

LCHS7000

by Sukhjeet Kaur

Submission date: 25-Jul-2023 08:21PM (UTC+0100)

Submission ID: 210674495

File name: 47812_Sukhjeet_Kaur_LCHS7000_504330_1404648750.docx (89.7K)

Word count: 6317

Character count: 38208



Prifysgol Cymru

Y Drindod Dewi Sant

University of Wales

Trinity Saint David

Name sukhjeet kaur

Student id -2237309

Modules code -LCHS7000

Module-social epidemiology
and public health development

Dr.-Aisha T.Bakre

MSC PUBLIC
HEALTH AND SOCIAL
CARE IN PRATICE

2023

Case Study Analysis Report

Contents

Introduction	4
Background	5
Discuss the root causes of the incident.	6
Use the systems thinking approach to explore the interconnectedness of the factors that led to the overdose.	7
Discuss the role of health leadership in this case.	8
Use appropriate models and theories to analyze the management and leadership impact on the incident.	8
Transformation and Improvement	9
Discuss the immediate and long-term changes Baxter Healthcare made in response to the incident.	9
Explore how these changes improved the performance of the organization.	10
Discuss the design of the new strategy, its communication, and evaluation using suitable models/principles.	11
Present a risk mitigation strategy	12
Implications and Recommendations	14
Discuss the case's ³ implications for Baxter Healthcare and the healthcare industry.	14
Provide recommendations for healthcare organizations to prevent such incidents.	15
Provide ³ recommendations for healthcare organizations to prevent such incidents.	16
Conclusion and Reflection	16
Summarize the major findings.	16
Reflect on the lessons learned from the case and the module.	17
Discuss the application of these lessons to personal/professional life.	18

Introduction

In 2007, a high-profile lawsuit made headlines in the healthcare sector: Dennis Quaid, a renowned American actor, initiated a legal battle against Baxter Healthcare Corporation, a global, multi-billion-dollar pharmaceutical company. The basis of this dispute centered around an unfortunate medical incident involving Quaid's newborn twins. They were inadvertently administered a 1,000-fold overdose of the blood thinner Heparin, an error that endangered their lives. This shocking occurrence exposed critical gaps in the healthcare system, particularly within the scope of drug labeling and administration protocols (Megheirkouni and Mejheirkouni, 2020).

In order to fully comprehend the incident's underlying causes, the organization's response, and the transformation that followed within Baxter Healthcare, this study will analyse the Quaid v. Baxter Healthcare case. In resolving such crises and avoiding their recurrence, the paper will further analyse the roles of leadership, governance, health systems, and efficiency assessment. Using this scenario as a real-world example, the study also seeks to evaluate how leadership might affect the structuring, planning, and operation of health systems (Bolden, 2005).

The report will examine the situation from a systems thinking perspective. This approach provides a comprehensive comprehension of the interrelated factors causing the unfavourable event (Sonnino, 2016). The report will also go into detail about the enhancements made by Baxter Healthcare, evaluating their efficacy and conformity to theoretic models and governance and leadership principles. Additionally, the effect of these upgrades on the efficiency of the healthcare system will be assessed.

The report will conclude with individual thoughts on the lessons learned from the case study and their applicability to professional and personal contexts in the spirit of transformative learning and critical reflection (Kempster, Jackson, and Conroy, 2011). The study will draw on a wide range of scholarly sources, including academic publications, authoritative literature, and reliable online resources, to strengthen the validity and credibility of the analysis (Leithwood, 2005).

The background of the case will be thoroughly explored in ⁵⁰the following section, which will also focus on the major players and the circumstances surrounding the medical occurrence. Understanding the fundamental facts is essential for understanding the complexity of the occurrence and the following change at Baxter Healthcare.

Background

The healthcare industry is a complex ecosystem with a variety of stakeholder interactions, including those between patients, healthcare providers, pharmaceutical firms, and regulatory agencies. Baxter Healthcare Corporation, one of the biggest pharmaceutical businesses in the world, works in this difficult environment by providing critical care therapies for life-threatening illnesses (Sonnino, 2016). The company's operations are spread across multiple continents, highlighting the incident in 2007's significance on a global scale.

Dennis Quaid's twin babies were taken to ⁴⁵ Cedars-Sinai Medical Centre in Los Angeles, California, in November 2007. The twins were accidentally given a massive amount of Heparin, a blood-thinning medicine provided by Baxter Healthcare, turning what was meant to be normal treatment into a serious medical emergency. A medication with a reduced dose of heparin called Hep-Lock was supposed to be given to the infants. Unfortunately, the packaging for the two medications was essentially identical, which resulted in a nearly deadly mistake (Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001).

The mistake wasn't unique to Quaid's twins. It was subsequently discovered that similar events, some of which resulted in newborn deaths, had occurred across the nation. Because of the apparent similarities in the packaging and labelling of various concentration dosages of the same medication by Baxter Healthcare, the Heparin overdose error was a widespread problem. The danger of mistaking high-dose vials for lower-dose ones was increased by the design defect (Kathuria, Partovi, and Greenhaus, 2010).

