

RECEIVED

SEP 9 2015

OFFICE OF THE  
SENATE COUNCIL**1. General Information**

1a. Submitted by the College of: PUBLIC HEALTH

Date Submitted: 5/6/2015

1b. Department/Division: Dept of Health Mgmt &amp; Policy

1c. Contact Person

Name: Andrea Perkins

Email: andrea.perkins@uky.edu

Phone: 218-2021

Responsible Faculty ID (if different from Contact)

Name: Sarah Wackerbarth

Email: sbwack0@uky.edu

Phone: 218-2079

1d. Requested Effective Date: Semester following approval

1e. Should this course be a UK Core Course? No

**2. Designation and Description of Proposed Course**

2a. Will this course also be offered through Distance Learning?: No

2b. Prefix and Number: CPH 680

2c. Full Title: Fundamentals of Healthcare Quality and Safety

2d. Transcript Title: Healthcare Quality and Safety

2e. Cross-listing:

2f. Meeting Patterns

LECTURE: 45

2g. Grading System: Graduate School Grade Scale

2h. Number of credit hours: 3

2i. Is this course repeatable for additional credit? No

If Yes: Maximum number of credit hours:

If Yes: Will this course allow multiple registrations during the same semester?

2j. Course Description for Bulletin: This course introduces you to the broad discipline of health services systems with an emphasis on quality and patient safety. By the end of this course you will have a better understanding of the theory, methods, structures, and processes of health services, quality and patient safety and why the core areas of interest are so important in health care.

- 2k. Prerequisites, if any: CPH 600 or permission of instructor
- 2l. Supplementary Teaching Component:
3. Will this course taught off campus? No  
If YES, enter the off campus address:
4. Frequency of Course Offering: Spring,  
Will the course be offered every year?: No  
If No, explain: Will be offered every other year
5. Are facilities and personnel necessary for the proposed new course available?: Yes  
If No, explain:
6. What enrollment (per section per semester) may reasonably be expected?: 15
7. Anticipated Student Demand  
Will this course serve students primarily within the degree program?: Yes  
Will it be of interest to a significant number of students outside the degree pgm?: Yes  
If Yes, explain: It is on a list of electives for the "Quality & Safety" track of the proposed "Graduate Certificate in Improving Healthcare Value".
8. Check the category most applicable to this course: Relatively New – Now Being Widely Established,  
If No, explain:
9. Course Relationship to Program(s).  
a. Is this course part of a proposed new program?: No  
If YES, name the proposed new program:  
b. Will this course be a new requirement for ANY program?: No  
If YES, list affected programs:
10. Information to be Placed on Syllabus.  
a. Is the course 400G or 500?: No  
b. The syllabus, including course description, student learning outcomes, and grading policies (and 400G-/500-level grading differentiation if applicable, from 10.a above) are attached: Yes

## Distance Learning Form

Instructor Name:

Instructor Email:

Internet/Web-based: No

Interactive Video: No

Hybrid: No

1. How does this course provide for timely and appropriate interaction between students and faculty and among students? Does the course syllabus conform to University Senate Syllabus Guidelines, specifically the Distance Learning Considerations?

2. How do you ensure that the experience for a DL student is comparable to that of a classroom-based student's experience? Aspects to explore: textbooks, course goals, assessment of student learning outcomes, etc.

3. How is the integrity of student work ensured? Please speak to aspects such as password-protected course portals, proctors for exams at interactive video sites; academic offense policy; etc.

4. Will offering this course via DL result in at least 25% or at least 50% (based on total credit hours required for completion) of a degree program being offered via any form of DL, as defined above?

If yes, which percentage, and which program(s)?

5. How are students taking the course via DL assured of equivalent access to student services, similar to that of a student taking the class in a traditional classroom setting?

6. How do course requirements ensure that students make appropriate use of learning resources?

7. Please explain specifically how access is provided to laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the course or program.

8. How are students informed of procedures for resolving technical complaints? Does the syllabus list the entities available to offer technical help with the delivery and/or receipt of the course, such as the Information Technology Customer Service Center (<http://www.uky.edu/UKIT/>)?

9. Will the course be delivered via services available through the Distance Learning Program (DLP) and the Academic Technology Group (ATL)? NO

If no, explain how student enrolled in DL courses are able to use the technology employed, as well as how students will be provided with assistance in using said technology.

