

Introduction

Identification of risk is the cornerstone of a risk management plan. The risks impacting a behavioral health organization are multitude, complex and an integral facet of service provision. Since the catastrophic events of 9/11/01, the assumption of risk within the general American culture has also changed forever. LifeStream has a long-term corporate commitment to risk management through the identification of risk and the reporting and trending of occurrences across the array of services provided, using an assortment of functions including:

- Monthly, quarterly and yearly trending of events to various performance improvement committees, the Executive Management Team and the Board of Directors
- Identification of sentinel event frequency and severity with Root Cause Analysis sessions held to enhance performance and diminish the potential for re-occurrence
- Endorsement of JCAHO Behavioral Health Care's National Safety Goals

We believe that we had a strong and comprehensive system to identify risk factors incorporated into our Emergency Preparedness Plan which is revised annually. As a part of our mitigation strategies we routinely assessed the range of environmental hazards potentially impacting each facility. However, the assessment was not quantitative, and presented limited opportunities for addressing risk hazards in a systematic or priority fashion. We endeavored to increase our proactive identification of risks impacting the organization and therefore expanded the scope of analysis through an objective, quantitative structure.

Concept of Operation

As we began to conceptualize the scope of the analysis, we envisioned a matrix that would capture the major types of risk impacting our organization, sub-components of these major headings, and identification of the level of risk for each facility owned, operated or leased by the company. Initially our thoughts centered around the concepts of FMEA – Failure Mode Effects Analysis, but our literature review suggested that approach to be a more narrow focus than the scope of analysis that we sought to implement at this point in time. Additional discussions led us to seek assistance from a national consulting firm, Sequest Technologies, Inc., who provided us with a template for approaching the center-wide hazard risk analysis. This was the tool that we were seeking.

Implementation

The hazard risk analysis template allowed us to better organize our thinking about the actual scope of risks. The matrix allowed us to assign a numerical value to each of the following factors associated with the identified risk:

- Probability (of this occurrence)
- Impact (of an occurrence)
- Preparedness

2006 Negley Awards Application

LifeStream Behavioral Center

Scoring each risk hazard as a result of the value assigned to each of these three factors resulted in a score that was identified as the Risk Severity.

Our first task was to Beta test the template at an individual facility site within the organization. Our intentions were to individualize the template in a manner that would make it intimately suited for our organization. We chose our Inpatient services campus as it contains a variety of programs including a psychiatric hospital, crisis stabilization unit, school, and residential program. Also on the campus are transportation, center-wide purchasing and maintenance departments.

The major headings for identification of risk on the template were:

- ↓ Security
- ↓ Severe Weather
- ↓ Utilities
- ↓ Internal Incidents
- ↓ Community Incidents

We immediately found a few areas for modification. Within the *Security* hazard risk area, we eliminated the topic of Infant Abduction as not applicable to our organization. Our resulting protocol is seen below:

Organisational Risk Analysis				Facility Type: Level of Care:	Hospital Inpatient	
Facility	Hospital	Organizational Risk Analysis Date	Probability	Impact	Preparedness	Risk Severity
		11-Jul-06	0 = None 1 = Low 2 = Moderate 3 = High	0 = None 1 = Low 2 = Moderate 3 = High	0 = Not applicable 1 = Well prepared 2 = Partially prepared 3 = Not prepared	0-3 = None 4-12 = Low 13-27 = High
Security	Utilities Internal Incidents Severe Weather					
			Probability	Impact	Preparedness	Risk Severity
			Bomb Threat			5
			Facility Access Control			3
			Weapons Brought Into Facility			3
			Neighborhood Crime			4
			Patient Identification (HIPPA)			3
			Employee Identification			3
			Terrorist Attack			2
			Hostage Situation			2
			Workplace violence			5
			Totals			39
						Total Risk Severity
Vulnerability Area Severity Ranges						
0-37 = Low						
28-54 = Moderate						
55-81 = High						
			Moderate			

Under the *Severe Weather* header were the hazard risk areas of Avalanche, Earthquake and Blizzard. Since no one on the team could remember the last time we had experienced any of these weather conditions locally, we decided to remove these items for potential scoring. We also revised the assessment to include Lightening as a separate Severe Weather risk, since Florida is identified as the lightening strike capitol of the world.

