

1

2

3

**DELIRIUM ASSESSMENT IN THE MEDICAL-SURGICAL**

4

**POPULATION: A QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

5

by

6

Veronica A. Valazza, MSN, MBA

7

8

JOHN SCHMIDT, DNP, Faculty Mentor and Chair

9

LYDIA FORSYTHE, PhD, Committee Member

10

SANDRA GIBSON, MS, Committee Member

11

12

13

Patrick Robinson, PhD, Dean, School of Nursing and Health Sciences

14

15

16

A DNP Project Presented in Partial Fulfillment

17

Of the Requirements for the Degree

18

Doctor of Nursing Practice

19

20

For submission to *American Journal of Nursing*

21

22

23

Capella University

24

December, 2016

25           **Acknowledgements**

26                       The author would like to thank the nurses and the leadership staff  
27 of the facility for assisting in the completion of this project.

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 Abstract

36 **Background:** Delirium is a complex syndrome that can affect many patients  
37 resulting in adverse outcomes. The use of a delirium assessment tool assists in the  
38 identification of delirium. The aim of this project was to determine whether  
39 delirium education and the use of a validated assessment tool can assist in the  
40 early identification of delirium.

41 **Methods:** The Iowa Model of Evidence-Based Practice was utilized for this  
42 project. This model involves the identification of a problem and the application of  
43 evidence based research. The collaboration of the organization and an  
44 interdisciplinary team is required to implement and sustain change.

45 **Interventions:** The intervention implemented included educating the staff  
46 regarding delirium and the implementation of a delirium assessment tool.  
47 Ongoing mentoring of the staff was required.

48 **Data Collection:** All patients admitted to the unit that meet inclusion criteria will  
49 be included in the project. Retrospective chart reviews were conducted weekly to  
50 determine the results of the delirium assessment and nursing compliance.

51 **Results:** The delirium assessment was completed on 67 out of 76 patients.  
52 Delirium was identified in 36 patients. These results were found to be statistically  
53 significant.

54 **Conclusions:** The aim of the project was to determine if education and the use of  
55 a validated assessment tool would assist nurses in identifying delirium. The early

56 identification of delirium will assist the healthcare team in implementing

57 strategies to mitigate the adverse outcomes of delirium.

58 *Key Words: Delirium, CAM, confusion assessment method, delirium assessment*

59

60 Delirium Assessment in the Medical-Surgical Patient: A Quality Improvement  
61 Project

62 Caring for patient's experiencing delirium can be very challenging for  
63 nurses in the hospital environment. Delirium is defined as an acute confusion with  
64 fluctuating mental status (Layne, Haas, Davidson, & Klopp, 2015). These patients  
65 often exhibit behaviors that are difficult to deal with. Nurses, through their  
66 assessment skills and their relationships with patients and families, can identify  
67 acute changes in patients (Faught, 2014).

68 Delirium can affect up to 56% of patients admitted to the hospital (Day,  
69 Higgins, & Koch, 2008). In specific patient populations, such as, post-surgical,  
70 critical care and palliative care, the risk of delirium is increased. Nurses play a  
71 pivotal role in the early identification of delirium. To prevent adverse outcomes, it  
72 is essential that delirium be recognized early (Olson, 2012). These adverse  
73 outcomes include increased length of stay, increased mortality, cognitive deficits,  
74 and increased costs associated with hospitalization. Additionally, these patients  
75 have an increased risk of being admitted to a long- term facility (Faught, 2014).  
76 The utilization of an assessment tool, will assist nurses in the early recognition of  
77 patients experiencing delirium.

