IT TAKES A VILLAGE TO BEAT THE PERFECT STORM:

Why Now is the Time for a Multidisciplinary Approach to Preventing Heel Pressure Ulcers
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Merriam-Webster defines a “perfect storm” as “a critical or disastrous situation created by a powerful concurrence of factors.” Sadly, a unique set of circumstances is creating a perfect storm with regard to the prevention of heel pressure ulcers. Delineating the increased challenges in lowering heel pressure ulcer prevalence can lead to the conclusion that surrender may be the only option. However, as the complexities involved in preventing heel pressure ulcers increase, approaches to pressure ulcer prevention can expand and evolve. This paper posits that a truly multidisciplinary approach to heel pressure ulcer prevention can help meet and overcome today’s challenges.

THE PROBLEM

Put simply, heel pressure ulcer prevalence rates are not decreasing as much as they should be. Kelleher et al. note, “Despite the increased focus on prevention of HAPU (Hospital Acquired Pressure Ulcers), prevalence rates range from 14% to 17% and incidence rates range between 7% and 9%. An estimated 60,000 patients die of pressure ulcer (PU)-related complications each year. The average cost of PU care per patient has been estimated at $43,180 per hospital stay with an annual cost of approximately $11 billion.”

Lyder et al. also emphasize that pressure ulcer prevalence is not decreasing at the rate one would assume based on efforts to lower cases of pressure ulcers: “Fifty-one thousand eight hundred forty-two discharges were included in the final study sample for the combined years 2006 and 2007….The HAPU incidence rate was determined to be 4.5% (2,313/51,842), and PU prevalence on admission was 5.8% (2,999/51,842). Of the 2,999 individuals who entered the hospital with a PU, 16.7% (502/2,999) developed at least one new PU at a different location during their hospitalization.”

The HAPU incidence rate was determined to be 4.5% (2,313/51,842), and PU prevalence on admission was 5.8% (2,999/51,842). Of the 2,999 individuals who entered the hospital with a PU, 16.7% (502/2,999) developed at least one new PU at a different location during their hospitalization. Of the hospital-acquired pressure ulcers as “never events” in 2008, it is difficult to understand, at first glance, why prevalence rates are not decreasing. Upon further examination, it becomes clear that obstacles are in the way of heel pressure ulcer prevention and are indeed creating the aforementioned “perfect storm.” These obstacles include a lack of understanding of what allows pressure ulcers to form, an aging population, and a nursing shortage. Let’s examine each of these factors in more detail.

NEW RESEARCH YIELDS MORE QUESTIONS THAN ANSWERS

As medical professionals uncover more facts about heel pressure ulcer development, the prospect of being able to prevent heel pressure ulcers seems to extend further beyond reach. Bry et al. note that “intrinsic and extrinsic factors affecting mechanical forces acting on the skin and its microclimate are not the only source of skin breakdown. Findings also demonstrate that patients who developed a HAPU had multiple risk factors and comorbidities. Based on these findings, we believe that the current approach to risk assessment for HAPUs is incomplete and needs to be reframed to include measurement of comorbid conditions.”

In addition to the impact of comorbidities on patients at risk for pressure ulcers, research has also uncovered more information about factors specifically related to the skin that can also increase a patient’s susceptibility for pressure ulcers. Black et al. write that “Heat and moisture accumulation between the surface of the bed and the patient’s skin is referred to as the skin microclimate. Research focusing on the association between microclimate and PU development is scant. Kokate applied a warmed indentor to skin and found that as skin temperature rose, so did the damage to the skin.”

In addition to potentially damaging factors like moisture and high temperatures, the skin itself, it is now believed, can simply begin to break down because of various conditions. Curry et al. report that “Langemo and Brown conducted a systemic review of terms associated with acute, chronic, and end-stage skin failure. They defined acute skin failure as an ‘event in which skin and underlying tissue die due to hypoperfusion concurrent
with a critical illness.’ They noted that when patients become critically ill, they develop risk factors for Change to PUs as well as skin failure, such as poor tissue perfusion, decreased nitrogen balance, and immobility.”

AN AGING POPULATION

According to the Administration on Aging, 39.6 million people in 2009 were 65 or older. As Figure 1 illustrates, this number is expected to almost double by 2030. 
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<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
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<th>FY 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in millions.