10. Does the syllabus contain all the required components? NO

11. I, the instructor of record, have read and understood all of the university-level statements regarding DL.

Instructor Name:

SIGNATURE[ALHAYS0]Andrea L Perkins|CPH 680 NEW College Review|20150506

SIGNATURE[ZNNIKO0]Roshan Nikou|CPH 680 NEW Graduate Council Review|20150909

## New Course Form

<https://myuk.uky.edu/sap/bc/soap/rfc?services=>

Open in full window to print or save

Generate R

## Attachments:

Browse...

Upload File

	ID	Attachment
Delete	5005	CPH680 4 21 2015 Syllabus.pdf

First 1 Last

(\*denotes required fields)

## 1. General Information

- a. \* Submitted by the College of: PUBLIC HEALTH Submission Date: 5/6/2015
- b. \* Department/Division: Dept of Health Mgmt & Policy
- c.
- \* Contact Person Name: Andrea Perkins Email: andrea.perkins@uky.edu Phone: 218-2021
- \* Responsible Faculty ID (if different from Contact) Sarah Wackerbarth Email: sbwack0@uky.edu Phone: 218-2079
- d. \* Requested Effective Date:  Semester following approval OR  Specific Term/Year<sup>1</sup>
- e.
- Should this course be a UK Core Course?  Yes  No
- If YES, check the areas that apply:
- Inquiry - Arts & Creativity  Composition & Communications - II
- Inquiry - Humanities  Quantitative Foundations
- Inquiry - Nat/Math/Phys Sci  Statistical Inferential Reasoning
- Inquiry - Social Sciences  U.S. Citizenship, Community, Diversity
- Composition & Communications - I  Global Dynamics

## 2. Designation and Description of Proposed Course.

- a. \* Will this course also be offered through Distance Learning?  Yes<sup>1</sup>  No
- b. \* Prefix and Number: CPH 680
- c. \* Full Title: Fundamentals of Healthcare Quality and Safety
- d. Transcript Title (if full title is more than 40 characters): Healthcare Quality and Safety
- e. To be Cross-Listed<sup>2</sup> with (Prefix and Number):
- f. \* Courses must be described by at least one of the meeting patterns below. Include number of actual contact hours<sup>3</sup> for each meeting pattern type.
- |   |  |                                 |                                 |
|---|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="text" value="45"/> Lecture | <input type="text"/> Laboratory <sup>1</sup> | <input type="text"/> Recitation | <input type="text"/> Discussion |
| <input type="text"/> Indep. Study       | <input type="text"/> Clinical                | <input type="text"/> Colloquium | <input type="text"/> Practicum  |
| <input type="text"/> Research           | <input type="text"/> Residency               | <input type="text"/> Seminar    | <input type="text"/> Studio     |
| <input type="text"/> Other              | If Other, Please explain: _____              |                                 |                                 |
- g. \* Identify a grading system:
- Letter (A, B, C, etc.)
- Pass/Fail
- Medicine Numeric Grade (Non-medical students will receive a letter grade)
- Graduate School Grade Scale
- h. \* Number of credits: 3
- i. \* Is this course repeatable for additional credit?  Yes  No
- If YES: Maximum number of credit hours: \_\_\_\_\_
- If YES: Will this course allow multiple registrations during the same semester?  Yes  No

## j. \* Course Description for Bulletin:

This course introduces you to the broad discipline of health services systems with an emphasis on quality and patient safety. By the end of this course you will have a better understanding of the theory, methods, structures, and processes of health services, quality and patient safety and why the core areas of interest are so important in health care.

## k. Prerequisites, if any:

CPH 600 or permission of instructor

l. Supplementary teaching component, if any:  Community-Based Experience  Service Learning  Both3. \* Will this course be taught off campus?  Yes  No

If YES, enter the off campus address: \_\_\_\_\_

## 4. Frequency of Course Offering.

a. \* Course will be offered (check all that apply):  Fall  Spring  Summer  Winter

b. \* Will the course be offered every year?  Yes  No

If No, explain: Will be offered every other year

5. \* Are facilities and personnel necessary for the proposed new course available?  Yes  No

If No, explain: \_\_\_\_\_

## 6. \* What enrollment (per section per semester) may reasonably be expected? 15

## 7. Anticipated Student Demand.

a. \* Will this course serve students primarily within the degree program?  Yes  No

b. \* Will it be of interest to a significant number of students outside the degree pgm?  Yes  No

If YES, explain:

It is on a list of electives for the "Quality & Safety" track of the proposed "Graduate Certificate in Improving Healthcare Value".

