

1

2 **Performance of the Safer Nursing Care Tool to measure nurse staffing**
3 **requirements in acute hospitals: a multi-centre observational study**

4

5 **[Short title: Performance of the Safer Nursing Care Tool]**

6

7 Peter Griffiths^{1,2,3*}, Christina Saville¹, Jane E Ball¹ David Culliford^{1,2}, Natalie
8 Pattison^{4,5,6}, Thomas Monks^{1,7}

9

¹ School of Health Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, Hampshire, UK

10 ²National Institute for Health Research Applied Health Research Centre (Wessex), Southampton,
11 Hampshire UK

12 ³Portsmouth Hospital NHS Trust, Portsmouth, Hampshire, UK

13 ⁴Clinical Services, The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

14 ⁵University of Hertfordshire, School of Health and Social Work, Hatfield, Hertfordshire UK

15 ⁶East and North Hertfordshire NHS Trust, Stevenage, Hertfordshire UK

16 ⁷ College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

17

18 *Corresponding Author Peter.griffiths@soton.ac.uk 023 80 597877

19

20

21 **Performance of the Safer Nursing Care Tool to measure nurse staffing**
22 **requirements in acute hospitals: a multi-centre observational study**

23

24 **Abstract**

25 **Objectives**

26 To determine the precision of nurse staffing establishments estimated using the
27 SNCT patient classification system, and to assess whether the recommended staff
28 levels correspond with professional judgements of adequate staffing.

29 **Setting / population**

30 81 medical/surgical units in 4 acute care hospitals.

31 **Methods**

32 Nurses assessed patients using the SNCT and reported on the adequacy of staffing
33 at least daily for one year. Bootstrap samples of varying sizes were used to estimate
34 the precision of the tool's recommendations for the number of nurses to employ on
35 each unit. Multi-level regression models were used to assess the association
36 between shortfalls from the measured staffing requirement and nurses' assessments
37 of adequate staffing.

38 **Results**

39 The recommended minimum sample of 20 days allowed the required number to
40 employ to be estimated with a mean precision of 4.1%. For most units, much larger
41 samples were required to estimate establishments within +/- 1 whole time staff
42 member. Every registered nurse hour per patient day shortfall in staffing was
43 associated with an 11% decrease in the odds of nurses reporting that there were
44 enough staff to provide quality care and a 14% increase in the odds of reporting that
45 necessary nursing care was left undone. No threshold indicating an optimal staffing

46 level was observed. Surgical specialty, patient turnover and more single bedded
47 rooms were associated with lower odds of staffing adequacy.

48 **Conclusions**

49 The SNCT can provide reliable estimates of the number of nurses to employ on a
50 unit, but larger samples than the recommended minimum are usually required. The
51 SNCT provides a measure of nursing workload that correlates with professional
52 judgements, but the recommended staffing levels may not be optimal. Some sources
53 of systematic variations in staffing requirements for some units are not accounted
54 for. SNCT measurements are a potentially useful adjunct to professional judgement,
55 but cannot replace it.

56 [words 300]

57

58

59

60 Introduction

61 In acute care hospitals, the ability to determine the ‘right’ number of nursing staff to
62 employ and to deploy on any given shift is an imperative, as nurse staffing levels
63 influence both efficiency and quality of care delivery. On the one hand, professional
64 nurses and nursing support staff form the largest group of staff and the largest
65 variable costs faced by hospitals. Nursing budgets are thus frequently targeted in the
66 drive for cost savings.¹ On the other hand, inadequate nurse staffing is linked to
67 deficits in the quality and safety of care.² However, despite the existence of many
68 tools to determine staffing requirements and an extensive literature, evidence about
69 the ability of any tool to reliably and accurately estimate staffing requirements is
70 extremely limited.^{3,4} In this paper, we consider the “Safer Nursing Care Tool”
71 (SNCT), which is used in the majority of acute hospitals in the United Kingdom’s
72 National Health Service(NHS)⁵ and endorsed by the National Institute for Health and
73 Care Excellence (NICE),⁶ the body that produces evidence based guidelines for the
74 NHS. We explore the reliability and precision of the estimates of required staffing
75 establishments (that is the number of nurses to employ for a hospital unit) made
76 using the tool and the extent to which estimated staffing requirements correspond
77 with professional judgement of sufficient staffing. Despite the tool’s widespread use
78 and the importance of these considerations, these factors have not been previously
79 studied.

80 Associations between higher registered nurse staffing levels in hospitals and
81 improved care quality have been demonstrated in many studies.^{2,7-9} Outcomes
82 include lower risks of in-hospital mortality¹⁰, shorter lengths of stay¹¹ and fewer
83 omissions of necessary care.¹² Such findings have underpinned policies to make

84 minimum nurse staffing levels mandatory in some jurisdictions, most notably
85 California in the USA. Yet studies showing associations between nurse staffing
86 levels and outcomes rarely provide a clear indication of how many staff are needed
87 for different patients, despite evidence that needs can vary considerably, nor do
88 most studies demonstrate tipping points in relationships, which could be one
89 indication of an optimal staffing level.²

90 Consequently, tools and systems to guide decisions about the number of nursing
91 staff to employ, or to deploy on any given shift are still widely used either in
92 conjunction with or as an alternative to mandatory minimums. At the heart of most
93 tools is some form of patient level assessment, which is translated into a measure of
94 required nursing time.^{3,4} Many such tools exist, although they are largely
95 unsupported by robust evidence. Studies used to support the validity of tools to
96 determine staffing requirements simply tend to show that staff demand estimated
97 using a given tool correlates with some other measure of demand. In the absence of
98 a gold standard, and without addressing whether the staffing according to the
99 predicted level is sufficient to deliver the required care, such evidence is significantly
100 limited. Different tools, while providing results that are highly correlated, can and do
101 give dramatically different estimates of the staffing required by the same group of
102 patients.⁴ For example applying a new system to estimate the staffing required for
103 low acuity wards resulted in an estimate that was double that derived from the
104 existing system.¹³