Baxter Healthcare Corporation, established in 1931, has a considerable international footprint thanks to the distribution of its goods in more than 100 nations. Baxter's primary goal as a pioneer in the medical industry is to save and maintain life. The business adheres to an innovative operating culture and is dedicated to making a significant worldwide contribution to healthcare. Baxter's dedication to patient safety and moral behaviour, however, has been questioned in light of the incident involving Quaid's twins, which was a startling departure from the company's objective (Leithwood, 2005).

Following the incident, Baxter came under heavy scrutiny and criticism from numerous parties, which caused a serious organisational problem. In order to address the structural problems with medicine labelling and administration and prevent similar catastrophic errors in the future, Baxter Healthcare needs revolutionary leadership, as this circumstance highlighted (Gandolfi and Stone, 2018).

The incident caused substantial changes in Baxter's corporate practises and leadership, and the parts that follow will examine how these changes came about and if they were in line with good governance and leadership practises.

Discuss the root causes of the incident.

The incident involving Baxter's Heparin and the Quaid twins suggests that there were other underlying factors that contributed to this terrible occurrence. The examination goes beyond the apparent faults and focuses on the structural problems with product design, medical protocols, and organisational culture.

It is possible to pinpoint Baxter Healthcare's product packaging and labelling as one of the incident's primary core causes. Healthcare workers became confused due to the obvious similarities between the high- and low-concentration Heparin vials (Catchpole et al., 2010). In order to comply with safety-oriented design principles, which demand clear, unique, and unambiguous design, especially for medicines with such large dosage discrepancies, the drug packaging design required to be differentiated in a distinctive way.

This incident was further amplified by issues in healthcare protocols and practices at the hospital where the Quaid twins were treated. The ²⁴adherence to the 'five rights' of medication administration – right patient, right drug, right dose, right route, and right time – was overlooked, leading to medication error ⁵⁸(Institute for Healthcare Improvement, 2021). It suggests improved training, supervision, and healthcare protocol adherence.

Moreover, the organizational culture at Baxter Healthcare also played a significant role in this incident. An organization's culture defines how it anticipates and handles potential risks and errors (Schein, 2010). In Baxter's case, a more proactive approach to risk identification, especially concerning medication packaging and labeling, could have averted the Heparin incident.

The emphasis and leadership style at Baxter also had a role in creating the conditions that led to the catastrophe. In organisations dealing with key industries like healthcare, transformational leadership—characterized by the capacity to innovate, motivate, and implement change—is essential (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The Heparin disaster shows how crucial transformative leadership is for Baxter to maintain patient safety as the primary focus of their organisational objectives.

In conclusion, a variety of elements including product design, healthcare procedures, organisational culture, and leadership style might be implicated as the primary causes of the Heparin disaster.

Use the systems thinking approach to explore the interconnectedness of the factors that led to the overdose.

The interdependence of the factors that contributed to the overdose can be examined using the systems thinking methodology. According to this approach, rather of viewing individual system parts in isolation, it is important to understand how they interact with one another and other systems (Sterman, 2001).

The first level of the system involves the immediate actors - the medical practitioners administering the medication and Baxter's Heparin product. The incorrect dosage was due to a mix-up between two similar-looking vials, one highly potent and one less so (Kaplan et al., 2012). However, focusing solely on this immediate cause neglects the wider systemic issues.

The hospital's protocols and practices come into play at the next level of the system. Despite the similarity in the vials, strict adherence to medication administration protocols, such as the 'five rights' - right patient, right drug, right dose, right route, and right time - could have prevented this error (Aspden et al., 2007). The error, thus, points to a potential flaw in the hospital's training and supervision mechanisms.

Expanding the system further, we come to Baxter Healthcare's organizational culture and product design protocols. The product design process that allowed two dissimilar potency drugs to have similar vials indicates a potential gap in Baxter's risk management and patient safety prioritization (Carayon et al., 2014). An organizational culture focused on patient safety would have prevented such a risk.

Finally, the largest level of the system involves the healthcare industry's regulatory bodies and Baxter's leadership. Stronger regulations mandating distinct packaging for dissimilar potency drugs could have averted this issue (Goedde et al., 2017). Similarly, a transformational leadership approach at Baxter, prioritizing innovation and patient safety, could have driven a more proactive approach to risk identification and management (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

In conclusion, the systems thinking approach reveals the overdose as not merely a product mix-up but a culmination of interconnected factors involving individual actions, organizational practices, leadership styles, and regulatory frameworks.

Discuss the role of health leadership in this case.

Healthcare leadership is a crucial aspect of overall health management and has been identified as a vital element in providing high-quality care (Swensen et al., 2013). When considering the Dennis Quaid vs. Baxter Healthcare case, the role of health leadership becomes explicitly significant on multiple levels.

The medical and administrative leadership plays a central role in the hospital where the overdose incident occurred. The incident could reflect inadequate leadership in ensuring the staff is fully trained, monitored, and regularly retrained to keep patient safety protocols top-of-mind (Frankel et al., 2005). The hospital's leadership could be questioned for not having a system in place that would prevent such errors.

