



# Readiness Checklist

## Stop Checking the Box. Start Rebuilding the Foundation.

You know what PA-PSRS requires. But are your systems built to keep up or just to catch up? Use this checklist to evaluate if your infrastructure is truly supporting smarter, scalable safety reporting.



**Is your taxonomy mapped to all 11 major PA-PSRS event categories and accessible at the point of reporting?**

Categories include Medication Errors, Falls, Equipment Issues, and Complications

### Action:

- If staff need to guess or scroll through static lists, you're likely seeing misclassifications or "Other" overuse.
- Look for solutions where state-aligned taxonomy is embedded in the reporting interface, making it easier to select the right category intuitively.



**Are subcategories and Harm Scores (A-I) built into your reporting logic and not just your audit process?**

PA-PSRS uses these to define severity and understand preventability.

### Action:

- Spot check recent events: Are frontline reporters consistently selecting accurate subcategories and harm levels?
- Systems should guide users through structured fields dynamically, not rely on back-end cleanup by reviewers.



**Are "Serious Events" and "Incidents" flagged and routed according to Act 13 definitions during reporting, not after?**

This distinction is critical for PSA reporting accuracy and board level accountability.

### Action:

- If classification happens after the event is submitted, that creates bottlenecks and risks.
- Prioritize workflows that automatically logic based on severity and outcome inputs, supporting Act 13 distinctions in real time.



### **Does your taxonomy support specialty-specific visibility (OB, psych, diagnostics, etc.)**

Generic buckets limit insight especially in specialty areas.

#### **Action:**

- Look at your ability to segment by specialty domain. If you're retrofitting details into generic categories, data integrity suffers.
- Systems should offer built-in support for clinical nuance, allowing patterns to emerge without custom builds.



### **Are contributing factors captured using structured options and linked to event types?**

PA-PSRS reviewers emphasize contributing factor analysis, not just what happened but why.

#### **Action:**

- If you're relying on narrative fields or post-event RCAs to identify drivers, you're missing learning opportunities.
- Choose tools where contributing factors are selectable, reporting, and mapped to trends right from the initial report.



### **Are required fields pre-configured to PA-PSRS expectations and completed consistently?**

Fields such as Event Date, Discovery Date, Location, and Role are all required for proper submission.

#### **Action:**

- Run a report. How often are key PA-PSRS fields incomplete or defaulted?
- Seek solutions that validate required fields as part of the workflow, reducing rework and rejections.



### **Can your taxonomy structure support both current manual submission and future automation (e.g. HL7, XML)?**

Electronic submissions aren't currently required, but readiness is a strategic advantage.

#### **Action:**

- Ask your vendor if your current data structure is ready to scale electronic submission with minimal reconfiguration.
- Look for a system designed with interoperability and standardized coding in mind, not just compliance workarounds.

## **Are you building for today's checklist or tomorrow's challenges?**

Talk to our team today.

[www.RLDatix.com](http://www.RLDatix.com)

© 2025 RLDatix. All rights reserved.