

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/10597401>

Standards in Medical Record Keeping

Article in *Clinical medicine* (London, England) · July 2003

DOI: 10.7861/clinmedicine.3-4-329 · Source: PubMed

CITATIONS

156

READS

4,139

2 authors, including:



John G Williams

Swansea University

235 PUBLICATIONS 6,009 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Standards in medical record keeping

Robin Mann and John Williams

Abstract – Medical records serve many functions but their primary purpose is to support patient care. The RCP Health Informatics Unit (HIU) has found variability in the quality of records and discharge summaries in England and Wales. There is currently a major drive to computerise medical records across the NHS, but without improvement in the quality of paper records the full benefits of computerisation are unlikely to be realised.

The onus for improving records lies with individual health professionals. Structuring the record can bring direct benefits to patients by improving patient outcomes and doctors' performance.

The HIU has reviewed the literature and is developing evidence-based standards for record keeping including the structure of the record. The first draft of these standards has been released for consultation purposes. This article is the first of a series that will describe the standards, and the evidence behind them.

KEY WORDS: medical records, standards

Medical records serve many functions in the modern healthcare environment. These can be broadly divided into *primary* and *secondary* functions (Table 1). In this article, deficiencies in current record-keeping practice that interfere with these functions are highlighted. The case is argued for establishing evidence-based standards for record keeping.

How it was

Records have been kept in a variety of ways since the inception of modern medicine. In the 1880s, physi-

cians at the Mayo Clinic in Minnesota kept all their patients' records in a personal leather-bound ledger. This was replaced in 1907 with patient-based records, and this method of record-keeping is still used today by some domiciliary health visitors.

The first major attempt to standardise medical records in the UK came in 1965 with the publication of the Tunbridge report.¹ This produced some of the standard hospital medical records forms we use today (Box 1).

In his report, Tunbridge also described the problems of extracting information from records for secondary purposes. He proposed that medical records should be standardised and 'mechanised', so that the new methods of sorting and storing information could be used to full advantage.¹

In 1968, Weed described the problem-orientated medical record (POMR). He proposed that the clinical record should be structured around the patient's problems, rather than medical problems, and be updated in detail on a daily basis.² Later evaluation of the Weed POMR, with each problem described in the progress notes by the subheadings 'subjective', 'objective', 'assessment' and 'plan' (SOAP), cast doubt on the predicted improvements in clinical processes,³ but Weed had acknowledged that his proposals would be impractical using paper records and suggested that the full POMR would only be possible with computerisation.²

How it is

Despite these calls for standardisation over 30 years ago, problems remain with record-keeping systems and medical records in the UK.

In 1995, the Audit Commission examined 200 case notes from eight hospitals and found many different structures to the records, and some with no structure

Robin Mann
MBBch, Health Informatics Unit, Royal College of Physicians

John Williams
FRCP, Professor of Health Services Research, University of Wales, Swansea

Clin Med
2003;3:329-32

Table 1. Primary and secondary functions of medical records.	
Primary functions	Supporting direct patient care <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aide memoir• Communication
Secondary functions	Medico-legal record Source of information for: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clinical audit and research• Resource allocation• Epidemiology• Service planning• Performance monitoring

Key Points

-**The primary purpose of the medical record is to support patient care**.....
-**The current standard of clinical records is variable**.....
-**Patients benefit from structuring clinical information within the record**.....
-**The RCP Health Informatics Unit is developing evidence based standards for record keeping**.....

Box 1. Examples of standardised hospital medical record (HMR) forms.

HMR 1	Identification sheet/summary
HMR 1 (IP)	Identification sheet (case note copy)
HMR 250 KX	Admission form
HMR 4(a) L	History sheet – one
HMR 4 b	Continuation sheet
HMR 100	Standard mount sheet (gummed)
HMR 111	Inpatient medication
HMR 6	Anaesthetic record
HMR 302	Nursing preoperative checklist
HMR 200	TPR and BP sheet
HMR 5A1	Operation consent by patient
HMR 210D	Diabetes chart
HMR 210A	Daily intake – output chart
HMR 2D	Discharge summary

TPR = temperature, pulse and respiration; BP = blood pressure.

at all. More than half had no index of contents; half were fat and disorganised; they were focused on episodes (outpatient, day-case or inpatient) rather than the continuum of the patient's care; and they were diagnosis- or procedure-led rather than problem orientated. The records were not integrated, with medical, nursing and other components kept separate.⁴ The Commission repeated the audit in 1999, found improvement in some areas but inconsistency still remained.⁵

The Kennedy report from the Bristol Inquiry also criticised current record-keeping practices and standards.⁶

In 2002, the RCP Health Informatics Unit (HIU) audited 149 case notes in five hospitals in England and Wales as part of the evaluation of a training package for junior doctors. We looked at the completeness of the notes for completed admissions, various features of individual entries, and markers for quality of printed

discharge summaries. We found that 35% of the case notes were without a problem list; 29% and 22% had pages without patient identification and name respectively; 9% of all entries were not entirely legible; 10% were unsigned and 11% undated; 83% of all entries did not identify the lead clinician present (presumed to be the decision maker).