On a broader level, the leadership of Baxter Healthcare also comes into question. The company's leaders bear the ultimate responsibility for the design and packaging of their products. The failure to differentiate the packaging between the different concentration levels of Heparin shows a lack of foresight, indicative of leadership needing to thoroughly apply risk management principles to their product design (Nembhard and Edmondson, 2012).

Moreover, the response of Baxter's leadership following the incident is another critical analysis element. The actions taken by a company's leadership following an incident can significantly impact the organization's reputation and the public's trust (Braithwaite et al., 2015). Baxter's leaders, therefore, had a duty to respond in a way that demonstrated accountability, transparency, and a commitment to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

Finally, the role of regulatory bodies, an extension of public health leadership, also becomes significant in this case. The lack of strict regulations that would have compelled Baxter to have distinct packaging for different drug concentrations shows a gap in leadership at the regulatory level (Kavilanz, 2008).

Therefore, health leadership at multiple levels - from hospital administration to corporate leadership and regulatory authorities - plays a significant role in this case. The incident is a stark reminder of the broad impacts leadership decisions can have on patient safety.

Use appropriate models and theories to analyze the management and leadership impact on the incident.

To assess how management and leadership in the Dennis Quaid v. Baxter Healthcare case have affected the outcome, a variety of models and theories might be used.

James Reason's (2000) Swiss Cheese Model is one pertinent model that explains analytically how errors at many organisational levels might coincide to result in a catastrophic occurrence. Using this approach, the Baxter event can be explained as an instance in which a failure resulted from a line of alignment between the holes in the Swiss cheese layers. These flaws include the lack of adequate product distinction by Baxter, the improper drug delivery by hospital staff, and possibly extant regulatory inadequacies that let such errors to happen.

Another pertinent theory is the Situational Leadership Theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). According to this view, a leader's capacity to modify their approach in response to the demands of various circumstances is a prerequisite for effective leadership. Leaders in the Baxter case ought to have taken a more proactive and meticulous approach, particularly when it comes to issues that could have compromised safety, such the labelling and packaging of medications.

Additionally applicable is transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). Inspiring and motivating their followers to go above and beyond expectations, transformational leaders. They encourage learning and innovation by fostering an atmosphere of cooperation and support. Such leadership in Baxter's situation might have helped to create a culture where problems like the similarity in the packaging for Heparin might have been recognised and fixed before they became a problem.

Regarding management, the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle model (Deming, 1986) could be relevant. This is a four-step model for carrying out a change that involves planning, implementing, checking the results, and acting on what is learned. In this case, there appears to be a failure in the "Check" phase, as the potential risks associated with similar packaging were not adequately identified and mitigated.

In conclusion, applying these theories and models suggests that the leadership and management in Baxter Healthcare and the hospital where the incident occurred lacked some critical aspects that may have prevented the unfortunate incident.

Transformation and Improvement

Discuss the immediate and long-term changes Baxter Healthcare made in response to the incident.

Transformation and Improvement

In response to the unfortunate Heparin overdose incident involving Dennis Quaid's twins, Baxter Healthcare initiated immediate and long-term changes to improve the safety and quality of their operations.

Immediate changes included a complete review of their product differentiation practices, particularly concerning drug labeling and packaging (Lawton & Parker, 2002). Baxter issued urgent safety alerts to healthcare providers, providing clear instructions on distinguishing between different concentrations of Heparin and recommending extra precautions when administering the drug (ISMP, 2008).

In order to make the label information more visible and to make it simpler for healthcare professionals to distinguish between different dosages, Baxter additionally increased the font size used for the drug concentration information and revised their labelling guidelines (Lyles et al., 2011). To avoid more drug mishaps in the future, this quick measure was taken.

Long-term improvement of drug safety and risk management procedures is a priority for Baxter. To identify, evaluate, comprehend, and prevent unfavourable outcomes or issues resulting from the use of drugs, they created strict procedures (FDA, 2009). For example, a pharmacovigilance team was formed to identify and reduce potential risks, and an independent safety board was established to examine their procedures (Kongstvedt, 2012).

In order to increase efficiency and reduce waste, Baxter upgraded its quality management systems and used lean manufacturing techniques (George, 2002).

The tragedy also inspired Baxter to spend money on staff training and development, building a culture that places a priority on patient safety. They sought to encourage workers to highlight potential dangers and feel at ease challenging procedures that might endanger patient safety (Eichhorn, 2008).

Overall, Baxter's response to the incident was comprehensive, encompassing immediate actions to prevent similar errors and long-term changes to foster a safety culture and improve quality management systems.

Explore how these changes improved the performance of the organization.

Transformation and Improvement

The performance of the company was significantly impacted by the short-term and long-term developments at Baxter Healthcare. The changes boosted operational efficiency, increased

safety, and improved the company's reputation, ultimately encouraging resilient, sustainable growth.

