Appendix C

 Table C.1. Patient level variables (with operatationalized definitions, supporting evidence and data sources) used as potential predictors for teams' shared mental models of discharge readiness

Variable	Source	Operationalized	Evidence
Principal diagnosis	Electronic Medical Records (EMR)	Hospital admission diagnosis (heart failure, acute myocardial infarction, pneumonia, hip replacement, knee replacement, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) as identified from EMR via admission or after visit summary note.	3, 22, 41- 46
Age	Patient Survey	Number of years alive	30, 42- 43, 46
Gender	Patient Survey	Male, female	42, 44, 46
Marital status	Patient Survey	Patient reported marital status (Married, unmarried)	28, 42, 44
Educational attainment	Patient Survey	Patient reported highest level of education completed (Some high school; High school degree; Some college or greater education)	2, 28, 45- 46
Employment status	Patient Survey	Patient reported employment status (Working, Not working/retired)	2, 28, 44, 49
Insurance type(s)	Patient Survey	Patient reported insurance payer (Medicare only; Dual Medicaid and Medicare; Private/group plan only; Private/group plan and Medicare)	41-43, 46
Number of recent hospital admisisons	Patient Survey	Patient reported number of hospital admissions in the last 12 months	41-43, 46
Length of hospital stay	EMR, Patient Survey	Duration of days admitted during index hospitalization	43, 47
Number of medications at discharge	EMR	Number of medications recorded on patient's home instruction medication list	47-48
Number of comorbidities	EMR	Number of comorbidities on physician's discharge summary note problem list	43, 48
Cognitive status	Patient Survey	Pfeiffer's Short portable mental status (SPMSQ) was used to measure patient level of cognition; ranges from 0 (<i>intact</i>) to 10 (<i>severe</i>) on day of discharge ²⁹	45

Table C.	2. Systen	n level va	riables (v	vith opera	tationalize	ed definitio	ons, sup	porting e	evidence	and c	data
sources)	used as	potential	predictor	s for tean	ns' shared	mental m	odels of	dischar	ge readin	ess	

Variable	Sources	Operationalized	Evidence
Teams'	Clinician	The number of years post-professional school of the	10, 32-
professional	Surveys	teams' nurse, coordinator, physician- repsectively.	33, 50
experience			
Teams' RN	Nurse Survey	Education level of nurse in the discharge team	31, 49
educational		(Associate's Degree in Nursing [ADN], Bachelor of	
Dackground	Coordinator	Science in Nursing [BSN]).	12 10
reams DC	Coordinator	toom (ADN, BSN, Master of Social Work [MSW])	13, 49
background	Survey		
Number of float	Triangulated	Count of the number of providers who do not work	13 51
staff	via Clinician	on a dedicated unit that were on the discharge	10, 01
	Surveys	team.	
Team member	Triangulated	For each discharge event the providers were asked	1-4, 8, 13
communication	via Clinician	to indicate how many times they communicated with	, ,
	Surveys	the following individuals on the day of hospital	
		discharge: patient, family, RN, DC, and MD.	
		Responses were triangulated to determine if all	
		team members (RN, MD, DC) communicated with	
		each other on the day of discharge (Yes = Full team	
Deffections	T (1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.	communication /No = Not full team communication).	4.0.40
Patient-team	I riangulated	For each discharge event the providers were asked	1-3, 10,
communication	via Clinician	to indicate now many times they communicated with	13, 41,
		discharge: patient family RN DC and MD	23, 04
	Surveys	Responses were triangulated to determine if all	
		team members communicated directly with the	
		patient on the day of hospital discharge (Yes/No)	
Quality of	Triangulated	Adapted from the Team Survey ³³ Likert scale	4-6, 13,
communcation on	via Clinician	(strongly disagree [1] to strongly agree [7]) to	47
day of discharge	Surveys	answer: "overall, the team communicated	
		appropriately while discharging this patient from the	
		hospital." Aggregated to the team level by averaging	
		the RN, MD, and DC scores.	
Quality of	Triangulated	Adapted from Millward and Jeffries Team Survey ³³	4-6, 13,
teamwork on day of	via Clinician	Likert scale (<i>strongly disagree</i> [1] to <i>strongly agree</i>	47
discharge	Surveys	[7]) to answer: "I feel that we worked together as a	
		Aggregated to team level by averaging the PN_MD	
		and DC scores	
New day of	Triangulated	For each event clinicians reported how many days	40 49
discharge team	via Clinician	they had worked with the patient. If all providers had	10, 10
ale ella ge teall	Surveys	worked with the patient for more than one day, then	
	, -	the team was determined to be an experienced	
		discharge team. If there was at least one member of	
		the discharge team for whom it was their first day	
		working with the patient, then the team was	
		determined to be a new day of discharge team.9	
Teams' perception	Triangulated	Team's average score of unit safety using the	52-53
of unit safety	via Clinician	Global Patient Safety Grade ⁵² scale; 1(<i>failing</i>) to 5	
	Surveys	(excellent) unit culture of patient safety	