Of 87 printed discharge summaries in the notes, 17% had no diagnosis, 19% had no procedure, 21% had no follow-up arrangements, and 75% gave the GP no information on what the patient had been told. Two hospitals had 16% and 24% of printed summaries without dates.

The delay in producing the printed summary was variable. For dated summaries, the longest average delay was 26 days, and the shortest was zero. The site that produced a printed discharge summary on the day of discharge had an electronic system (Fig 1).

We also examined inter-auditor variability and found that there were considerable differences in opinion between senior and junior doctors and nursing and audit staff as to what constituted a 'problem list', and even larger discrepancies in counting numbers of procedures in some sites.

The problem

There is currently a major drive to develop electronic records systems across the UK.⁷⁻⁹ The NHS Information Authority has been in place for five years to implement the strategy in England. One of the objectives is to replace existing paper records with electronic records by 2008.

However, computerising medical records in their current state will create more problems than it solves: a mess computerised is a computerised mess.

Part of the solution is to develop evidence-based standards for record-keeping, including standards for structuring the clinical record.

Structuring the record

In *Setting the record straight*, the Audit Commission recommended that there should be one folder per patient, an agreed structure to the record, and standards for content.⁴ These recommendations are supported by evidence which indicates that structure can improve patient outcomes and doctors' performance (Tables 2 and 3).

Wyatt argued that structured records are easier and quicker to search and therefore can improve decision-making, but they have the disadvantage of being more difficult to write.²⁸ However, some have found no significant difference in the time taken to complete structured proformas and free-text history sheets.^{20,29} Furthermore, Wright described how structuring information could enhance interpretation and therefore limit clinical errors, improving patient outcomes and reducing the costs of healthcare.³⁰

There is also evidence that structured discharge summaries are preferred by GPs;³¹⁻³⁶ they improve continuity of care;³³ and they make it easier to extract information for 'secondary

Fig 1. Average delay in producing printed discharge summary (reproduced from the Health Informatics Unit medical records audit).




Table 2. Studies assessing how improved structure of medical records affects patient outcomes.

Authors	Outcome measured	Results	Comments
Rogers and Haring 1979 ¹⁰	Number of days readmitted	Decreased	Possibly confounded
Humphreys <i>et al.</i> 1992 ¹¹	Number of problems at follow-up	No change	RCT
Humphreys <i>et al.</i> 1992 ¹¹	Patient satisfaction with treatment	Increased	RCT
Zenni and Robinson 1996 ¹²	Patient satisfaction with treatment	Increased	Small sample size

RCT = randomised controlled trial

purposes³, such as audit and performance monitoring.^{37,38} These benefits are summarised in Box 2.

Evidence-based standards for record keeping

In order to address these problems, the HIU is developing evidence-based standards for inpatients' record keeping. The initial draft standards have been published for consultation purposes at www.rcplondon.ac.uk/college/hiu/recordstandards.

The draft standards address the admission clerking, the discharge or transfer summary, and the entries made between admission and discharge. They also address special entries for patient information, consent forms and death. Formal piloting and evaluation *in situ* is planned.

We acknowledge that introducing any innovation into clinical practice requires organisational change as well as changes in ways of working for clinicians. It has been found that providing education and support for staff can ease the introduction of structured proformas in the hospital setting.³⁴ This should start at induction,^{17,20,33} and be maintained by reinforcement and monitoring.

The draft standards are supported by a comprehensive portfolio of educational exercises, *Laying the foundations for good medical practice – a generic training programme for senior house officers*,³⁹ which also contains an audit tool. Junior doctors are encouraged to audit records regularly against the standards.

Conclusions

In this article we have highlighted problems in medical record keeping and shown that structuring the record may improve patient outcomes and doctors' performance. The next article will explore what is meant by 'structure' and describe the evidence for how the record should be structured.

If you are interested in participating in the piloting process, please contact Dr Robin Mann at the Health Informatics Unit.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank David Andrew and Dipak Kalra for their historical references, and Nick Michell, Myles Mylvahan, Christine O'Brien, Claire Pulford and Mohammed

Table 3. Studies assessing how improved structure of medical records affects doctors' performance.

