

Covenant School of Nursing

Disciplinary Action Summary Assignment

Instructional Module 2

Student Name: Cristen Moreno

Date: 10/24/2021

DAS Assignment # ___4___ (1-4)

Name of the defendant: Cheryl A. Barajas

License number of the defendant: 517659

Date action was taken against the license: 05/10/2014

Type of action taken against the license: Voluntary surrender

While Cheryl A. Barajas was employed on the Oncology outpatient unit at St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital in Houston, Texas, she failed to immediately stop a blood transfusion. This patient had a history of reacting to blood transfusions, and their blood pressure and pulse increased significantly after 18 minutes of beginning the transfusion. The nurse failed to notify the provider and failed to check the patient's vitals again until more than an hour later. At this point the patient's blood pressure had become critically elevated, and instead of stopping the transfusion and notifying the provider, the nurse just lowered the rate of transfusion. At the next vital sign check about 30 minutes later, the patient's blood pressure was no longer at a critical level but was still elevated and the patient had developed a rapid pulse. Cheryl refused to notify the provider in a timely manner and when she did, they ordered that the blood transfusion be stopped. The nurse did not stop the transfusion, and after talking to the provider again, administered Benadryl to manage the patient's response. The patient was discharged and did not experience any lasting effects or harm.

The patient did not experience any lasting effects from the blood transfusion, but the nurse's actions could have caused serious damage or even death to the patient. She went against the physician's order to stop the blood transfusion and she did not critically think about how adverse effects can seriously harm a patient. She stated that the physician had yelled at her in the past about stopping the blood transfusion before calling to check first, and during this incident the same physician yelled at her for not stopping the blood transfusion first. At this point, she should have used her critical thinking skills and advocated for her patient instead of being scared of the physician. Ultimately, it was her license on the line and not the physician's.

I think a better action to take would have been to stop the blood transfusion due to the critically high vital signs the patient was producing during the checks. It was unsafe to have her patient experience these adverse effects from blood products, especially if the patient is known to have reactions to blood products in the past. I think she should have been checking vitals more frequently as well. The patient should have been a higher priority considering their previous reactions.