explored included: participants' experience of PM, the way in which PM
7 was used in the project and for which purpose, its contribution to the success of the initiative,
8 key elements that helped the PM exercise as well as problems and challenges related to its
9 use. Interviews were audio recorded, anonymized and transcribed by independent
10 professional transcriptionists.

11 Semi-structured observations of 3 PM sessions from 2 QI projects (P5, P7) were conducted to
12 capture real-time data with the objective to gain a sense of how process maps were generated
13 as well as of how participants were behaving and interacting.⁵⁴ The choice of the 3 PM
14 sessions to observe was opportunistic, as only 3 PM sessions were conducted within the
15 sampled QI projects during the observation period for which permission to observe was
16 granted. Observation notes were taken during the PM sessions, and then transcribed and
17 discussed among the research team. A large amount of documentation produced during all the
18 stages of CLAHRC projects was also analysed in order to have access to projects' details and
19 other relevant contextual information. Observations and documentation were used only to
20 document and corroborate interview data, which was the main input to data analysis.

21

22 **2.5 Data analysis**

23 Qualitative data analysis was guided by constant comparative techniques.⁵⁵ NVivo software
24 was used for the analysis of the interviews. One author (GA) started to become familiarized

1 with the interviews' text by reading (and re-reading) the transcriptions and developed
2 preliminary open codes. Two authors in parallel (GA, LL) progressively combined
3 preliminary codes into sub-categories, and then grouped these into broader categories. The
4 code structure was iteratively developed as further interviews were added to the dataset. The
5 core categorical scheme that emerged was then applied to all the dataset. During this process
6 the analysis was documented in Memos with explicit links to source text. Links between
7 categories and emerging themes were progressively developed and agreed among authors to
8 check for consistency and validation.^{55,56}

9 Emerging themes were progressively refined by comparing evidence from data with existing
10 literature exploring in particular: the influence of context factors on the success of healthcare
11 improvement,²⁶ methodological literature and practical guidelines on PM in healthcare^{7,18-20}
12 and non-healthcare field,^{16,17} and PM success factors derived from a structured analysis of
13 real projects outside the healthcare setting.⁴⁴

14

15

16 **3. FINDINGS**

17 Results are presented according to: (i) benefits of PM within QI projects, (ii) success factors
18 and challenges of PM within QI projects.

19

20 **3.1 Benefits of PM within QI projects**

21 The benefits related to the use of PM are grouped in 8 major subcategories as detailed in
22 *Table 2* along with representative quotations.

23

Benefit	Representative Quotation (s)
a. Break down the complexity and gather a shared understanding of the reality	
Better understanding of how the process actually works.	<i>"What happened in a lot of these meetings is that people assume a lot, and then realize actually maybe it doesn't work in that way". P1, QI EXPERT. SCIENTIST</i>
Shared understanding of reality between the different process stakeholders.	<i>"without the process map we wouldn't have understood that the nurses and the doctors were doing the same thing, we wouldn't have understood that they were recording it in all different places an that they didn't know what each other was doing" P3, FACILITATOR</i>
Break down process complexity.	<i>"It was able to make a very complex service quite simple when it's in a process map, so it's a lot easier to see and understand". P2, NURSE</i>
Understanding the process and identify the value from the patient's perspective.	<i>"A very sound methodology (...) based on reality. By reality I mean both the physical and psychological reality for a patient" P4, SERV. USER</i>
b. Identify gaps and improvement opportunities adopting a system perspective	
Identification of gaps and improvement opportunities across different organizations and care settings.	<i>"You can see what's wrong with the system, and you can actually start seeing things that you could change in a better way (...) you know why these things are not happening, so you can actually start thinking about solutions in a more pragmatic way" P1, QI EXPERT.</i>
Design of a new process.	<i>"this was brainstorming how it would look, I guess, rather than mapping an existing process" P6, FACILITATOR2</i>
Make a compromise within the team and find shared solutions.	<i>"Instead of having just on-going arguments and discussions we actually managed to get in a solution (...) it allows solutions, it allowed us to say, OK, you have been here debating this for the last 25 minutes so what are we doing? Instead of just leaving it in the air (...) if you are writing a process and people just can't get to an agreement they need to (...) that pressure (...) allows for them to have an agreement" P2, PR. MANAGER</i>
c. Engage stakeholders in the project	
Enhance stakeholders' engagement in the project.	<i>"the reason why I started immediately with that tool was because I had so many different people that I had to engage (...) and also I felt like the team didn't really know what they were doing and how they fit within the purpose of the actual project". P2, PR. MANAGER</i>
d. Identify and align project's objectives and fit intervention to the context	
A key starting point for improvement projects allowing the scope, desired objectives and boundaries to be identified.	<i>"I did find it to be beneficial because it set the scene and it was a great beginning discussion point as to what areas we need to look at" P4, PHARMACIST</i>