## 8. \* Check the category most applicable to this course:

Traditional – Offered in Corresponding Departments at Universities Elsewhere

Relatively New – Now Being Widely Established

Not Yet Found in Many (or Any) Other Universities

## 9. Course Relationship to Program(s).

a. \* Is this course part of a proposed new program?  Yes  No

If YES, name the proposed new program: \_\_\_\_\_

b. \* Will this course be a new requirement for ANY program?  Yes  No

If YES, list affected programs: \_\_\_\_\_

## 10. Information to be Placed on Syllabus.

a. \* Is the course 400G or 500?  Yes  No

If YES, the *differentiation for undergraduate and graduate students must be included* in the information required in 10.b. You must include: (i) identify additional assignments by the graduate students; and/or (ii) establishment of different grading criteria in the course for graduate students. (See SR

b.  \* The syllabus, including course description, student learning outcomes, and grading policies (and 400G-/500-level grading differentiation if applicable above) are attached.

<sup>1</sup> Courses are typically made effective for the semester following approval. No course will be made effective until all approvals are received.  
<sup>2</sup> The chair of the cross-listing department must sign off on the Signature Routing Log

- <sup>13</sup> In general, undergraduate courses are developed on the principle that one semester hour of credit represents one hour of classroom meeting per week for a semester, exclusive of any laboratory meeting. Laboratory meeting, generally, is two hours per week for a semester for one credit hour. (from SR 5.2.1)
- <sup>14</sup> You must also submit the Distance Learning Form in order for the proposed course to be considered for DL delivery.
- <sup>15</sup> In order to change a program, a program change form must also be submitted.

Rev 8/09

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
COLLEGE OF PUBLIC HEALTH

---

Course Syllabus

Course Number: CPH 680      Spring 201x

***Fundamentals of Healthcare Quality and Safety***

---

**LOCATION AND MEETING TIME:**

Location: TBA

Schedule: TBA

---

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

Instructor: Sarah Wackerbarth, PhD.  
Associate Professor, Health Management & Policy  
College of Public Health Bldg.  
111 Washington Ave., Rm. 103C  
(859) 218-2079  
[sbwack0@uky.edu](mailto:sbwack0@uky.edu) (preferred)  
Office hours: Tuesdays 10:30-11:30, or by appointment

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course introduces you to the broad discipline of health services systems with an emphasis on quality and patient safety. By the end of this course you will have a better understanding of the theory, methods, structures, and processes of health services, quality and patient safety and why the core areas of interest are so important in health care.

**COURSE PREREQUISITES**

CPH 600 or permission from the instructors

**CORE COMPETENCIES AND COURSE OBJECTIVES**

The faculty has established a set of core competencies related to positions that students typically enter after graduation. The course objectives stated in this table relate directly to specific competencies and apply to all students who take this course.

Illustrative related course objectives* The students should:	
<u>MPH Program</u>	
Apply quality and performance improvement concepts to organizational performance.	Learn methods of process and quality improvement.
Use principles of evidence-based public health to design and implement policies, programs, and strategies to improve population health.	Develop and monitor performance metrics.
<u>MHA Program</u>	
Apply appropriate quantitative methods for	Utilize satisfaction surveys and customer feedback.

measuring and assessing the services (clinical and non-clinical) provided by healthcare organizations.	Learn definitions of quality.
Speak and write in a clear, logical, and grammatical manner in formal and informal situations, including cogent business presentations and use of social media.	Prepare written reports and verbal presentations that are clear, crisp, and compelling, both individually and in teams.
Apply current methods for monitoring, assessing, and improving organizational performance, including patient safety, clinical quality, and patient satisfaction.	Identify performance and quality indicators. Coordinate and promote the distribution of performance information within an organization
Demonstrate commitment to objective self-assessment and on-going development that will lead to personal and professional growth throughout their career.	Demonstrate clear understanding of their personal core values.
<i>*Each student's attainment of these objectives will be assessed through their performance on class projects and the final examination and by their level of engagement and contributions to classroom dialog.</i>	

### **TEXTBOOKS**

There is no required textbook for this course. Required readings are listed in the syllabus and available for download via the University of Kentucky Libraries E-Journal collections or via the World Wide Web.

### **GRADING & COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

The following scale will be used in evaluating and grading student performance:

Participation	10%
Project Management of Module	25%
Module Tasks	40%
Final Project	25%

**Participation** The course has been designed to generate discussion and active learning. To reinforce that aim, a significant portion of the course grade is allocated to participation.