78 **Problem**

79 The development of delirium in hospitalized patients is associated with  
80 serious consequences, such as, increased length of stay, increased morbidity, long

81 term cognitive dysfunction and increased mortality that may last up to one year  
82 (Vasilevskis et al., 2011). Nurses play an important role in the early identification  
83 of delirium. Prompt assessment and early identification of delirium may help to  
84 prevent adverse outcomes (Olson, 2012). Strategies to treat delirium are based on  
85 the ability to accurately recognize and diagnose the syndrome (Scott, McIlveney,  
86 & Mallice, 2013). It was noted by Day et al (2008) that many healthcare  
87 disciplines lack the education and preparation to easily identify delirium and a  
88 high level of clinical nursing skill is needed to identify delirium. Failure to  
89 identify delirium was noted in up to 50% of cases (Lemiengre et al., 2006).

90       Currently, the Confusion Assessment Method (CAM) tool is being  
91 utilized in the critical care units to identify patients at risk for developing  
92 delirium. A tool is not available for use on the medical-surgical units. The nurses  
93 on the medical-surgical units conduct a neurological assessment twice daily on all  
94 patients' A neurological assessment checks for level of consciousness and  
95 orientation at that time (Wei, Fearing, Sternberg, & Inouye, 2008). Delirium is  
96 present in 6% to 56% of medical patients and 15 to 53% of surgical patients  
97 (Saczynski et al., 2014). These patients are currently being cared for outside of the  
98 critical care areas. Strategies to treat delirium are based on the ability to  
99 accurately recognize and diagnose the syndrome (Baker, Taggart, Nivens, &  
100 Tillman, 2015; Lemiengre et al., 2006; Scott et al., 2013; Vasilevskis et al., 2011).  
101 Without the use of an assessment tool, it can be difficult for nurses to recognize

102 delirium (Morandi et al., 2008). The use of the CAM tool assesses for the  
103 presence of cognitive decline and fluctuating levels of consciousness (Wei et al.,  
104 2008). The PICOT question utilized for this DNP project is “In medical-surgical  
105 nurses, how does the education of nurses and the implementation of the  
106 Confusion Assessment Method influence the identification of delirium in patients  
107 over a three-month period”.

### 108 **Available Knowledge**

109 Delirium is defined as a syndrome that begins acutely with changes in  
110 consciousness and cognition with a fluctuating course (Van den Boogard,  
111 Schoonhoven, Van der Hoeven, Van Achterberg, & Pickkers, 2012). Three  
112 different subtypes have been identified: hyperactive, hypoactive, and mixed. With  
113 hyperactive delirium, the patient exhibits symptoms of agitation, hallucinations,  
114 and delusions (Van den Boogard et al., 2012). In hypoactive delirium, the patient  
115 is lethargic, responds slowly and has inappropriate speech (Van den Boogard et  
116 al., 2012). In the mixed type of delirium, there is alterations between the  
117 hyperactive and hypoactive types (Van den Boogard et al., 2012).

118 Delirium is associated with adverse outcomes, such as, increased  
119 mortality, increased length of stay, and the increased risk of being  
120 institutionalized after discharge (Fortini et al., 2014; Kiely et al., 2009; Tan &  
121 Scott, 2015; Tomasi et al., 2012). It has been associated with one-year mortality  
122 and these rates are higher than those for heart disease and pneumonia (Kiely et al.,

123 2009). The risk of mortality increases over time. The affected patients are unable  
124 to interact within their environment, which leads to increased debility and adverse  
125 events (Kiely et al., 2009). Delirium is more common in adult hospitalized  
126 patients (Lemiengre et al., 2006; Mudge, Maussen, Duncan, & Denaro, 2012).

### 127 **Confusion Assessment Method**

128 The CAM is an instrument and diagnostic algorithm utilized for the  
129 identification of delirium and was designed for non-psychiatric health care  
130 professionals to diagnose delirium quickly and accurately (Wei et al., 2008). It is  
131 designed to be used with hospitalized adult patients and can be used in a variety  
132 of settings (Waszynski & Petrovic, 2008; Wei et al., 2008). The tool assesses for  
133 the presence of delirium, severity, and fluctuation of delirium (Wei et al., 2008).  
134 The CAM consists of nine criteria for delirium: acute onset and fluctuation,  
135 inattention, disorganized thinking, altered level of consciousness, disorientation,  
136 memory impairment, disturbances in perception, psychomotor dysfunction and an  
137 altered sleep cycle (Lemiengre et al., 2006; Wei et al., 2008).