Fit the improvement intervention to the specific local context.	<i>"I think it's also helpful in thinking about how your intervention fits into the current system (...) you need to adapt your intervention in order to fit better with the current system (...) and I think PM helps to do that" P6, FACILITATOR</i>
e. Identify responsibilities and monitor project progress	
Understand who has the ownership of the different parts of the project and identify responsibilities for improvement.	<i>"for me it was a little bit about ownership and really identifying the roles that people had within the process (...) have a wider picture of where people were integrated within the services (...) it was not only about understanding what was happening and how the system was working (...) but also understanding who owned that specific part of process (...) it was a tool and a way of saying, OK, you're responsible about this, what are you going to do to make it better?" P2, PR. MANAGER</i>
Keep the emphasis on project progress.	<i>"it's also a way of recording what you're doing and looking back and saying, oh, we did this, oh, this was how this was in the beginning, now look at how it is now (...) It allows the comparison of what you were before or what they were at the start and how it, things are being delivered now" P2, PR. MANAGER</i>
f. Learning	
Learning about good practices and "system-thinking".	<i>"An exercise in bringing all together, allowing everyone to have ideas and allowing people to meet and share some good practices" P2, CLIN. LEAD</i>
g. Increased empathy	
Increased empathy between professional groups and learn about people.	<i>"in the process mapping exercise, the social workers explained to the nurses why they had to have an OT assessment (...) and the nurses didn't realized that, but there was tension between the two beforehand (...) and the nurses were going, oh so that's why you keep going on wanting an OT assessment, I didn't know, oh well we will try" P3, FACILITATOR</i>
h. Ease of use and simplicity of the method and of the physical outcome: the process map	
Ease of use and simplicity of the method.	<i>"I feel it's a tool that really you can learn so much about it on the go (...) it is quite practical and easy to use. It's not something high level (...) it gives them [the team] empowerment of what they are going to do next" P2, PR. MANAGER</i>
Provides a physical output, a process map, which is highly visual and easily understandable.	<i>"For me it was a lot easier to see it that way rather than in paragraphs or in a big list (...) I like, quite like visuals, so that for me, really helped me show me where the service is" P2, NURSE</i>

1

2 Table 2: The benefits of Process Mapping for QI project

1 According to interviewees, the main benefits of PM in healthcare are its capacity to break
2 down the complexity of healthcare processes and provide a shared understanding of the
3 reality amongst a composite group of stakeholders (*Table 2 - a*). In the analysed QI projects,
4 PM was usually (7/8 projects) conducted during facilitated multidisciplinary workshops. In
5 many cases this was the first time that health professionals working on the same care process
6 talked each other:

7 *“It’s a very useful stakeholder exercise, and people who maybe don’t usually*
8 *meet (...) I think the greatest value is in the stakeholders all being in the same room*
9 *and sharing their experience” P2, CLIN. LEADI*

10 Our data show that PM acts as a means to gather a realistic vision of reality from different
11 stakeholder perspectives (including patients) and enables the identification of improvement
12 opportunities by adopting a system view (*Table 2 - a, b, f*).

13 People joining the PM exercise also stated that visually representing the process through
14 Process Maps, was very helpful to support multidisciplinary communication during the
15 process map generation and later during the project. The physical representation of processes
16 was also useful to help disseminate and document the process after the project completion
17 (*Table 2 - h*).

18 According to PM participants, the use of PM in the early stages of a project allowed to
19 effectively engage process stakeholders by involving them in the identification and
20 refinement of project’ objectives. This helped QI projects’ teams to align project’ objectives
21 with individual objectives, gain a better understanding of roles and responsibilities, and to
22 adapt the improvement intervention to fit better with the local context (*Table 2 - c,d,e*). Team
23 members also reported that the use of PM throughout the different stages of the QI projects
24 allowed to monitor progress and further inform change actions (*Table 2 - f*).

1 Finally, interviewees reported that the social interaction of process stakeholders during the
2 PM exercise helped increase empathy between professional groups and to decrease the
3 resistance to change, thus allowing participants to reach agreement and arrive at a shared
4 solution (*Table 2 - b, g*).

5 *“everybody has an opinion and those opinions are expressed and at the end*
6 *of the meeting we’ve found a solution” P1, SERV. USER*

7 *“instead of having just ongoing arguments and discussions we actually*
8 *managed to get a solution and in that way that’s what felt about the process map” P2,*
9 *PR. MANAGER*

10

11 **3.2 Success factors of PM within QI projects**

12 Following the analysis of empirical data and their comparison with established literature (*2.5*
13 *Data analysis*), we have identified five factors related to successful PM exercises: (i) simple
14 and appropriate visual representation, (ii) information gathered from multiple stakeholders,
15 (iii) facilitator’s experience and soft skills, (iv) basic training, (v) iterative use of PM
16 throughout the project.

17 Each PM success factor, along with examples of quotations from interviews, is described
18 below.

19

20 *3.2.1 Simple and appropriate visual representation*

21 The visual representation of the process map emerged as a very important factor not only to
22 engage participants and support the debate during PM workshops, but also for its further use
23 during the project, such as feedback and validation, or dissemination to different
24 organizational levels. Our data suggested that the simplicity of the methods used is crucial for
25 stakeholder engagement, in particular clinical staff.