**Modules** Each student will serve as project manager for one module. The project manager is responsible for designing the module, assigning the tasks, and producing a collective deliverable. The modules will be assigned during the first week. The project manager will need to develop and assign discussion questions, provide evaluative feedback on the participation of classmates (using a Team Work Evaluation Rubric, provided below), produce a Summary Report of key discussion points, and present the Summary during the in-class Discussion Session of the module. The project manager will be evaluated by classmates (using a Project Manager Evaluation Rubric, provided below) as well as the course instructor (using a Summary Report Evaluation Rubric, provided below).



**Team Work Evaluation Rubric:** Rate each person on six criteria using the levels as defined. Fractional points (e.g., 3.5) are allowed.

	4. DISTINGUISHED	3. PROFICIENT	2. APPRENTICE	1. NOVICE
QUALITY OF ANALYSIS	Incorporated key points. Response was balanced. Included facts from reliable sources.	Incorporated key points. Analysis was balanced.	Incorporated some points but response was lacking in breadth or depth.	Missed some key points. Or provided response that focused on only one issue. Or, included more opinion than fact (or analysis).
WRITING	The report provided additional details that were unique/interesting and related to the task. The report was well-written without grammar errors.	The report was well-written without grammar errors.	The report had one or two grammar issues.	The report needed extensive editing.
CONTENT - CREATIVITY	Response demonstrated interpretation of module materials and additional research. Used pictures, images or other visual aids to display ideas.	Response demonstrated interpretation of module materials.	Response demonstrated interpretation of only some module materials. Lacked displays.	Response demonstrated only weak interpretation.
ORGANIZATION - TIME MANAGEMENT	Seemed to use time well. Work was turned in early or on time.	Finished on time, but seemed slightly rushed (e.g., no final edit)	Finished on time, but seemed really rushed (e.g., major issues with continuity between sections and/or proofreading)	Report submitted late.
DESIGN - LAYOUT AND ORGANIZATION	Response was well-organized with headings and subheadings. Length was appropriate. Good organization that allowed for easy reading.	Response was fairly well-organized with headings and subheadings. Good organization that allowed for easy reading. Maybe too long (or too short).	Response lacked headings or other means that allowed for easy reading. Length was appropriate.	Response lacked headings or other means that allowed for easy reading and length was not appropriate.
FULFILLS EXPECTATIONS	Expectations exceeded.	Expectations met.	Minimal expectations met.	Response did not meet expectations.

**Project Manager Evaluation Rubric:** Rate the project manager on the seven criteria using the levels as defined. Fractional points (e.g., 3.5) are allowed.

	4. DISTINGUISHED	3. PROFICIENT	2. APPRENTICE	1. NOVICE
MODULE DESIGN	Selected material was interesting and provided a competent overview of the subject. I could tell they did a very thoughtful job.	Selected material provided a competent overview of the subject.	Selected material seemed redundant (or unfocused).	Selected material seemed random.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The questions fit the module and directed my understanding. I enjoyed responding to these tasks.	The questions fit the module and directed my understanding.	The questions fit the module but seemed very basic and didn't further my understanding (e.g., seemed like "busywork").	The questions didn't fit the module.
TIME REQUIREMENT	I devoted more time (than expected) to this module because I wanted to.	I was able to complete the module and tasks with the time expectation.	It took me longer than expected to complete the module and tasks (but it was a value-added experience).	It took me longer than expected to complete the module and tasks (and it felt like "busy-work").
SUMMARY REPORT - CONTENT	Incorporated key points. Response was balanced - I could see my individual response reflected in the summary.	Incorporated key points. Response was fairly balanced.	Too long (or too short) - lacked balance.	Didn't appear to reflect individual responses.
SUMMARY REPORT - WRITING	The report provided additional details that were unique/interesting and related to the task. The report was well-written without grammar errors.	The report was well-written without grammar errors.	The report had one or two grammar issues.	The report needed extensive editing.
SUMMARY REPORT - PRESENTATION	The presentation was engaging. It kept my attention and helped guide my understanding.	The presentation kept my attention and helped guide my understanding.	The presentation was a good overview of the material, but didn't advance my understanding.	The presentation seemed unfocused or was unclear.
FULFILLS EXPECTATIONS	Expectations exceeded.	Expectations met.	Minimal expectations met.	Response did not meet expectations.

**Summary Report Evaluation Rubric:** Rate the project manager on the seven criteria using the levels as defined. Fractional points (e.g., 3.1; 3.5) are allowed.

