National Testing of the Nursing – Kids Intensity of Care Survey for Pediatric Long-term Care

Amanda Hessels, PhD, MPH, RN, CIC, CPHQ, FAPIC[a,b,*], **Sharon W Darby, DNP RN, NHA, FACHE**[c], **Edwin Simpser, MD**[d], **Lisa Saiman, MD, MPH**[e], and **Elaine L. Larson, RN, PhD, FAAN, CIC**[a]

[a]Columbia University, School of Nursing, 617 W. 168th St, Room 340, New York, NY, USA 10032

[b]Hackensack Meridian Health, Ann May Center for Nursing

[c]Children's Hospital of Richmond at VCU, Brook Rd Campus, 2924 Brook Rd, Richmond, Va 23220

[d]St. Mary's Healthcare System for Children, 29-01 216th Street, Bayside, New York 11360

[e]Columbia University Medical Center, Pediatric Infectious Diseases, 650 West 168th St PH 4-470, New York, NY 10032

Abstract

Purpose—The purpose of this study is to test the Nursing–Kids Intensity of Care, a measure of the intensity of nursing care needs, defined as the quantity and type of direct and indirect care activities performed by caregivers in a national sample.

Design and Methods—A 40-item tool previously tested in a small sample was psychometrically tested on a sample of 116 children with complex medical conditions by 33 nurse raters across 11 pediatric sites.

Results—The Nursing–Kids Intensity of Care tool demonstrated components of usability, feasibility, inter-rater, test-retest and internal consistency reliability and construct validity in the national study sample.

Conclusions—Additional testing to further establish psychometric sufficiency and expanded use to quantify the intensity of nursing care needs of children with complex medical conditions in pediatric long-term care settings is recommended.

Practice Implications—This novel measure could assist the nursing administrators, educators and staff of pediatric long-term care facilities assess the intensity of care needs of their residents.

*Corresponding : Amanda Hessels, ah3269@cumc.columbia.edu, Office phone: 1-212-342-3898, Cell phone: 1-732-312-8870.

Conflicts of Interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

PURPOSE

The number of children with chronic, complex medical conditions (CMC) has increased substantially over the past decade due to medical advances and increased survival (Hall, 2011). In the United States (US), there are an estimated 11 million children with special needs of whom as many as 29,000 reside in a pediatric long-term care facility (Caicedo, 2015; Cohen et al., 2011; Freidman & Kalichman 2014; Hall, 2011). There are an estimated 100 pediatric long term care facilities in the U.S. (Larson, Cohen, Murray & Saiman, 2014). The care needs of these children are distinct and dependent on the nature of each child's physical, functional, and developmental status and need for invasive, supportive or assistive devices and care (Cohen et al., 2011; Freidman & Kalichman 2014). For example, assistive orthotic devices, frequent respiratory suctioning, gastro-enteral feedings, behavioral therapy, or palliative care may be needed. Underlying medical diagnoses of children with CMC may include cystic fibrosis, oncologic diseases, congenital anomalies, multi-system disorders and other conditions that determine these special needs (Cohen et al., 2011; Freidman & Kalichman 2014). Consequently, planning and providing sufficient care services and appropriate human and material resources are challenging and dependent on many factors, including the intensity of each child's care needs. Nursing intensity was defined as the direct and indirect patient care activities performed by caregivers and included factors that had an impact on the level of work required to perform those activities.

Unfortunately, nursing needs of the children with CMC are not well described, inconsistent definitions are used, and have been measured with tools designed for adults (Navarra, Schlau, Murray et al., 2016). The development and testing of a measure to help quantify the characteristics and intensity of nursing care needs is an important precursor to care planning and appropriate allocation of resources. The Nursing-Kids Intensity of Care Survey (N-KICS) was designed to begin to address this gap and assess intensity of nursing care for pediatric residents of long-term care (LTC) facilities with CMC and its initial development, testing and use were recently reported (Navarra, Schlau, Murray et al., 2016). In brief, in an iterative process pilot testing and item identification was performed followed by field testing and data collection at three sites. Results of testing the N-KICS at three pediatric LTC facilities confirmed an acceptable standard for limited reliability and validity and feasibility by interrater reliability and face validity when used for clinical and research purposes.