1 *“I think one should not make it too technical for participants, otherwise it’s*
2 *actually off putting. Most people in healthcare, like myself and busy clinicians, want*
3 *to be able to just put out our ideas as commissioners rather than being forced to*
4 *adopt kind of certain project management rules, they’re very off putting for some*
5 *people.” P2, CLIN. LEAD1*

6 Interviewees reported that it is important to provide a representation which is simple,
7 understandable and appropriate to its use. Team members, and in particular project managers,
8 also reported that for an effective PM exercise it is important to map a process to a level of
9 detail and using modelling language which are appropriate to the audience.

10 *“The language needs to make sense to the team you’re talking to (...) What I*
11 *like sometimes is actually when I need to share it with wider people like project*
12 *managers, then it is good to use the standard signage for process mapping (...) What*
13 *I find important is ‘de-scaring’ people (...) If I’m working with the local nursing*
14 *team, I don’t want it to look too professional ... So if I would do it with the local*
15 *nursing team on a ward, I would maybe actually do it by hand (...) If I’m doing pretty*
16 *boxes and layout, (...) possibly my nursing team on the ward will say, gosh, I never*
17 *have the time to do something like that, so I can’t do process mapping.” P7, PR.*
18 MANAGER

19 20 3.2.2 Information gathered from multiple stakeholders

21 Different data sources (stakeholders, databases, documentation) and data collection methods
22 (observations, interviews) may be adopted to build a process map.[36]However, in our
23 sample QI projects participants pointed to the experience of people who actually do the work
24 as the main information source.

1 *“They’ve [facilitators] got to be able to explain and facilitate and document*
2 *and capture what’s being discussed, but the thing to make sure you actually get the*
3 *right information is having the right people. So it’s about their knowledge, the team*
4 *structure, basically those things.” P4, CLIN. LEAD*

5 According to participants, team members don’t need to have a deep knowledge of PM
6 techniques. It is important, instead, that they know the process that is going to be mapped.
7 Ensuring the right people are engaged, who know the different parts of the process and have
8 diverse perspectives on it, plays a key role in gathering the right information and providing a
9 realistic picture of how the process actually works.

10 The involvement of stakeholders who can provide insights into actual practices is therefore
11 essential to build a shared understanding between participants. However many challenges
12 were experienced in releasing staff from their daily responsibilities and engaging them in
13 process mapping sessions.

14 *“It’s always a challenge to persuade people it’s worthwhile giving up the*
15 *time to do it, yeah, because you’re taking them away from clinical and patient facing*
16 *time.” P3, FACILITATOR*

17 The involvement of patients was also considered to be very important, as they are at the
18 centre of care processes and incorporating their perspective in the service analysis and
19 improvement is fundamental. The PM workshops should therefore be organized to encourage
20 attendance and effective participation, by scheduling meetings at convenient times and
21 holding them in a pleasant venue.

22

23

1 3.2.3 Facilitator's experience and soft skills

2 While a deep knowledge of the process being mapped was not perceived as important to the
3 success of the PM exercise, the facilitators' experience was reported as crucial.

4 *"You need somebody who is clearly experienced in the methodology,*
5 *particularly if you're working with a group such as us who haven't really done any*
6 *formal quality improvement."* P2, CLIN. LEAD1

7 Experienced facilitators were seen as able to gather different perspectives by encouraging the
8 expression of diverse opinions and managing power dynamics within the group so everybody
9 had the opportunity to contribute without being judged or criticized. This required a relaxed
10 atmosphere to ensure people are pleased to spend their time working together, sharing ideas
11 and learning.

12 *"So sometimes people can be far too serious about things, and to have a little*
13 *bit of fun with it, and to have a little bit of laughter brought in, and it helps everybody*
14 *I think because they all feel good about what they're doing."* P1, SERV. USER

15 Interviewees believed that it was extremely important for the facilitator to establish an
16 appropriate communication strategy. This would help to incentivize participation by busy
17 clinical staff by ensuring the team understood why it was worthwhile for them to participate
18 in the PM exercise and the value of their contributions. This was even more relevant if the
19 team had no experience of QI and was therefore sceptical about its benefits.

20 *"Clinicians are very time poor people and investing two or three hours in a*
21 *process that they haven't quite understood why they should be wanting to do this will*
22 *make it fail. Whereas (...) getting people to understand that it's time consuming but*
23 *worthwhile is a challenge, therefore a good facilitator to take that through, is*
24 *incredibly crucial to the process.* P2, CLIN. LEAD1

1 A good facilitator would use a simple and pragmatic approach during the PM workshop and
2 language that is as near as possible to that of participants, in order to maintain attention and
3 stimulate participation. Physically drawing the process map on paper during the meeting was
4 found to be useful in supporting the discussion and helping people to break down the process
5 complexity. Generic charting software were instead used for creating a neat representation of
6 the process map. This was reported to facilitate feedback to the front-line staff and
7 management, both for validation and dissemination.

8

9 *3.2.4 Basic training*

10 Team members (with the exception of facilitators) demonstrated scarce knowledge of the
11 range of charting software available and of the PM techniques. According to team members
12 interviewed, training should be straightforward in order to allow people with no QI
13 background (and little time) to understand the main concepts of PM. Providing practical
14 examples to clarify the meaning of PM symbols to be used in the session was found to be
15 useful to this aim.

16

17 *2.5 Iterative use of PM throughout the project*

18 Interviewees believed that the continuous revision and use of PM throughout the project is a
19 fundamental requirement for its effective use within a QI project.