105 Furthermore, although a key driver for choosing to use a tool is the assertion that
106 variable patient need cannot be efficiently met by fixed staffing levels,¹⁴ little
107 consideration has been given to the impact of variation on the resulting estimates of
108 average staffing requirements. Inter-rater reliability and agreement is often reported,

109 the precision with which the unit staffing requirement as a whole is estimated, either
110 on a given day or over time, is not. ⁴

111 The SNCT ¹⁵ is reported to be used in 80% of National Health Service acute
112 hospitals in England.⁵ The tool was originally designed to determine the required
113 number of staff to employ (the establishment) for each unit unit to ensure that there
114 are sufficient staff to fill daily rosters to meet average need, but it is increasingly used
115 to monitor and determine daily demand for staff. It is an example of a patient
116 classification system.⁴ Patients are classified into one of five groups, based on their
117 acuity and dependency on nursing care, with each group having an associated
118 weighting (described as a ‘multiplier’) indicating the number of nursing staff
119 required.¹⁵ At the time of writing, the most recently published multipliers for general
120 adult inpatient units were based on observations of 40,000 patient care episodes.⁶
121 The multipliers represent the average of staff time to provide all direct patient care
122 and ancillary work for patients in each group with allowances made for annual leave,
123 study time and sickness absence when determining the number of nurses to employ.

124 ¹⁵

125 The SNCT has been shown to correlate strongly with an alternative classification
126 system and high inter-rater agreement is reported. ^{16, 17} However, while the tool’s
127 handbook recommends a sample of at least 20 days to establish a reliable baseline
128 for setting establishments, we could find no evidence of the precision of the resulting
129 estimates. In our review of literature, we found no direct evidence that using this or
130 any other tool improved the quality of care. ⁴

131 This observational study aims to provide evidence about the reliability and validity of
132 the SNCT by addressing the precision of the estimated establishment and the extent

133 to which staffing shortfalls relative to the level implied by the tool is associated with
134 nurses' judgement that staffing levels are insufficient to sufficient to deliver all
135 necessary care with acceptable quality. Because factors such as patient turnover,
136 specialty and layout are not directly considered in patient classifications yet may
137 influence staffing requirements¹⁸⁻²⁰, we also examine the extent to which staffing
138 levels determined using the SNCT are sufficient to accommodate variation in
139 demand associated with these factors by determining whether there is an
140 independent association between these factors and judgements of staffing adequacy
141 when considering the effect of shortfalls from the SNCT recommended staffing level.

142 **Methods and materials**

143 We used routinely collected data and and nurse reports over one year (2017) from
144 81 acute medical/surgical units (2178 beds) in four NHS hospital trusts (hereafter
145 referred to as hospitals for brevity) in England. For each unit and for each day we
146 identified staffing measurements: the staffing level deployed (from the electronic
147 roster), the staffing level required (based on patient classifications using the SNCT),
148 and nurses' professional judgement of the completeness of care and adequacy of
149 staffing to deliver quality (through a micro survey embedded in the daily
150 assessments). SNCT and staffing adequacy assessments were provided by the
151 nurse in charge of the shift, hereafter referred to as 'shift leader' for brevity.

152 **Setting & inclusion**

153 The study sites were one university teaching hospital, two general hospitals and a
154 specialist cancer hospital (two sites) based in London, South East and South West
155 England. The hospitals serve diverse populations including rural areas, deprived
156 inner city populations and specialist national referrals. All hospitals undertook
157 reviews of nurse staffing establishments at least twice a year. Two had been using

158 the SNCT as part of this process for some time while two adopted it shortly before
159 the study commenced.

160 We included general medical and surgical units that provided 24 hour inpatient care.
161 Services out of scope of the SNCT (e.g. paediatrics, intensive care, maternity,
162 neonatal and palliative care), and any others with highly atypical staffing
163 requirements (e.g. bone marrow transplant and isolation units), as determined by a
164 local co-investigator, were excluded. Our unit sample represented 74% of all beds
165 across the four hospitals.

166 [Data sources and measures](#)

167 Over the course of one year at least twice per day, shift leaders recorded the number
168 of patients in each SNCT category and made judgements about staffing adequacy
169 (see below) in electronic systems. Local leads trained potential shift leaders on
170 participating units in the use of the SNCT and completion of the staffing adequacy
171 questions. Supporting information and brief guidance was provided on laminated
172 sheets kept near the unit computers where data were entered. Other data for the
173 study were routinely collected for administrative purposes (roster, patient admissions
174 or discharges). Each hospital supplied a profile for each unit with main speciality and
175 layout including the number of beds / single rooms.

176 [Study variables](#)

177 We used the most up-to-date SNCT multipliers available at the start of the study.¹⁵
178 We took the reported counts of patients in each category and calculated the
179 weighted average multiplier per unit and day. We multiplied this by the patient count
180 derived from the patient administration system, in case any patients were omitted
181 from shift leader reports. This figure provides an estimate of the required unit

182 establishment (number of staff to employ). We used morning assessments and
183 patient count at 7am for our main analysis. To determine the implied daily hours, we
184 used a 37.5 hour working week for 1 whole time equivalent, removing the 22%
185 'uplift', which is added to the SNCT establishment to account holidays, study and
186 sick leave.

187 For each unit we used the average observed skill mix on that unit as a proxy for the
188 planned skill mix of registered nurses and nursing assistants. The SNCT does not
189 directly account for patients identified as requiring 1 to 1 supervision, often referred
190 to as 'specialing' ²¹ even though the implied staffing requirement is very high.
191 Therefore, where we wanted to identify the staffing requirements for any particular
192 day, we identified the number of such patients from records and added the required
193 hours to our estimated staffing requirement. However, because such enhanced care
194 would form part of the care observed to determine the SNCT multipliers and thus be
195 included in the average, we made no additional allowance when estimating
196 establishments to be employed.