	4. DISTINGUISHED	3. PROFICIENT	2. APPRENTICE	1. NOVICE
MODULE DESIGN	Selected material was interesting and provided a competent overview of the subject. I could tell they did a very thoughtful job.	Selected material provided a competent overview of the subject.	Selected material seemed redundant (or unfocused).	Selected material seemed random.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The questions fit the module and directed my understanding. I enjoyed responding to these tasks.	The questions fit the module and directed my understanding.	The questions fit the module but seemed very basic and didn't further my understanding (e.g., seemed like "busywork").	The questions didn't fit the module.
TIME REQUIREMENT	I devoted more time (than expected) to this module because I wanted to.	I was able to complete the module and tasks with the time expectation.	It took me longer than expected to complete the module and tasks (but it was a value-added experience).	It took me longer than expected to complete the module and tasks (and it felt like "busy-work").
SUMMARY REPORT - CONTENT	Incorporated key points. Response was balanced - I could see my individual response reflected in the summary.	Incorporated key points. Response was fairly balanced.	Too long (or too short) -- lacked balance.	Didn't appear to reflect individual responses.
SUMMARY REPORT - WRITING	The report provided additional details that were unique/interesting and related to the task. The report was well-written without grammar errors.	The report was well-written without grammar errors.	The report had one or two grammar issues.	The report needed extensive editing.
SUMMARY REPORT - PRESENTATION	The presentation was engaging. It kept my attention and helped guide my understanding.	The presentation kept my attention and helped guide my understanding.	The presentation was a good overview of the material, but didn't advance my understanding.	The presentation seemed unfocused or was unclear.
FULFILLS EXPECTATIONS	Expectations exceeded.	Expectations met.	Minimal expectations met.	Response did not meet expectations.

**Final Project** will be completed in two parts. For part 1 the student will prepare a proposal identifying a healthcare process (e.g., registration, discharge, materials management) or problem to examine. The deliverable for part 2 will be a list of "take-aways" that focus on defining the problem and recommendations for next steps.

Final grade will be calculated by dividing total points earned by total points possible. The final letter grade will be assigned using the following standard UK graduate breakdown:

90-100 = A    80-89 = B    70-79 = C    <69 = E

### **INSTRUCTOR EXPECTATIONS**

1. Attend and be on time for every class session; the classes will start on time.
2. Place cell phones and any other electronic devices on silent or vibrate during class. Please refrain from answering emails, texts, etc. during class.
3. Be prepared by completing the readings and other assignments before each class session.
4. Contribute actively and constructively to class discussions and team projects.
5. Be sure your individual and team papers use proper English grammar, syntax, and spelling. You are encouraged to use spell check and grammar check prior to submitting written work. The UK Writing Laboratory is available to anyone who may need assistance.

### **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

Per university policy, students shall not plagiarize, cheat, or falsify or misuse academic records. Students are expected to adhere to University policy on cheating and plagiarism in all courses. The minimum penalty for a first offense is a zero on the assignment on which the offense occurred. If the offense is considered severe or

the student has other academic offenses on their record, more serious penalties, up to suspension from the university may be imposed.

Plagiarism and cheating are serious breaches of academic conduct. Each student is advised to become familiar with the various forms of academic dishonesty as explained in the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Complete information can be found at the following website: <http://www.uky.edu/Ombud>. A plea of ignorance is not acceptable as a defense against the charge of academic dishonesty. It is important that you review this information as all ideas borrowed from others need to be properly credited.

Part II of *Student Rights and Responsibilities* (available online <http://www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/Code/part2.html>) states that all academic work, written or otherwise, submitted by students to their instructors or other academic supervisors, is expected to be the result of their own thought, research, or self-expression. In cases where students feel unsure about the question of plagiarism involving their own work, they are obliged to consult their instructors on the matter before submission.

When students submit work purporting to be their own, but which in any way borrows ideas, organization, wording or anything else from another source without appropriate acknowledgement of the fact, the students are guilty of plagiarism. Plagiarism includes reproducing someone else's work, whether it be a published article, chapter of a book, a paper from a friend or some file, or something similar to this. Plagiarism also includes the practice of employing or allowing another person to alter or revise the work which a student submits as his/her own, whoever that other person may be.

