



Phase 2. Falls and Fragility Fracture Audit Programme: National Audit of Inpatient Falls (January 2020)

Clinical Audit Proforma (VERSION 2)

Q 1.11

QUESTIONS	FIELD HELP
Did this patient have a fall resulting in a femoral fracture i	n your Trust / Health Board?
 □ Yes - a fall is known to have occurred □ No - no fall known to have occurred □ Not a patient at this Trust/Health Board 	Carefully check your records for the patient identified below and only answer 'Yes' if you can confirm the patient was an inpatient in your organisation at time in question and that there was a documented fall that resulted in a femoral fracture.
☐ Duplicate record	Check the online help for further details.

	QUESTIONS	FIELD NOTES
2.1	Time and date when the patient was admitted to the trust / health board where the fall resulting in the femoral fracture occurred:	
	DATE: DD/MM/YYYY: TIME: HH:MM:	Please record the date and time the patient arrived at your hospital. It is important to record the arrival time because this is the first point of contact with the organisation.
2.2	Time and date of fall which caused the femoral fracture:	
	DATE: DD/MM/YYYY: TIME: HH:MM:	Please record the date and time of the fall that caused the femoral fracture
2.2		
2.3	Type of ward where fall happened:	
	 □ Medical □ Assessment unit / Emergency department □ Mental health ward □ Older persons/frailty ward □ Rehab ward □ Surgical □ Trauma and orthopaedic ward □ Other 	Assessment unit is a short stay decisions unit e,g, Emergency department(ED), Acute Medicine Unit (AMU) or Clinical Decision Unit (CDU) or equivalent. If your trust does not have wards categorised as medical, surgical, admissions unit, older persons/frailty, rehab or mental health ward, select 'other'.

	QUESTIONS	FIELD NOTES
3.1	Was a documented multi-factorial risk assessment (MFRA) completed?	
	☐ Yes ☐ No documented MFRA (if yes – answer 3.1a)	A definition of MFRA can be found in the download section. This specifies what the National Audit of Inpatient Falls agrees to be the necessary components of a MFRA.
3.1a	How many days prior to the fall that caused the fracture had the multifactorial risk fall risk assessment (MFRA) been undertaken or updated?	
	Days:	The number of days should be counted from either the first MFRA or a subsequent update. Whichever date is closest to the fall that caused the fracture should be used.
3.2	Prior to the fall that caused the femoral fracture, had this patient had any other falls during the same admission?	
	☐ Yes ☐ No (if yes answer 3.3)	Indicate 'Yes' if there are any falls recorded that occurred before the fall that caused the femoral fracture. This should refer to falls that occurred during the SAME admission (to the Trust/Health Board) as the fall that caused the femoral fracture, even if the falls occurred in other ward locations. Do not include falls that occurred before the admission episode in question or during previous admissions.
3.3	Was there documented evidence that the MFRA and in	tervention plan had been reviewed following the inpatient fall(s)?

	□ Yes □ No	Review the actions taken after each inpatient fall. If there was more than one fall, only indicate 'Yes' if there is documented evidence of a re-assessment after every fall. See definition of MFRA and intervention plan (downloads page).
3.4	Was there documented evidence that the MFRA and intervention plan was being followed at the time of the fall that caused the femoral fracture?	
	Yes No	To answer this question, firstly review the MFRA. Any risks identified by the MFRA should be linked to intervention actions. Review clinical documentation to ascertain whether intervention actions had been undertaken / were in place at the time that the patient had the fall that caused the fracture. If an intervention action had been recommended in clinical documentation, but was not in place at the time of the fall that caused the fracture, answer: No. If there was no or an incomplete MFRA or no intervention actions recommended to address identified risk factors answer 'No' See document for definition of MFRA and intervention plan (downloads page).
3.5	Had the patient had a documented assessment of vision occurred?	n during the admission when the fall that caused the femoral fracture
	 ☐ Yes - no visual impairment identified ☐ Yes - visual impairment identified ☐ Not documented 	A vision assessment should identify the presence of visual impairment and/or the need for visual aids such as spectacles. The following three elements are necessary for a vision assessment to meet the criteria for this audit: questioning about spectacle use and simple testing of distance and near vision (see Q1-3 in the RCP tool)
3.6	Had the patient had a documented lying / standing blood pressure measurement during the admission when the fall that caused the femoral fracture occurred?	
	 ☐ Yes - no evidence of orthostatic hypotension ☐ Yes - evidence of orthostatic hypotension ☐ Not documented ☐ Not possible 	Definition of lying / standing BP and OH (link to the RCP guidance). Only use the option not possible, if the patient was unable to stand for the duration of the inpatient stay prior to the femoral fracture.

3.7	Is there documented evidence that the patient had a medication review during the admission when the fall that caused the femoral fracture occurred?	
	☐ Yes☐ No☐ Not applicable	This question is asking whether the patient's medications were assessed to identify any drugs that might contribute to falls. This could be by a doctor, pharmacist or any other appropriate member of staff. It is also asking whether any changes were made in light of this, or if a decision was recorded that no changes were required/possible.
		Medication review may not always result in de-prescribing of medications known to contribute to falls. Provided the review includes an assessment weighing up the risk and benefit of decisions regarding medications that contribute to fall risk, this constitutes a medication review.