Age of course is not the only concern. Conditions like diabetes, which can cause multiple complications, are on the rise. In fact, in 2010 the CDC projected that by 2050, 1 in 3 adults would be diagnosed with diabetes. A comprehensive report by the American Heart Association indicates that adults 65 and older are at much higher risk for cardiovascular complications. With the number of people over the age of 65 projected to double by 2030, it is easy to extrapolate how much diagnoses of diabetes and other conditions will also increase.

NURSING SHORTAGES

In parallel to the rise in elderly and ailing patients is the continuing nursing shortage. The American Nursing Association notes that more than 50% of current nurses are close to retirement age. Molly M. Gadd reported in 2012 that “In many institutions, RNs are expected to carry out a pressure ulcer risk assessment for all patients daily along with their comprehensive assessment.” This type of burden will only increase as the number of patients continues to outpace the number of nurses in healthcare facilities.

THE PERFECT STORM

With all the previously identified factors contributing to the problem of heel pressure ulcers, how can the goal of lowering prevalence be achieved? One clear answer is that the effort to prevent heel pressure ulcers must no longer reside solely in the domain of the WOC Nurse. In fact, evidence suggests that a truly multidisciplinary approach can go a long way towards helping facilities lower heel pressure ulcer prevalence. Before building a multidisciplinary team, however, facilities must improve internal communication.

COMMUNICATION IS KEY

Before beginning to construct a multidisciplinary team, it is essential to maximize the efficiency of interdepartmental communication in your facility. Beitz and Van Rijswijk observe, “Communication channels in many health organizations are not conducive to major innovations. Time and staff constraints, and the absence of needed supplies and equipment are frequently cited barriers to implementing evidence-based practice.” Without proper communication channels, a patient will not benefit from a multidisciplinary approach. As Kelleher et al. note, “We found that peer-to-peer discussions during bedside rounds were perceived to be more effective and meaningful to critical care nurses than were typical educational strategies of online education modules and classroom staff in-service education.” This indicates the value that communication can carry, especially when conducted in person, between healthcare professionals.

For the prevention of heel pressure ulcers, WOC Nurses can help guide other members of the team to more effective communication methodologies. The onus is on each professional, however, to ensure that all communication channels remain open.

Once it is clear that communication can occur efficiently and effectively in your facility, attention
can be turned to developing a fully multidisci-
plinary approach to heel pressure ulcer preven-
tion. The next logical question, of course, is who
should be represented as part of that effort?
Niderhauser et al. surveyed 24 teams and found
the following breakdown of team members:

![Figure 2]

Professionals included in pressure ulcer
prevention teams

As Figure 2 illustrates, a wide variety of profes-
sionals can be incorporated into the effort to
lower pressure ulcer prevalence. With so many
potential participants, Taggart et al. suggest
assigning “champions” when employing a multi-
disciplinary approach: “To assure integration of
evidence-based care, facilitation needed to occur
at the organizational and unit levels. Developing
staff champions has been identified as a critical
factor to quality improvement success and im-
proving patient care.”

As reiterated previously, effective communication amongst all team mem-
ers is also essential.

Having shown the diversity of personnel who can
participate in a multidisciplinary team effort to
help prevent heel pressure ulcers, it is important
to detail how different healthcare professionals
beyond the WOC Nurse can contribute to an ef-
fort to lower heel pressure ulcer prevalence. This
process will begin with the case for IT specialists.

THE CASE FOR INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY

There are three primary ways that IT specialists
can participate in efforts to lower heel pressure
ulcer prevalence. These are digital photography,
patient/caregiver education, and automated sys-
tems that assist in maximizing a patient’s care
while in a facility.

Digital Photography
New research is indicating that digital photog-
raphy may be able to play a role in helping pre-
vent the development of heel pressure ulcers in
at-risk patients. Jesada et al. report that “There
are many potential uses for digital photography
in acute care hospitals, from documenting and
preserving forensic evidence to improving treat-
ment.” In particular, recent research is focusing
on whether digital photography can be used
for long-distance pressure ulcer staging. While
some limitations stand in the way of this becom-
ing a regular practice, Jesada et al. note that
“Recognizing the current limitations of digital
photography use for pressure ulcer staging may
facilitate solutions for addressing them. Recently,
for example, Bowling and co-investigators used
an optical wound imaging system to provide a
color-calibrated three-dimensional image of dia-
betic foot wounds that could be viewed remotely
by a clinician with computer software enabling in-
teractive control of the wound being displayed.”