Students may discuss assignments among themselves or with an instructor or tutor, but when the actual work is done, it must be done by the student, and the student alone. When a student's assignment involves research in outside sources of information, the student must carefully acknowledge exactly what, where and how he/she employed them. If the words of someone else are used, the student must put quotation marks around the passage in question and add an appropriate indication of its origin. Making simple changes while leaving the organization, content and phraseology intact is plagiaristic. However, nothing in these Rules shall apply to those ideas which are so generally and freely circulated as to be a part of the public domain (Section 6.3.1).

Please note: Any assignment you turn in may be submitted to an electronic database to check for plagiarism.

### **ACCOMMODATIONS**

If you have a documented disability that requires academic accommodations, please see me as soon as possible during scheduled office hours. In order to receive accommodations in this course, submit to me a Letter of Accommodation from the Disability Resource Center. If you have not already done so, please register with the Disability Resource Center for coordination of campus disability services available to students with disabilities. Contact Jake Kames via email at [jkames@email.uky.edu](mailto:jkames@email.uky.edu) or by telephone (859) 257-2754. You may also visit the DRC website for information on how to register for services as a student with a disability: <http://www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/DisabilityResourceCenter/>

### **INCLEMENT WEATHER**

The University of Kentucky has a detailed policy for decisions to close in inclement weather. The snow policy is described in detail at [http://www.uky.edu/PR/News/severe\\_weather.htm](http://www.uky.edu/PR/News/severe_weather.htm) or you can call (859) 257-1754.

### **RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES**

Students will be given the opportunity to make up work (typically, exams or assignments) when students notify their instructor that religious observances prevent the student from completing assignments according to deadlines stated in

this syllabus. Students must notify the course instructor at least two weeks prior to such an absence and propose how to make up the missed academic work.

#### **ATTENDANCE POLICY**

Because this class requires student participation in small groups, students must communicate in advance of planned absences and within 48 hours of unplanned and unavoidable absences. Students are allowed up to two unexcused absences without penalty. Students with more than two unexcused absences will have their semester grades lowered by 5 percentage points for every additional absence. For these purposes, an absence is defined as missing one hour or more of the class period without an excuse approved by the instructor.

#### **EXCUSED ABSENCES POLICY**

Students need to notify the professor of absences prior to class when possible. S.R. 5.2.4.2 defines the following as acceptable reasons for excused absences: (a) serious illness, (b) illness or death of family member, (c) University-related trips, (d) major religious holidays, and (e) other circumstances found to fit "reasonable cause for nonattendance" by the professor.

Students anticipating an absence for a major religious holiday are responsible for notifying the instructor in writing of anticipated absences due to their observance of such holidays no later than the last day in the semester to add a class. Information regarding dates of major religious holidays may be obtained through the religious liaison, Mr. Jake Karnes (859-257-2754).

Students are expected to withdraw from the class if more than 20% of the classes scheduled for the semester are missed (excused or unexcused) per university policy.

#### **VERIFICATION OF ABSENCES**

Students may be asked to verify their absences in order for them to be considered excused. Senate Rule 5.2.4.2 states that faculty have the right to request "appropriate verification" when students claim an excused absence because of illness or death in the family. Appropriate notification of absences due to university-related trips is required prior to the absence.

#### **LATE WORK POLICY**

Assignments are due at the beginning of the class period. Assignments will be accepted up to 1 week after they are due, however, a 10% penalty will be assessed. Consent of instructor must be obtained. You must turn in all materials to pass the course.