20 *“I actually think that if you had somebody doing that who doesn’t know what*
21 *they’re doing and isn’t going to put the work in afterwards and isn’t going to use the*
22 *map with the team afterwards, it’s a waste of time (...) let’s map and then let’s*
23 *constantly use that map, let’s remind ourselves why this is the intervention that we’re*
24 *looking at.” P3, FACILITATOR*

25

1 4. DISCUSSION

2 This work is the first empirical study exploring the use of PM in healthcare throughout a
3 rigorous analysis of QI practice. Using a rich qualitative dataset based on the experience
4 reported by a range of QI team members, we have identified the main benefits of PM within
5 QI projects and success factors supporting its effective use.

6 Taking the PM process as a whole, in which the development of the process map is only one
7 step, it emerges that there are benefits attributable to PM that may not be as readily apparent.
8 In particular, our findings suggest that the main benefits derived from the use of PM within
9 healthcare QI projects are not related to the graphical representation of the process, but to the
10 social interactions between participants during all the PM process. In a health care context,
11 this is social role played by PM maybe especially important due to the high number of
12 participants typically involved in care processes, each with diverse motivations and specific
13 knowledge of the process under analysis. Enhancing communication and gathering consensus
14 among process stakeholders through their full and informed involvement is therefore a key
15 success factor for the successful implementation of improvement projects.^{32,39}

16 Our research corroborates previous findings highlighting how PM serves a crucial role within
17 healthcare as an “ice-breaker”, fostering communication among healthcare professionals with
18 highly specialized clinical knowledge and different representations of or attitudes towards the
19 process in question.^{57,58} These findings confirm previous theories about QI implementation
20 and change management in healthcare pointing to the need for consistent control over project
21 progress and the importance of defining shared objectives and enhancing stakeholder
22 engagement by involving them in the early stages of projects.⁵⁹⁻⁶¹

23 Compared to existing healthcare literature on PM,^{7,18-20} mainly developed by QI experts and
24 practitioners, this study has been informed by investigation of empirical cases, focusing on
25 stakeholders with different perspectives and roles in PM exercises. This has allowed aspects

1 overlooked by prior literature to emerge. For example, QI team members have reported how
2 involvement in the PM exercise helped them to increase their knowledge about this technique
3 and their empathetic connection with colleagues and other healthcare professionals working
4 in the same process.

5 Our findings are aligned with previous QI research reporting on the influence of contextual
6 factors on the success of QI projects. We have enriched these findings by highlighting
7 specific issues related to the use of PM, as drawn from actual team experience.³⁴

8

9 We found that effective use of QI methods within complex multi-stakeholder healthcare
10 systems is influenced not only by the methods used to conduct a PM exercise (techniques,
11 tools, data collection, etc.), but also by the context in which they are used.

12 For example, we found that as knowledge and practice related to care processes is fragmented
13 across different organizations and professional groups, involvement in the PM exercise of the
14 right people is key.

15 As a consequence, the role of PM facilitators also emerges as much more significant in
16 healthcare compared to findings from the existing literature, which focuses on other
17 industries.⁴⁴ Their capacity to breakdown the complexity of healthcare processes and align
18 the scope of the exercise with the scope of the project is perceived as very important for
19 guiding QI teams that often have no previous experience of these techniques. Together with
20 technical knowledge about PM techniques, soft skills of facilitators emerge as crucial for
21 involving and motivating stakeholders across organizational boundaries.

22 Moreover, our findings reveal that whilst for the team members a deep knowledge of PM
23 techniques is not perceived as essential, previous experience with QI methods is a relevant
24 success factor. This confirms findings in research on QI⁴¹ that highlight how previous

1 experience positively impacts not only on the technical knowledge of PM methods, but also
2 on the engagement of the team in the project, as it increases awareness of the benefits that are
3 achievable.

4 From a practical perspective this study helps to increase the healthcare community's
5 awareness of the benefits that a versatile and simple tool such as PM could provide if
6 appropriately used throughout QI projects. In doing so it encourages healthcare practitioners
7 to use PM within QI projects and highlights relevant aspects to take into consideration to
8 improve the adoption of PM in practice.

9

10

11 **5. LIMITATIONS**

12 The main limitation of this work is related is that most of the projects included in the study
13 have used the same methodological approach to PM, based on multi-stakeholders meetings to
14 generate the process maps. In only one project (P8), the process map was drawn by the QI
15 team using data from observations. Further research is needed to test whether our findings
16 hold in QI projects developed by teams using different approaches to conducting the PM
17 exercise, for example by following the patients, or when PM is used within other techniques
18 such as Six-Sigma or Lean.

19 Within our QI project cases, in order to increase generalizability of the findings, our sampling
20 strategy sought to develop a comprehensive understanding of the use of PM from different
21 perspectives, by interviewing multiple stakeholders with different roles in each project and
22 with different backgrounds.

1 Another limitation of this study is the potential for social desirability bias of responses, as
2 some participants may have responded in ways that were seen as more desirable to CLAHRC
3 NWL researchers they were familiar with (JR and LL). This bias was mitigated by the fact that
4 the main researcher responsible for participants' recruitment and data collection (GA) was new
5 to CLAHRC NWL and unknown to the majority of interviewees.