197 From the electronic roster we identified hours worked by registered nurses and
198 nursing assistants each day (from 7am to 7am) and divided these by the number of
199 patient days (patient hours / 24) to calculate hours per patient day (HPPD) for each
200 unit for each day. We calculated a measure of staff shortfall, by subtracting the
201 required hours (according to the SNCT plus specialing requirements) from the hours
202 actually deployed on that day. If more staff than the estimated requirement were
203 deployed, the shortfall was negative. We also calculated daily patient turnover per
204 staff member (the numbers of patients entering and leaving units divided by the total
205 staff hours).

206 The outcomes measured were a number of variables reflecting the adequacy of
207 nurse staffing, as reported by the nurse in charge of the shift ('shift leader'). The shift
208 leader responded to three brief items every time they provided SNCT ratings, directly
209 inputting responses into the same system as used for SNCT (see Table 1). Two
210 items, based on the widely used RN4CAST / International Hospital Outcomes
211 surveys of nurse staffing and quality, asked whether there were enough staff for
212 quality and whether any necessary care was left undone.^{12, 22} We also asked about
213 staff missing breaks, as nurses may miss breaks to complete care activities, creating
214 additional staff time that avoids adverse effects of staffing shortfalls.²³ These
215 questions constituted the micro-survey.

216 Table 1 Staffing adequacy questions

Questions

Were there enough nursing staff to provide quality care on the last shift?

Was necessary nursing care left undone (missed) on the last shift because there were too few nursing staff?

Were staff breaks missed on the last shift because there were too few nursing staff?

217

218 **Data cleaning and Analysis**

219 Data cleaning, processing and statistical analyses were carried out in R statistical
220 software V3.5.0.²⁴ We identified and removed extreme values of staffing shortfall,
221 where values lay outside the mean plus or minus three standard deviations
222 (approximately 1.5% of cases). This removed atypical periods if the unit was not
223 functioning as normal, e.g. over the Christmas period, or where there is an extreme
224 error in the recorded SNCT ratings. Where there were major changes such as unit
225 moves, changes to the patient population or bed numbers, data for that unit were
226 split and treated as separate units. We found some evidence of consistent reverse
227 coding of data inputs (0/1 for yes/no) for some staffing adequacy questions in
228 several units of one hospital. This appeared to result from erroneous staff training.
229 Because it was discovered partway through the study we developed logical rules to

230 identify units where this occurred and recode data, considering the implications of
231 this through sensitivity analyses where we excluded the hospital entirely.

232 To understand the accuracy of the estimated establishment we first considered the
233 minimum recommended sample size of the SNCT data collection, which is 20 days
234 twice a year. We used 1000 bootstrap samples of 20 days' data to estimate a mean
235 establishment with a 95% confidence interval for the establishment on each unit. We
236 repeated this with bootstrap samples of increasing numbers of days to assess the
237 accuracy of larger samples. For each unit, we calculated both the precision of the
238 estimate, that is half the width of the confidence interval expressed as a % of the
239 mean, and the absolute value of the confidence interval in whole time equivalent
240 (WTE) staff members. We determined the number of units where the confidence
241 interval of the establishment was 2 WTE or less (that is no more than +/-1 WTE
242 difference from the mean) or 1 WTE or less (mean +/- .5).

243 We modelled the relationship between staffing deficits (in HPPD) and nurse-reported
244 measures of staffing adequacy. We fitted multilevel logistic regression models for
245 binary outcomes using the glmer (generalised linear mixed effects regression)
246 function from the lme4 package ²⁵ in R. Staffing was nested in unit which was nested
247 in hospital. All models included control for day of the week, proportion of single
248 rooms, turnover and unit specialty (surgical vs medical or mixed). We considered
249 the association of staffing adequacy outcomes with deviation of both registered
250 nurse staffing and nursing assistant staffing from their estimated requirements. We
251 also fitted models using the deviation in total hours and skill mix (registered nurse
252 proportion).

253 After modelling the linear and main effects, we introduced quadratic terms for the
254 staffing level variables to assess non-linear relationships and we investigated
255 whether staffing variables interacted with other variables. We compared the fit of
256 models using the Akaike and Bayesian information criteria (AIC, BIC), preferring
257 models with lower values, indicating better fit / more parsimonious models.²⁶

258 Ethical approval and registration

259 Ethical approval was granted by the University of Southampton Ethics committee
260 (reference 18809). The study was prospectively registered (ISRCTN 12307968).²⁷

261 Results

262 We had useable SNCT ratings on 96% of occasions and responses to staffing
263 adequacy questions on 85% or more of possible occasions. After data cleaning and
264 linkage, we had 22,364 unit days where we could assess the association between
265 staffing shortfalls and perceptions of staffing adequacy.

266 Average unit staffing levels and skill mix varied considerably between hospitals and
267 between units within hospitals (Table 2). At a hospital level, average estimated
268 staffing requirements of units corresponded closely with the observed staffing levels
269 in 3 of 4 hospitals although all were somewhat understaffed relative to the estimated
270 requirement (8% or less). Larger differences between actual staffing and SNCT
271 estimates occurred on smaller, generally specialist, units with more single rooms
272 (where apparent overstaffing occurred), and some larger medical units (where
273 extremes of apparent understaffing occurred). In hospital C, a specialist hospital with
274 many small units, average unit staffing was 50% higher than the SNCT estimated
275 requirement.

276 Table 2 Mean and range of unit’s average daily staffing levels, skill mix, SNCT estimated staffing
 277 requirements.