Note: RN=Nurse, DC=Coordinator, MD=Physician

Additional References for Appendix C

41. Goodman D, Fisher E, Chang C. After hospitalization: A Dartmouth atlas report on readmissions among Medicare beneficiaries. Princeton, NJ: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. 2013.

42. Ross JS, Mulvey GK, Stauffer B, Patlolla V, Bernheim SM, Keenan PS, Krumholz HM. Statistical models and patient predictors of readmission for heart failure: A systematic review. *Arch of Intern Med.* 2008;168:13:1371-1386.

43. Van Walraven C, Bennett C, Jennings A, Austin PC, Forster AJ. Proportion of hospital readmissions deemed avoidable: A systematic review. *CMAJ.* 2011;183:7:E391-E402.

44. Nguyen OK, Makam AN, Clark C, et al. Predicting all-cause readmissions using electronic health record data from the entire hospitalization: Model development and comparison. *J Hosp Med.* 2016;11:7:473-480.

45. Lau D, Padwal RS, Majumdar SR, et al. Patient-reported discharge readiness and 30-day risk of readmission or death: a prospective cohort study. *Am J of Med.* 2016;129:1:89-95.

46. Krumholz HM, Chaudhry SI, Spertus JA, Mattera JA, Hodshon B, Herrin J. Do nonclinical factors improve prediction of readmission risk?: Results from the Tele-HF study. *JACC: Heart Fail.* 2016;4:1:12-20.

47. Gittell JH, Fairfield KM, Bierbaum B, et al. Impact of relational coordination on quality of care, postoperative pain and functioning, and length of stay: a nine-hospital study of surgical patients. *Med Care.* 2000;38:807–819.

48. Wimmer BC, Dent E, Bell JS, Wiese MD, Chapman I, Johnell K, Visvanathan R: Medication regimen complexity and unplanned hospital readmissions in older people. *Ann Pharmacother.* 2014;48:9:1120-1128.

49. Gillespie BM, Chaboyer W, Longbottom P, Wallis M. The impact of organizational and individual factors on team communication in surgery: A qualitative study. *Int J of Nursing Stud.* 2010;47:6:732-741. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.11.001; 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.11.001

50. Meltzer D, Manning WG, Morrison J, Shah MN, Jin L, Guth T, Levinson W. Effects of physician experience on costs and outcomes on an academic general medicine service: results of a trial of hospitalists. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2002 Dec 3;137(11):866-74.

51. Canonne C, Aucouturier JJ. Play together, think alike: Shared mental models in expert music improvisers. *Psychology of Music.* 2016;44:3:544-58.

52. Sorra JS, Dyer N. Multilevel psychometric properties of the AHRQ hospital survey on patient safety culture. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2010;10:199.

53. Weaver SJ, Lubomksi LH, Wilson RF, Pfoh ER, Martinez KA, Dy SM. Promoting a culture of safety as a patient safety strategy: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med.* 2013;158(5.p.2):369-74.