

The Decision-Use Framework

How to Convert Silent Cardiac APP Judgment Into a Repeatable OR Decision System

By **Pol Martin D. Vedar, PA-C, MBA**

The MBA PA

A three-layer architecture — communication triggers, readiness standards, and decision-use systems — for cardiac surgery programs that hire APPs for their clinical judgment and then build no infrastructure to use it. Includes the twelve decision points of the cardiac case, a per-APP competency staging model, the four-step decision loop, a three-wave rollout sequence, the economics of wasted judgment, and a program self-assessment.

Your Experienced APP Saw the Problem. The System Had No Way to Use the Judgment.

By the time the room caught up, the decision had already been made without them.

The conduit looked marginal. Your experienced APP recognized the concern early — thin-walled, slightly varicose, questionable enough that they would have paused before using it. But they didn't say anything. Not because they didn't know. Because in your OR, the APP doesn't speak until the surgeon asks. And the surgeon didn't ask. So the harvest happened, the anastomosis was attempted, and twenty minutes later the room was managing a technical problem that an earlier sentence might have helped the team address before it developed.

That APP has fifteen years of cardiac surgery experience. Their assessment drew on substantial pattern recognition. But the assessment never entered the formal decision loop. It stayed exactly where it's always stayed: inside their head, silent, waiting for an invitation that never came.

This is the most expensive unused asset in cardiac surgery — and almost nobody measures it.

Every program you've ever seen hires APPs for their clinical judgment. The interview is about judgment. The references are about judgment. The credentialing file is a proxy for judgment. And then, the moment they're on the team, the program builds zero infrastructure to actually use that judgment at the decision points where it matters most. The judgment is present. It's just passive. It sits there, correct and unused, while decisions get made around it.

The program assumes judgment will surface naturally. It doesn't. Not reliably. Judgment surfaces when three things are true: the APP knows when to speak, the team trusts what they say when they speak, and the system routes what they say into the actual decision. When any one of those three is missing, judgment stays silent — and the program pays for the silence in complications, delays, re-work, and the slow, quiet exit of the exact APPs whose judgment it most needs.

The Decision-Use Framework fixes all three. It's not about making APPs "speak up more." It's about building the infrastructure that converts judgment — which every experienced APP already has — into decisions that reliably change the plan at the moment it can still be changed.

The conduit decision loop is the flagship example, but it's only one of a dozen decision points in a cardiac case. Plan changes mid-case. Hemodynamic instability. Bleeding at the cannulation site. Weaning from bypass. Closure. Each one is a place where your APP's judgment is either used or wasted — and the difference between "used" and "wasted" is not the APP's talent. It's the system.

This framework shows you how to build that system — the communication triggers that tell an APP when to surface judgment, the readiness standards that make the team trust it when they do, and the decision-use systems that route it into the decision loop so it changes the outcome instead of the conversation.

Part 1 — Why Elite Judgment Goes Unused: The Three Failure Modes

Every cardiac surgery program has APPs whose clinical judgment has been built through years of repeated exposure. They've harvested a thousand conduits. They've seen complications that newer APPs have only read about. They can recognize a hemodynamic trend, a bleeding pattern, or a tissue-plane concern early enough to raise it while the team still has options. These are the people the program leans on — the ones surgeons request, the ones new grads shadow, the ones whose timely observations can change how a case unfolds.

And yet, in most programs, this person's judgment is systematically unused at the moments it matters most. Not because they're not good enough. Because the system around them fails in one of three specific, predictable ways.

Failure Mode 1: Judgment Is Silent

There are no communication triggers.

The APP's judgment exists, but there is no defined moment when it's supposed to be voiced. So the APP waits. They wait for the surgeon to ask. They wait for an obvious opening. They wait for the situation to become bad enough that speaking up feels justified rather than intrusive.

Cardiac ORs run on a tight, unspoken choreography. Everyone has a role, and the APP's role — in many rooms — is to assist, not to initiate. The APP who has spent years learning not to interrupt, not to slow the case down, not to challenge the surgeon, arrives at the exact decision point where their input would matter most — and says nothing, because nothing in the choreography told them this was the moment to speak.

The conduit assessment is the clearest example. The APP evaluates the vein. They have a professional opinion about it — informed by a thousand harvests. But there's no defined trigger that says "APP verbalizes conduit quality concern at this point in the case." So the opinion stays silent. The surgeon proceeds. And an available assessment contributes nothing to the decision.