Under *Utilities* we removed the topic code of Central Medical Vacuum as not applicable throughout the organization. We also noted the organization's geographical and facility diversity as impacting the scope of risks and determined that while our hospital campus was the only site with an Emergency Generator the item would remain. We understood that the hazard risk topic could be scored as not applicable (NA) for other sites and could also provoke consideration of the need for, and surrounding issues of concern when assessing other Center (typically residential) facilities.

We had many discussions concerning the applicability of certain risks identified under the *Community Incidents*, including Aviation accident and Train crash. Our initial thinking was that there was no major airport or passenger rail service in our treatment service area, therefore these events would have little impact upon us. Upon further consideration we concluded that both were realistic possibilities impacting the region, retained them and subsequently scored them accordingly low.

During the first use of the hazard risk analysis template we also noted the importance of defining the hazard being identified. Initial thinking concerning the hazard risk area of 'Workplace Violence' had different members of the team focusing on program specific issues of violence. Our school representative saw this as student assaults towards staff, our residential representative reflected on the occurrences of flare-ups by one resident against another, while another representative suggested that the correct interpretation was that of staff injuries due to another staff or significant other within the workplace environment. Understanding that all three hazards needed analysis, we defined Workplace Violence as: staff on staff, including significant others, and random acts of violence (including such acts as robbery, assault, rape, car jacking) perpetrated upon staff while on LifeStream property or off-site job functions. 'Patient on patient assaults' and 'Patient on employee assaults' were retained under the *Internal Incidents* header.

With these modifications made, we now had an individualized assessment protocol. We then calculated scoring criteria which reflected the changes and omissions made. Our intention was to be able to score each facility across all five major risk headers using the specific range of hazard risk items. Scoring each hazard item with a rating of zero through three points on each dimension of hazard probability, impact and readiness would render a Risk Severity score for each. A compilation of the specific items under each major header would determine the Risk Severity Score. Utilizing pre-determined scoring criteria, we were then able to categorize each facilities score as Low, Moderate or High in each of the five major hazard areas of Security, Severe Weather, Utilities, Internal Incidents, Community Incidents. For this reason the hazard risk analysis protocols were built as Excel spreadsheets. In this format the data can be manipulated in a variety of ways to capture data for general or specific hazard risk reports impacting the organization, types of programs such as residential sites, or a single facility.

Scoring the Organization

LifeStream's programs operate within a large geographic area and therefore multiple service centers are necessary. As a comprehensive behavioral health organization, the scope of services ranges from a psychiatric hospital, to residential programs for the elderly, adult and adolescent and child mentally ill and substance abuse populations, a specialized school,

day treatment, and outpatient locations. There were twenty-three individual locations to be scored under the new hazard risk analysis. The Team (our multi-discipline center-wide safety committee) met for multiple sessions throughout the month of July and early August to complete the hazard assessments. At five pages per site, the twenty-three locations resulted in 115 pages of raw data. Fortunately, the Excel format allowed the data to be quickly entered, scored and manipulated into a variety of summary sheets, and reports. As anticipated, the objective nature of the protocol format resulted in hazards being identified as low, moderate or high. When we scored the raw data we saw that we had twenty-three hazard risks identified as Moderate or High. A summary of our findings is as follows:

Center Wide Risk Assessment Summary												
Facility	Overall Security Ranking	Security Score	Overall Utilities Ranking	Utilities Score	Overall Severe Weather Ranking	Severe Weather Score	Overall Internal Incidents Ranking	Internal Incidents Score	Overall Community Incidents Ranking	Community Incidents Score	Overall Risk Severity Ranking	Risk Severity Score
Hospital	13	39	7	27	11	35	1	40	1	24	1	165
LSA/VL	1	48	14	21	13	35	3	35	1	24	2	165
LSA/VE	2	45	23	18	18	34	2	36	1	24	3	160
CR II / EOP	14	36	11	23	1	38	4	30	1	24	4	154
ADM	3	46	3	28	2	38	23	17	1	24	5	161
OTPR	16	33	2	26	14	35	9	28	1	24	6	150
GRTS East	18	31	1	29	5	36	6	30	1	24	7	150
Teen Choice	20	31	5	26	8	36	7	30	1	24	8	149
Estes House	15	33	6	27	9	35	5	30	1	24	9	149
GRTS West	19	31	4	28	6	36	8	29	1	24	10	148
SIPP	23	30	10	27	7	36	11	29	1	24	11	146
Full Circle	7	42	13	22	4	36	18	22	1	24	12	146
Phoenix House	21	30	8	27	15	35	10	29	1	24	13	146
Phoenix North	22	30	9	27	16	35	12	28	1	24	14	144
FACT	6	42	18	19	10	35	17	22	1	24	15	142
CM	5	42	17	19	17	34	16	22	1	24	16	141
LRH	12	40	22	18	12	35	13	23	1	24	17	140
SOP	11	42	15	21	22	31	22	22	1	24	18	140
LLOP	8	42	19	18	23	32	19	22	1	24	19	139
SoLOP	10	42	21	19	21	31	21	22	1	24	20	138
CCCS	4	42	16	19	19	31	15	22	1	24	21	138
MPO	9	42	20	19	20	31	20	22	1	24	22	138
Adult Choice	17	31	12	22	3	36	14	22	1	24	23	135
The Center's Overall Risk Severity Range												
0 - 2600										Indicates Low Rating		
2601 - 5600										Indicates Moderate Rating		
5601 - 9487										Indicates High Rating		
Center's Total										Indicates 1-5 Ranking		
3373										Overall Rating: Moderate		