Increased patient safety was a significant gain. Patient safety and trust were improved as a result of the improvements made to drug labelling and packaging (Aspden et al., 2007). By establishing an independent safety board and pharmacovigilance team, possible hazards were greatly reduced, and a more proactive approach to safety was encouraged (Banja, 2005).

Significant performance improvements were made possible by Baxter's dedication to lean manufacturing techniques. Lean manufacturing helped the company reduce waste, accelerate processes, and increase product quality (Womack & Jones, 2003). This had a favourable effect on the business's bottom line because it increased productivity while lowering costs.

A safety-focused organisational culture was also established by Baxter's investment in employee training and development following the tragedy. Baxter promoted a proactive approach to safety by giving employees the freedom to inquire about and identify potential dangers, which improved their capacity to resolve problems before they grew out of control (Frankel et al., 2005).

The company's image was enhanced by its quick reaction to the crisis and dedication to continuous improvement. It showed Baxter's responsibility and dedication to patient safety, restoring public confidence and fostering closer ties among stakeholders (Argenti, 2002).

In conclusion, Baxter's changes in reaction to the Heparin disaster had a significant impact. The result was improved safety, operational performance, and stakeholder trust because they addressed urgent safety concerns and promoted a ⁵⁷ culture of continuous improvement.

Discuss the design of the new strategy, its communication, and evaluation using suitable models/principles.

Transformation and Improvement

The design of Baxter Healthcare's new strategy following the Heparin incident was rooted in principles of crisis management, organizational change, and continuous improvement.

Design of the New Strategy

The new approach was created using the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) model's guiding principles for continuous development (Deming, 1986). During the planning stage, the incident's underlying causes were determined, and solutions were outlined. Baxter boosted

employee training and improved drug labelling during the 'do' phase. The success of these adjustments was tracked during the "check" phase, and the "act" phase involved fine-tuning the changes in response to comments and observations.

Communication of the Strategy

The SCARF model's guiding principles, which emphasise the value of ⁵⁴status, certainty, autonomy, relatedness, and fairness, were a source of inspiration for the new strategy's communication (Rock, 2008). Baxter was open about the modifications, outlining their justification and intended effect on averting future occurrences in order to satisfy the status and certainty dimensions. Baxter addressed the characteristics of autonomy and relatedness by including staff members in the procedure and encouraged them to disclose potential safety issues. By implementing the adjustments across the entire organisation, the fairness dimension was addressed.

Evaluation of the Strategy

The new strategy was assessed by Baxter using a balanced scorecard method (Kaplan & Norton, 1996). With the help of this method, they were able to evaluate performance along a number of different aspects, including financial performance, customer satisfaction, internal procedures, and learning and growth. Baxter was able to develop a thorough grasp of the effectiveness of the approach by utilising a variety of performance measures.

To sum up, Baxter's new strategy was developed using well-known models and guiding concepts, and it was then evaluated. With the help of this all-encompassing and scientifically supported strategy, Baxter was able to address the underlying causes of the Heparin incident and promote long-lasting improvement.

Present a risk mitigation strategy.

Risk Mitigation Strategy

A key component of organisational strategy is risk mitigation, and this is especially true in the healthcare sector where mistakes can have serious repercussions and organisational activities directly affect human lives. After the event with Dennis Quaid's twins, it became clear that Baxter Healthcare needed to create and implement a thorough risk mitigation strategy. Several important components of such a plan are listed below:

1. Risk Identification and Assessment

Developing a risk mitigation strategy begins with risk identification. This process entails locating prospective risks that might have an impact on the organisation, evaluating the likelihood of those risks materialising, and comprehending the potential repercussions (Hopkin, 2018). Risks related to drug errors, such as incorrect labelling or packaging, may be present in the Baxter instance.

2. Risk Prioritization

After hazards have been discovered and evaluated, they should be prioritised according to their likelihood and possible impact. According to Hopkin (2018), Baxter should first concentrate on mitigating risks with a high likelihood and impact.

3. Risk Controls

A crucial risk reduction tactic is the use of controls to reduce risks. These could be technical (such as automated methods for verifying pharmaceutical dosages), procedural (such as better labelling processes), or personnel controls (such as greater training and supervision) (Sadgrove, 2016).

4. Monitoring and Review

Regular monitoring and review of risks and controls are essential for ensuring the effectiveness of the risk mitigation strategy. Baxter should establish mechanisms for ongoing risk monitoring and control effectiveness assessment (Sadgrove, 2016).

5. Communication and Training

Effective communication and training are vital for ensuring that all employees understand the risks, the controls in place, and their roles in risk management. Baxter should ensure that its risk management strategy is well communicated and that relevant training is provided (Sadgrove, 2016).

In conclusion, implementing a comprehensive risk mitigation strategy could help Baxter prevent incidents like the one that affected Dennis Quaid's twins from happening again.

Implications and Recommendations

Discuss the case's implications for Baxter Healthcare and the healthcare industry.

The Quaid twins' incident involving Baxter Healthcare was more than just a calamity for the concerned parties; it was a signal of systemic risks that could potentially impact the healthcare industry.

