

Covenant School of Nursing

Disciplinary Action Summary Assignment

Instructional Module 2

Student Name: Jeffrey Goodman

Date: 05-20-2022

DAS Assignment #: 3 (1-4)

Name of the defendant: Lesley Anne Hartis

License number of the defendant: 760468

Date action was taken against the license: March 13, 2018

Type of action taken against the license: Warning with Stipulations

Multiple stipulations were placed on Mrs. Hartis. She had a "single state" restriction placed on her license. She had to take remedial education courses. She also had to work in a clinical setting for 64 hours per month for a total of one year, which included incident reporting and performance evaluations to be submitted to the Board of Nursing. Upon compliance with the orders, the license restriction could be removed.

Use the space below to describe the events which led to action taken against the license. If multiple charges were in play, be sure and cite them, e.g. drug diversion, HIPAA violation, abandonment, forfeiture on student loans, etc.

While employed as a director of nursing, Mrs. Hartis failed to ensure that weekly wound assessments were conducted, failed to accurately assess wounds, failed to intervene concerning the wounds, and failed to notify the primary care physician. The charges against Mrs. Hartis concerned neglect of a particular patient, who received only one wound assessment within a one-month timeframe. Also, it is suspected that the wound assessment was not complete and accurate. The lack of regular and accurate assessments prevented appropriate interventions from being taken in a timely manner, which may have resulted in additional harm to the patient. The patient in question suffered from a Stage IV necrotic heel wound and a Stage III coccyx ulcer. As director of nursing, it was Mrs. Hartis's responsibility to verify assessments and treatment orders for all patients within her department. This responsibility included performing weekly wound rounds with a wound care nurse to monitor the condition of existing wounds as well as to inspect for new wounds.

Use the space below to provide a description of measures you think could have prevented any action being taken against the license and/or would have prevented harm to the patient, if harm occurred. Consider which universal competencies were violated.

Mrs. Hartis violated the following universal competencies: critical thinking and documentation. Critical thinking involves assessment of a patient's symptoms. Even if the patient is unable to respond, the nurse must evaluate what could potentially be wrong, such as assessing skin integrity for a patient who is immobile. Documentation is also an important universal competency. Caring for a patient without properly documenting can limit the ability of others to care for the patient. For instance, the disciplinary action report stated her conduct "deprived the patient's physician the opportunity to institute timely medical interventions." Patient

harm could have been prevented by Mrs. Hartis conducting weekly wound rounds of all the patients in a proper and regular manner, as was required by the hospital. Proper documentation would have enabled all members of the health care team to care for the patient properly.

Use the space below to describe what action you think a prudent nurse would take as the first to person to discover the event described, in other words, you are the one who discovers the patient has been harmed by the nurse or you have discovered the impairment or criminal activity cited in the disciplinary action.

Reporting on the director of nursing can be a daunting task for a floor nurse. However, the nurse has a responsibility to advocate for her patients and not her boss. Negligence must be reported no matter who is the culprit. The nurse should report the matter up the chain of command until it is resolved. This reporting may need to extend to directly contacting the Board of Nursing.