138 Sands, Dantoc, Hartshorn, Ryan, & Lujic (2010) found that when nurses  
139 received appropriate education on the CAM, the tool had a sensitivity of 94% and  
140 a specificity of 89%. The sensitivity decreased to 40% when the staff had minimal  
141 training. Additions have been made to the CAM to allow it to be used for different  
142 patient populations, such as critical care, emergency department, and long term  
143 care (Wei et al., 2008). The efficacy of the tool is dependent on the patient



144 population, comorbidities, and severity of illness (Powers et al., 2013). The CAM  
145 tool is most effective in identifying patients with hypoactive delirium (Saczynski  
146 et al., 2014).

### 147 **Recognition of Delirium**

148 Van Ejik et al. (2011) demonstrated that the identification of delirium by  
149 critical care physicians and nurses was noted to show a sensitivity of 29% and  
150 35% respectively as compared to physicians and nurses that were specifically  
151 educated in the recognition of delirium. Iseli, Brand, Telford, & LoGuidice (2007)  
152 found that 20% of delirium cases go unrecognized. This lack of recognition may  
153 be due to the lack of an assessment tool for cognitive impairment and a lack of  
154 awareness surrounding hypoactive delirium (Fortini et al., 2014). Nurses failed to  
155 recognize delirium in more than 50% of cases and this may be due to a lack of  
156 knowledge and training (Lemiengre et al., 2006). This under recognition can lead  
157 to adverse outcomes (Sands, Dantoc, Hartshorn, Ryan, & Lujic, 2010) and delays  
158 treatment (Van Ejik et al., 2011).

### 159 **Education and Training**

160 In a study by Baker, Taggart, Nivens and Tillman (2015), 8.33% of nurses  
161 reported minimal competency in the ability to recognize delirium. The  
162 discrepancy in different results may be related to inadequate training or  
163 incomplete implementation of an assessment tool (Van Ejik et al., 2011). To  
164 improve the recognition of delirium, it is essential that adequate training be

165 provided. Early recognition is needed to develop a multifaceted and  
166 interdisciplinary approach to treat and prevent delirium (Lemiengre et al., 2006).

### 167 **Nursing Implications**

168 Key nursing responsibilities in the recognition of delirium include  
169 completion of routine assessments, recognizing pre-disposing and precipitating  
170 factors, and the use of delirium assessment tools (Baker et al., 2015). In a study by  
171 Scott et al., (2013), nurses felt that the use of a screening tool enhanced care and  
172 improved their neurological assessments. After attending educational sessions, the  
173 nurses felt that delirium was a very serious problem and that delirium assessment  
174 should be a standard of care (Scott et al., 2013).

175 Assessing delirium can be challenging for nurses due to the fluctuating and  
176 variability of the disease process. Some of the barriers that nurse may encounter in  
177 the utilization of assessment tools include time, perceived difficulty in using the  
178 tools and the generalizability of the different tools (Voyer et al., 2015). The amount  
179 and type of education the nurses receive will reflect on their confidence level in  
180 administering the tool (Voyer et al., 2015). It is essential that nurses have education  
181 and mentoring to develop confidence in performing the assessment (Waszynski &  
182 Petrovic, 2008).

### 183 **Rationale**

184 The implementation of an assessment tool assists the bedside nurse in  
185 recognizing the presence of delirium early in their hospitalization and is critical to

186 prevent adverse outcomes. A multitude of factors can cause delirium. With the  
187 prompt recognition of delirium, the interdisciplinary team can put into place  
188 strategies to treat the patient's condition.

189         The nurses' ability to conduct the assessment accurately and with  
190 confidence is essential. Education of the staff along with role playing and  
191 mentoring is necessary for the successful implementation of the tool.  
192 Implementing change in practice is not always easy. Nurses need support and  
193 engagement to make a successful change in practice. The process should be used  
194 facility wide to decrease variation and to provide consistency in the evaluation  
195 (Andrews, Silva, Kaplan, & Zimbro, 2015).

