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INTERIM EVALUATION OF A CLINICAL EDUCATORS PILOT STUDY VIA A MULTI-STAKEHOLDER ONLINE SURVEY
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Aims/Objectives/Background In England, the demand for emergency care is increasing, complicated by challenges with recruitment and retention of multi-professional teams in Emergency Departments (ED). The intense working environment that clinical ED staff face is recognised as a cause of staff dissatisfaction, attrition and premature career 'burnout.' A new 'shop floor' Clinical Educator (CE) role may improve the retention and wellbeing of multi-professional ED teams. A Health Education England pilot developed and recruited CEs across 54 acute trust EDs in England, from 2017. Aston University and the Royal College of Emergency Medicine were jointly commissioned to undertake a service benefit evaluation.

Methods/Design An online survey was circulated to CEs, learners and managers across the 54 study sites. Each group answered questions relating to experiences, opinions and reflections. Topics included impact of a CE on patient flow, confidence and competence of staff, as well as sustainability and any impact on staff wellbeing.

Results/Conclusions

Results 314 individuals accessed the survey and 291 eligible respondents completed it, including: 187 learners, 65 CEs and 39 ED Clinical Directors/Managers.

• Learners (169/187), CE (63/65) and managers (39/39) saw no change/an improvement in patient flow.
• 100% of CEs felt that a CE in the ED improved competence and confidence of staff (88.2% of learners, 89.7% of managers).
• 7% (61/65) of CEs and 87.2% (34/39) managers agree that CEs have improved wellbeing of staff.
• 8% of managers (26/39) were unsure whether the CE role would be funded beyond the pilot, but 66.7% (26/39) strongly supported continuation of the CE role.

Conclusion Interim evidence suggests that CEs positively impact the multi-professional ED workforce.

ULTRASOUND DIRECTED REDUCTION OF COLLES’ TYPE DISTAL RADIAL FRACTURES IN ED (UDIRECT): A FEASIBILITY RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL
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Aims/Objectives/Background Travel restrictions during this Covid-19 pandemic created a barrier to bringing external examiners to conduct simulation assessments, a crucial component of emergency medicine examinations in India. Indefinite postponement would prevent several final year trainees from progressing and would have added to their stress and frustration during an already challenging time.

We conducted these evaluation via tele-simulation and sought to evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of tele-simulation as tool for assessing the management of critically ill or injured patients by emergency medicine (EM) trainees. Our secondary outcome was a survey evaluating the attitudes and perceptions of fairness of this remote simulation modality for both faculty and trainees.

Methods/Design 104 residents from 14 separate hospitals across India were evaluated in pairs by a local facilitator and a remote examiner via Zoom. There were 14 local facilitators and 10 remote examiners based in the US, UK and India. All residents examined were given the same simulation case he examination over the course of 7 hours. Real time online structured evaluation forms were completed by both evaluators and each candidate was discussed after every pair to agree a pass/fail grade. The external examiners were blinded to the students overall 3 year performance, theory and thesis results. The tele-simulation evaluation was triangulated with the final examination theory and thesis exam grades and overall clinical performance and feedback over 3 yrs from their local supervisor. We surveyed local faculty, remote examiners and trainees.

Results/Conclusions 32 paired tele-simulation examinations were conducted by 24 local and remote examiners from India, United Kingdom and USA over 7 hours. Of the 14 candidates who failed, their tele-simulation grades correlated with overall performance. The interim data analysis of the survey results show that 96.7% thought the exam was fair Tele-simulation is a feasible and effective way to evaluate EM trainees.
Methods/Design We conducted a 1:1, single blind, parallel group, randomised controlled feasibility trial in two UK hospitals. Adults with Colles’ type distal radial fractures requiring manipulation in the ED were recruited by supervising emergency physicians supported by network research nurses. Participants were randomised to ultrasound directed fracture manipulation (intervention) or standard care with sham ultrasound (controls). The trial was run through Exeter Clinical Trials Unit and consent, randomisation and data collection conducted electronically in REDCap cloud. All participants were followed up at 6 weeks to record any surgical intervention and also underwent baseline and 3 month quality of life (EQ-5D-5L) and wrist function (Patient Rated Wrist Evaluation (PRWE)) assessments.

Results/Conclusions We recruited 47 patients in total, with 23 randomised to the interventional arm and 24 randomised to the control arm. We were able to follow up 100% of the patients for the 6 week follow up. Data analysis and results will be presented at the time of the conference.
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Abstract 292 Figure 2 Primary induction agents selected throughout the study period