However, additional testing of the N-KICS with larger, varied samples was needed and a logical next step to confirm generalizability and determine whether expanded use is warranted and ascertain if the tool is useable and feasible for widespread clinical use. Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to assess components of validity and reliability of the N-KICS for children with CMC in a national sample of pediatric LTC settings and the secondary aim was to test the usability and feasibility of the instrument.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Study Design and Setting

Testing of the N-KICS was conducted at clinical affiliates of the Pediatric Complex Care Association (PCCA, http://pediatriccomplexcare.org) by registered nurses (RNs) and nurse managers caring for children with CMC in pediatric LTC facilities. Facilities met the following criteria: minimum of 25 licensed beds, provision of care to children requiring long-term care (average stay of at least 2–3 months), willingness to collaborate, and commitment to have data collected by RNs who worked in a pediatric LTC facility for a minimum of one year. Recruitment of clinical sites occurred during the Annual PCCA Conference (2014) using focus group meetings to describe the nature and purpose of this study to potential participants. The annual PCCA educational conference includes presentations on evidence based practices, research, innovative programs, services and practices to improve care for the pediatric complex care population. Attendees include nurses, administrators, physicians, social workers, educators, and occupational, speech and physical therapists. Additionally, flyers describing the study were distributed during the PCAA meeting to recruit sites not participating in focus groups. PCCA attendees provided contact information to the research team if they were interested in volunteering to test the N-KICS tool. Word-of–mouth also yielded additional participants who contacted the study team after learning of the study through their personal and professional networks, including the PCCA's research committee. We sought to recruit a convenience sample for this exploratory study of 10–15 sites, or 10–15% of an estimated 100 such facilities in the US.

In each facility, the N-KICS tool was used by two nurse clinicians to score patient records and one nurse manager to provide a subjective rating. Inclusion criteria for the two nurse clinicians per site were RN staff members who provided direct clinical care to pediatric patients with CMC who had similar education (diploma, baccalaureate, masters) and duration of work experience (less than 5 years, 5–10 years, or more than 10 years).

Medical records selected to be scored by N-KICS included pediatric residents 21 years of age or younger with an expected length of stay in the pediatric LTC facility for 60 days and had not experienced a significant change in condition over the last 30 days. The sample size of pediatric residents at each site was determined using the following criteria: facilities with 100 beds included a sample of at least 10 residents and facilities with >100 beds sampled 10% of their total resident population. These criteria were chosen as the tool was designed to measure ongoing intensity representative of nursing care needs over the previous 30 days, rather than acute changes in care needs, in this long-term care population. Sites were instructed to randomly select records for review after establishing the record met inclusion criteria. Demographic information of children was not collected from medical records.

N-KICS Measures

Nursing intensity was defined as the direct and indirect care activities (such as administering medications, performing wound care and providing family education, coordination of services, respectively), performed by caregivers and included factors that had an impact on

the level of work required to perform those activities. The theorized dimensions of nursing intensity included: severity of illness, complexity of care, patient dependency and time needed to provide care. The initial development and pilot testing of the tool has been described elsewhere (Navarra, Schlau, Murray et al., 2016). Briefly, N-KICS is a 40 item pen and paper tool that asks nurses to select the number (range 1 through 4) best representing a pediatric resident's care needs during the past 30 days. Definitions for each care need and corresponding score values (including writing in "not applicable") were provided on the tool. The possible range follows content mapping and content expert review in which items were assigned different ranges; by example vital signs is scored 2–4, whereas escort for school attendance is scored 1–4 and stoma care is scored as 1 or 2, to enable quantification of unequal intensity (Appendix Nursing-Kids Intensity of Care Survey (N-KICS) Tool). For all items, higher scores suggest increased nursing care needs; the possible range of the composite score was 19–104. The time to complete each evaluation was estimated to be 15 to 20 minutes. In prior testing this tool demonstrated inter-rater reliability (Pearson's correlation coefficients 0.85), face, construct and content validity by content mapping, expert panel and statistical significant relationships between subjective and objective ratings ($p<.05$).

