# **Project Adoption Profile: REFERRALS TO RADIOLOGY**

# **PROJECT BACKGROUND**

This profile is for the initiative led by the Chilliwack Division of Family practice to improve referrals to medical imaging by building on successes of other medical imaging projects within BC. The entire project was 18 months with a budget of \$130,000. The project steering committee included a lead GP, lead SP, medical imaging manager, booking clerk, ER physician, GP's, and project manager.

# **PROJECT GOAL**

Improve timeliness of radiology exams for Chilliwack patients through improving the referral process, identification of level of urgency and improving communication referrals between radiology and family physicians.

# **BENEFIT FOR PHYSICIANS**

- Improved communication.
- Increased knowledge about imaging guidelines.
- Time saved which can reduce wait-times.
- Appropriate and faster referrals.
- Timely results received.







# CHALLENGES AND DELIVERABLES

To get an understanding of the issues experienced by radiologists, GP's, SP's, MOA's and radiology staff, a stakeholder meeting was held to hear various perspectives from all those involved and develop the deliverables which would address the challenges.

Key Deliverables are numbered and further indicated with an asterisk (*)ProblemBaseline Data –Strategies and *DeliverablesSuccess			· · · ·
Identified	start of project	Strategies and Denverables	Indicator
		Dhusisian Ding & Learn	76% of GP's
Inappropriate	50 requisitions were returned each week	Physician Dine & Learn	
or incomplete referrals		Imaging Guidelines to improve	indicated they
referrals	due to	knowledge	learned
	inappropriateness or		something new
	incompleteness	*1. New requisition "Smart" form	about medical
		Designed with pop-up	imaging
	91% of radiologists	guidelines to support	<b>72%</b> felt the
	indicated they	immediate learning.	sessions helped
	receive	Mandatory fields and	them make
	inappropriate	reminders that pop up as the	better referrals
	referrals	GP completes the form serve	
		to ensure completeness,	Only 2
	64% of rad staff	adequate patient history and	requisitions are
	indicate they always	reason for exam provide	<b>returned</b> per
	or often receive	enough info for the	week post-
	incomplete forms	radiologists to understand	project (from
		request.	outside area)
Problem	Baseline Data –	Strategies and *Deliverables	Success
Identified	start of project		Indicator
Lack of	24% of radiologists	MOA Tour and Talks	100% of MOA's
		• Two tours of the rediclosy dont	felt they had a
communication	were satisfied with	<ul> <li>Two tours of the radiology dept</li> </ul>	Tell they had a
communication between	were satisfied with communication	• Two tours of the radiology dept were held for MOA's to attend	better
		<b>.</b> .	=
between		were held for MOA's to attend	better
between radiology and	communication	were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&A, how to better	better understanding of
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&A, how to better prepare patients, completing	better understanding of referral process
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&A, how to better prepare patients, completing	better understanding of referral process after the tours
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&A, how to better prepare patients, completing referrals, etc. GP/SP dialogue	better understanding of referral process after the tours 100% felt they
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&A, how to better prepare patients, completing referrals, etc.	better understanding of referral process after the tours 100% felt they had a better
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	<ul> <li>were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&amp;A, how to better prepare patients, completing referrals, etc.</li> <li>GP/SP dialogue</li> <li>3 engagement meetings with</li> </ul>	better understanding of referral process after the tours 100% felt they had a better relationship with
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	<ul> <li>were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&amp;A, how to better prepare patients, completing referrals, etc.</li> <li>GP/SP dialogue <ul> <li>3 engagement meetings with physicians to discuss "pet</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	better understanding of referral process after the tours 100% felt they had a better relationship with
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	<ul> <li>were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&amp;A, how to better prepare patients, completing referrals, etc.</li> <li>GP/SP dialogue <ul> <li>3 engagement meetings with physicians to discuss "pet peeves" and solutions to improve</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	better understanding of referral process after the tours 100% felt they had a better relationship with radiology staff
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	<ul> <li>were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&amp;A, how to better prepare patients, completing referrals, etc.</li> <li>GP/SP dialogue <ul> <li>3 engagement meetings with physicians to discuss "pet peeves" and solutions to improve</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	better understanding of referral process after the tours 100% felt they had a better relationship with radiology staff 88% of GP's and
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	<ul> <li>were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&amp;A, how to better prepare patients, completing referrals, etc.</li> <li>GP/SP dialogue <ul> <li>3 engagement meetings with physicians to discuss "pet peeves" and solutions to improve communication</li> </ul> </li> <li>One Phone Line</li> </ul>	better understanding of referral process after the tours 100% felt they had a better relationship with radiology staff 88% of GP's and SP's felt there
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	<ul> <li>were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&amp;A, how to better prepare patients, completing referrals, etc.</li> <li>GP/SP dialogue <ul> <li>3 engagement meetings with physicians to discuss "pet peeves" and solutions to improve communication</li> </ul> </li> <li>One Phone Line <ul> <li>One phone number was set up in</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	better understanding of referral process after the tours 100% felt they had a better relationship with radiology staff 88% of GP's and SP's felt there was opportunity
between radiology and family	communication 39% of GP's satisfied	<ul> <li>were held for MOA's to attend followed by Q&amp;A, how to better prepare patients, completing referrals, etc.</li> <li>GP/SP dialogue <ul> <li>3 engagement meetings with physicians to discuss "pet peeves" and solutions to improve communication</li> </ul> </li> <li>One Phone Line</li> </ul>	better understanding of referral process after the tours 100% felt they had a better relationship with radiology staff 88% of GP's and SP's felt there was opportunity for networking