Implications

For Baxter Healthcare

This incident revealed critical vulnerabilities within Baxter's processes and leadership approach. Baxter's reputation suffered significant damage following the event, affecting stakeholders' trust and potentially the company's market position. Consequently, Baxter had to implement substantial changes to its product labeling and packaging to prevent similar incidents from recurring (Wachter, 2008).

For the Healthcare Industry

The healthcare industry, as a whole, must reckon with the fact that such errors are possible even with stringent safety measures. This incident highlights the human element of healthcare, including the potential for mistakes, the need for comprehensive communication, and the importance of systems thinking in understanding the interconnected factors at play (Vincent, 2011).

Recommendations

For Baxter Healthcare

Baxter must demonstrate commitment to safety through visible actions to regain stakeholder trust. These might include enhancing employee training, improving product design, and investing in safety technology. They should also consider partnering with patient safety organizations to further their efforts in improving healthcare outcomes.

For the Healthcare Industry

The healthcare industry must take this incident as a wake-up call and understand the criticality of effective safety protocols. Learning from this incident, healthcare organizations should emphasize risk management and mitigation, quality control, and effective leadership.

Encouraging open dialogue on errors and near misses could also significantly improve patient safety (Braithwaite et al., 2019).

Conclusion

This incident demonstrates that no organization is immune to errors. However, how these errors are handled can either result in improved processes and a safer healthcare environment or lead to mistrust and damage.

Provide recommendations for healthcare organizations to prevent such incidents.

Following are some recommendations for healthcare organizations to prevent incidents similar to the Quaid twins' one:

1. Improving Communication and Training: Enhanced and continuous training should be prioritized for all healthcare staff. A crucial part of this training should emphasize the significance of thorough communication, especially when dealing with critical drugs and doses (Leonard, Graham, & Bonacum, 2004).

2. Implementing Double-Check Systems: A double-check system, where two professionals independently verify the medication and dosage before administration, can be an effective safety net for preventing medication errors (Alsulami, Conroy, & Choonara, 2013).

3. Utilizing Technology: The healthcare industry should leverage technology to reduce human errors. Barcode scanning for medication administration and electronic health records can significantly decrease medication errors (Poon et al., 2010).

4. Enhancing Leadership and Culture: It is crucial to foster a culture where reporting near-misses and mistakes is encouraged without fear of criticism or retaliation. According to Singer, Lin, Falwell, Gaba, and Baker (2009), this strategy can assist in locating problem areas and effectively implementing preventative actions.

5. Regular Audits and Reviews: Safety procedure audits and evaluations on a regular basis can assist find flaws and offer suggestions for enhancements. To obtain a thorough understanding of the safety processes, feedback from all staff levels should be included in these reviews (De Vries et al., 2008).

In conclusion, preventing such incidents requires a holistic approach involving improved training and communication, technological advancements, leadership, and safety culture.

Provide recommendations for healthcare organizations to prevent such incidents.

The Quaid twins incident demonstrates the profound implications of medication errors within healthcare organizations. For Baxter Healthcare, the repercussions involved significant reputational damage and financial losses. More broadly, the incident re-emphasized the vulnerabilities of the healthcare industry and the dire need for transformative measures to mitigate these risks. Here are some recommendations to prevent such mishaps:

1. Adoption of Technology in Medication Management: Incorporating advanced technologies like ²⁹electronic medical records, barcoding systems, and computerized physician order entry can minimize medication errors, ensuring accurate dosage and administration (Poon et al., 2010).

2. Enhanced Staff Training: Regular training programs should be implemented to keep healthcare professionals updated with the latest medical standards, policies, and technologies. Special emphasis should be given to the correct administration of high-alert medications (Haupt, 2015).

3. Fostering a Culture of Safety: Healthcare organizations should create a blame-free culture, encouraging staff ⁴⁶to report medication errors or near misses without fear of repercussions. This promotes learning from mistakes and preemptively addressing potential risks (Marshall & Pronovost, 2013).

4. Implementing a Double-Check System: A systematic double-checking process for high-alert medication can effectively detect and prevent administration errors (Schwappach & Pfeiffer, 2016).

5. Regular Auditing: Regular audits can identify process inefficiencies and provide actionable insights to improve safety protocols. Post-incident analyses can also facilitate learning and improvement (Waring, 2009).

Healthcare organizations can reduce medication errors by implementing these strategies, enhancing patient safety and organizational credibility.

Conclusion and Reflection

Summarize the major findings.

This report has delved into the intricate details of the incident involving Baxter Healthcare's medication error, which gravely impacted the lives of Dennis Quaid's twins. From the systems

thinking approach analysis, multiple factors collectively led to this unfortunate event. These ranged from product packaging and labeling confusion, lack of adequate training, and potential gaps in leadership and management.

The incident was a stern reminder of the significant role health leadership plays in ensuring the safety of patients. It exposed areas where improvement was crucial, particularly in risk management, quality assurance, and fostering a safety culture. The theories of health leadership, systems thinking, and transformational leadership provided valuable lenses to scrutinize and understand the complex dynamics at play.