196         The integration of evidence-based practice (EBP) into clinical practice  
197 will facilitate the ability to provide higher quality care to patients. Nurses at the  
198 bedside can recognize clinical problems but may have difficulty clarifying the  
199 exact problem and what the next steps are. To initiate EBP, there are several  
200 components that need to be in place. These include: support from hospital  
201 administration, adequate resources, unit based clinical leaders, and mentors to  
202 assist them with the process (Lusardi, 2012). The Iowa Model of Evidence-Based  
203 practice was utilized as the framework for this project. This model can help nurses  
204 translate research into clinical practice (Brown, 2014). The model focuses on a  
205 lack of knowledge or a problem focused trigger and whether the quality of care  
206 can be improved (Doody & Doody, 2011).

**207 Aims**

208           The aim of this project was to determine whether the education of the  
209 nurses regarding delirium and use of the CAM tool could identify the presence of  
210 delirium in the medical-surgical patient. The CAM tool is easy to use and can be  
211 completed quickly, so the compliance of the nurses in completing the assessment  
212 was collected. If the presence of delirium is recognized earlier, interventions can  
213 be put into place to decrease to improve the quality of care.

**214 Methods****215 Context**

216           This project took place at a tertiary care hospital located in Western New  
217 York. The Intermediate Care Unit was chosen as the setting. This is an 18- bed  
218 unit, consisting of all private rooms. The hospital has several critical care units  
219 and many of the patients admitted to this unit are received from these units. The  
220 patient population on the unit includes a variety of diagnoses and those who  
221 require complex care and closer monitoring. The average nurse patient ratio is  
222 1:3. The unit is staffed with Registered Nurses, Certified Medical Assistants  
223 (CMA's), and Nurse Practitioners. This unit was chosen for the project due to the  
224 consistency of the medical team.

**225 Interventions**

226           The nurses were educated on delirium and on how to utilize the CAM tool.  
227 The nurses were educated on-line with a PowerPoint tool prior to the

228 implementation of the assessment tool. The project leader proctored all classes to  
229 answer questions. The education included a definition of delirium, the differences  
230 between the subtypes and how to recognize them, risk factors and complications  
231 of delirium, and the use of the CAM tool. A case study was included in the  
232 education. Additionally, documentation of the results of the assessment was  
233 reviewed. The setting for the education was the hospital library, where several  
234 computers are located. The education was continued until all the nurses were  
235 educated. The nurse practitioners and CMA's were invited to the education  
236 sessions. The PowerPoint was posted on the education board as reference for the  
237 staff. Additional educational sessions were added throughout the implementation  
238 period, as needed.

239         Each patient room is equipped with a laptop computer. A copy of the  
240 assessment tool was attached to each computer for staff reference. The assessment  
241 tool was to be completed on admission to the unit, each shift and with any  
242 behavioral change.

### 243 **Study Interventions**

244         Retrospective chart reviews were conducted to determine the compliance  
245 of the nurses in completing the assessment tool. It was completed on admission, if  
246 it was done within 24 hours of admission. Additionally, the assessment results  
247 were noted. Descriptive statistics will be used to analyze the data. The Chi Square  
248 was used to determine if statistical significance was found in the ability of the

249 nurses to identify the presence of delirium. The statistics was conducted using  
250 SPSS software, version 22.

### 251 **Analysis**

252 Data were collected via retrospective chart reviews and analyzed utilized  
253 SPSS software. Descriptive statistics collected will include percentages and  
254 frequency distributions for both types of data being collected: compliance of the  
255 nursing staff in completing the CAM assessment tool and whether the use of the  
256 tool could identify delirium (Heavey, 2015). Inferential statistics will be  
257 conducted using a contingency table and the chi square test. The contingency  
258 table will assist in the organizing of the data and the chi square test will be able to  
259 assist the project leader in determining whether the results are statistically  
260 significant (Khan Academy, 2015).

