

**Methods.** Using the same audit tool developed in 2019, six wards (2 geriatric, 3 medical and 1 surgical) were audited. Patients over 65 given oral or intramuscular sedating medications had their drug charts and notes reviewed. Data were collected on type of sedation, route prescribed, whether it was prescribed regularly or PRN, whether an indication was documented, underlying diagnosis and what monitoring took place post sedation.

**Results.** 297 drug charts were reviewed, and 13 patients were prescribed rapid tranquilisation (RT). The maximum daily dose was included in 63% of prescriptions similar to that of the first audit (58%). The most common route of administration was intramuscular, unlike the previous audit which was oral/intramuscular.

50% of prescriptions documented an indication, of which 25% were illegible. Whilst in the first audit the figure was 33%.

Of all the patients prescribed RT, 77% had a diagnosis of delirium, 77% had a diagnosis of dementia and about 53.8% had both. In both audits 100% of patients had a diagnosis of dementia or delirium. Most prescriptions were for lorazepam (75%). There was no evidence of observations being taken in line with post RT monitoring in the trust policy in both audits

**Conclusion.** Further work needs to be done to improve practice. Interventions to date have not been effective. Further plans for QI work include updating the RT policy to be more specific and useful for the acute trust, to fit in with a recently introduced electronic records system (ERS) and to include a clear section on older adults with signposting to the delirium and dementia policies. As well as adding prompts and protocols to the ERS to support safe prescribing and dispensing of RT. Teaching will be repeated and a poster has been developed and promoted on all the wards. The project group are planning to join the trust's 'medication safety huddle' regularly to include pharmacists in teaching and work. The audit will be repeated in three months time.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.

## Improving Allergy Status Documentation on Electronic Patient Records- a Trust-Wide In-Patient Quality Improvement Project

Dr Natalie Cook<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr Aparna Prasanna<sup>2</sup>, Dr Rhea Mathews<sup>3</sup>, Dr Josh Cabada<sup>2</sup>, Dr Meghnaa Hebbar<sup>3</sup> and Dr Shakeel Jaffar<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Black Country Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, Walsall, United Kingdom; <sup>2</sup>Black Country Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, Wolverhampton, United Kingdom; <sup>3</sup>Black Country Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, Dudley, United Kingdom and <sup>4</sup>Black Country Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, West Bromwich, United Kingdom

\*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2023.261

**Aims.** NICE guideline CG183 states that "both the drug and the description of the reaction must be documented on all forms of prescription and in a patient's medical records". Black Country Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (BCPNFT) documents allergy status on both paper drug charts and the Electronic Patient Record<sup>™</sup> (EPR). Incomplete Allergy Status on EPR poses a significant patient safety risk, particularly in an era of hybrid working and out of hours input from remotely based clinicians. The standard for this audit is that 100% of drug charts and Rio notes should have allergy status documented. The BCPNFT is a collection of psychiatric services across four towns- Dudley, Walsall, West Bromwich and Wolverhampton. The

aim was to ensure consistent practice and standards across all sites. Following the initial data collection, discussion of findings and Action Plan (AP), and to ensure consistent standards, it was agreed to expand the project to include all General Adult in-patient units.

**Methods.** A data collection tool was designed collaboratively with the QI Department, to capture demographics, diagnosis, admission duration, legal status and allergy status both written and digital. This tool applied for all 96 older adult in-patients across the four localities within the trust on 03.10.22. The only exclusion criteria was admission within 24 hours of the data collection date.

**Results.** Data Collection: 100% of Paper Drug Charts had allergy status documented, only 70% have type or severity of allergic reaction documented. Despite 76% of in-patients admission of 4 weeks or longer, only 62% of patients had their allergy status documented on EPR, this varied from 30-100% across individual wards. EPR allergy status documented: Wolverhampton 93% West Bromwich 100% Dudley 33% Walsall 39%

**Conclusion.** The results from all four localities were presented at the respective locality post graduate teaching, the EPR configuration team meeting and the QI Group meeting to gain Multi-Disciplinary Team feedback for both low documentation rates and high variability across sites. Based on this feedback, the AP comprised of incorporating an Allergy Status prompt into the electronic clerking document, visual prompts of stickers and posters across all wards. Also, liaising with Pharmacy to request they also update the allergy status on EPR; and Ward Matrons who have added an Allergy Status alert onto their bed state view. Data will then recollect post AP interventions, across all older and working age adult inpatient wards- a sample size of around 300 patients. The second data collection is currently being undertaken.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.

## Our Care Improvement System

Dr Alina Cuhraja\*, Ms Jill Sullivan, Dr Inga Boellinghaus, Ms Josephine Wray, Mr Michael Charles, Mr Olukunle Oluwole-Moore, Dr Hugh Williams and Ms Emma Jones

South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

\*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2023.262

**Aims.** Our Care Improvement System is an integrated quality and performance system designed to develop co-ordinated approach to managing performance at all levels of the organisation, ensuring everything we do is aligned to achieving our goals set out in our Trust strategy. The aim of this programme is to help the team move away from typical firefighting routines, towards a more structured routine of problem solving, applying quality improvement tools and methodology.

**Methods.** Five members of multidisciplinary team (MDT) in a Lewisham Community Mental Health Team were chosen as the core working team. They underwent four-month training programme which was one day per month plus weekly team coaching sessions from the Trust's Quality Improvement lead. One targeted measure was identified. This was to focus on improving patient discharges for more manageable caseloads, and ultimately provide a better staff and patient experience. A3 methodology was adopted to provide a structured framework for thinking through the problem. This included: problem statement, current situation, aims statement, root cause analysis, change ideas, actions,