6 Interviewer bias could also have influenced respondents and distorted the outcome of the
7 interview. This bias was reduced by the use of fixed-wording questions and of two
8 interviewers with different backgrounds and training.^{62,63}

9 As PM is often part of a broader improvement initiative, participants' experience could have
10 been influenced by the wider complex context of the change process.⁵¹ We have addressed
11 this risk in the analysis phase and designed interviews questions to specify areas of interest.

12 Many research techniques were used to limit bias in the analysis phase and ensure
13 trustworthiness and validity of results.^{64,65} These included audiorecording and independent
14 professional preparation of the transcripts, a rigorous documentation of analysis, persistent
15 and prolonged engagement with data, peer debriefing, data and analytic triangulation.⁴⁹ For
16 example, the use of observations balanced the retrospective nature of interviews⁵⁴ and the
17 involvement of QI experts in focus groups conducted during the study (from the definition of
18 the research question to the validation of results) helped to guide the analysis and further
19 validate findings. Moreover, the diverse background of researchers, including experienced
20 improvement scientists, ensured multiple perspective and consistency of results.

21

22

23

1 **6. CONCLUSIONS**

2 There is no single recipe-book of PM techniques to ensure success – its use in practice
3 depends heavily on the scope of the project, on the setting and organizational and behavioural
4 aspects. However, PM project team members reported that PM was a pivotal tool when
5 applied iteratively through the lifecycle of healthcare QI projects. The more complex a
6 process, the more the clinical and organizational knowledge about it is likely to be
7 fragmented, and the more likely that stakeholder objectives and interests may conflict. In
8 these circumstances, QI projects are especially likely to benefit from PM.

9 These features, together with the relative ease of the method, make PM a promising technique
10 in healthcare improvement, where more sophisticated tools and techniques often fail.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 REFERENCES

2

- 3 1. Chassin MR, Becher EC. The Wrong Patient. *Ann Intern Med.* 2002 Jun 4;136(11):826.
- 4 2. Gaba DM, Singer SJ, Sinaiko AD, Bowen JD, Ciavarelli AP. Differences in Safety
5 Climate between Hospital Personnel and Naval Aviators. *Hum Factors.* 2003 Jun
6 1;45(2):173–85.
- 7 3. Klein JG. Five pitfalls in decisions about diagnosis and prescribing. *BMJ.* 2005 Apr
8 2;330(7494):781–3.
- 9 4. Reason J. *Human Error.* Cambridge University Press; 1990. 324 p.
- 10 5. Tucker AL. The impact of operational failures on hospital nurses and their patients. *J*
11 *Oper Manag.* 2004 Apr 1;22(2):151–69.
- 12 6. Øvretveit J. Does improving quality save money. A review of evidence of which
13 improvements to quality reduce costs to health service providers. [Internet]. London: The
14 Health Foundation.; 2009. Available from:
15 [http://www.health.org.uk/sites/health/files/DoesImprovingQualitySaveMoney_Evidence.](http://www.health.org.uk/sites/health/files/DoesImprovingQualitySaveMoney_Evidence.pdf)
16 [pdf](http://www.health.org.uk/sites/health/files/DoesImprovingQualitySaveMoney_Evidence.pdf)
- 17 7. NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement. *Improvement Leaders' Guide. Process*
18 *Mapping, analysis and redesign. General improvement skills.* [Internet]. Coventry: NHS
19 Institute for Innovation and Improvement; 2005. Available from:
20 [https://www.england.nhs.uk/improvement-hub/wp-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/improvement-hub/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2017/11/ILG-1.2-Process-Mapping-Analysis-and-Redesign.pdf)
21 [content/uploads/sites/44/2017/11/ILG-1.2-Process-Mapping-Analysis-and-Redesign.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/improvement-hub/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2017/11/ILG-1.2-Process-Mapping-Analysis-and-Redesign.pdf)
- 22 8. *Lean thinking for the NHS* [Internet]. London: NHS confederation.; 2006. Available
23 from: [http://www.leanuk.org/media/37654/Lean-Thinking-in-the-NHS-Daniel-T-Jones-](http://www.leanuk.org/media/37654/Lean-Thinking-in-the-NHS-Daniel-T-Jones-and-Alan-Mitchell.pdf)
24 [and-Alan-Mitchell.pdf](http://www.leanuk.org/media/37654/Lean-Thinking-in-the-NHS-Daniel-T-Jones-and-Alan-Mitchell.pdf)
- 25 9. Tomson CR, Veer SN van der. Learning from practice variation to improve the quality of
26 care. *Clin Med.* 2013 Feb 1;13(1):19–23.
- 27 10. Shortell SM, Rundall TG, Hsu J. Improving Patient Care by Linking Evidence-Based
28 Medicine and Evidence-Based Management. *JAMA.* 2007 Aug 8;298(6):673.
- 29 11. Kruskal JB, Reedy A, Pascal L, Rosen MP, Boiselle PM. Quality Initiatives: Lean
30 Approach to Improving Performance and Efficiency in a Radiology Department.
31 *RadioGraphics.* 2012 Mar 1;32(2):573–87.
- 32 12. Colligan L, Anderson JE, Potts HW, Berman J. Does the process map influence the
33 outcome of quality improvement work? A comparison of a sequential flow diagram and a
34 hierarchical task analysis diagram. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2010 Jan 7;10:7.
- 35 13. Niemeijer GC, Trip A, de Jong LJ, Wendt KW, Does RJMM. Impact of 5 Years of Lean
36 Six Sigma in a University Medical Center: *Qual Manag Health Care.* 2012;21(4):262–8.