### 261 **Ethics**

262 IRB approval was not needed as this project was exempt. All patients that  
263 met the inclusion criteria were included in the study and received the assessment.  
264 The assessment was used to improve the care provided to the patient. During the  
265 data collection period, each patient was assigned a unique identification number.  
266 It was determined since this was a quality improvement project, informed consent  
267 was not needed.

268

269

270

**Results****271 Compliance**

272 Ninety patients were admitted to the unit during the data collection period.

273 Sixty-six (73.3%) patients were assessed within 24 hours of admission to the unit.

274 Six patients (6.7%) were not assessed within the first 24 hours. Four patients

275 (4.4%) were not assessed for delirium during the project period and 14 patients

276 (15.6%) were excluded from the study. Exclusion criteria included those patients

277 under age 18, previously diagnosed with delirium, suffered from a brain injury,

278 those that are comatose and those patients that do not understand English.

**279 Identification of Delirium**

280 Of the 90 patients admitted to the unit during the data collection period, 36

281 patients (40%) were found to be CAM positive and 31 patients (34.4%) were

282 noted to be negative. One patient (1.1%) was unable to be assessed and eight

283 assessments (8.9%) was never completed. Fourteen patients (15.6%) were

284 excluded. The results of the assessment were entered into SPSS software and

285 utilizing the chi square statistic the results were found to be statistically

286 significant using a p value of 0.05.

287

**Discussion****288 Summary**

289 One of the aims of this project was to assess whether specific education of

290 nurses on delirium will influence their ability to identify patients experiencing

291 delirium. For this project, the nurses received education via a PowerPoint, which  
292 included the use of the CAM tool. The detection of delirium can be a challenge  
293 for nurses. The compliance of the nurses completing the assessment upon  
294 admission was 73.3%. This assessment was completed within 24 hours of  
295 admission to the unit. Of the completed assessments 36 patients (40%) were  
296 found to be positive for delirium using the CAM tool. Thirty-one patients (34.4%)  
297 were found to be negative for delirium utilizing the tool.

298         This project demonstrated that with education and consistent mentoring,  
299 along with the implementation of an assessment tool, nurses could improve their  
300 detection of delirium in patients. With the diagnosing of delirium earlier in their  
301 hospital stay, strategies can be put into place to prevent the development of  
302 delirium. This project highlighted the importance of bringing this knowledge to  
303 the bedside to assist the healthcare team in developing treatment strategies.

#### 304 **Interpretation**

305         This project demonstrated that nurses could identify delirium utilizing the  
306 CAM tool. Forty percent of patients were found to be positive for delirium. It  
307 was also noted that the nursing staff needed consistent mentoring to complete the  
308 assessment. The selected tool was straightforward for the nurses to complete in  
309 this setting. There was no baseline data at the facility to be able to improve  
310 whether there was improvement in the identification of delirium.



311           Various studies have found different prevalence rates of delirium in  
312 patients. Day et al (2008) found that delirium was identified in up to 56% of  
313 hospitalized patients. In the study by Saczynski et al (2014) the prevalence of  
314 delirium was found to be 22.7% when trained interviewers completed the  
315 assessments. In this study, there was a comparison between chart reviews and the  
316 use of an interview method in the identification of delirium. Trained researchers  
317 completed the assessments. In this study, it was noted that the research staff may  
318 have included information from the family when completing the assessment.  
319 Fortini et al (2013) found that 11% of patients of older adults hospitalized in  
320 internal medicine units developed delirium. This study was completed over a two-  
321 month period and only included geriatric patients.

322           It has been noted that many healthcare disciplines lack the knowledge base  
323 to adequately identify delirium in patients. Prior to implementing an educational  
324 program, a baseline assessment of nursing knowledge should be determined  
325 (Middle & Miklancie, 2015). To design an effective program, nurses should be  
326 included to determine their preferred venue of learning. The use of an assessment  
327 tool coupled with the appropriate education has been found to improve nurses'  
328 knowledge of delirium (Middle & Miklancie, 2015). For this project, the  
329 education was accomplished using a PowerPoint presentation, along with  
330 informational huddles throughout the data collection period.