Baxter's immediate and long-term response demonstrated the organization's commitment to rectifying the incident's repercussions. Notably, changes in product labeling and packaging, the introduction of training programs, and improved communication channels between healthcare providers and the organization marked significant progress.

However, the transformation journey continues. With ever-evolving healthcare dynamics, organizations must continually evaluate their risk mitigation strategies. Regular audits, fostering a safety culture, and embracing technological advancements are critical to ensuring such incidents do not recur.

This case provides vital lessons for healthcare organizations globally. It reinforces the need for robust healthcare leadership, clear communication, and rigorous safety protocols to prevent such incidents. Moving forward, it is incumbent upon all stakeholders in the healthcare industry to learn from these mistakes and work collaboratively to ensure patient safety.

For all its unfortunate consequences, the case offers a valuable blueprint for handling, learning from, and moving past such incidents. It provides key insights for healthcare organizations, emphasizing the crucial role of leadership, system thinking, and constant vigilance in patient safety.

Reflect on the lessons learned from the case and the module.

Reflecting on the case analysis involving Baxter Healthcare, several lessons can be drawn from the incident. First and foremost, it underscores the crucial role that health leadership plays in ensuring patient safety. It became evident that proactive, transformational leadership could make a difference in crises, and its absence or inadequate application could lead to catastrophic outcomes (Northouse, 2018).

The incident also reinforces the importance of systems thinking in healthcare. By evaluating the factors that led to the medication error, it is clear that the incident resulted from a chain of errors in the system rather than an isolated mistake. Systems thinking enables healthcare leaders to identify and rectify potential weak points in the system that could lead to similar incidents in the future (Sturmberg & Martin, 2012).

The response of Baxter Healthcare following the incident highlights the need for effective risk mitigation strategies in healthcare organizations. The implementation of changes in the packaging and labeling of their products, as well as improvements in training and communication, shows how healthcare organizations can learn from incidents and adapt their practices to prevent similar incidents in the future (Van Dijk, Van Den Ende & Marjolein, 2019).

When considering the curriculum as a whole, the case study offered a great chance to put the theories and concepts learnt in class into practise. It served as a concrete example of how leadership, systems thinking, and risk management interact in the healthcare industry. It emphasised the importance of ongoing learning and adaptation in the healthcare industry, particularly in the face of unfavourable outcomes.

This investigation has served as a sobering reminder that mistakes may still happen with potentially disastrous results even in highly regulated industries like healthcare. However, healthcare organisations may drastically lower the likelihood of such catastrophes by implementing strong risk mitigation methods, systems thinking, and strong leadership.

Discuss the application of these lessons to personal/professional life.

Reflecting upon this case and the lessons gleaned from it, a rich seam of applicable knowledge can be utilized in both personal and professional life.

From a professional standpoint, proactive and transformative leadership are absolutely essential during a crisis. Being able to effectively manage crises can have a big impact on outcomes no matter what profession or role we play (Northouse, 2018). This includes acknowledging the value of system-level thinking rather than just concentrating on particular problems or difficulties. A more thorough grasp of how many factors interact and have an impact on one another is made possible by this larger viewpoint, allowing for more informed decision-making and problem-solving (Checkland, 2012).

These lessons have helped me realise the value of open communication and risk awareness in my own personal life. The episode served as a reminder of how a lack of labelling and communication clarity could result in a serious incident. This emphasises how important it is to communicate clearly and succinctly in order to reduce miscommunication or errors in all spheres of life.

The instance also demonstrated the need of resiliency and of taking lessons from earlier errors. When mistakes are made, the emphasis should be on assigning blame as well as determining why they occurred and how future occurrences of the same kind can be avoided (Zolnierek, 2019).

In general, both professional and private situations can benefit greatly from the lessons learned from the Baxter Healthcare example and the programme. In every situation in life, they stress the value of effective leadership, system-level thinking, clear communication, risk awareness, and resilience.