- 1 14. Robbins J, Garman AN, Song PH, McAlearney AS. How High-Performance Work
2 Systems Drive Health Care Value: An Examination of Leading Process Improvement
3 Strategies. *Qual Manag Healthc*. 2012 Sep;21(3):188.
- 4 15. Sirio CA, Segel KT, Keyser DJ, Harrison EI, Lloyd JC, Weber RJ, et al. Pittsburgh
5 Regional Healthcare Initiative: A Systems Approach For Achieving Perfect Patient Care.
6 *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2003 Sep 1;22(5):157–65.
- 7 16. Jacka JM, Keller PJ. *Business Process Mapping: Improving Customer Satisfaction*. John
8 Wiley & Sons; 2009. 337 p.
- 9 17. Damelio R. *The Basics of Process Mapping, 2nd Edition*. CRC Press; 2011. 186 p.
- 10 18. Trebble TM, Hansi N, Hydes T, Smith MA, Baker M. Process mapping the patient
11 journey: an introduction. *BMJ*. 2010 Aug 13;341:c4078.
- 12 19. Jackson TL. *Mapping Clinical Value Streams*. 1 edition. Boca Raton: Routledge; 2013.
13 124 p.
- 14 20. McLaughlin N, Burke MA, Setlur NP, Niedzwiecki DR, Kaplan AL, Saigal C, et al.
15 Time-driven activity-based costing: a driver for provider engagement in costing activities
16 and redesign initiatives. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2014 Nov 1;37(5):E3.
- 17 21. Antonacci G, Reed JE, Lennox L, Evans L. Process mapping in healthcare: a systematic
18 review. [Internet]. PROSPERO 2018 CRD42017082140; Available from:
19 https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=82140
- 20 22. Chand S, Moskowitz H, Norris JB, Shade S, Willis DR. Improving patient flow at an
21 outpatient clinic: study of sources of variability and improvement factors. *Health Care*
22 *Manag Sci*. 2009 Sep 1;12(3):325–40.
- 23 23. Taylor AJ, Randall C. Process mapping: enhancing the implementation of the Liverpool
24 Care Pathway. *Int J Palliat Nurs*. 2007 Apr 1;13(4):163–7.
- 25 24. Ben-Tovim DI, Dougherty ML, O’Connell TJ, McGrath KM. Patient journeys: the
26 process of clinical redesign. *Med J Aust*. 2008 Mar 17;188(6 Suppl):S14-17.
- 27 25. King DL, Ben-Tovim DI, Bassham J. Redesigning emergency department patient flows:
28 Application of Lean Thinking to health care. *Emerg Med Australas*. 2006 Aug
29 1;18(4):391–7.
- 30 26. Hughes RG. Tools and Strategies for Quality Improvement and Patient Safety. In:
31 Hughes RG, editor. *Patient Safety and Quality: An Evidence-Based Handbook for Nurses*
32 [Internet]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2008
33 [cited 2018 Feb 3]. (Advances in Patient Safety). Available from:
34 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK2682/>
- 35 27. Ulhassan W, von Thiele Schwarz U, Westerlund H, Sandahl C, Thor J. How Visual
36 Management for Continuous Improvement Might Guide and Affect Hospital Staff: A
37 Case Study. *Qual Manag Healthc*. 2015 Dec;24(4):222.