Data Collection and Procedures

The Institutional Review Board of Columbia University Medical Center approved this study. After identification of participating sites and completing any facility specific institutional review board approvals, the participants received one-on-one and small group training via teleconferences that included individualized sampling strategy clarification for sites. A tutorial for scoring the N-KICS tool, study logistics and data management was also provided. Participants reached 100% scoring reliability through training with the principal investigator using examples cases prior to use in the field. To characterize the study sites and participants each site completed an information sheet that included facility size; geographic location; and nurse clinicians' education and duration of experience in pediatric LTC.

The nurse raters were instructed to select the medical records as follows. To assure that there is no bias in which children are scored, we requested they be selected by sampling from an alphabetized list or by a list of their sequential medical record numbers. For example, if they needed to score 10 children and have 100 beds, select every 10th child from the list.

At each site, two nurse clinicians independently used N-KICS to assess the care needs of the same children. Each child's care needs were assessed twice by each nurse, with an approximate one-week interval between assessments. To establish translational construct validity, that is how well the construct is translated by face and content validity, the nurse manager also independently rated the intensity of care needs of the children (once) by using the N-KICS tool and subjectively categorizing each child's care needs into one of three groups: low, average, or high intensity of care needs (DeVon et al.; 2007). All these data were collected between February and July of 2015.

In addition to the field testing, a follow up 1.5 hour interactive session was conducted with conference participants during the PCCA Annual Conference in November, 2015 to ascertain their perceptions on ease of use; applicability to them; duration to complete; and

intent to use. Conference participants were provided with information on the study and informed if they choose to participate that would indicate consent and their information would be included as additional study data. To simulate the use of N-KICS for medical record review two case study vignettes were designed by two physicians trained in research and familiar with the pediatric LTC population. These case studies were pre-tested with the research team and following minor modifications to the case studies they were presented at PCCA and tested using the N-KICS by administrators, direct care providers and other staff from a variety of pediatric LTC, clinic, and care settings attending the session to further ascertain the usability, feasibility and planned and potential use of the N-KICS tool.

Data analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using STATA/MP software (version 12.1, 2011, StataCorp LP, College Station, TX). All data were checked for missing data and completeness, which were confirmed to be non-problematic. Therefore, no data imputation was performed. Total scores were computed per child per nurse clinician rater at both time one and time two (approximately one week apart). Demographic data and intensity scores were descriptively analyzed and bivariate analyses were used to compare scores between nurse clinician raters. Test-retest reliability was examined with Pearson correlations between time one and time two (one week interval) for each nurse clinician rater. Inter-rater reliability was examined with Pearson correlations between the two nurse clinicians with comparable education and experience who rated each child's care needs comparing the composite N-KICS scores between the RNs. Internal consistency reliability was examined by calculating the Cronbach's alpha statistic. Construct validity was explored to examine if there was correlation in the hypothesized direction of the tool by examining the relationship between the nurse managers' subjective rating of low, average, or high intensity and the composite score a nurse clinician rated the same child's care needs. (Waltz et al., 2005; Weston, Drew & Rosthenthal, 2003).

RESULTS

Eleven pediatric LTC sites participated, representing all U.S. census regions, predominantly the Northeast (n= 5; 45.5%), followed by the South (n= 3; 27.3%), Midwest (n= 2; 18.2%) and West (n=1; 9%). The average bed size of the facilities was 60 (range 26–97 beds). Thirty-three nurse raters (including both clinician and managers) participated; of the 28 of who provided complete demographic information the majority had >10 years of experience (48%), followed by 5–10 years (27%) and <5 years (24%), and 75% attained a bachelors, 14% a masters and 11% an associate degree. These 33 Raters across 11 sites scored 116 unique medical records at two times, completing a total of 464 surveys, 11 surveys were missing some item level data, and no data were imputed.

Reliability and Validity

The mean composite intensity scores of the residents sampled and scored by the nurse clinicians using N-KICS ranged from 18–80 (M= 53.93, SD = 13.07) and 26–82 (M= 53.55, SD = 12.43), at time one and two respectively. Inter-rater reliability between the two raters at each site was calculated using the composite N-KICS scores of 116 children and

demonstrated statistically significant correlations by Pearson's correlation coefficient at both time one ($r = 0.87$, $p < .05$) and time two ($r = 0.89$, $p < .05$). Test–retest reliability correlations by Pearson's correlation coefficient were conducted using the total composite scores from both T1 and T2. Statistical significance the first ($r = 0.95$, $p < .05$) and second ($r = 0.97$, $p < .05$) groups of raters was demonstrated for each site.