The silent-judgment signal: After a complication or near-miss, the APP says some version of "I saw that, but I didn't want to say anything" or "I thought about flagging it." The judgment was present the whole time. The trigger to surface it was missing.

Failure Mode 2: Judgment Is Untrusted

There are no readiness standards.

The APP speaks — and nothing happens. Not necessarily because the assessment is wrong, but because the team has no calibrated understanding of how to weigh this APP's judgment. There's no readiness standard that tells the team what the APP is prepared to assess independently and how that assessment should enter the decision loop. So when the APP voices a concern, the surgeon has to evaluate it from scratch, in real time, against an unknown — and under pressure, the default is to discount it.

This is the second failure: the program hired for judgment but never made that judgment legible. The new-grad APP's concern and the fifteen-year APP's concern sound identical in the moment — "I'm worried about this vein." The surgeon can't tell, from the words alone, whether they're hearing trained pattern recognition or generalized anxiety. So they discount it. The experienced APP learns that speaking up doesn't change anything, and — worse — that speaking up repeatedly and being overridden erodes their standing. So they stop speaking up. The judgment was voiced, it was not trusted, and the trust deficit drove it back underground.

The untrusted-judgment signal: The APP has flagged real problems before and been overridden, or the team treats the APP's input as optional color rather than a decision input. The APP's concerns are "noted" but don't change the plan. Over time, the APP stops offering concerns, because offering them costs credibility and changes nothing.

Failure Mode 3: Judgment Is Invisible

There are no decision-use systems.

The APP speaks, and the team even listens — but the judgment never connects to the actual decision. It enters the conversation and evaporates. Nobody captures it. Nobody routes it into the surgical plan, the documentation, or the postoperative handoff. The judgment was correct, it was voiced, it was even acknowledged — and it still didn't become a decision.

This is the third and most subtle failure: the decision loop is open. The conduit assessment is made, the concern is raised, the surgeon considers it — but there's no defined point in the case where that concern must result in a decision (use the segment, discard it, harvest an alternative, alter the plan). So the concern sits in the air, the case continues on its default path, and the decision gets made by default rather than by design. Judgment was visible — briefly — but it never became a decision input.

The invisible-judgment signal: The APP's input is heard but not acted on, and there's no record that it was ever offered. After the case, nobody can point to where the APP's judgment was incorporated into the plan — because it wasn't. The loop never closed.

The three failure modes compound. Silent judgment never gets the chance to be trusted. Untrusted judgment retreats into silence. Invisible judgment is voiced and trusted but never acted on. The program that says "we have great APPs" while building none of the infrastructure to use their judgment is leaving its single most expensive asset — years of accumulated clinical pattern recognition — sitting unused in the OR, case after case after case.

Part 2 — The Decision-Use Framework: A Three-Layer Architecture

The Decision-Use Framework converts APP judgment into decisions by building three layers of infrastructure, each addressing one of the three failure modes. The layers stack: each one depends on the layer beneath it, and the system only works when all three are present.

LAYER

Layer 1: Communication Triggers "When should the APP surface judgment?"

FAILURE MODE ADDRESSED

Judgment is silent

WHAT IT BUILDS

A defined, explicit set of decision points in the cardiac case where the APP is expected to verbalize an assessment — so judgment doesn't wait for an invitation.

LAYER

Layer 2: Readiness Standards "How do we know this APP's judgment is trustworthy?"

FAILURE MODE ADDRESSED

Judgment is untrusted

WHAT IT BUILDS

A documented, staged definition of what competency looks like at each level — so when the APP speaks, the team knows exactly what weight to give it.

LAYER

Layer 3: Decision-Use Systems "How does judgment become a decision?"

FAILURE MODE ADDRESSED

Judgment is invisible

WHAT IT BUILDS

A formal decision loop at each trigger point — so the APP's assessment is captured, routed into the plan, and recorded, not just heard.

Why Three Layers — and Why Order Matters

A communication trigger without a readiness standard creates noise. If you tell an APP "speak up when you're concerned" but the team doesn't trust the APP's judgment, you've just added interruption to an OR that already runs on tight choreography — and the interruptions will be discounted. The trigger needs a calibration behind it: the team must know this APP's concern at this decision point is worth pausing for.