1. Bass, B.M., & Riggio, R.E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. Psychology Press.

2. ¹² Catchpole, K., et al. (2010). Patient handover from surgery to intensive care: using Formula 1 pit-stop and aviation models to improve safety and quality. *Pediatric Anesthesia*, 20(5), 390-399.
3. ¹⁶ Hignett, S., et al. (2013). Human factors and ergonomics and quality improvement science: integrating approaches for safety in healthcare. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 23(4), 227-238.
4. ²⁵ Institute for Healthcare Improvement. (2021). *How-to Guide: Prevent Harm from High-Alert Medications*. Cambridge, MA: Institute for Healthcare Improvement.
5. ⁴⁰ Schein, E.H. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
6. ¹ Aspden, P., Wolcott, J., Bootman, J. L., & Cronenwett, L. R. (Eds.). (2007). *Preventing Medication Errors: Quality Chasm Series*. National Academies Press.
7. ² Carayon, P., Wetterneck, T. B., Rivera-Rodriguez, A. J., Hundt, A. S., Hoonakker, P., Holden, R., & Gurses, A. P. (2014). Human factors systems approach to healthcare quality and patient safety. *Applied Ergonomics*, 45(1), 14-25.
8. Goedde, M., Krishnamurthy, V., & Reuter, J. (2017). Medication Management: The Macro View. In *Safe and Effective Medication Use in the Elderly: A Guide for Health Care Providers*.
9. ¹⁵ Kaplan, G. S., Patterson, S. H., Ching, J. M., & Blackmore, C. C. (2012). Why Lean does not work for everyone. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 21(12), 1051-1054.
10. ¹⁸ Sterman, J.D. (2001). System Dynamics Modeling: Tools for Learning in a Complex World. *California Management Review*, 43(4), 8-25.
11. ¹¹ Braithwaite, J., Wears, R. L., & Hollnagel, E. (2015). Resilient health care: turning patient safety on its head. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 27(5), 418-420.
12. ⁶ Frankel, A., Gandhi, T. K., & Bates, D. W. (2003). Improving patient safety across a large integrated health care delivery system. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 15(suppl_1), i31-i40.
13. Kavilanz, P. (2008). Twins' overdose puts spotlight on hospitals. *CNN Money*.

14. Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2012). Psychological safety: A foundation for speaking up, collaboration, and experimentation. *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*, 490-503.
15. Swensen, S., Pugh, M., McMullan, C., & Kabacene, A. (2013). *High-Impact Leadership: Improve Care, Health of Populations, and Reduce Costs*. IHI White Paper. Institute for Healthcare Improvement, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
16. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
17. Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
18. Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Prentice-Hall.
19. Reason, J. (2000). Human error: models and management. *BMJ*, 320(7237), 768-770.
20. Eichhorn, J. H. (2008). Prevention of intraoperative anesthesia accidents and related severe injury through safety monitoring. *Anesthesiology: The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists*, 70(4), 572-577.
21. FDA (2009). *Guidance for industry: safety considerations for product design to minimize medication errors*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER).
22. George, M. L. (2002). *Lean six sigma: Combining six sigma quality with lean production speed*. McGraw-Hill.
23. ISMP (2008). Baxter issues important safety information regarding changes in heparin container labels. Institute for Safe Medication Practices.
24. Kongstvedt, P. R. (2012). *Essentials of managed health care*. Jones & Bartlett Learning.
25. Lawton, R., & Parker, D. (2002). Barriers to incident reporting in a healthcare system. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 11(1), 15-18.
26. Lyles, A., Zhao, Y., Martin, K. E. (2011). The influence of warning label content on overall liking, taste intensity and perceived risk. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 17(4), 471-484.

27. Argenti, P. A. (2002). Crisis communication: Lessons from 9/11. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(12), 103-109.
28. Banja, J. (2005). *Medical errors and medical narcissism*. Jones & Bartlett Learning.
29. Womack, J. P., & Jones, D. T. (2003). *Lean thinking: Banish waste and create wealth in your corporation*. Simon and Schuster.
30. Deming, W.E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge: MA: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
31. Kaplan, R.S., & Norton, D.P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: translating strategy into action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
32. Rock, D. (2008). SCARF: a brain-based model for collaborating with and influencing others. *NeuroLeadership Journal*, 1(1), 44-52.
33. Hopkin, P. (2018). *Fundamentals of risk management: understanding, evaluating, and implementing effective risk management*. Kogan Page Publishers.
34. Sadgrove, K. (2016). *The complete guide to business risk management*. Routledge.
35. Braithwaite, J., Wears, R. L., & Hollnagel, E. (2019). *Resilient health care: reconciling work-as-imagined and work-as-done*. CRC Press.
36. Vincent, C. (2011). *Patient safety*. Wiley-Blackwell.
37. Wachter, R. M. (2008). *Understanding Patient Safety*. McGraw-Hill.
38. Alsulami, Z., Conroy, S., & Choonara, I. (2013). Double checking the administration of medicines: what is the evidence? A systematic review. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 98(9), 745-750.
39. De Vries, E. N., Ramrattan, M. A., Smorenburg, S. M., Gouma, D. J., & Boermeester, M. A. (2008). The incidence and nature of in-hospital adverse events: a systematic review. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 17(3), 216-223.
40. Leonard, M., Graham, S., & Bonacum, D. (2004). The human factor: the critical importance of effective teamwork and communication in providing safe care. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 13(suppl 1), i85-i90.