The N-KICS scale demonstrated internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha >0.70), adequate for new tool standards (Waltz & Strickland, 2005), (Table 1). Item-analysis was conducted to ascertain the effect of eliminating individual items on the scale internal consistency. This analysis indicated that with exception of two items, burn and cast care, all items should be retained, as there was no appreciable effect on total scale reliability (AERA, 2014; Waltz & Strickland, 2005).

Construct validity was examined after dichotomizing composite scores as "high" or "low/ standard" using the median score of the sample as the cutoff point (54.5)/<54.5). Similarly, the subjective intensity ratings provided by the nurse managers were dichotomized as "high" or "low/standard". Bivariate analysis (χ^2) demonstrated statistically significant associations between the composite scores from each set of raters and time periods and the nurse managers' subjective rating as shown in Table 2.

Usability and Feasibility

Participants of the national testing reported that the N-KICS tool was clear, understandable and easy to use, demonstrating face validity. Time to complete the medical record review and N-KICS tool was approximately 10–15 minutes. A few definitions and related scoring criteria required clarification when applied in these diverse settings. For example, the type of the caregiver (nurse, licensed aide) who escorts the child to the clinic or school varies by site and intensity of care needs; this care component is not specified on the current tool. Several sites also noted that chest physiotherapy was performed by skilled nurse providers, requiring time, as opposed to the use of a specialized oscillatory vest (ABI) which is the definition of chest physiotherapy in N-KICS. Participants also commented that wound care related to surgical procedures signifies intensity of nursing care not captured on the tool, and that such care differs from wound care related to pressure ulcers which is captured on the tool. Clarification of the definition of intermittent versus continuous pulse oximetry monitoring was also requested by some nurse clinician raters as children may be monitored continuously for several hours, but only during overnight hours.

Sixty respondents seeing and using the tool for the first time during the session at the PCCA annual conference suggested that a user manual or guideline with definitions of terms that would accompany the tool would be beneficial and foster consistent use in lieu of the training provided by the research team. Similar to the national testing cohort, these participants also suggested that some definitions (e.g., type of caregiver escort for children) required clarification. There was consensus that N-KICS is different than an acuity tool that assesses a child's severity of illness. Based on participant feedback potential uses for the N-KICS tool were identified as: 1) an RN scheduling tool to cohort residents by intensity score; 2) an educational tool for novice nurses; and 3) an administrative tool to benchmark

care needs and to promote appropriate resource allocation. Lastly, participants were asked if they would like to use N-KICS in their workplace and 78% responded affirmatively.

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge this study is the first extension of testing conducted on this novel tool. The N-KICS demonstrated inter-rater, test-retest and internal consistently reliability in a national convenience sample of 116 children with CMC by 33 nurses from 11 sites. Construct validity was established by the association between the nurse manger subjective rating of intensity and the nurse clincians' objective scored intensity. With the exception of two items, burn and cast care, all items contributed to overall scale reliability and should be retained; however, clarification of definitions for several items may further improve reliability. In comparison to other results (Navarra et al., 2016) this finding indicates a more parsimonious tool may have acceptable psychometric properties for widespread use.

While several components of the instrument were examined, additional psychometric testing is needed to fully assess the instrument's reliability and validity, including factor analysis, to identify the underlying constructs of care measured, content validity to assess whether the tool is relevant to all diverse settings providing care for children with CMC, and discriminant validity testing to assess if the items or tool measures something other than intensity, such as acuity.

The contribution of these study findings is the advancement of a measure that quantifies the intensity of nursing care needs in a highly-specialized population and setting, children with CMC in LTC. The pediatric population with CMC is a designated priority population for healthcare delivery improvements (Agrawal, 2015; Schwalenstocker et al., 2008). Despite prioritization, there is limited evidence of the most effective an efficient delivery of care models for this vulnerable population (Cohen, 2011). Thus, beyond the research implications and in the context of the growing population in both numbers and intensity, along with increased focus on fiscal restraint and reimbursement, the potential importance of this measure to benchmark intensity internally or externally is notable. The lack of standardized measures makes these comparisons impossible and thus difficult to assess resource demand and utilization as well as strategize the best care delivery models (Schwalenstocker et al., 2008). Policy implications include use of the N-KICS tool internally to better manage resources as well as externally to add to process and staffing measures tied to public and private reimbursement for care.