331           This project is aligned with the strategic plan of the hospital. Through the  
332 development of a delirium protocol, the hospital would like to improve patient  
333 outcomes and decrease the utilization of critical care beds. These patients are  
334 often transferred to critical care beds as they are unable to be managed on  
335 medical-surgical units. To sustain change, the facility needs to have sustained  
336 leadership support and ongoing monitoring to determine compliance. Some of the  
337 barriers the nurses encountered were that the assessment was not included in the  
338 EMR and they needed to free text the results of the delirium assessment. When  
339 the assessment was positive for delirium there was no protocol in place for the  
340 nurses to implement. It is essential the development of protocols occur to support  
341 interventions to mitigate the adverse outcomes of delirium. In the study by Mudge  
342 et al., (2012), their interventions include the use of a delirium bay, which  
343 supported the use of targeted interventions. These interventions included both  
344 behavioral and medications.

#### 345 **Limitations**

346           There were several limitations noted with this project. There was no  
347 baseline data collected prior to the initiation of the project. The study included a  
348 small number of patients, since only one nursing unit was included. The three-  
349 month data collection period limited the number of patients that could be  
350 identified with delirium. For this project, the nurses needed to document the  
351 presence of delirium in the Electronic Medical Record as a clinical note as there

352 was no area in the medical record for the documentation of the results. Since, the  
353 CAM was originally developed to be utilized in the critical care environment,  
354 another limitation of the project is this tool may not be the appropriate to be used  
355 with the medical-surgical population. Additionally, there was delay in the nurses  
356 adopting the use of the tool and this may be related to competing projects. At the  
357 facility, a new SMART pump was being implemented at the same time.

### 358 **Conclusion**

359         The identification of delirium early in a patient's hospitalization is  
360 essential for the prevention of adverse outcomes. Bedside nurses are the perfect  
361 candidates to conduct delirium assessments due to the amount of time they spend  
362 with patients and their families. It is essential that nurses receive appropriate  
363 education and mentoring to develop confidence in completing the assessment.  
364 With the use of the CAM tool and the implementation of proper protocols and  
365 policies, patients' experiencing delirium will receive a higher quality of care in  
366 medical-surgical units.

367

368

## References

- 369 Andrews, L., Silva, S. G., Kaplan, S., & Zimbro, K. (2015). Delirium monitoring  
370 and patient outcomes in a general intensive care unit. *American Journal of*  
371 *Critical Care*, 24(1), 48-56. doi:10.4037/ajcc2015740
- 372 Baker, N. D., Taggart, H. M., Nivens, A., & Tillman, P. (2015). Delirium; why  
373 are nurses confused? *MedSurg Nursing*, 24(1), 15-22. Retrieved from  
374 www.medsurnursing.net
- 375 Brown, C. G. (2014). The Iowa model of evidence-based practice to promote  
376 quality care: An illustrated example in oncology nursing. *Clinical Journal*  
377 *of Oncology Nursing*, 18(2), 157-159. doi: 10.1188/14.CJON.157-159
- 378 Day, J., Higgins, I., & Koch, T. (2008). Delirium and older people: What are the  
379 constraints to best practice in acute care? *International Journal of Older*  
380 *People*, 3(3), 170-177. doi:10.1111/j.1748-3743.2108.00115x
- 381 Doody, C. M., & Doody, O. (2011). Introducing evidence into nursing practice:  
382 Using the IOWA model. *British Journal of Nursing*, 20(11), 661-664. doi:  
383 10.12968/bjon.2011.20.11.661
- 384 Faught, D. D. (2014). Delirium; the nurse's role in prevention, diagnosis and  
385 treatment. *MedSurg Nursing*, 23(5), 301-305. Retrieved from  
386 www.medsurnursing.net
- 387 Fortini, A., Morettini, A., Tavernese, G., Facchini, S., Toani, L., & Pazzi, M.  
388 (2014). Delirium in elderly patients hospitalized in internal medicine