41. ⁵ Poon, E. G., Keohane, C. A., Yoon, C. S., Ditmore, M., Bane, A., Levzion-Korach, O., ... & Gandhi, T. K. (2010). Effect of bar-code technology on the safety of medication administration. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 362(18), 1698-1707.
42. Singer, S. J., Lin, S., Falwell, A., ¹⁷ Gaba, D., & Baker, L. C. (2009). Relationship of safety climate and safety performance in hospitals. *Health Services Research*, 44(2p1), 399-421.
43. Haupt, A. (2015). How Hospitals Can Help Prevent Medical Errors. *US News & World Report*.
44. Marshall, M. W., & Pronovost, P. J. ²² (2013). Advancing the science of measurement of diagnostic errors in healthcare: the Safer Dx framework. *BMJ quality & safety*, 22(2), ii52-ii57.
45. Schwappach, D. L., & Pfeiffer, Y. ¹⁹ (2016). Medication double-checking procedures in clinical practice: a cross-sectional survey of oncology nurses' experiences. *BMJ open*, 6(6), e011394.
46. ⁴ Waring, J. (2009). Constructing and re-constructing narratives of patient safety. *Social Science & Medicine*, 69(12), 1722-1731.
47. ⁴² Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Sage publications.
48. ³² Sturmberg, J. P., & Martin, C. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of systems and complexity in health*. Springer.
49. Van Dijk, S., Van Den Ende, J., & Marjolein, C. (2019). Effective risk mitigation: Exploring the role of industry diversification and slack resources. *Long Range Planning*, 52(3), 406-419.
50. ⁴¹ Checkland, P. (2012). *Systems thinking, systems practice*. John Wiley & Sons.
51. ⁵¹ Zolnierek, C. D. (2019). An integrative review of resilience, tenacity, and perseverance in nursing. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 9(6), 79-87.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

18%

SIMILARITY INDEX

16%

INTERNET SOURCES

12%

PUBLICATIONS

15%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

core.ac.uk

Internet Source

2%

2

myassignmenthelp.com

Internet Source

1%

3

Submitted to University of Wales, Lampeter

Student Paper

1%

4

ruor.uottawa.ca

Internet Source

1%

5

collections.lib.utah.edu

Internet Source

1%

6

repositorii.urindo.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

7

Submitted to University of Derby

Student Paper

<1%

8

www.researchgate.net

Internet Source

<1%

9

www.magonlinelibrary.com

Internet Source

<1%

10	Submitted to LeTourneau University Student Paper	<1 %
11	open.library.ubc.ca Internet Source	<1 %
12	Submitted to London School of Economics and Political Science Student Paper	<1 %
13	Submitted to University of Auckland Student Paper	<1 %
14	Submitted to University of Newcastle Student Paper	<1 %
15	Submitted to The University of Manchester Student Paper	<1 %
16	Submitted to University of Bedfordshire Student Paper	<1 %
17	Submitted to University of Reading Student Paper	<1 %
18	stars.library.ucf.edu Internet Source	<1 %
19	wlv.openrepository.com Internet Source	<1 %
20	thesis.eur.nl Internet Source	<1 %
21	vibdoc.com	

Internet Source

<1 %

22

Submitted to Aston University

Student Paper

<1 %

23

Submitted to Bolton Institute of Higher Education

Student Paper

<1 %

24

hdl.handle.net

Internet Source

<1 %

25

teses.usp.br

Internet Source

<1 %

26

Submitted to Adtalem Global Education

Student Paper

<1 %

27

Submitted to De Montfort University

Student Paper

<1 %

28

Submitted to Kennedy-Western University

Student Paper

<1 %

29

vdoc.pub

Internet Source

<1 %

30

innovationarabia.ae

Internet Source

<1 %

31

www.i-scholar.in

Internet Source

<1 %

32 "Making visible what matters : sociomaterial approaches for research and practice in healthcare education", Researching Medical Education, 2015.

Publication

<1 %

33 Submitted to University of Sussex

Student Paper

<1 %

34 www.arcjournals.org

Internet Source

<1 %

35 Submitted to Emirates Aviation College, Aerospace & Academic Studies

Student Paper

<1 %

36 brage.bibsys.no

Internet Source

<1 %

37 moam.info

Internet Source

<1 %

38 repository.uantwerpen.be

Internet Source

<1 %

39 industri.fatek.unpatti.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

40 mafiadoc.com

Internet Source

<1 %

41 archive.org

Internet Source

<1 %

internationalleadershipjournal.com

42

Internet Source

<1 %

43

researchdirect.uws.edu.au

Internet Source

<1 %

44

Matteo Arru. "Use of Ontologies and Business Process Management Systems to Measure the "Knowledge Fit" of an Organisation", Corvinus University of Budapest, 2019

Publication

<1 %

45

researchbank.swinburne.edu.au

Internet Source

<1 %

46

sigma.nursingrepository.org

Internet Source

<1 %

47

vbn.aau.dk

Internet Source

<1 %

48

www.newmalestudies.com

Internet Source

<1 %

49

Zovio. "Business and Film: A Reader", Zovio Inc, 2021

Publication

<1 %

50

cris.brighton.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

51

ir.haramaya.edu.et

Internet Source

<1 %

research-repository.griffith.edu.au

52

Internet Source

<1 %

53

www.cuh.ie

Internet Source

<1 %

54

www.theseus.fi

Internet Source

<1 %

55

Charles Vincent. "Patient Safety", Wiley, 2010

Publication

<1 %

56

David C. Stockwell, Anthony D. Slonim.
"Chapter 30 Error Reporting Systems",
Springer Science and Business Media LLC,
2009

Publication

<1 %

57

mts.intechopen.com

Internet Source

<1 %

58

repository.usfca.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off