Limitations

In this study pediatric resident information was not collected; therefore we are unable to discern if the tool is equally valid and useful across all pediatric age groups or if the distribution of residents studied at these sites represents the distribution of residents in other facilities. Data extracted from medical records depend on the quality and consistency of those trained to use the tool and rely on the completeness and accuracy of data entered in the medical record. We were unable to test the reliability of the data collected from the medical records by those using the tool. Though all U.S. census regions were represented this is a small, convenience sample. Despite the need for further testing, given the findings of this

current study we believe the information is highly relevant and timely for current nursing practice.

Clinical Implications

The N-KICS provides a comprehensive assessment of the nursing intensity of care needs for children with CMC in pediatric LTC settings. The tool is easy to use and can be completed by a nurse or nurse manager in 10–15 minutes. This study supports reliability and validity of the N-KICS tool in this sample and setting; potential users should consider the population and setting in which they intend to use the tool. It is composed of 40 items, such as infection control needs, respiratory care, assistance with feeding, and family education, that provide an assessment of a child's intensity of care needs over the course of 30 days. Once the assessment information is collected and tabulated, the information can be used at the point of care. End-users reported high level support and broad interest for use of N-KICS as a clinical tool, continuing education and training tool for nurses, and administrative tool. Potential uses include an adjunct to staffing decision tools, a training tool for novice nurses and nurses new to the setting to develop clinical competencies and efficiencies, and an administrative tool to allocate resources as such as additional nursing or non-nursing personnel if needed, supplies or equipment.

Conclusion

N-KICS tool has demonstrated components of reliability and validity in a national, convenience sample. Additional testing to further establish psychometric sufficiency and expanded use to quantify the intensity of nursing care needs of children with CMC in pediatric LTC settings is recommended.

Acknowledgments

References

Agrawal R. Complex Care in Pediatrics: Great Progress, Greater Challenges. 2015. Journal of Pediatric Rehabilitation Medicine. 8(2):71–4. [PubMed: 26409860]

American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Association and National Council on Measurement and Education. Standards for educational and psychological testing. Washington, DC: AERA; 2014.

Caicedo C. Health and Functioning of Families of Children with Special Health Care Needs Cared for in Home Care, Long-term care, and Medical Day Care Settings. Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics. 2015; 36(5):352–61. [PubMed: 25933227]

Cohen E, Kuo DZ, Agrawal R, Berry JG, Bhagat SKM, Simon TD, Srivastava R, et al. Children with Medical Complexity: An Emerging Population for Clinical and Research Initiatives. Pediatrics. 2011; 127(3):529–538. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2010-0910 [PubMed: 21339266]

DeVon HA, Block ME, Moyle-Wright P, Ernst DM, Dayden SJ, Lazzara DJ, … Kostas-Polston E. A psychometric toolbox for testing validity and reliability. Journal of Nursing Scholarship. 2007; 39(2):155–164. [PubMed: 17535316]

Friedman SL, Kalichman MA. Out-of-home placement for children and adolescents with disabilities. Pediatrics. 2014; 134(4):836–46. [PubMed: 25266436]

Larson EL, Cohen B, Murray M, Saiman L. Challenges in conducting research in pediatric long-term care facilities. Clinical Pediatrics. 2014; 53(11):1041–6. [PubMed: 24990364]

Navarra AM, Schlau R, Murray M, Mosiello L, Schneider L, Jackson O, … Larson E. Assessing Nursing Care Needs of Children with Complex Medical Conditions: The Nursing Kids Intensity of Care Survey (N-KICS). Journal of Pediatric Nursing. 2016; 31:299–310. DOI: 10.1016/j.pedn. 2015.11.012 [PubMed: 26777429]

Schwalenstocker E, Bisarya H, Lawless ST, Simpson L, Throop C, Payne D. Closing the gap in children's quality measures: a collaborative model. Journal for Healthcare Quality. 2008; 30(5):4–11.

