Overview: It has long been known that hand hygiene among health care workers plays a central role in preventing the transmission of infectious agents. But despite a Joint Commission requirement that Centers for Disease Control and Prevention hand hygiene guidelines be implemented in hospitals, compliance among health care workers remains low. The authors argue that hospitals may best improve compliance by assessing the barriers to it, measuring the rates of compliance, educating staff on the importance of hand hygiene, making sanitizing products more available for staff use, and holding staff accountable. The authors emphasize as well that lasting improvement in hand hygiene is a collaborative effort that depends on the committed support of hospital administrators.
Each year in U.S. hospitals there are approximately 1.7 million health care–associated infections and nearly 100,000 associated deaths.\(^1\) Many states now require hospitals to publicly disclose their rates of hospital-acquired infections, and in October the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services will no longer make payments for the treatment of eight hospital-acquired conditions, including some types of infections.\(^2\) It has been proposed that several other types of infections be added to that list in 2009; many private insurers are also refusing payment for such conditions.

Nurses and other health care workers are frequently reminded of the importance of hand hygiene in preventing infections. And yet in a review of studies conducted between 1980 and 2001, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) found that among all health care workers, compliance with “recommended hand-hygiene procedures” was “poor,” occurring an average of 40% of the times that it should have.\(^3\)

The compliance rate isn’t low because the importance of hand hygiene hasn’t been well established. In a 1988 review of more than 100 years of studies, one of us (ELL) wrote that “the collective evidence from experimental and nonexperimental studies is consistent with the hypothesis that handwashing is causally associated with a reduction in risk of infection”\(^4\); more recently, Bryan and colleagues as well as the CDC have provided summaries of the overwhelming evidence supporting the efficacy of hand hygiene in reducing infections.\(^3,5\)

**CDC guidelines.** The CDC published the latest *Guideline for Hand Hygiene in Health-Care Settings* in 2002.\(^1\) In it were two major new recommendations:

- Health care facilities seeking accreditation to institute compliance-monitoring and compliance-improvement programs.\(^6\)
- The increased use of alcohol-based hand sanitizers at many health care institutions has made hand hygiene more convenient and less time-consuming.

Hand sanitizers reduce the need for sinks. The dispensers are small and can be made accessible at every stage of patient care; some dispensers can be worn or carried in a pocket. A 1999 observational study in two ICUs by Earl and colleagues found that the availability of alcohol-based hand sanitizers “resulted in a sustained increase in hand antisepsis rates among health care workers.”\(^7\) In addition, a study by Boyce and colleagues comparing the effects of either using an alcohol-based sanitizer or washing hands with the hospital’s unmedicated soap found that the alcohol-based hand sanitizer was less damaging to nurses’ skin.\(^8\)

**BARRIERS TO ADHERENCE**

Hand hygiene is simple, but it’s also repetitive and dull. Infections develop slowly after an initial exposure, and the direct connection between the poor hand hygiene of an individual nurse or physician and a particular patient’s infection is rarely obvious or observable. Positive feedback for acts of compliance is also rare. According to our experience and a review of the literature, common barriers to staff members’ compliance with hand hygiene guidelines include

- a lack of access to handwashing sinks.\(^1\)
- insufficient time.\(^9\)
- skin irritation.\(^3\)
- ignorance about the problem.\(^3\)
- individual preferences or habits.

Low staffing and high patient acuity can make compliance even more difficult. Whether individual units and hospital administrators value hand hygiene has also been associated with compliance rates.\(^10\)

Ironically, there may be an inverse relationship between the importance of hand hygiene and its actual practice. Results of an observational study conducted in Geneva, Switzerland, by Pittet and colleagues showed lower rates of handwashing on critical care units.\(^11\)
Barriers to Hand Hygiene and Possible Solutions

A lack of access to sinks
Put alcohol-based hand sanitizers in areas where sinks are not readily available.

A lack of time
Alcohol-based hand sanitizers can be placed in many patient care areas (check with your local fire department for restrictions) and can increase opportunities for quick hand hygiene.

Dry, chapped skin on hands
Alcohol will sting unhealed areas, and some staff members may tolerate particular products better than others. Involve staff in trying several alcohol-based hand sanitizers before deciding on one, and involve employee health services in creating a plan to manage hand-skin problems among staff. Alcohol-based sanitizers that have lotion in them can be helpful for staff who have very sensitive skin. Alternative products—such as an antibacterial liquid soap, or a mild, nonantimicrobial soap—may be necessary for some staff.

Ignorance
Discuss the following topics with staff:
• when to use alcohol-based hand sanitizers and when it’s necessary to wash with soap and water
• strategies to improve the health of their skin when using hand hygiene products
• hand hygiene initiatives and the level of compliance on the unit.
• patients at the institution who have healthcare–associated infections.
A brief, simple Web tutorial about hand hygiene practice provided by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention can be found at www.cdc.gov/handhygiene/training/interactiveEducation.

The high cost of products and initiatives
Ask your infection prevention and control or quality improvement colleagues what programs your facility has in place. There may be a budget already approved for hand hygiene products and initiatives; if not, let your administrators know that this is an important safety issue.