- 1 28. Parry GC, Turner CE. Application of lean visual process management tools. *Prod Plan*
2 *Control*. 2006 Jan 1;17(1):77–86.
- 3 29. Edwards N. Can quality improvement be used to change the wider healthcare system?
4 *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2005 Apr 1;14(2):75–75.
- 5 30. Clarkson PJ, Buckle P, Coleman R, Stubbs D, Ward J, Jarrett J, et al. Design for patient
6 safety: A review of the effectiveness of design in the UK health service. *J Eng Des*. 2004
7 Apr 1;15(2):123–40.
- 8 31. Antonacci G, Calabrese A, D’Ambrogio A, Giglio A, Intrigila B, Ghiron NL. A BPMN-
9 Based Automated Approach for the Analysis of Healthcare Processes. In: 2016 IEEE
10 25th International Conference on Enabling Technologies: Infrastructure for Collaborative
11 Enterprises (WETICE). 2016. p. 124–9.
- 12 32. Proudlove NC, Bisogno S, Onggo BSS, Calabrese A, Levialdi Ghiron N. Towards fully-
13 facilitated discrete event simulation modelling: Addressing the model coding stage. *Eur J*
14 *Oper Res*. 2017 Dec 1;263(2):583–95.
- 15 33. Pradhan M, Edmonds M, Runciman WB. Quality in healthcare: process. *Best Pract Res*
16 *Clin Anaesthesiol*. 2001 Dec 1;15(4):555–71.
- 17 34. Beuscart-Zéphir M-C, Pelayo S, Anceaux F, Maxwell D, Guerlinger S. Cognitive
18 analysis of physicians and nurses cooperation in the medication ordering and
19 administration process. *Int J Med Inf*. 2007 Jun 1;76:S65–77.
- 20 35. Taylor MJ, McNicholas C, Nicolay C, Darzi A, Bell D, Reed JE. Systematic review of
21 the application of the plan–do–study–act method to improve quality in healthcare. *BMJ*
22 *Qual Saf*. 2013 Sep 10;bmjqs-2013-001862.
- 23 36. Rebuge Á, Ferreira DR. Business process analysis in healthcare environments: A
24 methodology based on process mining. *Inf Syst*. 2012 Apr 1;37(2):99–116.
- 25 37. Lenz R, Reichert M. IT support for healthcare processes – premises, challenges,
26 perspectives. *Data Knowl Eng*. 2007 Apr 1;61(1):39–58.
- 27 38. Zander K. Nursing case management: strategic management of cost and quality
28 outcomes. *J Nurs Adm*. 1988 May;18(5):23–30.
- 29 39. Panella M, Marchisio S, Di Stanislao F. Reducing clinical variations with clinical
30 pathways: do pathways work? *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2003 Dec 1;15(6):509–21.
- 31 40. Farley K. The COPD critical pathway: a case study in progress. *Qual Manag Health Care*.
32 1995;3(2):43–54.
- 33 41. Kaplan HC, Provost LP, Froehle CM, Margolis PA. The Model for Understanding
34 Success in Quality (MUSIQ): building a theory of context in healthcare quality
35 improvement. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2011 Jan 1;bmjqs-2011-000010.
- 36 42. Schubert L, Liu A, Gan G, Amini A, Hutchison R, Ernest J, et al. Practical
37 implementation of quality improvement for high-dose-rate brachytherapy. *Pract Radiat*
38 *Oncol*. 2016 Jan 1;6(1):34–43.

- 1 43. Sujan MA, Chessum P, Rudd M, Fitton L, Inada-Kim M, Cooke MW, et al. Managing
2 competing organizational priorities in clinical handover across organizational boundaries.
3 J Health Serv Res Policy. 2015 Jan 1;20(1_suppl):17–25.
- 4 44. Bandara W, Gable GG, Rosemann M. Factors and measures of business process
5 modelling: model building through a multiple case study. Eur J Inf Syst. 2005 Dec
6 1;14(4):347–60.
- 7 45. Jun GT, Ward J, Morris Z, Clarkson J. Health care process modelling: which method
8 when? Int J Qual Health Care. 2009 Jun 1;21(3):214–24.
- 9 46. Eisenhardt KM, Graebner ME. Theory Building From Cases: Opportunities And
10 Challenges. Acad Manage J. 2007 Feb 1;50(1):25–32.
- 11 47. 4.5 Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRCs).
12 2011 [cited 2014 Sep 10]; Available from: [http://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/about-](http://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/about-NIHR/Briefing-Documents/4.5-Collaborations-for-Leadership-in-Applied-Health-Research-and-Care.pdf)
13 [NIHR/Briefing-Documents/4.5-Collaborations-for-Leadership-in-Applied-Health-](http://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/about-NIHR/Briefing-Documents/4.5-Collaborations-for-Leadership-in-Applied-Health-Research-and-Care.pdf)
14 [Research-and-Care.pdf](http://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/about-NIHR/Briefing-Documents/4.5-Collaborations-for-Leadership-in-Applied-Health-Research-and-Care.pdf).
- 15 48. Caldwell SE, Mays N. Studying policy implementation using a macro, meso and micro
16 frame analysis: the case of the Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research
17 & Care (CLAHRC) programme nationally and in North West London. Health Res Policy
18 Syst. 2012 Oct 15;10:32.
- 19 49. Kennedy TJT, Lingard LA. Making sense of grounded theory in medical education. Med
20 Educ. 2006 Feb 1;40(2):101–8.
- 21 50. The Discovery of Grounded Theory; Strategies for Qualitative... : Nursing Research
22 [Internet]. [cited 2018 Feb 3]. Available from:
23 [https://journals.lww.com/nursingresearchonline/Citation/1968/07000/The_Discovery_of_](https://journals.lww.com/nursingresearchonline/Citation/1968/07000/The_Discovery_of_Grounded_Theory__Strategies_for.14.aspx)
24 [Grounded_Theory__Strategies_for.14.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/nursingresearchonline/Citation/1968/07000/The_Discovery_of_Grounded_Theory__Strategies_for.14.aspx)
- 25 51. Onwuegbuzie A, Leech N. Sampling Designs in Qualitative Research: Making the
26 Sampling Process More Public. Qual Rep. 2007 Jun 1;12(2):238–54.
- 27 52. Morse JM. The Significance of Saturation. Qual Health Res. 1995 May 1;5(2):147–9.
- 28 53. Barach P, Johnson JK. Understanding the complexity of redesigning care around the
29 clinical microsystem. BMJ Qual Saf. 2006 Dec 1;15(suppl 1):i10–6.
- 30 54. Patton MQ. Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. Health Serv
31 Res. 1999 Dec;34(5 Pt 2):1189–208.
- 32 55. Miles MB, Huberman AM. Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook. SAGE;
33 1994. 358 p.
- 34 56. Glaser B. Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Routledge;
35 2017. 282 p.
- 36 57. Soe A, Chetcuti P, Fox G, Tomlin S. A bronchiolitis integrated care pathway for children.
37 Int J Care Pathw. 2012 Mar 1;16(1):3–8.