Hospital	Total hours per patient day			Skill mix (% registered nurses)			Estimated staffing requirement		
	Mean	[Min	Max]	Mean	[Min	Max]	Mean	[Min	Max]
A	7	[5.4	10.4]	51%	[42%	70%]	7.4	5.9	10.2
B	6.8	[5.0	8.9]	56%	[39%	79%]	7.3	6.0	9.4
C	10.5	[7.5	14.2]	75%	[70%	78%]	7	6.3	7.4
D	6.5	[5.2	8.4]	49%	[40%	63%]	7	6.5	7.6
All	7.3	[5.0	8.4]	56%	[39%	79%]	7.2	5.9	10.2

278
 279

280 Across all units, using the recommended minimum of 20 days’ data, the average
 281 precision was 4.1% but varied by unit (range 0.6% - 13.5%). In absolute terms, the
 282 average width of the 95% confidence intervals for the establishment was 2.9 whole
 283 time equivalent staff (that is approximately mean +/- 1.5 WTE). The confidence
 284 interval width was ≤ 2 WTE in 27/86 units and ≤ 1 WTE in only 3/86.

285 As the number of days sampled increases from 20 there was a marked increase in
 286 precision (Figure 1), with most units (56/86) yielding a confidence interval width of ≤ 2
 287 WTE from a sample of 40 days. The benefits of increased sample sizes diminishes
 288 with larger samples however, and even with samples of 180 days only 53/77 units
 289 gave a confidence interval width that was ≤ 1 WTE wide (Table 3).

290 ***Fig 1 Mean precision and confidence interval width of staffing establishment***
 291 ***estimates with different sample sizes***

292 Table 3 Average widths of 95% confidence intervals for the mean using different sample sizes to
 293 estimate establishment

Sample size taken for the estimate	Average confidence interval width (WTE)	Average precision	Number units with confidence interval width 1 WTE or less	Number units with confidence interval width 2 WTE or less	Number of units ¹
20	2.9	4.2%	3	27	86
40	2.1	3.0%	7	56	86
60	1.7	2.5%	10	64	86
80	1.5	2.1%	20	72	86
100	1.3	1.9%	31	74	82
120	1.2	1.8%	39	74	81
140	1.1	1.6%	44	74	81
160	1.0	1.5%	50	75	80
180	1.0	1.4%	53	73	77

1. Because units with establishment and / or specialty changes were treated as separate units for analysis, the total exceed the number of units participating in the study. As the available data for some units was less than the sample required for the estimate, the number of units for larger samples is reduced.

294

295 Across all units, a mean of 78% of shifts were assessed by the nurse in charge as
 296 having enough staff to deliver quality care (unit mean range 24% to 96%). Necessary
 297 nursing care was reported left undone because of too few staff on 5% of shifts
 298 (range 0-25%) and breaks were reported missed on 5% of shifts (range 0-29%).

299 Shortfalls in staffing levels relative to the requirement for that day, estimated using
 300 the SNCT, were associated with nurses' perceptions of staffing adequacy (Table 4).
 301 In the multivariable models, for each registered nurse hour shortfall, the adjusted
 302 odds of the shift leader reporting that there were enough staff for quality were 11%
 303 lower, the odds of reporting nursing care left undone were increased by 14%, and
 304 the odds of staff missing breaks were increased by 12%. Findings are similar for
 305 shortfalls of nursing assistants.

306 Factors other than shortfalls relative to the SNCT estimated requirement were also
 307 associated with perceptions of staffing adequacy. Nurses on surgical units were less
 308 likely to perceive adequate staffing compared to nurses on other (medical or mixed)
 309 units. For example, the odds of nurses reporting that there were enough staff for

310 quality were 44% lower on surgical units. Although relationships were not always
 311 significant and confidence intervals were wide, the odds of reporting enough staff for
 312 quality were substantially lower on units with a higher proportion of single rooms.
 313 Similarly, odds of reporting care left undone and missed breaks were substantially
 314 increased on units with a higher proportion of single rooms and units with higher
 315 turnover, although again confidence intervals were wide and relationships were not
 316 all statistically significant. Nurses were more likely to report that there were enough
 317 staff for quality and less likely to report missed care and missed breaks on Saturday
 318 compared to Monday, although there was no consistent pattern that suggested
 319 weekends differed from weekdays.

320 Table 4 Association between staffing shortfall and nurse perceptions of staffing adequacy: univariable
 321 and multivariable models

Variable	Enough staff for quality				Nursing care left undone				Staff breaks missed			
	odds ratio*	adj odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p-value	odds ratio*	adj odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p-value	odds ratio*	adj odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p-value
Registered nurse shortfall (HPPD)	0.94	0.89	[0.87, 0.92]	<0.001	1.09	1.14	[1.08, 1.20]	<0.001	1.08	1.12	[1.06, 1.18]	<0.001
Nursing assistant shortfall (HPPD)	0.90	0.86	[0.83, 0.89]	<0.001	1.08	1.14	[1.07, 1.20]	<0.001	1.06	1.11	[1.05, 1.17]	<0.001
Turnover (per nursing hour)	0.35	0.88	[0.29, 2.68]	0.827	7.16	3.52	[0.63, 19.64]	0.151	3.85	5.06	[0.97, 26.54]	0.136
Unit type – medical or mixed												
Surgical	0.57	0.56	[0.33, 0.94]	0.029	2.00	1.96	[1.11, 3.47]	0.021	2.13	2.04	[1.17, 3.55]	0.011
Proportion single rooms	0.50	0.39	[0.14, 1.04]	0.059	2.17	3.09	[1.09, 8.76]	0.034	2.00	2.01	[0.71, 5.68]	0.185
Day of week- Monday												
Tuesday	1.11	1.12	[0.99, 1.26]	0.079	0.86	0.86	[0.69, 1.06]	0.160	0.94	0.71	[0.58, 0.88]	0.001
Wednesday	1.28	1.28	[1.13, 1.45]	<0.001	0.95	0.96	[0.78, 1.18]	0.684	1.01	0.61	[0.49, 0.76]	<0.001
Thursday	1.09	1.08	[0.96, 1.23]	0.199	0.90	0.91	[0.73, 1.13]	0.383	0.96	0.81	[0.66, 1.00]	0.045
Friday	1.03	1.03	[0.91, 1.17]	0.608	0.93	0.93	[0.74, 1.15]	0.486	1.03	0.79	[0.64, 0.97]	0.028
Saturday	1.28	1.29	[1.14, 1.47]	<0.001	0.74	0.75	[0.60, 0.95]	0.016	0.86	0.50	[0.40, 0.64]	<0.001
Sunday	1.02	1.01	[0.90, 1.15]	0.816	1.08	1.12	[0.90, 1.38]	0.308	0.84	0.82	[0.66, 1.01]	0.058
Variance partition coefficient for units**		0.22				0.22				0.23		
Variance partition coefficient for hospitals**		0.11				0.15				0.10		
Akaike information criterion		20695				8376				8094		
Bayesian information criterion		20807				8488				8206		