Authors	Outcome measured	Results	Comments
Adams <i>et al.</i> 1986 ¹³	Junior doctor correct diagnosis	Improved	
Duggan <i>et al.</i> 1990 ¹⁴	Recorded and observed performance	Improved	Not randomised
Lilford <i>et al.</i> 1992 ¹⁵	Doctors' response to risk factors	Improved	
Humphreys <i>et al.</i> 1992 ¹¹	Completeness of documentation	Increased	RCT
Wallace <i>et al.</i> 1994 ¹⁶	Completeness of documentation	Increased	Before and after study
Goodyear and Lloyd 1995 ¹⁷	Completeness of documentation	Increased	Retrospective, no control
Teo <i>et al.</i> 1995 ¹⁸	Completeness of documentation	Increased	Before and after study
Robinson <i>et al.</i> 1996 ¹⁹	Completeness of documentation	Increased	Before and after study
Zenni and Robinson 1996 ¹²	Doctors conformance to guidelines	Increased	Small sample size
Belmin <i>et al.</i> 1998 ²⁰	Completeness of documentation	Increased	Before and after study
Belmin <i>et al.</i> 1998 ²⁰	Accuracy of recorded information	Increased	Before and after study
Johns <i>et al.</i> 1992 ²¹	Documentation of counselling	Improved	
Shank <i>et al.</i> 1989 ²²	Screening recommendations	Improved	Before and after study
Cohen <i>et al.</i> 1982 ²³	Screening procedures	Improved	RCT
Irtiza-Ali <i>et al.</i> 2001 ²⁴	Documentation of admission history	Improved	Audit reported in letter
Cheney <i>et al.</i> 1987 ²⁵	Screening procedures	Improved	RCT
Wrenn <i>et al.</i> 1993 ²⁶	Completeness of documentation	Improved	High risk of selection bias
Town <i>et al.</i> 1990 ²⁷	Completeness of documentation	Improved	Before and after study

Box 2. Benefits of adopting evidence-based standards for record keeping.

Improved quality of records:

- Improved completeness of information
- Improved accuracy of information

Better patient information:

- Improved communication
- Informed patients
- Greater patient involvement in decision-making

Improved patient outcomes

Improved data validity for secondary purposes:

- Improved central returns
- Accurate performance data
- Better research data
- Better NHS management information

More efficient health services

Improved public health

Qadiri for arranging and undertaking case notes audits in their local hospitals.