- 389 wards. *Internal Emergency Medicine*, 9, 435-441. doi:10.1007/s11739-  
390 013-0968-0
- 391 Heavey, E. (2015). *Statistics for nursing: A practical approach* (2nd ed.).  
392 Retrieved from  
393 <https://online.vitalsource.com/#/books/9781284081602/cfi/6/6!/4/16@0:7>  
394 8.1
- 395 Iseli, R. K., Brand, C., Telford, M., & LoGiudice, D. (2007). Delirium in elderly  
396 general medical inpatients: a prospective study. *Internal Medicine*  
397 *Journal*, 37, 806-811. doi:10.1111/j.1445-5994.2007. 01386.x
- 398 Khan Academy. (2015). Inference for categorical data (Chi-square tests).  
399 Retrieved from: [www.khanacademy.org/math/probability/statistics-](http://www.khanacademy.org/math/probability/statistics-inf/chisquare)  
400 [inf/chisquare](http://www.khanacademy.org/math/probability/statistics-inf/chisquare)
- 401 Kiely, D. K., Marcantonio, E. R., Inouye, S. K., Shaffer, M. L., Bergmann, M. A.,  
402 Yang, F. M., & Jones, R. N. (2009). Persistent delirium predicts increased  
403 mortality. *Journal of the American Geriatric Society*, 57(1), 55-61.  
404 doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2008. 02092.x
- 405 Layne, T., Haas, S. A., Davidson, J. E., & Klopp, A. (2015). Postoperative  
406 delirium prevention in the older adult: An evidence-based process  
407 improvement project. *MedSurg Nursing*, 24(4), 256-263. Retrieved from  
408 [www.medsurnursing.net](http://www.medsurnursing.net)

- 409 Lemiengre, J., Nelis, T., Joosten, E., Braes, T., Foreman, M., Gastmans, C., &  
410 Milisen, K. (2006). Detection of delirium by bedside nurses using the  
411 confusion assessment method. *Journal of the American Geriatric Society*,  
412 54, 685-689. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2006.00667.x
- 413 Lusardi, P. (2012). So you want to change practice: Recognizing practice issues  
414 and channeling those ideas. *Critical Care Nurse*, 32(2), 55-64.  
415 doi:10.1037/ccn2012899
- 416 Middle, B., & Miklancie, M. (2015). Strategies to improve nurse knowledge of  
417 delirium. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, 218-229.  
418 doi:10.1097/NUR.0000000000000138.
- 419 Morandi, A., Pandharipande, P., Trabucchi, M., Rozzini, R., Mistraletti, G.,  
420 Trompeo, A. C., & Ely, E. W. (2008). Understanding international  
421 differences in terminology for delirium and other types of acute brain  
422 dysfunction in critically ill patients. *Intensive Care Medicine*, 34(10),  
423 1907-1915. doi:10.1007/s00134-008-1177-6
- 424 Mudge, A. M., Maussen, C., Duncan, J., & Denaro, C. P. (2012). Improving  
425 quality of delirium care in a general medical service with established  
426 interdisciplinary care: a controlled trial. *Internal Medicine Journal*, 270-  
427 278. doi: 10.1111/.1445-5994.2012.02840.x
- 428 Olson, T. (2012). Delirium in the intensive care unit: Role of the critical care  
429 nurse in early detection and treatment. *Dynamics*, 13(4), 12-16.