322 *Odds ratio derived from entering this variable only into the multilevel model. Calculated as between-group residual variance
 323 divided by total variance using the latent variable approach²⁸

324 We tested for non-linear relationships with registered nurse and nursing assistant
325 shortfalls, as would be expected if the SNCT provides a threshold for adequate
326 staffing. We estimated models using effects that were significant in the main effects
327 models, adding a variable for staffing shortfall squared for each staff group. For
328 nursing care left undone, the non-linear term for registered nurse staffing was
329 significant but there was no clear indication that the model was preferable (AIC Δ -2,
330 BIC Δ +14) and the overall relationship was not changed substantially. No indication
331 of a threshold where benefit / harm starts could be observed (see **FIG 2**). Other non-
332 linear terms were not significant and associated with increased AIC & BIC (S1 Table
333 5).

334 **FIG 2 Change in odds of reporting care left undone with change in staffing shortfalls**
335 **estimated from model with non-linear staffing effects**
336

337 We estimated models that included all statistically significant variables and
338 interactions between staffing and these variables. There were no significant
339 interaction effects between registered nurse shortfall and nursing assistant shortfall
340 and both AIC and BIC increased for these models (S1 Table 6), so the simpler
341 models were preferred.

342 Models using overall care hours (registered nurse and assistants) per patient day
343 gave similar coefficients, with each care hour per patient day of shortfall associated
344 with a 12% reduction in the odds of reporting enough staff for quality and no
345 significant associations with skill mix (S1 Table 7). Because of the coding errors
346 noted from units in one of the hospitals, we repeated the main models omitting data
347 from this hospital. Results were largely unchanged with no effect on substantive
348 conclusions (see S1 Table 8 for an example).

349 **Discussion**

350 This study reports the first independent assessment of the SNCT, which is widely
351 used to determine staffing levels in English hospitals. Using the recommended
352 minimum 20 day sample, estimates for the number of nurses that should be
353 employed on a ward had an average precision of 4.2%, with wide confidence
354 intervals for the absolute staff numbers needed. A sample of 40 days gave an
355 estimate within +/- 1 staff members for the majority of wards but much larger
356 samples (100 days or more) are required to estimate the staff required with a
357 confidence interval no more than 1 staff member wide in the majority of wards. When
358 staffing levels were lower relative to the required level estimated using the SNCT for
359 that day, staff were less likely to report that they had enough staff for quality, more
360 likely to report that necessary nursing care was omitted and staff breaks missed.
361 These relationships appeared to be linear, with no threshold when staffing reached
362 the SNCT recommended level. Other factors not included in the patient
363 classifications used by the SNCT, including presence of single bedded patient
364 rooms, patient turnover and unit speciality may also influence whether a given
365 staffing level is deemed to be sufficient by nurses working on the unit.

366 The original purpose of the SNCT was to ensure that units employed sufficient
367 nurses to be able to provide the care hours required by patients. Existing reports
368 attest to the inter-rater reliability of the tool ^{16, 17} but the recommendation that this
369 staffing establishment is estimated using at least 20 days of SNCT data recognises
370 that daily demand is variable and estimates based on small samples may be
371 imprecise. The average level of precision achieved from 20 days of observations in
372 our study appears, superficially, to be potentially acceptable. However, this masks

373 considerable variation in precision between units and large absolute differences in
374 terms of numbers of staff. Using a conventional (if technically slightly inaccurate)
375 interpretation of the confidence interval, this means that for many units, estimates
376 could vary from a true staffing requirement by more than 2 whole staff members. The
377 absolute importance of such differences may vary by unit, but the potential
378 significance of such inaccuracy is great.

379 Small increases in the number of days used to estimate establishments yield
380 substantial improvements in precision, although there are rapidly diminishing returns
381 from samples of more than 40 days. As more and more hospitals are gathering
382 SNCT ratings on a daily basis it may be that these data could be drawn on to review
383 establishments with the resource of periodic review invested instead into quality
384 control for the unit reports. Moving averages could be substituted for intermittent
385 review, with statistical process control methods used to determine when changes in
386 demand sufficient to revise the establishment have occurred ²⁹.