Steering Committee on Quality Improvement and Management and Committee on Hospital Care. Principles of Pediatric Patient Safety: Reducing Harm Due to Medical Care. Pediatrics. 2011; 127(6):1199–1210. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2011-0967 [PubMed: 21624879]

Waltz, CF.Strickland, OL., Lenz, ER., editors. Measurement in nursing and health research. 3. New York: Springer; 2005.

Westen D, Rosenthal R. Quantifying construct validity: Two simple measures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 2003; 84(3):608–618. [PubMed: 12635920]

Appendix

	Definition and Score 1	Definition and Score 2	Definition and Score 3	Definition and Score 4	Score
Vital Signs		Vital Signs daily	Vital Signs 2–3 times daily	Vital Signs 4 or more times daily	
Weight	Every 3 months	Monthly	Weekly	Daily	
Observation	Child observed every 15 minutes	Child observed every 15 minutes *and* caregiver is assigned to only 3 residents	Child must remain in direct visualization of staff member at all times	Child is within arm's reach of staff member at all times	
Bathing		Assist with bathing set up	Bathing **with 1 person** assistance	Bathing **with 2 person** assistance	
Mouth Care		Assist with mouth care set up	Mouth care provided **with 1 person** assistance	Mouth care provided with **2 person** assistance	
Functional Status - Ambulation/Mobility	**1 person** assistance with ambulation, transfers, and mobility **4 or less times per day**	**1 person** assistance with ambulation, transfers, and mobility **more than 4 times per day**	**2 person** assistance with ambulation, transfers, and mobility **4 or less times per day**	**2 person** assistance with ambulation, transfers, and mobility **more than 4 times per day**	
Escort for School Attendance	Escort 1–2 days per week	Escort 3 days per week	Escort 4 days per week	Escort 5 days per week	
Escort for Clinic Visits		Once weekly or less	2 times per week	3 or more times per week	
Nutritional Support with *meals*		Assist with feeding set up only	Resident fed **with 1 person** assistance	Resident fed **with 2 person** assistance	
Nutritional Support with *bottle feeds*			Bottle feeding provided every 4 hours or less frequently (i.e. q6h or 8h)	Bottle feeding provided more frequently than every 4 hours (i.e. q 3 or q 2h)	
	Definition and Score 1	Definition and Score 2	Definition and Score 3	Definition and Score 4	Score
			Initiation and maintenance of continuous enteral feed	Initiation and observation of bolus enteral feed (GT or NG) **OR** Initiation and maintenance of total	