- 430 Powers, J. S., Doering, T., Gordon, S., Eden, S. K., Shintai, S., & Schnelle, J.  
431 (2013). Exploring the utility of ultra-brief delirium assessments in a  
432 nonintensive care geriatric population; the GEM study. *The Gerontologist*,  
433 53(6), 1051-1055. doi:10.1093/geront/gns161
- 434 Saczynski, J. S., Kosar, C. M., Xu, G., Puelle, M. R., Schmitt, E., Jones, R. N., &  
435 Inouye, S. K. (2014). A tale of two methods: Chart and interview methods  
436 for identifying delirium. *Journal of the American Geriatric Society*, 62(3),  
437 518-524. doi:10.1111/jgs.12684
- 438 Sands, M. B., Dantoc, B. P., Hartshorn, A., Ryan, C. J., & Lujic, S. (2010). Single  
439 question in delirium (SQiD): testing its efficacy against psychiatrist  
440 interview, the confusion assessment method and the memorial delirium  
441 assessment scale. *Palliative Medicine*, 24(6), 561-565.  
442 doi:10.1177/1269216310371556
- 443 Scott, P., McIveney, F., & Mallice, M. (2013). Implementation of a validated  
444 delirium assessment tool in critically ill adults. *Intensive and Critical Care*  
445 *Nursing*, 29(2), 96-102. doi: 10.1016/j.iccn.2012.09.001
- 446 Tan, A. H., & Scott, J. (2015). Association of point prevalence diagnosis of  
447 delirium on length of stay, 6-month mortality, and level of care on  
448 discharge at Waitemata District Health Board, Auckland. *NZMA*,  
449 128(1411), 68-76. Retrieved from [http://www.nzma.org.nz/journal/read-](http://www.nzma.org.nz/journal/read-the-journal/all-issues/2010-2019/2015/vol-128-no-1411/6482)  
450 [the-journal/all-issues/2010-2019/2015/vol-128-no-1411/6482](http://www.nzma.org.nz/journal/read-the-journal/all-issues/2010-2019/2015/vol-128-no-1411/6482)

- 451 Tomasi, C. D., Grandi, C., Salluh, J., Soares, M., Giombelli, V. R., Cascaes, S., ...  
452 Pizzol, F. D. (2012). Comparison of CAM-ICU and ICDSC or the  
453 detection of delirium in critically ill patients focusing on relevant  
454 outcomes. *Journal of Critical Care*, 27, 212-217. doi:  
455 10.1016/jcc.2011.05.015
- 456 Van den Boogard, M., Schoonhoven, L., van der Hoeven, J. G., van Achterberg,  
457 T., & Pickkers, P. (2012). Incidence and short term consequences of  
458 delirium in critically ill patients: A prospective observational cohort study.  
459 *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 49, 775-783. doi: 10.1016/j  
460 Van Ejik, M., van den Boogard, M., van marnum, R. J., Benner, P., Eikelenboom,  
461 P., Honing, M. L., & Slooter, A. (2011). Routine use of the confusion  
462 assessment method for the intensive care unit. *American Journal of*  
463 *Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 184, 340-344. doi:  
464 10.1164/rccm.201101-0065oc
- 465 Vasilevskis, E. E., Morandi, A., Boehm, L., Pandharipande, P. P., Girard, T. D.,  
466 Jackson, J. C., ... Ely, E. W. (2011). Delirium and sedation recognition  
467 using validated instruments reliability of bedside intensive care  
468 assessments from 2007 to 2010 [Supplemental material]. *Journal of the*  
469 *American Geriatric Society*, 59(92), 249-254. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-  
470 5415.2011.03673x



- 471 Voyer, P., Champoux, N., Desrosiers, J., Landreville, P., McCusker, J., &  
472 Carmichael, P. (2015). Recognizing acute delirium as part of your routine  
473 [RADAR]: a validation study. *BMC Nursing*, *14*(19), 19.  
474 doi:10.1186/s12912-015-0070-1
- 475 Waszynski, C. M., & Petrovic, K. (2008). Nurses' evaluation of the confusion  
476 assessment method: a pilot study. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing*,  
477 *34*(4), 49-56. doi: 10.3928/00989134-20080401-06
- 478 Wei, L. A., Fearing, M. A., Sternberg, E. J., & Inouye, S. K. (2008). The  
479 confusion assessment method: A systematic review of current usage.  
480 *Journal of the American Geriatric Society*, *56*(5), 823-830.  
481 doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2008.01674.xn  
482