387 For some units, variation is such that the estimated establishment may always be
388 imprecisely estimated and our results also highlight that unmeasured influences on
389 demand arising from factors such as unit layout and speciality may also have a
390 substantial systematic influence on the staffing requirements. In these cases, the use
391 of professional judgement, already emphasised within the guidance for the SNCT, is
392 paramount. In the face of an apparently objective measure, it is easy to prioritise the
393 measured quantity despite the substantial uncertainty associated with it. ³⁰ It is clear
394 from both these results and the wider literature that professional judgement remains
395 an essential element in determining the required level of nurse staffing. ^{3, 4}

396 Although our results about other influences on workload were imprecise, both
397 turnover and single rooms have been identified in other research as factors that
398 increase nursing workload,^{18-20, 31, 32} because of the specific work associated with
399 admissions and discharge, increases in indirect care requirements and, for single
400 rooms, the need for increased surveillance of potentially vulnerable patients. The
401 increased workload associated with turnover is acknowledged in the SNCT, where
402 revised multipliers are provided specific to acute admissions units, to reflect the high
403 patient turnover,¹⁵ Our findings could arise because variation in turnover within and
404 between general units is not be sufficiently accommodated within the average
405 demand across all patients. Our findings are consistent with surgical units having
406 higher workload for a given level of acuity / dependency, which may also result from
407 indirect care associated with surgery, such as arranging transports and providing
408 escorts.³³ This is a novel finding, and where recommendations or mandates for
409 minimum staffing levels exist, medical units are not generally differentiated from
410 surgical units.³⁴ .

411 While there must be a balance between parsimony and accuracy in any tool, overall
412 our conclusion, based on these findings is that the current SNCT staffing
413 recommendations may fit some units better than others. Possible revisions to the
414 SNCT recommended staffing levels, represented by different “multipliers” for
415 different unit types and layouts, requires further investigation but the importance of
416 exercising professional judgments about other factors affecting workload is clear.

417 Although the SNCT multipliers were originally derived using professional expert
418 estimates of time required, subsequent developments have used empirical
419 observations to revise the multipliers.¹⁷ Our study is the first to show that staffing

420 shortfalls, relative to requirement estimated using the tool are associated with
421 professional judgements that staffing is insufficient to maintain quality care and other
422 indicators that staffing may be inadequate. However, if the SNCT were indicating a
423 level of staffing that was judged sufficient to meet all care needs with quality, the
424 relationship between shortfall and staffing adequacy would be expected to diminish
425 as staffing levels increase above the recommended level. Instead the relationships
426 we observed were essentially linear, with no evidence of a threshold above which
427 additional staffing had little effect on the likelihood that nurses would report that there
428 were enough staff. A recent study using the RAFAELA system, widely used in
429 Northern Europe, gave a similar finding. Staffing above the level defined as ‘optimal’
430 by the system was associated with decreases in mortality^{35, 36}. A recent study found
431 that staffing below establishment as determined using the SNCT was associated
432 with an increased risk of death in hospital.^{11, 20} However, other results from this study
433 also showed a linear effect for registered nurse staffing with no threshold. So while
434 our findings are consistent with the SNCT providing a measure of demand, there is
435 no evidence to support the recommended staffing levels as optimal in any
436 meaningful sense.

437 The effects of registered nurse and nurse assistant shortfalls on perceptions of
438 staffing adequacy were similar but independent. However, the contribution of the two
439 groups is not equivalent nor are they interchangeable. A large body of research
440 points to the specific importance of maintaining a rich registered nurse skill mix for
441 patient safety.³⁷ More recent studies have shown the important contribution of both
442 registered nurses and assistants in maintaining both patient safety and the quality of
443 interpersonal care.^{11, 38, 39} Simple substitutions are not feasible because the

444 contributions of each group are distinct and effective deployment of assistants is
445 likely to be contingent on having sufficient RNs to supervise and support them.^{11, 38}

446 The SNCT, while widely used in England is by no means the only staffing tool
447 available. Given the vast numbers of reports and different tools it is hard to say
448 definitively that there is no data that would allow comparison of the precision of the
449 SNCT with other tools for estimating staffing establishments, but our reviews found
450 no recent studies giving similar data about other tools.^{3, 4} In this study we have
451 asked (and answered) a number of questions about the SNCT. These questions: the
452 precision with which establishments are estimated, the extent to which the averages
453 provided from a patient classification can accommodate variation from factors that
454 are unrelated to individual patients and whether the identified staffing level is in any
455 sense “optimal”, all need to be asked of other tools. Our recent reviews suggest such
456 questions are rarely asked of other tools and are even more rarely answered.

457 [Limitations](#)

458 Training was provided to unit nurses in using the SNCT but the extensive nature of
459 the study is such that the reliability of the ratings we used is likely to be less than that
460 achieved by expert raters in a dedicated review of establishments. However, the
461 wide variation in precision of estimates of unit establishments is unlikely to be
462 explained by this factor alone. Furthermore, the circumstances of our study resemble
463 routine use of the system when, as is now becoming common, assessments are
464 completed daily by shift leaders. We did find evidence of systematic coding errors for
465 the assessment of staffing adequacy on some units, although our substantive
466 conclusions were unaffected. However, this may indicate that less systematic errors
467 were also occurring. The effect of such errors would be to attenuate our ability to

468 estimate relationships and so we may be underestimating the relationship between
469 staffing shortfalls and perceptions of staffing adequacy. Our measures of staffing
470 adequacy relied on subjective reports by nurses, but these subjective assessments
471 have been shown to be associated with important patient outcomes⁴⁰⁻⁴². Our sample
472 was large but arose from only four hospitals so we cannot be sure that these results
473 would generalise across all hospitals.

474 **Conclusions**

475 The SNCT can provide a reliable estimate of a unit staffing establishment but larger
476 samples than the currently recommended minimum are required for most units to
477 provide estimates that are within 1 whole time equivalent staff member of the mean.
478 For some units, such precision is hard to obtain and there may be systematic
479 variations in staffing requirements associated with some unit types that are not
480 accounted for by the SNCT. While we recommend further exploration of the factors
481 affecting the reliability and validity of the SNCT estimates, and suggest that moving
482 averages instead of periodic reassessments could be used to identify when changes
483 in establishments are needed, our findings also firmly underpin the conclusion that
484 measurement is an adjunct to professional judgements, not a replacement for it. The
485 SNCT does appear to provide a measure of nursing workload but the recommended
486 staffing levels derived from it are not necessarily optimal.