## Key Deliverables are numbered and further indicated with an asterisk (\*)







		<ul> <li>Listing of all GP's and SP's including radiology was developed with contact numbers and photos to improve contact sharing</li> </ul>	<b>30% increase in</b> <b>satisfaction</b> with communication
Congestion/ Waitlists	Due to returned requisitions and processing time, approx. 1 hour of clerical time and 1 hour of SP time per day was spent on incomplete/inapprop riate Requisitions.	By focusing on improving referrals themselves and reducing incompleteness/inappropriatene ss, the medical imaging department could spend more time processing necessary referrals.	Medical imaging has <b>saved at</b> <b>least 1 hour per</b> <b>day</b> as a result of the reduction from 50 returns to 2.
Lack of communication regarding urgent referrals and results	Only 39% of GP's were satisfied with the timeliness of receiving results. 65% of GP's indicated they receive urgent results in a timely manner.	<ul> <li>*3. Referral Process card</li> <li>Timelines and protocols were agreed to by Radiology and urgent/emergent processes were communicated on a referral card.</li> <li>Requisition Form Watermarks</li> <li>Urgent/emergent identifiers were also included on electronic requisition form.</li> </ul>	<b>93%</b> of GP's indicate they now receive urgent results in a timely manner.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO SPREAD COMMUNITIES**

### General

If a community were to take on a piece of the project and adopt at a local level for the greatest impact, it is recommended to adapt the requisition form for your physicians' EMR vendors.

### **Stakeholder Perspectives**

Title	Notes
Physician Champion(s)	N/A
Health Authority	N/A
Community Partner	N/A

# SPREAD OF PROOF OF CONCEPT

#### PLANNING

Consultation with key physicians in your community to review key challenges with respect to radiology and determine if referral form would be an effective tool to create positive impacts. The team would also need to review the requisition form and guidelines to ensure that the guidelines listed reflect local capacity to meet.







#### **ENGAGEMENT & IMPLEMENTATION:**

In Chilliwack, we held a large stakeholder meeting and found that most physicians and MOA's were able to download the new form after the launch event. We also promoted use of the new form in Division enews, emails to physicians and staff going around to each office to support this and delete the old form. We held one additional small lunch meeting to demonstrate the form and assist those that had not attended the launch event. Note that technical support may be required to adapt the requisition form to additional EMR's outside of OSCAR. Costs for this component may vary.

#### **EVALUATION**

The evaluation plan for the project was developed and initiated concurrently with the project plan. This included satisfaction levels, appropriateness, incompleteness with requisitions, and timeliness of receiving results. Evaluation tools can be provided to the spread community to save development of tools and costs.

#### **SUSTAINABILITY**

Funding and staff support is required to ensure project sustainability and improvements continue to be supported after the project ends.

Planning	\$10,000	
Engagement & Implementation	\$15,000	
Evaluation	\$3000	
Sustainability and Spread	\$2000	
TOTAL	\$30,000	

#### **BUDGET SUMMARY**

#### SUPPORTING SPREAD

The Chilliwack project team is happy to provide support and advice to communities interested in adopting a part of this project, in particular, the requisition form may require some technical support. This can be provided through skype, teleconference support or an in-person meeting.

# For more information contact:

```
Host Division: Ridge Meadows
Division Executive Director:
N/A
```

Project Manager: Tracy Miyashita, <u>tmiyashita@divisionsbc.ca</u> 604-537-4507

Shared Care Liaison: Gary Sveinson gsveinson@doctorsofbc.ca