CPH 680 Detailed Schedule

Week	Topic and Readings	
1	<p><b>Course Introduction</b></p> <p><b>Module Assignments</b></p>	
2	<p><b>Introduction to Patient Safety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institute of Medicine, Committee on Health Care in America (2001). Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. Washington (DC): National Academy Press. Available from: <a href="http://www.nap.edu/books/0309072808/html/">http://www.nap.edu/books/0309072808/html/</a></li> <li>- Kohn, L.T., Corrigan, J.M., &amp; Donaldson, M., (Eds) (2000). To Err is human: building a safer health system. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Available from: <a href="http://psnet.ahrq.gov/resource.aspx?resourceID=157">http://psnet.ahrq.gov/resource.aspx?resourceID=157</a></li> </ul>	
3	<p><b>Module 1: The Science of Patient Safety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Berwick, D.M. (1996). A primer on leading the improvement of systems. <i>BMJ</i>. 312(7031):619-22.</li> <li>- Leape, L. L. (1994). Error in medicine. <i>JAMA</i>, 272(23), 1851-1857.</li> <li>- Wachter, R. M. (2010). Patient safety at ten: unmistakable progress, troubling gaps. <i>Health affairs</i>, 29(1), 165-173.</li> </ul>	Module 1 Tasks
4	<p><b>Module 2: Advancing Patient Safety through Systems Thinking and Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Kaplan, G. S. (2012). Pursuing the perfect patient experience. <i>Frontiers of health services management</i>, 29(3), 16-27.</li> <li>- Carroll, J. G. (2002). Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. <i>Quality Management in Healthcare</i>, 10(4), 60-61.</li> </ul>	Module 2 Tasks
5	<p><b>Module 3: Identifying &amp; Mitigating Patient Safety Risks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brennan, T.A., Leape, L.L., Laird, N.M. et al. (1991). Incidence of adverse events and negligence in hospitalized patients. Results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study I. <i>NEJM</i>; 324:370-376.</li> <li>- Leape LL, Brennan T.A., Laird N, et al. (1991). The nature of adverse events in hospitalized patients. Results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study II. <i>NEJM</i>; 324:377-384.</li> </ul>	Module 3 Tasks
6	<p><b>Discussion of Modules 1-2</b></p>	<p>Module 1 Summary Report due</p> <p>Module 2 Summary Report due</p>
7	<p><b>Module 4: Balancing Systems and Individual Accountability in a Safety Culture</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wachter, R. M., &amp; Pronovost, P. J. (2009). Balancing "no blame" with accountability in patient safety. <i>N Engl J Med</i>, 361(14), 1401-1406.</li> <li>- Marx, D. (2001). Patient safety and the "just culture": a primer for health care executives. April 17, 2001. <i>Prepared for Columbia University under flagrant provided by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute</i>. Available at: <a href="http://www.mers-tm.net/support/marx_primer.pdf">www.mers-tm.net/support/marx_primer.pdf</a>.</li> <li>- Sexton, J. B., Thomas, E. J., &amp; Helmreich, R. L. (2000). Error, stress, and teamwork in medicine and aviation: cross sectional surveys. <i>Bmj</i>, 320(7237), 745-749.</li> </ul>	Module 4 Tasks due
8	<p><b>Module 5: Increasing Patient Safety Awareness and Practice among Clinicians and Staff</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Morath, J. (2011). Nurses create a culture of patient safety: it takes more than projects. <i>OJIN: The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing</i>, 16(3).</li> <li>- Goode, L. D., Clancy, C. M., Kimball, H.R., Meyer, G., &amp; Eisenberg, J.M. (2002) When is good good enough"? The role and responsibility of physicians to improve patient safety. <i>Academic Medicine</i>. 77(10):947-52.</li> <li>- Leonard, M., Graham, S., &amp; Bonacum, D. (2004). The human factor: the critical importance of effective teamwork and communication in providing safe care. <i>Quality and Safety in Health Care</i>, 13(suppl 1), i85-i90.</li> </ul>	Module 5 Tasks due
9	<p><b>Module 6: Strategies for Engaging Executives and Clinical Leaders</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pronovost, P. J., Miller, M. R., Wachter, R. M., &amp; Meyer, G. S. (2009). Perspective: physician leadership in quality. <i>Academic Medicine</i>, 84(12), 1651-1656.</li> <li>- Goeschel, C. A., Wachter, R. M., &amp; Pronovost, P. J. (2010). Responsibility for quality improvement and patient safety: hospital board and medical staff leadership challenges. <i>CHEST Journal</i>, 138(1), 171-178.</li> </ul>	Module 6 Tasks due