487 **[words 5551 –approx. 614 in tables and figures]**

488

489

490 **Acknowledgements**

491 The authors of this paper wish to acknowledge the contributions of Rosemary
492 Chable, Andrew Dimech, Jeremy Jones, Yvonne Jeffrey, Antonello Maruotti,
493 Alejandra Recio Saucedo, and Nicola Sinden who contributed to the acquisition of
494 funding and the design of the project; and Clare Aspden, Tracey Cassar and Shirley
495 Hunter (Poole Hospitals Trust) who contributed to data collection. This paper draws
496 on research and data to be reported in more detail in the NIHR Journals Library
497 Health Services and Delivery Journal.

498

499 References

- 500 1. Kavanagh KT, Cimiotti JP, Abusalem S, et al. Moving healthcare quality
501 forward with nursing-sensitive value-based purchasing. *J Nurs Scholarsh*
502 2012; 44: 385-395. 2012/10/17. DOI: 10.1111/j.1547-5069.2012.01469.x.
- 503 2. Griffiths P, Ball J, Drennan J, et al. Nurse staffing and patient outcomes:
504 Strengths and limitations of the evidence to inform policy and practice. A
505 review and discussion paper based on evidence reviewed for the National
506 Institute for Health and Care Excellence Safe Staffing guideline development.
507 *Int J Nurs Stud* 2016; 63: 213-225. 2016/05/01. DOI:
508 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2016.03.012.
- 509 3. Saville CE, Griffiths P, Ball JE, et al. How many nurses do we need? A review
510 and discussion of operational research techniques applied to nurse staffing.
511 *Int J Nurs Stud* 2019; 97: 7-13. 2019/05/28. DOI:
512 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2019.04.015.
- 513 4. Griffiths P, Saville C, Ball J, et al. Nursing workload, Nurse Staffing
514 Methodologies & Tools: a systematic scoping review & discussion. *Int J Nurs*
515 *Stud* 2019 (in press).
- 516 5. Ball J, Barker H, Griffiths P, et al. *Implementation, Impact and Costs of*
517 *Policies for Safe Staffing In Acute Trusts: Report to Funders.* 2019.
518 Southampton: University of Southampton.
- 519 6. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Safer Nursing Care Tool
520 (SNCT): statement of endorsement,
521 [https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/sg1/resources/endorsed-resource-the-safer-](https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/sg1/resources/endorsed-resource-the-safer-nursing-care-tool-snct-11943902)
522 [nursing-care-tool-snct-11943902](https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/sg1/resources/endorsed-resource-the-safer-nursing-care-tool-snct-11943902) (2014, accessed 29 October 2018).
- 523 7. Griffiths P, Recio-Saucedo A, Dall'Ora C, et al. The association between
524 nurse staffing and omissions in nursing care: A systematic review. *J Adv Nurs*
525 2018; 74: 1474-1487. 2018/03/09. DOI: 10.1111/jan.13564.
- 526 8. Kane RL, Shamliyan TA, Mueller C, et al. The association of registered nurse
527 staffing levels and patient outcomes: systematic review and meta-analysis.
528 *Med Care* 2007; 45: 1195-1204. 2007/11/17. DOI:
529 10.1097/MLR.0b013e3181468ca3.
- 530 9. Shekelle PG. Nurse-patient ratios as a patient safety strategy: a systematic
531 review. *Ann Intern Med* 2013; 158: 404-409. 2013/03/06. DOI: 10.7326/0003-
532 4819-158-5-201303051-00007.
- 533 10. Aiken LH, Sloane DM, Bruyneel L, et al. Nurse staffing and education and
534 hospital mortality in nine European countries: a retrospective observational
535 study. *Lancet* 2014; 383: 1824-1830. 2014/03/04. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-
536 6736(13)62631-8.
- 537 11. Griffiths P, Ball J, Bloor K, et al. Nurse staffing levels, missed vital signs and
538 mortality in hospitals: retrospective longitudinal observational study. *Health*
539 *Services and Delivery Research Journal* 2018; 6: 38. DOI:
540 10.3310/hsdr06380.
- 541 12. Ball JE, Murrells T, Rafferty AM, et al. 'Care left undone' during nursing shifts:
542 associations with workload and perceived quality of care. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2014;
543 23: 116-125. 2013/07/31. DOI: 10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001767.
- 544 13. Hoi SY, Ismail N, Ong LC, et al. Determining nurse staffing needs: the
545 workload intensity measurement system. *J Nurs Manag* 2010; 18: 44-53.
546 2010/05/15. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2009.01045.x.