	QUESTIONS	FIELD NOTES
4.1	Was a documented enhanced supervision prescription, being followed at the time of the fall that caused the fracture?	
	 □ No enhanced supervision prescription □ No - prescribed but not followed □ Yes (If no prescribed but not followed or yes – answer 4.2) 	Enhanced supervision prescription is an individualised plan for provision of increased supervision compared to what would usually be provided in the setting in which the patient is based. It might include: movement sensors, closer observation, cohorting, intentional rounding, one-to-one supervision, bay tagging.
4.2	Which of these options best describes the primary enhanced supervision prescription at the time of the fall that caused the fracture?	
	 □ Movement sensors □ Closer observation □ Cohorting □ Intentional rounding 	Answer, as to what was prescribed, even if it was not followed at the time of the fall.

□ One-to-One supervision	
☐ Bay tagging	

	QUESTIONS	FIELD NOTES
5.1	Was the fall that caused the femoral fracture witnessed?	
	□ Yes □ No	Was there documented evidence that the fall had been witnessed?
5.2	What was the patient documented to have been doing at	t the time of the fall that caused the femoral fracture?
	 □ Lying/sitting in the bed □ Sitting in a chair □ Using a commode □ Transferring between the bed/chair/commode □ Walking on the ward □ Using the toilet/bathroom □ Not on the ward at the time of the fall 	If the patient was in the process of getting up or sitting down from the bed / chair / commode, choose "transferring between the bed / chair / commode"

	 □ Not known as the fall was unwitnessed □ Not documented 	
5.3		ely configured for safe transfers at the time of the fall that caused the
	femoral fracture?	
	□ Yes □ No	The bed should have been positionned at an appropriate height based on an individualised assessment of the patient, with a judgement weighing up the risk of the patient falling from the bed against the difficulty of standing from a bed that is too low. Answer No if there was no documentation of bed height.
5.4	Was there documented evidence that an appropriate before femoral fracture?	d rail prescription was in place at the time of the fall that caused the
	 □ Bed rails not recommended □ Bed rails recommended □ No assessment Answer 5.4 a if a bed rail prescription in place	A bed rail prescription should include a documented assessment to ascertain whether bed rails should be raised. This audit does not support the use of bed rails as a falls prevention intervention, unless they are supported by an assessment and the presence of indications as specified in the NLRS guidance. This prescription should be up to date based on the patient's needs at the time of the fall that caused the fracture
а	a) Was the bed rail prescription plan in place at the time	
	□ Prescription being followed□ Prescription not being followed	
5.5	Was there documented evidence that any of the following fracture?	g actions were taken at the time of the fall that caused the femoral
А	The patient was given the call bell and instructed on how	to use it:

В	 □ Yes □ No □ Not appropriate □ Not documented The patient was informed that they should ask for help be 	Choose 'Not appropriate' where it has been deemed following an assessment that the patient would be unable to use a call bell effectively. Pefore moving:
	 Yes No Not appropriate Not documented 	Answer 'Not applicable' if the MFRA mobility assessment indicated no need for supervision when transferring or walking. Choose 'Not appropriate' where it has been deemed following an assessment that the patient would be unable to remember to ask for help.
С	An alternative strategy was put into place as the patient	was deemed unable to ask for help or use the call bell:
	 Yes No Not appropriate Not documented 	Only answer Yes if there was documented evidence of an assessment that highlighted: 1. Use of a call bell or prompting to ask for help was deemed unlikely to be effective due to poor cognition or delirium and, 2. An alternative strategy was in place for the patient to seek assistance. Answer 'Not appropriate' if an alternative strategy was not indicated (assessment for dementia and delirium identified no evidence of cognitive impairment or confusion and no communication issues were observed).
d	A walking aid was situated within the patients reach (if aid was indicated in the mobility plan)?	
	 □ Yes □ No □ Not applicable □ Not documented 	Only answer 'Not applicable' if a walking aid was not required (as stated in mobility assessment and plan).
5.6	Was there evidence that the patient's mobility plan was time of the fall that resulted in the femoral fracture	followed with regards to walking aid use and supervision provided at the