Clinical Education
Another exciting methodology for incorporating
IT into pressure ulcer prevention strategies is to
engage them in the development of clinical edu-
cation programs for patients and caregivers. In
late 2012 Jane Schubart reported on a pilot study
that measured how much an e-learning program
could assist patients with Spinal Cord Injury (SCI)
in preventing pressure ulcers. SCI patients are
vulnerable to pressure ulcers at the heel and
elbow in particular.

The advantages of such an e-learning program
extend beyond a hands-on approach to educa-
tion for the patient. With an effective e-learning
program, nursing time spent educating patients
and caregivers could also be reduced.
However, Schubart acknowledges that the sample size for this pilot study was small and also notes, “The question remains whether, given access, users who need it would choose to use it on their own or whether it would be more effective as a structured intervention integrated into formal rehabilitation programs.”

Automated Systems
A third major function IT can play in heel pressure ulcer prevention is the development of automated systems that will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of heel pressure ulcer prevention programs. A prime example of this type of integration occurred at the NCH Healthcare System in Florida. In an effort to reduce heel pressure ulcer prevalence in the 2-hospital system, an IT program was created that automatically generates a consult with a WOC Nurse for patients at high risk for developing heel pressure ulcers. Joan McInerney, WOC Nurse Coordinator at the NCH system, notes that as a nurse answers questions about a patient, the computer measures each answer based on all six Braden subscales. If the final score is 13 or less the system automatically schedules a WOC Nurse consult for the patient. Professional offloading devices are also ordered automatically through this system.

Undoubtedly there are countless other ways to incorporate IT personnel into heel pressure ulcer prevention efforts. As technology continues to evolve, the possibilities will only become more numerous.

THE CASE FOR DIETITIANS
There are two key areas in which dietitians can help lower heel pressure ulcer prevalence. The first is offering nutritional recommendations based on the patient’s specific condition. The second is assisting patients and their families in making dietary decisions when comorbidities are present.

Nutritional Recommendations
Information about how nutrition impacts a patient’s ability to prevent heel pressure ulcers is becoming an increasingly important focus in hospitals and acute care facilities. Crawford and Fields-Varnado note that “reducing the hemoglobin A1C level to less than 7% can reduce the risk of diabetic complications like neuropathy, and they also suggest B12 to help prevent neuropathic symptoms.” Preventing diabetic neuropathy can be an important stepping stone to preventing heel pressure ulcers. The more a patient can maintain full sensation in the lower extremities, the more capable they will be of alerting healthcare professionals of pain or pressure sensations.

Assisting in the Decision Making Process
Where comorbidities exist, dietitians can assist patients and their families in choosing what nutritional therapy system would work best. Nancy Collins describes a situation in which a patient was diagnosed with renal failure as well as a Stage IV pressure ulcer. She writes, “For the wound, we typically recommend extra protein; for the renal failure we typically recommend decreased protein. In these cases, I prefer to speak to the patient and his/her family and get a sense of their goals and wishes.”

THE CASE FOR THE OPERATING ROOM TEAM
Over the last few years there has been extensive research into the risk of heel pressure ulcer development during long operations. Because the patient is unconscious, they are unable to communicate whether there is pressure or discomfort at the lower extremities. A 2010 study of heel pressure ulcer incidence in orthopedic patients found that “Heel pressure ulcers occurred in 17% of people undergoing elective (joint replacement surgery) or emergency (hip fracture repair) orthopedic procedures. All heel ulcers occurred in acute care…” In a more recent study, Allegretti et al. note that “The incidence of pressure ulcers in patients undergoing general surgical procedures ranges from 4% to 38%. In a national study, 8.5% of all patients undergoing surgeries with durations greater than 3 hours developed PrUs.”

There are two areas in which the expertise of OR professionals can assist in helping prevent heel pressure ulcers: a thorough evaluation of patients before the surgery begins and monitoring of the patient during the operation.