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Krause, T., &amp; Dunn, S. (2006). How are leadership and culture related to patient safety. <i>Behavioral Science Technology, Inc.</i> Available from: <a href="http://www.npsf.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/IG_White-Paper-How-Are-Leadership-and-Culture-are-Related-to-Patient-Safety-Mar-2007.pdf">http://www.npsf.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/IG_White-Paper-How-Are-Leadership-and-Culture-are-Related-to-Patient-Safety-Mar-2007.pdf</a>.</li> </ul>	
10	Discussion of Modules 3-5	Module 3 Summary Report due Module 4 Summary Report due Module 5 Summary Report due
11	<b>Module 7: Obstacles and Opportunities for Patient and Family Engagement in Patient Safety</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hibbard, J. H., Peters, E., Slovic, P., &amp; Tusler, M. (2005). Can patients be part of the solution? Views on their role in preventing medical errors. <i>Medical Care Research and Review</i>, 62(5), 601-616.</li> <li>- Weissman, J. S., Schneider, E. C., Weingart, S. N., Epstein, A. M., David-Kasdan, J., Feibelmann, S., ... &amp; Gatsonis, C. (2008). Comparing patient-reported hospital adverse events with medical record review: do patients know something that hospitals do not? <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i>, 149(2), 100-108.</li> <li>- Weingart, S. N., Zhu, J., Chiappetta, L., Stuver, S. O., Schneider, E. C., Epstein, A. M., ... &amp; Weissman, J. S. (2011). Hospitalized patients' participation and its impact on quality of care and patient safety. <i>International Journal for Quality in Health Care</i>, mzt002.</li> </ul>	Module 7 Tasks
12	<b>Module 8: Methods for Measuring Performance and Clinical Outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chassin, M. R., Loeb, J. M., Schmaltz, S. P., &amp; Wachter, R. M. (2010). Accountability measures—using measurement to promote quality improvement. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i>, 363(7), 683-688.</li> <li>- Leape, L. L., Berwick, D. M., &amp; Bates, D. W. (2002). What practices will most improve safety?: evidence-based medicine meets patient safety. <i>JAMA</i>, 288(4), 501-507.</li> </ul>	Module 8 Tasks
13	Discussion of Modules 6-8	Module 6 Summary Report due Module 7 Summary Report due Module 8 Summary Report due
14	<b>Module 9: The Role of Health Information Technology in Patient Safety</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Classen, D. C., Resar, R., Griffin, F., Federico, F., Frankel, T., Kimmel, N. &amp; James, B. C. (2011). 'Global trigger tool' shows that adverse events in hospitals may be ten times greater than previously measured. <i>Health Affairs</i>, 30(4), 581-589.</li> <li>- Wachter, R. M. (2006). Expected and unanticipated consequences of the quality and information technology revolutions. <i>JAMA</i>, 295(23), 2780-2783.</li> <li>- Reckmann, M. H., Westbrook, J. I., Koh, Y., Lo, C., &amp; Day, R. O. (2009). Does computerized provider order entry reduce prescribing errors for hospital inpatients? A systematic review. <i>Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association</i>, 16(5), 613-623.</li> </ul>	
15	<b>Module 10: The National Landscape: Policy, Regulation, and the Environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lau, H., &amp; Litman, K. C. (2011). Saving lives by studying deaths: using standardized mortality reviews to improve inpatient safety. <i>Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety</i>, 37(9), 400-408.</li> <li>- Wachter, R. M., Foster, N. E., &amp; Dudley, R. A. (2008). Medicare's decision to withhold payment for hospital errors: the devil is in the details. <i>Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety</i>, 34(2), 116-123.</li> <li>- Litvak, E., &amp; Bisognano, M. (2011). More patients, less payment: Increasing hospital efficiency in the aftermath of health reform. <i>Health Affairs</i>, 30(1), 76-80.</li> </ul>	
16	Discussion of Modules 9-10 Course Wrap-up	Module 9 Summary Report due Module 10 Summary Report due

Final Exam Date – last day to turn in Problem Definition Project Report

## Ellis, Janie

---

**From:** Nikou, Roshan  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 09, 2015 11:42 AM  
**To:** Brothers, Sheila C; Carvalho, Susan E; Ellis, Janie; Ett, Joanie M; Hippisley, Andrew R; Jackson, Brian A; Lindsay, Jim D.; Nikou, Roshan; Price, Cleo; Timoney, David M; Harmon, Camille  
**Cc:** Perkins, Andrea L; Johnson, Julia M; Shane, Rachel; Flaherty, Christopher W; Schuer, Kevin M  
**Subject:** Transmittals

**TO:** Andrew Hippisley, Chair and Sheila Brothers, Coordinator  
Senate Council

**FROM:** Brian Jackson, Chair and Roshan Nikou, Coordinator  
Graduate Council

Graduate Council approved the following course proposals and is now forwarding them to the Senate Council to approve.

### **New Courses**

CPH 680 Fundamentals of Healthcare Quality and Safety  
CPH 755 Leading Change with Healthcare Teams  
ENG 608 Craft of Writing  
SW 530 Responding to Military and Veteran Populations  
AAD 550 Gran Writing  
AAD 560 Teaching artistry for School-based Programs  
AAD 565 Community Engagement

### **Course Changes**

PAS 660 Family Medicine Clerkship  
PAS 669 Internal Medicine Clerkship

Roshan Nikou, MA  
The Graduate School  
The University of Kentucky  
101 Gillis Building - 0033