

MAGNUM P.I.

CHRIS LEDFORD, MD, and Christy Ledford, PHD
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

Q.I.



DEFINITIONAL DIFFERENCE

Quality/process (performance) improvement

- To contribute to *local* knowledge improving processes or practice
- Always involves activities which are standard of care
- Always no greater risk than if project not occurring

Research

- To contribute to *generalizable* knowledge
- May involve activities which are not standard of care or which are performed in novel ways
- Vary from minimal to greater than minimal risk

Where is the divergence?

HEURISTIC DIFFERENCE

- Is question bound by local systems practice model?
 - Yes: QI/PI
 - No: Research
- Voluntary nature
 - Is consent likely needed?
 - Yes: Research
 - No: QI/PI
 - Is the intervention going to happen if it's studied or not?
 - Yes: QI/PI
 - No: Research
- Do patients participate in data collection?
 - Yes: Research
 - No: QI/PI
- Does data collection occur outside of the clinic?
For example, at home or emailed surveys
 - Yes: Research
 - No: QI/PI

PUBLISHED QI EXAMPLES

The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

SPECIAL ARTICLE

Changes in Medicine after Implementation of a

A.J. Starmer, N.D. Spector, R. Srivastava, D.C. E.L. Noble, L.L. Tse, A.K. Dalal, C.A. Keohan, M.F. Wien, C.S. Yoon, K.R. Zigmont, K.M. W. M. Aylor, Z. Bismilla, M. Coffey, S. Mahant, J.L. Everhart, S.J. Patel, J.F. Bale, Jr., J.B. Spackman, F.S. Cole, D.F. Balmer, J.H. Hepps, J.O. Lofgren, and C.P. Landrigan, for the I-PAC

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND

Miscommunications are a leading cause of serious errors in multicenter studies assessing programs designed to improve patient care are lacking.

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Resident Scholarship Expectations and Experiences: Sources of Uncertainty as Barriers to Success

CHRISTY J. W. LEDFORD, PhD
DEAN A. SEEHUSEN, MD, MPH
MEUNDA M. VILLAGRAN, PhD
LAUREN A. CAFFERTY, BA
MARC A. CHILDRESS, MD

Abstract

Background Scholarly activity during residency is vital to resident learning and ultimately to patient care. Incorporating that activity into training is, however, a challenge for medical educators. Most research on medical student and resident attitudes toward scholarly activity to date has been quantitative and has focused on level of interest, desire to perform scholarship, and perceived importance of scholarship.

Objective We explored attitudes, expectations, and barriers regarding participation in scholarly activity among current residents and graduates of a single family medicine residency program.

Methods Using a phenomenologic approach, we systematically analyzed data from one-on-one, semistructured interviews with residents and graduates. Interviews included participant expectations and experiences with scholarly activity in residency.

Results The 20 participants (residents, 15 [75%]; residency graduates, 5 [25%]) identified uncertainty in their attitudes toward, and expectations regarding, participation in scholarly activity as an overarching theme, which may present a barrier to participation. Themes included uncertainty regarding their personal identity as a clinician, time to complete scholarly activity, how to establish a mentor-mentee relationship, the social norms of scholarship, what counted toward the scholarship requirements, the protocol for completing projects, and the clinical relevance of scholarship.

Conclusions Uncertainty about scholarly activity expectations can add to learner anxiety and make performing scholarly activity during residency seem like an insurmountable task. Programs should consider implementing a variety of strategies to foster scholarly activity during residency, including clarifying and codifying expectations and facilitating mentoring relationships with faculty.

DESIGNING QI AS SCHOLARSHIP

- Theoretical framework
- Evidence-based
- Systematic data collection
- Follow regulatory guidelines
 - Watch language: “study” vs “project”
- SQUIRE guidelines (www.squire-statement.org)
- Bottom line
 - Will you learn lessons that can benefit other practices?
 - Are your lessons translatable and replicatable?

REGULATORY FUNCTIONS

- Institutional Review Board
 - Perform administrative, scientific, and statistical review
 - Determination as “not research”
 - Publication clearance (security, HIPAA compliance, disclaimer)
- Quality management office
 - Still need publication clearance

DEVELOPING PI

	QI/PI	Research
Topic	Diabetes management	
Theoretical framework	Stages of change	
Method	Patients participation counts in nutrition and diabetes education class; Chart review	Patient focus groups and attitudinal surveys

MAGNUM P.I.



Refining YOUR question

BACKUP IDEAS/POINTS

- Specific Aims/ Research Question
- Feasible
- Interesting
- Novel
- Ethics
- Relevant
- Venues for dissemination