	 ☐ Yes ☐ Mobility plan was NOT FOLLOWED in full ☐ No mobility plan documented or plan unclear 	Please answer that the mobility was not followed regardless of the reason for this. There are many possible reasons for mobility plans not being followed. Ascertaining the underlying cause will form part of the post fall debrief.
5.7	Was there evidence that the patient had a continence care plan that was being followed at the time of the fall that fracture?	
	 □ No continence problems identified □ Continence care plan was being followed □ Continence care plan not followed □ Not documented 	An individualised continence care plan consists of a documented assessment of urinary and faecal continence, flagging any problems identified and a plan to address these problems.
5.8	Was the patient on their own at the time of the fall th	at caused the fracture?
	 □ The patient was on their own □ The patient was with a member of staff □ The patient was with a family member or friend □ Not recorded 	If the patient was in a location with another patient or visitor but no staff or family/friends were present – answer that the patient was on their own. If a member of staff or family member was in the same room or bay but did not have the patient in their sight line (i.e. the patient was behind a curtain or door), consider the patient to be on their own.
5.9	Was the patient using a walking or mobility aid at the t	time of the fall that caused the fracture?
	 □ Not indicated for this patient □ Aid in mobility plan was being used □ Recommended aid was NOT being used □ Not recorded 	A walking aid is a device used by the patient, designed with the purpose of supporting walking or transfers, usually by incorporating the arms to re-distribute some of the load of weight-bearing or to increase stability. Commonly encountered walking aids include sticks, crutches, frames or/and three and four-wheel walkers. A mobility aid, is a device that is used to enhance mobility more generally. This could include a wheelchair or braces/splints worn when mobilising. Review mobility plan to determine what walking/mobility aid had been recommended at the time of the fall that caused the fracture
5.10	Did the patient have a delirium care plan in place at th	e time of the fall that caused the fracture?

 □ Not delirious on formal assessment □ Delirium identified - but no care plan documented □ Delirium identified - care plan documented □ No assessment for delirium 	A delirium care plan includes a standardised assessment for the presence of delirium. If delirium is present, there should be a management plan in place which may consist of generic measures known to reduce delirium intensity and/or specific interventions tailored to assessment findings. This can be in the form of a specific care plan or detailed in the clinical notes.
☐ Not documented	If a patient develops a new onset confusion, assessment for delirium and initiation of a care plan should begin without delay. Therefore if there is evidence the patient has developed a new confusion before the fall that caused the fracture, but this was not identified on formal delirium assessment, answer not documented.

	QUESTIONS	FIELD NOTES
6.1	Is there documented evidence in the clinical notes that the patient was checked for signs or symptoms of potential for spinal injury and	
	fracture before they were moved?	

	☐ Yes - injury suspected☐ Yes - no injury suspected☐ No	If there is no outcome of the check for signs and symptoms documented in the clinical notes, answer 'No'.	
6.2	What manual handling method was used to move the patient following the fall that caused the femoral fracture (as documented in the clinical notes)?		
	 ☐ Flat lifting equipment/scoop hoist ☐ Standard hoist / other lifting equipment ☐ Ambulance service equipment ☐ Assisted to get up with help by staff ☐ Got up independently ☐ Method not documented 	As documented in the clinical notes. Note: record as 'Staff assisted to get up' if the patient was moved without equipment being used.	
6.3 Is there documented evidence that the patient had a medical assessment within 30 minutes of the fall fracture?		cal assessment within 30 minutes of the fall that resulted in the femoral	
	 □ Assessment by medically qualified professional within 30 minutes □ Assessment by other healthcare professional within 30 minutes □ Assessment by medically qualified professional within 12 hours □ No assessment recorded or it was undertaken more than 12 hours after fall 	This assessment should be performed by a medically qualified person (as stated in CG161). However, in settings where a doctor is not on site 24/7, a competent health care professional (other than a doctor) can perform an assessment to determine whether a fast track (transfer to emergency department) or routine follow-up (review within 12 hours) is required. When completing this audit, the definitions used by the NICE quality standards should be used. If a patient is seen by a non-medical professional first, but subsequently reviewed by a medically qualified professional within 30 minutes, answer: Assessment by a medically qualified professional within 30 minutes.	
6.4 Time and date that first dose of analgesia was given following the femoral fracture?		ng the femoral fracture?	
	Time of analgesia: Date of analgesia:		

6.5	What level of harm was attributed to the fall that caused the femoral fracture?	
	 □ Death □ Severe harm □ Moderate harm □ Low harm □ No harm 	See NRLS guidance. Please indicate the level of harm attributed to this fall as validated in your local reporting system (i.e. Datix/Ulysses/other).
6.6	Was there documented evidence that appropriate action was taken to inform next of kin (NOK) within 24 hours of the fall that caused the fracture?	
	 □ NOK were contacted □ The patient had requested not to contact NOK □ No NOK OR NOK were uncontactable □ Not documented 	
6.7	From reviewing the documentation, did there appear to be	any delays in transfer for femoral fracture care?
	□ Yes □ No	The audit already captures data on time between fall and start of hip fracture care. Therefore, the audit team are asked to complete this section if they judge hip fracture care to have been delayed as indicated in the clinical notes. Hip fracture care should begin as soon as a fracture is suspected. Adequate analgesia, diagnosis and medical stabilisation with the aim of prompt surgery is the expected standard of hip fracture care.
a	Unavailability of an appropriately trained individual to assess the patient following the fall?	
	□ Yes □ No	

b	Delay in accessing diagnostics (X-ray, CT, MRI)?	ccessing diagnostics (X-ray, CT, MRI)?	
	□ Yes		
	□ No		
С	Delay was due to time taken to arrange a within hospital transfer?		
	□ Yes		
	□ No		
d Delay was due to time taken to transfer to another hospital?			
	□ Yes		
	□ No		
е	There was a delay in identification / diagnosis of hip fracture		
	□ Yes		
	□ No		