Pre-Surgery Evaluation
With a greater understanding of the role comorbidities play in the development of heel pressure
ulcers, a multidisciplinary team can work together to determine whether the patient is at particular risk for the development of pressure ulcers. O’Neill et al. observe, “A typical PrU patient is geriatric with multiple comorbidities. At New York University Hospital, more than 50% of patients who undergo PrU debridement surgery have diabetes.” Figure 3 illustrates other comorbidities pressure ulcer patients exhibited based on a 2004 national survey:

Given the number of potential conditions a patient could present in the operating room, it is essential to observe which of those conditions could make the patient more susceptible to a heel pressure ulcer developing during surgery. Knowing the patient’s risk can allow the healthcare team to implement preventive measures such as the use of a professional heel offloading device during and after the operation.

Evaluating the Patient During Surgery
With increased knowledge about how a patient’s skin tissue can negatively respond to heat and moisture, the operating team can better evaluate the patient’s skin and recognize signs of pressure ulcer risk. Allegretti et al. note, “Tissues respond to heat with increased metabolic rates, and a combination of other factors, such as anesthesia, hypotension, and immobility, can contribute to the damage of the tissue integrity and be a contributing factor for PrU development.”

Heelift® Glide offers two key advantages that can assist caregivers in preventing heel pressure ulcers. First, the exterior of the Glide is a smooth, durable fabric that allows the patient’s leg to “glide” over bed sheets. This means that a patient’s foot or leg will not catch on blankets and thus will better maintain the ideal position for heel offloading. This can also reduce the amount of time nurses will need to spend reapplying the boot. Additionally, a forefoot strap further helps keep the foot in its proper position. Heelift® Glide also can address some of the new concerns about the skin’s microclimate. Ventilation holes make Heelift® Glide a cooler boot than many of the pillow style boots currently available, and a cooler boot can also mean less perspiration.

As an effective heel offloading device and as a time-saver for nurses, Heelift® Glide can be an invaluable member of your heel ulcer prevention team.
PROOF THAT THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACH WORKS

There is mounting evidence that a multidisciplinary approach to heel ulcer prevention is highly effective. In the aforementioned NCH Hospital System in Florida where IT personnel were integrated into the pressure ulcer prevention program:

The prevalence of pressure ulcers at NCH Healthcare System fell from 12.8 percent in January 2002 to 1.9 percent in January 2007; information provided in 2010 indicated that the pressure ulcer rate averaged 1.8 percent between July 2006 and July 2009, and that in December 2009 the rate was 1.7 percent, including pediatric and mental health patients (who had not previously been included). From January 2002 to January 2007, the prevalence of pressure ulcers on the heel fell from 6.7 percent to 1.1 percent.\(^3\)

Delmore et al. report similar benefits from implementing a multidisciplinary approach to pressure ulcer prevention. They write,

We visualized PU prevention as a wheel with the patient at the center and 8 spokes representing key elements of preventive care. The key elements were (1) assessment, including PU risk and regular skin assessment; (2) a defined skin care regimen; (3) measures to control extrinsic factors such as pressure, friction, shear, and moisture; (4) nutrition and hydration assessment and intervention; (5) use of appropriate support surfaces; (6) patient and family education; (7) clinician training; and (8) protocols and procedures that provide guidance to staff when providing preventive care.\(^3\)

This program helped reduce heel pressure ulcer prevalence from 7.3% to 1.3% over the course of one year.\(^3\)

In addition to these clinical cases proving the benefits of a multidisciplinary program, the AHRQ also recommends a fully integrated approach for heel ulcer prevention. You can access their detailed suggestions here.

CONCLUSION

A perfect storm is developing around the issue of heel pressure ulcer prevalence. An aging, ailing population, a nursing shortage, and the myriad ways pressure ulcers form can make lowering prevalence seem nearly impossible. A fully integrated multidisciplinary approach has been proven to significantly lower facility-wide heel pressure ulcer prevalence rates. Together with healthcare professionals from a variety of disciplines, a highly effective heel offloading device like Heelift\(^\text{®}\) Glide can make heel pressure ulcer prevention an achievable goal.
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