References

- 1 Ministry of Health Central Health Services Council. The standardisation of medical records. London: HMSO, 1965.
- 2 Weed LL. Medical records that guide and teach. *N Engl J Med* 1968;**278**: 652–7.
- 3 Switz DM. The problem-oriented medical record: evaluation and management of anemia before and during use. *Arch Intern Med* 1976;**136**:1119–23.
- 4 Audit Commission. *Setting the record straight – a study of hospital medical records*. London: HMSO, 1995.
- 5 Audit Commission. *Setting the record straight – a review of progress in health records services*. London: HMSO, 1999.
- 6 Kennedy Report. *Learning from Bristol: the report of the public inquiry into children's heart surgery at the Bristol Royal Infirmary 1984–1995*. Command Paper; CM 5207. London: Department of Health, 2002.
- 7 Department of Health. *Delivering 21st Century IT Support for the NHS – National Strategic Programme*. 2002. London: DH, 2002.
- 8 NHS Information Authority. *Information for health: an information strategy for the modern NHS 1998–2005*. 1998. www.nhs.uk/def/pages/info4health/1.asp
- 9 Welsh Assembly Government. *Informing Healthcare*. 2002.
- 10 Rogers JL, Haring OM. The impact of a computerized medical record summary system on incidence and length of hospitalization. *Med Care* 1979;**17**:618–30.
- 11 Humphreys T, Shofer FS, Jacobson S, Coutifaris C, Stemhagen A. Preformatted charts improve documentation in the emergency department. *Ann Emerg Med* 1992;**21**:534–40.
- 12 Zenni EA, Robinson TN. Effects of structured encounter forms on pediatric house staff knowledge, parent satisfaction, and quality of care. A randomized, controlled trial. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 1996;**150**: 975–80.
- 13 Adams ID, Chan M, Clifford PC, Cooke WM *et al*. Computer aided diagnosis of acute abdominal pain: a multicentre study. *BMJ (Clin Res Ed)* 1986;**293**:800–4.
- 14 Duggan AK, Starfield B, DeAngelis C. Structured encounter form: the impact on provider performance and recording of well-child care. *Pediatrics* 1990;**85**:104–13.
- 15 Lilford RJ, Kelly M, Baines A, Cameron S *et al*. Effect of using protocols on medical care: randomised trial of three methods of taking an antenatal history. *BMJ* 1992;**305**:1181–4.
- 16 Wallace SA, Gullan RW, Byrne PO, Bennett J, Perez-Avila CA. Use of a pro forma for head injuries in the accident and emergency department – the way forward. *J Accid Emerg Med* 1994;**11**:33–42.
- 17 Goodyear HM, Lloyd BW. Can admission notes be improved by using preprinted assessment sheets? *Qual Health Care* 1995;**4**:190–3.
- 18 Teo S, Hanson R, Van Asperen P, Giles H *et al*. Improving asthma documentation in a paediatric emergency department. *J Paediatr Child Health* 1995;**31**:130–3.
- 19 Robinson SM, Harrison BD, Lambert MA. Effect of a preprinted form on the management of acute asthma in an accident and emergency department. *J Accid Emerg Med* 1996;**13**:93–7.
- 20 Belmin J, de la Fourniere F, Bellot P, Medjahed S *et al*. Quality of the information collected during admission to a hospital geriatric service: importance of a structured medical record. *Presse Med* 1998;**27**: 1519–22.
- 21 Johns MB, Hovell ME, Drastal CA, Lamke C, Patrick K. Promoting prevention services in primary care: a controlled trial. *Am J Prev Med* 1992;**8**:135–40.
- 22 Shank JC, Powell T, Llewelyn J. A five-year demonstration project associated with improvement in physician health maintenance behavior. *Fam Med* 1989;**21**:273–8.
- 23 Cohen DI, Littenberg B, Wetzel C, Neuhauser D. Improving physician compliance with preventive medicine guidelines. *Med Care* 1982;**20**: 1040–5.
- 24 Irtiza-Ali A, Houghton CM, Raghuram A, O'Driscoll BR. Medical admissions can be made easier, quicker and better by the use of a pre-printed Medical Admission Proforma *Clin Med* 2001;**1**:327.
- 25 Cheney C, Ramsdell JW. Effect of medical records' checklists on implementation of periodic health measures. *Am J Med* 1987;**83**:129–36.
- 26 Wrenn K, Rodewald L, Lumb E, Slovis C. The use of structured, complaint-specific patient encounter forms in the emergency department. *Ann Emerg Med* 1993;**22**:805–12.
- 27 Town I, Kwong T, Holst P, Beasley R. Use of a management plan for treating asthma in an emergency department. *Thorax* 1990;**45**:702–6.
- 28 Wyatt JC, Wright P. Design should help use of patients' data. *Lancet* 1998;**352**:1375–8.
- 29 O'Driscoll, B. R. Personal communication. 2003.
- 30 Wright P, Jansen C, Wyatt JC. How to limit clinical errors in interpretation of data. *Lancet* 1998;**352**:1539–43.
- 31 Adams DC, Bristol JB, Poskitt KR. Surgical discharge summaries: improving the record. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 1993;**75**:96–9.
- 32 Bowns I R, Newton P, Long S, Walters S *et al*. Testing headings for communicating the personal health record: comparison from recipient's perspective. *Health Informatics J* 1999;**5**:179–87.
- 33 Brazy JE, Langkamp DL, Brazy ND, De Luna RF. Do primary care physicians prefer dictated or computer-generated discharge summaries? *Am J Dis Child* 1993;**147**:986–8.
- 34 Howard DJ. Structured discharge letter in a department of geriatric medicine. *Health Trends* 1986;**18**:12–4.
- 35 Rawal J, Barnett P, Lloyd BW. Use of structured letters to improve communication between hospital doctors and general practitioners. *BMJ* 1993;**307**:1044.
- 36 van Walraven C, Duke SM, Weinberg AL, Wells PS. Standardized or narrative discharge summaries. Which do family physicians prefer? *Can Fam Physician* 1998;**44**:62–9.
- 37 Essex B, Doig R, Rosenthal J, Doherty J. The psychiatric discharge summary: a tool for management and audit. *Br J Gen Pract* 1991;**41**:332–4.
- 38 Williams JG, Mann RY. Hospital episode statistics: time for clinicians to get involved? *Clin Med* 2002;**2**:34–7.
- 39 Royal College of Physicians. *Laying the Foundations for Good Medical Practice: A generic training programme for senior house officers*. Report of a working party. London:RCP, 2003.