A divided health care culture
Promote a work environment in which hand hygiene is seen as a collaborative effort in which both providers and community members have a stake. Invite members of the public to participate in meetings at which infection control and patient safety are discussed. Approach respected clinicians about being models of compliance with hand hygiene protocols. A system at one hospital involved recorded messages from unit leaders reminding staff to perform hand hygiene, resulting in improved compliance rates.1 Unit leaders should encourage staff to point out colleagues’ noncompliance without fear of reprisal.

Insufficient personal accountability
Use performance reviews to grade employees’ infection control performance, including hand hygiene compliance. Report uncorrected or repeated errors in hand hygiene practice. Some institutions use anonymous incident-tracking databases. Call your infection prevention and control department. Often a word from the epidemiologist or a letter for a health care worker’s personnel or credentialing file will correct the situation. Institutions may mandate additional infection control training for the noncompliant, and some have gone as far as dismissing staff for unsafe practices involving poor hand hygiene.
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Also, the sample examined may not be representative of the norm within a department. The Institute for Healthcare Improvement suggests observing complete patient encounters—rather than just individual acts of compliance or noncompliance—in order to confirm that all aspects of an institution’s hand hygiene protocol are followed. (This type of observation may not be feasible in certain situations, such as when curtains are closed to protect a patient’s privacy.)

The measurement of hand hygiene product use per patient day or patient visit gives an overall estimate of hand hygiene compliance and is less time-consuming than direct observation. But some institutions don’t have a good method of tracking product volume use, nor does this method provide specific information about who is using the product (staff, patients, or families) or which health care workers need to improve their practices or which steps in the hand hygiene process need improvement. Because of this, targeted improvement methods may require additional observational monitoring. Although there are devices in development that electronically compute the number of times that a product is used, such devices can’t measure the relation of that use to specific clinical indications or provide meaningful data on the rate of compliance.

Measuring compliance by self-report is not expensive; however, its validity has been called into question in a number of studies. Determing What Works

Most health care facilities now put some effort into programs to improve compliance. Some strategies to overcoming common barriers to hand hygiene adherence are described in Barriers to Hand Hygiene and Possible Solutions, page 42.

“Have you cleaned your hands?” One recent change that may increase the attention given to hand hygiene is the 2007 Joint Commission patient safety requirement that hospitals encourage patients and families to become involved in the patient’s care. For example, the Partners in Your Care program, developed at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, encourages patients and their families to ask health care workers whether they have cleaned their hands before they provide care; increases in hand hygiene compliance of 35% to 60% have been reported when this program is used. A multifaceted initiative. In an observational study, Pittet and colleagues measured the rates of hand hygiene compliance before and during implementation of a program of hand hygiene improvement in Geneva, Switzerland. This hospital-wide program resulted in an increase in the rate of compliance from 48% to 66% over a three-year period and significant decreases in the number of hospital-acquired infections. The program, which continues to this day, was designed to be multidisciplinary, multifaceted, and sustained over years rather than months. It included a promotion program in which color posters were displayed in 250 locations in the hospital. Health care workers collaborated on the posters; their ideas were then translated by an artist into cartoonlike messages. Topics included hand hygiene, hospital-acquired infections, and protecting hands with creams, among others. The hand hygiene project team gave hospital-wide recognition to the units that created the posters; three to five poster designs were displayed at any one time and changed weekly.

The program also made a priority of increasing the availability of bottles of alcohol-based hand sanitizer at each bedside as well as providing pocket-sized bottles to staff. Enhancing the accessibility of hand sanitizers made hand hygiene more convenient.

Perhaps the most important factor in the success of the program was that members of the hospital administration made it a hospital-wide priority, dedicating some funding to it, encouraging the participation of senior staff, participating themselves in meetings, and voicing support for the program.

Hand hygiene is simple, but improving compliance requires leadership, collaboration, accessibility of hand hygiene products, feedback on compliance and infection rates, and individual accountability.
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GENERAL PURPOSE: To explore for registered professional nurses the problem of noncompliance with hand hygiene guidelines and suggest strategies to improve compliance with those guidelines.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: After reading this article and taking the test on the next page, you will be able to:

• discuss the problem of noncompliance with hand hygiene guidelines.
• summarize the identified rates of compliance and various methods for monitoring adherence with hand hygiene guidelines.
• describe strategies for increasing compliance with hand hygiene guidelines.

TEST INSTRUCTIONS
To take the test online, go to our secure Web site at www.nursingcenter.com/CE/ajn.

To use the form provided in this issue,

• record your answers in the test answer section of the CE enrollment form between pages 48 and 49. Each question has only one correct answer. You may make copies of the form.
• complete the registration information and course evaluation. Mail the completed enrollment form and registration fee of $17.95 to Lippincott Williams and Wilkins CE Group, 2710 Yorktowne Blvd., Brick, NJ 08723, by August 31, 2010. You will receive your certificate in four to six weeks. For faster service, include a fax number and we will fax your certificate within two business days of receiving your enrollment form. You will receive your CE certificate of earned contact hours and an answer key to review your results. There is no minimum passing grade.
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• We also offer CE accounts for hospitals and other health care facilities online at www.nursingcenter.com. Call (800) 787-8985 for details.
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Your certificate is valid in all states.
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