- 1 58. Jones DEJ, Sutcliffe K, Pairman J, Wilton K, Newton JL. An integrated care pathway
2 improves quality of life in Primary Biliary Cirrhosis. *QJM Int J Med*. 2008 Jul
3 1;101(7):535–43.
- 4 59. Parkin P. *Managing Change in Healthcare: Using Action Research*. SAGE; 2009. 249 p.
- 5 60. Grol R, Wensing M, Eccles M, Davis D. *Improving Patient Care: The Implementation of*
6 *Change in Health Care*. John Wiley & Sons; 2013. 525 p.
- 7 61. Bate P, Mendel P, Robert G. *Organizing for Quality: The Improvement Journeys of*
8 *Leading Hospitals in Europe and the United States*. Radcliffe Publishing; 2008. 270 p.
- 9 62. McCracken G. *The Long Interview*. SAGE; 1988. 112 p.
- 10 63. Patton MQ. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. 2nd edition. Newbury Park,
11 Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc; 1990. 536 p.
- 12 64. Mays N, Pope C. Rigour and qualitative research. *BMJ*. 1995 Jul 8;311(6997):109–12.
- 13 65. Lewis S. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*.
14 *Health Promot Pract*. 2015 Jul 1;16(4):473–5.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 Appendix:

2 *Sampling and timeline of QI*
3 *projects*

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12


Project	Project Objective	Number of sites (project is implemented /replicated)	Settings (involved in the process mapped)	People involved in the PM exercise	Service users involved in PM	Team prior experience with PM*	Facilitator prior experience with PM **
P1	Aim: to improve the health, quality of life and experience of care for patients who are primarily diagnosed with acute heart failure. How: providing clinicians of the admitting hospital ward with a small (5 items), straightforward set of evidence-based practices, which, if reliably performed, have been proven to improve outcomes for these type of patient (bundle).	1	Hospital	QI experts, nurses, doctors, service user.	yes	yes	yes
P2	Aim: to raise awareness, improve recognition and quality of care for children with allergies and asthma. How: moving primary care level patients from secondary care (designing community based clinics) and providing training for school nurses, community nurses and parents to help them recognise and manage allergies and care for children closer to home.	2	Hospital, Primary care, School	QI experts, information/data analyst, nurses, dietician, manager, doctors, welfare assistants.	no	no	no
P3	Aim: to improve physical healthcare in people with long-term mental health needs. How: introducing a comprehensive physical healthcare assessment for patient admitted to the hospital, which includes tailored lifestyle advice and signposting,	1	Hospital	QI experts, doctors, nurses, ward manager, physical activity coordinator, psychologist, information/data	yes	no	yes

	and appropriate referrals and follow-up.			analyst, service user.			
P4	Aim: to sustainably improve the delivery of consistent, high quality medicines optimisation to achieve better patient experience and outcomes. How: integrating multidisciplinary medication review in the discharge process of patient pathways and clearly documenting this information to inform primary care.	5	Hospital, Primary care	QI experts, pharmacists, doctors, nurses, ward managers, physiotherapist, service user.	yes	yes	yes
P5	Aim: to improve the quality of life of patients with both psychological and respiratory problems. How: developing an integrated care pathway between physical and mental health services and also an integrated treatment resource for patients to improve their self-management of asthma and anxiety.	1	Community and Hospital	QI experts, psychologists, nurses, information/data analyst.	no	no	yes
P6	Aim: to improve the detection and treatment of an abnormal heart rhythm (Atrial Fibrillation) which may not cause any symptoms. How: embedding opportunistic screening performed through an innovative portable ECG monitor in primary care practices.	52	Primary care	QI experts, doctors, healthcare assistants, nurses, receptionists, service user.	yes	no	yes


P7	Aim: to improve clinical outcomes and experience of patients with asthma. How: by implementing national evidence-based guidelines providing clinical staff and patients with a small and simple set of admission and discharge recommendations (bundles).	1	Primary care, Hospital	QI experts, doctors, nurses, ward sisters, managers.	no	yes	yes
P8	Aim: to improve health and wellness in older people in nursing homes focusing on hydration, to reduce morbidity and prevent hospital admissions. How: by introducing daily practices encouraging a greater drink consumption (so residents have enough to drink throughout the day as part of their personalised care) and running training sessions	2	Community (care home)	(only for feedback on the PM - nurses, healthcare assistants, service users, family member, activity coordinator, managers)	(only feedback)	Observat.	Observat.

(*no: for most of the team was their first time; ** no: it was their first time)

A1. QI Projects' characteristics.



A.2 Schematic representation of QI projects by complexity of the process mapped.



A.3 Timeline of QI projects and data collection.