- 547 14. Buchan J. A certain ratio? The policy implications of minimum staffing ratios in
548 nursing. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2005; 10: 239-244. 2005/11/02. DOI:
549 10.1258/135581905774414204.
- 550 15. The Shelford Group. *Safer Nursing Care Tool Implementation Resource Pack*.
551 2014. The Shelford Group.
- 552 16. Hurst K, Smith A, Casey A, et al. Calculating staffing requirements. *Nurs*
553 *Manag (Harrow)* 2008; 15: 26-34. 2008/08/02. DOI:
554 10.7748/nm2008.07.15.4.26.c6616.
- 555 17. Smith S, Casey A, Hurst K, et al. Developing, testing and applying
556 instruments for measuring rising dependency-acuity's impact on ward staffing
557 and quality. *Int J Health Care Qual Assur* 2009; 22: 30-39. 2009/03/17. DOI:
558 10.1108/09526860910927934.
- 559 18. Hurst K. UK ward design: patient dependency, nursing workload, staffing and
560 quality-an observational study. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2008; 45: 370-381. doi: DOI:
561 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.09.007 2006/11/14. DOI:
562 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.09.007.
- 563 19. Maben J, Griffiths P, Penfold C, et al. One size fits all? Mixed methods
564 evaluation of the impact of 100% single-room accommodation on staff and
565 patient experience, safety and costs. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2016; 25: 241-256.
566 2015/09/27. DOI: 10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004265.
- 567 20. Griffiths P, Maruotti A, Recio Saucedo A, et al. Nurse staffing, nursing
568 assistants and hospital mortality: retrospective longitudinal cohort study. *BMJ*
569 *Qual Saf* 2019; 28: 609-617. 2018/12/06. DOI: 10.1136/bmjqs-2018-008043.
- 570 21. Wood VJ, Vindrola-Padros C, Swart N, et al. One to one specialising and
571 sitters in acute care hospitals: A scoping review. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2018; 84: 61-
572 77. 2018/05/18. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2018.04.018.
- 573 22. Sermeus W, Aiken LH, Van den Heede K, et al. Nurse forecasting in Europe
574 (RN4CAST): Rationale, design and methodology. *BMC Nurs* 2011; 10: 6.
575 2011/04/20. DOI: 10.1186/1472-6955-10-6.
- 576 23. Patterson J. The effects of nurse to patient ratios. *Nurs Times* 2011; 107: 22-
577 25. 2011/03/04.
- 578 24. R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*.
579 v3.5.0 ed. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2019.
- 580 25. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, et al. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models
581 Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 2015; 67: 1-48. sparse matrix
582 methods; linear mixed models; penalized least squares; Cholesky
583 decomposition 2015-10-07. DOI: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01.
- 584 26. Burnham KP and Anderson DR. Multimodel Inference. *Sociological Methods*
585 *& Research* 2016; 33: 261-304. DOI: 10.1177/0049124104268644.
- 586 27. Griffiths P. Using the Safer Nursing Care Tool to identify nurse staffing
587 requirements in hospitals. *ISRCTN* 2016;
588 <https://doi.org/10.1186/ISRCTN12307968>.
- 589 28. Goldstein H, Browne W and Rasbash J. Partitioning Variation in Multilevel
590 Models. *Understanding Statistics* 2002; 1: 223-231. DOI:
591 10.1207/S15328031US0104_02.
- 592 29. Wong H, Gan F and Chang T. Designs of moving average control chart.
593 *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* 2004; 74: 47-62.

- 594 30. Downie R and Macnaughton J. In Defence of Professional Judgement. *Adv*
595 *Psychiatr Treat* 2013; 15: 322-327. 2013/10/01. DOI:
596 10.1192/apt.bp.108.005926.
- 597 31. Needleman J, Buerhaus P, Pankratz VS, et al. Nurse staffing and inpatient
598 hospital mortality. *N Engl J Med* 2011; 364: 1037-1045. 2011/03/18. DOI:
599 10.1056/NEJMsa1001025.
- 600 32. Myny D, Van Hecke A, De Bacquer D, et al. Determining a set of measurable
601 and relevant factors affecting nursing workload in the acute care hospital
602 setting: a cross-sectional study. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2012; 49: 427-436.
603 2011/10/28. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.10.005.
- 604 33. Myny D, Van Goubergen D, Gobert M, et al. Non-direct patient care factors
605 influencing nursing workload: a review of the literature. *J Adv Nurs* 2011; 67:
606 2109-2129. 2011/07/05. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2011.05689.x.
- 607 34. Royal College of Nursing. *Policy Briefing: Mandatory Nurse Staffing levels*.
608 2012. London: RCN.
- 609 35. Fagerstrom L, Kinnunen M and Saarela J. Nursing workload, patient safety
610 incidents and mortality: an observational study from Finland. *BMJ Open* 2018;
611 8: e016367. 2018/04/25. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016367.
- 612 36. Junttila JK, Koivu A, Fagerstrom L, et al. Hospital mortality and optimality of
613 nursing workload: A study on the predictive validity of the RAFAELA Nursing
614 Intensity and Staffing system. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2016; 60: 46-53. 2016/06/15.
615 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2016.03.008.
- 616 37. Aiken LH, Sloane D, Griffiths P, et al. Nursing skill mix in European hospitals:
617 cross-sectional study of the association with mortality, patient ratings, and
618 quality of care. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2017; 26: 559-568. 2017/06/20. DOI:
619 10.1136/bmjqs-2016-005567.
- 620 38. Bridges J, Griffiths P, Oliver E, et al. Hospital nurse staffing and staff-patient
621 interactions: an observational study. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2019; 28: 706-713.
622 2019/03/29. DOI: 10.1136/bmjqs-2018-008948.
- 623 39. Shang J, Needleman J, Liu J, et al. Nurse Staffing and Healthcare-Associated
624 Infection, Unit-Level Analysis. *J Nurs Adm* 2019; 49: 260-265. 2019/04/23.
625 DOI: 10.1097/NNA.0000000000000748.
- 626 40. Ball JE, Bruyneel L, Aiken LH, et al. Post-operative mortality, missed care and
627 nurse staffing in nine countries: A cross-sectional study. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2018;
628 78: 10-15. 2017/08/29. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.08.004.
- 629 41. Recio-Saucedo A, Dall'Ora C, Maruotti A, et al. What impact does nursing
630 care left undone have on patient outcomes? Review of the literature. *J Clin*
631 *Nurs* 2018; 27: 2248-2259. 2017/09/01. DOI: 10.1111/jocn.14058.
- 632 42. Bruyneel L, Li B, Ausserhofer D, et al. Organization of Hospital Nursing,
633 Provision of Nursing Care, and Patient Experiences With Care in Europe. *Med*
634 *Care Res Rev* 2015; 72: 643-664. 2015/06/13. DOI:
635 10.1177/1077558715589188.
- 636
- 637