	Definition and Score 1	Definition and Score 2	Definition and Score 3	Definition and Score 4	Score
				parenteral nutrition from central line catheter	
Intake and Output		Monitoring of Intake and output	Monitoring of Intake and output with oral/enteral fluid replacement	Monitoring of Intake and output with fluid replacement via intravenous /central line catheter	
Elimination – diapers			Diapers changes every 4 hours or less frequently (i.e. q6h or 8h)	Diaper changes more frequently than every 4 hours (i.e. q 3 or q 2h)	
Elimination – urinary catheter		Condom catheter	Indwelling urinary catheter	Intermittent urinary catheterization one or more times/day	
Stoma care (GT/JT-Gastrostomy/Jejunostomy)	Routine care of site once daily	Care of site needed more frequently than once daily			
Ostomy Care (*check stoma, skin condition, fecal matter, adherence of pouch*)			Ostomy care twice daily	Ostomy Care two or more times per day with **1 person assistance**	
Pulse Oximetry monitoring			Intermittent monitoring	Continuous monitoring	
Respiratory Support-Non-invasive: *CPAP, BIPAP, O₂ therapy*			Non-invasive support 12 hours or less daily	Non-invasive support more than 12 hours daily	
Respiratory Support-Invasive *Ventilator with endotracheal tube or tracheotomy*				Invasive ventilator support	
	Definition and Score 1	**Definition and Score 2**	**Definition and Score 3**	**Definition and Score 4**	**Score**
Respiratory Care – Suctioning (oral, nasal and or trachea)	Suctioning 1–2 times/day	Suctioning 3–4 times/day	Suctioning 5–8 times/day	Suctioning more than 8 times/day	
Respiratory – Trachea Care		Trachea care once daily	Trachea care twice daily	Trachea care twice daily or more frequently with **1 person assistance**	
Respiratory Care – Chest therapy			Chest pulmonary therapy with ABI machine every 4 hours or less frequently (i.e. q6h)	Chest pulmonary therapy with ABI machine more frequently than every 4 hours (i.e. q 2 h)	
Neurologic – Seizure Disorder			**1 or more** seizures during past 30 days with *NO change in therapy*	**1 or more** seizures during past 30 days **with change in therapy**	
Infection Control				Droplet and or contact isolation	
Pain Management			Pain assessment and intervention every 4 hours or less frequently (i.e. q6h)	Pain assessment and intervention more frequently than every 4 hours (i.e. q 2 h)	
Family/Resident Education	Education 2–3 times per month	Education once weekly	Education 2 to 4 times weekly	Education 5 to 7 times weekly	
	Definition and Score 1	**Definition and Score 2**	**Definition and Score 3**	**Definition and Score 4**	**Score**
Medications (given PO, GT, NG)	1 - 2 meds per day	3 – 4 meds per day	5–6 meds per day	More than 6 meds per day	
Medications (given via IV/ central line)	1 med per day	2 meds per day	3 meds per day	4 or more meds per day	
Medications - inhaled	Nebulizer treatments 1–2 times/day **OR** MDI every 12–24 hours	Nebulizer treatments 3–4 times/day **OR** MDI every 6–8 hours	Nebulizer treatments 5–8 times/day	Nebulizer treatments more than 8 times/day	
Mobility Devices	Orthotics - 1 device	Orthotics - 2 devices	Orthotics - 3 devices	Orthotics – 4 or more devices	
Standing Program (older children)		1 time weekly	3 times weekly	5 times weekly	
Positioning Therapy (infants)			Once daily	Twice daily	
Skin Care – Pressure Ulcers	Wound care for Stage 1 pressure ulcer	Wound care for Stage 2 pressure ulcer	Wound care for Stage 3 pressure ulcer	Wound care for Stage 4 pressure ulcer	

	Definition and Score 1	Definition and Score 2	Definition and Score 3	Definition and Score 4	Score
Skin Care - Cast Care			Maintain and assess skin integrity for 2 or less casted extremities	Maintain and assess skin integrity for more than 2 casted extremities	
Skin Care - Burns	Superficial partial thickness (1st degree) burn with wound care one to times daily	Partial thickness (2nd degree) burn with wound care twice daily	Deep partial thickness (2nd degree) burn with wound care twice daily	Full thickness burn (3rd degree) with wound care twice daily or more frequently (i.e. 3 to 4 times daily)	
Laboratory collection and monitoring	Labs drawn less than one time weekly	Labs drawn 1–2 times weekly	Labs drawn 3 times weekly	Labs drawn more than 3 times weekly	
	Definition and Score 1	**Definition and Score 2**	**Definition and Score 3**	**Definition and Score 4**	**Score**
Diabetes/Glucose Monitoring				Glucose monitoring 4 or more times daily	
Hearing, Speech & Vision		Child with one limitation	Child with two limitations	Child with three limitations	
Behavior				Exhibits physically aggressive behavior toward self or others daily - requires active supervision to prevent harm	
Palliative Support		Chronic illness with progression - may include residents with DNR and/or DNI orders	Terminal illness, anticipated death within 6 months	End-stage terminal illness, anticipated death within 2 weeks	
TOTAL SCORE					

Comments: Please add any comments and or suggested changes/additions. Thank you!

_____
_____

_____
_____

_____
_____

_____
_____

_____
_____

_____
_____

_____
_____

_____
_____

Highlights

- A novel measure, the Nursing–Kids Intensity of Care (N-KICS) tool, was tested in a national sample.

- Nursing intensity was defined as the direct and indirect care activities (such as administering medications, performing wound care and providing family education, coordination of services, respectively) performed by caregivers and included factors that had an impact on the level of work required to perform those activities.

- N-KICS demonstrated components of usability, feasibility, inter-rater, test-retest and internal consistency reliability and construct validity in the national study sample.

- This may lead to a standardized method to quantitate the intensity of nursing care needs of pediatric residents in long-term care facilities.

