## Preparing for Disaster: A Developing a Hospital Emergency Augmentation Team SCHOOL of NURSING Megan Matters, DNP, RN, ACNPC/CNS-AG, CEN; HEALTH SYSTEM Richard Westphal, PhD, RN, PMHCNS/NP-BC; Dorothy Tullmann, PhD, RN, CNL; Tom Berry, MHA Background **Conclusions Purpose** PROBLEM To evaluate the readiness of an academic medical center to establish **SUMMARY** Major variations exists within the U.S. on the best and an augmentation team in order to prepare for HAZMAT mass Phase 1 - Potential Volunteer Pool most efficient way for hospitals to prepare for and respond casualty events • 1.8% (n=267) of hospital employees, previously to the surge of patients following a hazardous materials unidentified, reported disaster training experience **Evidence for Project** mass casualty incident. Hospitals needs trained and Team volunteers, (n=580)available decontamination teams to meet minimally ♦ 73.6% Female, 23.4% Male effective emergency plans. Most hospitals cannot rely on \* 35% Age 25 to 44 local or state public safety agencies to provide ♦ 81.7% Caucasian Volunteers decontamination support. ♦ 30.7% 1 to 5 years work experience LITERATURE ♦ 52.1% Direct patient care • Currently limited, based on expert opinion Mixed 46% Background in disaster training Clinical/ Work • Supports a hospital based team to augment an \* Sections: Acute care 9.8%, Administration 9.3% Non-History Emergency Department as a safe practice Clinical Ambulatory care 8.8%, Critical care 5.1% Team Augmentation teams ensure patient safety together with Phase 2 - Training Selected Volunteers (n=580) timely and appropriate care 2.2% (n=13) of volunteers trained Gap in recruiting and building augmentation teams Leader • 5 Clinicians (RN and MD) Turnover • 8 Administrative support sections Questions Min 6-8 Tiered Phase 3 - Barriers and Facilitators (n=580) Training members 23.3% (n=135) of volunteers contributed 1. How many personnel meet the qualifications for Greatest barrier to participation was scheduling/timing augmentation team membership? of training (62.6%) Top facilitators "excited to serve" & "sounded interesting" 2. How many qualified personnel are interested in further Figure 1. Augmentation team characteristics (blue) and barriers (red) **IMPLICATIONS** engagement and training? This project informs future strategies for interprofessional Phases **Methods** recruiting and sustaining augmentation teams. Teams such as these can improve the response capacity of the ED The project was completed in three phases: DESIGN 1. Evaluated the readiness and availability of staff with an during disasters where RNs are often on the front line of Multi-method descriptive cross-sectional study care. Also, it demonstrates how nurses' involvement in electronic survey 2. Implemented and evaluated a training program broad-spectrum systems leadership can strengthen practice SETTING excellence and enhance healthcare delivery. 3. Described barriers and facilitators to team development with · Academic medical center in central Virginia RECOMMENDATIONS an electronic survey • Population: 14,933 employees

- SAMPLE
- 966 full-time employees

REFERENCES ON HANDOUT

## Declarations

IRB-SBS approval #2015-0307-00 was obtained from the University of Virginia. The views expressed in this poster are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Army, the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

- Engage administrative personnel as team members • Focus recruitment on 1 to 5 year employees
- Provide tiered training approach Continuous team recruitment and development