Hazard Risk Analysis Results become Control Action Plans

Each of the twenty-three Moderate or High hazards was translated into a Control Action Plan which formulates the organization's response to the identified threat. Work on the Control Actions has begun by prioritizing the top ten and assignment of a Champion to each. The Status Report (an example is shown below) tracks, in summary fashion the documentation of progress towards goal completion of each Control Action. As the ten prioritized Actions are resolved,

additional Action Plans will become operational. The goal is to have all twenty-three Control Action Plans working towards completion before the fiscal year ends in June.

Environmental Panel's Control Action Plan Status Report

General Information									
Control Action #	Description of Control Action	Team Leader	Priority	Open Date	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
05-1	Bomb Threat	Bill Wahl	8	10/20/05					
05-2	Facility Access Control	Tim Camp	3	10/20/05					
05-3	Heat	Linda Detomaso	4	10/20/05					
05-4	High Winds	Tom Floyd	10	10/20/05					
05-5	Hostage Situation								
05-6	HVAC System								
05-7	Information Management System								
05-8	Lighting								
05-9	Medical/Clinical Incidents								
05-10	Neighborhood Crime								
05-11	Patient Identification/HIPPA	Sue Tucker	5	10/20/05					
05-12	Patient on Employee Assaults	Glenna Osborne	6	10/20/05					
05-13	Patient on Patient Assaults	COC: Rebecca Esarey Glenna Osborne	7	10/20/05					
05-14	Plumbing/Sewage	COC: Rebecca Esarey Tom Floyd		10/20/05					
05-15	Rainfall or Flood	Tom Floyd		10/20/05					
05-16	Terrorist Attack								
05-17	Tornado								
05-18	Weapons Brought Into Facility	Shelby Chavis	9	10/20/05					

Conclusions

The Hazard Risk Analysis tool has proven to be extremely useful to the organization. By quantifying the Risk Severity we were able to identify twenty-three areas of High or Moderate risks to the agency. Work was done by the Team to develop Action Control Plans for the purpose of eliminating the severity of the risk (such as tree removal at two of our facility sites) or reducing the impact of the risk through additional resource deployment and training. By prioritizing these Control Action Plans for implementation we believe that the most significant risks are now actively being addressed. This process has impacted our Center-wide safety committee (called the Environmental Panel) structure and transformed it into a workshop where all members are Champions of active performance improvement activities.

We hope that other organizations may benefit from this systematic approach to risk analysis.



LifeStream Behavioral Center is a JCAHO accredited comprehensive behavioral health provider. LifeStream is entering its thirty-seventh year of meeting the mental health and substance abuse care needs of Lake and Sumter County residents and provides a full continuum of services including, psychiatric hospitalization, crisis intervention and stabilization, case management, aftercare, daytreatment, aggressive community treatment, residential, and outpatient counseling services. Last year, over 238,000 behavioral health service units were provided.

LifeStream has also become a major provider of social service program elements within the areas of Child Welfare and School Readiness. During the previous year, over 43,000 social service contacts were delivered.

LifeStream began operations as a component of a local hospital in 1969. In 1971, we became an independent not-for-profit corporation, and since that time we have grown from forty-five employees to over five hundred fifty staff. The annual budget grew from less than \$750,000 to a projected \$39 million in FY 05-06.

LifeStream exists to provide quality life enrichment services to our community through prevention, education and treatment. We believe in human dignity and worth. Therefore, our living values are: Respect, Honesty, Competence, Fairness, Empathy, Communication and Integrity.

"Where Hope Comes to Life"