Table 1

N-KICS Item-Analysis and Scale Internal Consistency

Item	Scale reliability (α) when item removed			
	Time 1 Rater 1 (n= 116)	Time 1 Rater 2 (n= 105)	Time 2 Rater 1 (n= 114)	Time 2 Rater 2 (n= 106)
Vital Signs	0.76	0.69	0.74	0.73
Weight	0.77	0.70	0.74	0.74
Observation	0.77	0.70	0.74	0.74
Bathing	0.75	0.69	0.73	0.73
Mouth Care	0.75	0.70	0.73	0.73
Functional Status - Ambulation/Mobility	0.75	0.70	0.72	0.73
Escort for School Attendance	0.77	0.70	0.74	0.73
Escort for Clinic Visits	0.76	0.70	0.74	0.74
Nutritional Support with meals	0.76	0.70	0.73	0.73
Nutritional Support with bottle feeds	0.76	0.69	0.73	0.74
Nutritional Interventions	0.77	0.70	0.73	0.73
Intake and Output	0.77	0.72	0.74	0.73
Elimination – diapers	0.77	0.71	0.74	0.74
Elimination – urinary catheter	0.76	0.70	0.74	0.75
Stoma care (GT/JT- Gastrostomy/Jejunostomy)	0.76	0.69	0.73	0.72
Ostomy Care (check stoma, skin condition, fecal matter, adherence of pouch)	0.76	0.70	0.74	0.74
Pulse Oximetry monitoring	0.74	0.67	0.71	0.72
Respiratory Support-Non-invasive: CPAP, BIPAP, O_2 therapy	0.75	0.68	0.71	0.73
Respiratory Support-Invasive Ventilator with endotracheal tube or tracheotomy	0.75	0.68	0.71	0.72
Respiratory Care – Suctioning (oral, nasal and or trachea)	0.74	0.68	0.71	0.70
Respiratory – Trachea Care	0.74	0.68	0.71	0.71
Respiratory Care –Chest therapy	0.74	0.68	0.72	0.72
Neurologic – Seizure Disorder	0.76	0.70	0.74	0.74
Infection Control	0.77	0.70	0.74	0.75
Pain Management	0.77	0.70	0.73	0.74
Family/Resident Education	0.76	0.72	0.73	0.73
Medications (given PO, GT, NG)	0.75	0.69	0.72	0.74
Medications (given via IV/central line)	0.77	0.72	0.74	0.74
Medications - inhaled	0.75	0.69	0.71	0.73
Mobility Devices	0.76	0.69	0.73	0.74
Standing Program (older children)	0.77	0.71	0.74	0.74
Positioning Therapy (infants)	0.77	0.70	0.74	0.73
Skin Care – Pressure Ulcers	0.77	0.71	0.74	0.74
Skin Care - Cast Care	*	*	*	*

	Scale reliability (α) when item removed			
Item	Time 1 Rater 1 (n= 116)	Time 1 Rater 2 (n= 105)	Time 2 Rater 1 (n= 114)	Time 2 Rater 2 (n= 106)
Skin Care - Burns	*	*	*	*
Laboratory collection and monitoring	0.77	0.71	0.73	0.73
Diabetes/Glucose Monitoring	*	0.72	0.74	0.74
Hearing, Speech & Vision	0.76	0.70	0.73	0.74
Behavior	0.77	0.71	0.73	0.74
Palliative Support	0.76	0.71	0.73	0.74
Total Scale	**0.77**	**0.70**	**0.74**	**0.74**

*
Denotes item dropped from analysis secondary to no observations. Note: Sample size differs due to two missing responses between Time 1and Time 2 for Rater 1 and 1 missing response between Time 1 and Time 2 for Rater 2.

Table 2

Construct Validity by Nurse Manager Subjective and Nurse Objective Ratings

Total number categorized as "High" by nurse manager	Number scored "High" (54.5)			
	Time 1 Rater 1	Time 1 Rater 2	Time 2 Rater 1	Time 2 Rater 2
51	58	69	54	67
Total number categorized as "Standard"/ "Low" by nurse manager	Number scored "Low/Standard)" (<54.5)			
65	58	47	62	49
Pearson chi χ^2	21. 87[*]	8.53[*]	21.13[*]	[*]10.47

[*] significant at $p < .001$