A readiness standard without a communication trigger is a documented capability that never gets exercised. You can document that an APP is "competent to assess conduit quality independently" — but if there's no defined moment where they state that assessment, the capability sits unused. The standard needs a trigger to fire it.

And both, together, without a decision-use system, produce judgment that is voiced and trusted but never acted on. The trigger says "speak here." The standard says "we'll listen." But if there's no defined decision loop at that trigger point — no moment where the concern must result in a decision — the judgment evaporates into conversation. The system needs all three layers, in order, to close the loop from "the APP knows" to "the plan changed."

The framework's central claim is simple and testable: an experienced APP's judgment can change outcomes when three things are simultaneously true — there's a defined moment to voice it, a documented basis to weigh it, and a formal loop to decide what happens next. Build all three and judgment becomes a usable decision input. Leave any one out and an available assessment can remain inside the APP's head, correct or uncertain, and unused.

Communication Triggers

The first layer answers a question most programs never ask: at what exact points in a cardiac case is the APP expected to verbalize an assessment? The answer, in most programs, is "whenever they think they should" — which is not a trigger. It's an absence of one.

A communication trigger is a defined, explicit decision point where the APP is expected to state a clinical assessment, unprompted, whether or not the surgeon has asked. The trigger converts judgment from something the APP might offer into something the APP is expected to produce — and it does so by naming the moment, the content, and the format.

The Anatomy of a Communication Trigger

Four components. Leave any out and the trigger collapses back into "speak up when you feel like it."

COMPONENT

The Moment

WHAT IT DEFINES

The specific point in the case sequence when the trigger fires — not "during the case" but "after the conduit is visualized and before harvest begins."

EXAMPLE — CONDUIT ASSESSMENT

"After vein mapping and conduit visualization, before the first incision for harvest."

COMPONENT

The Content

WHAT IT DEFINES

The specific assessment the APP is expected to state — not "any concern" but a defined clinical judgment.

EXAMPLE — CONDUIT ASSESSMENT

"The APP states a conduit quality assessment: usable, marginal with specific concerns, or unacceptable — with the specific segment(s) and reason(s)."

COMPONENT

The Format

WHAT IT DEFINES

The specific form the communication takes — a defined phrase, a structured statement, a checklist item — so it's recognizable and routable.

EXAMPLE — CONDUIT ASSESSMENT

"Dr. [Name], conduit assessment: the proximal greater saphenous segment is marginal — thin-walled and varicose. I'd recommend the [alternative] instead."

COMPONENT

The Owner

WHAT IT DEFINES

Who is responsible for the trigger firing — so it's never ambiguous whose job it is to speak.

EXAMPLE — CONDUIT ASSESSMENT

"The scrubbed APP is responsible for surfacing the conduit assessment within role, training, and institutional scope. The trigger makes the moment explicit; the surgeon remains responsible for the clinical decision."

The Core Trigger Set — Twelve Decision Points in the Cardiac Case

A cardiac case contains a finite, identifiable set of decision points where an APP assessment may help the team recognize options early. Each becomes a named trigger.

TRIGGER

1. Conduit Assessment

THE MOMENT

After conduit visualization, before harvest

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

Conduit quality by segment — usable / marginal / unacceptable, with specific reasons and recommended alternatives.

TRIGGER

2. Cannulation Readiness

THE MOMENT

Before aortic and venous cannulation

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

Confirmation that the planned cannulation sites are suitable — or a flag that a site is calcified, thin, or unsuitable with a recommended alternative.

TRIGGER**3. Plan-Change Acknowledgment****THE MOMENT**

Any intraoperative change to the surgical plan

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

Verbal acknowledgment of the change and its implications for the APP's role — so the APP isn't operating on a stale plan.

TRIGGER**4. Hemodynamic Instability Recognition****THE MOMENT**

On recognizing a concerning hemodynamic trend

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

A specific, timed statement of the trend and its likely cause — not a vague "the pressure's dropping."

TRIGGER**5. Bleeding Assessment****THE MOMENT**

On identifying unexpected bleeding

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

Source, character, and rate of bleeding — with a recommended response if one is apparent.

TRIGGER**6. Bypass Weaning Readiness****THE MOMENT**

Before weaning from cardiopulmonary bypass

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

Confirmation of readiness to wean — or a flag of a concern (volume, rhythm, temperature, inotrope requirement) with a recommendation.

TRIGGER**7. Anastomosis Quality Check****THE MOMENT**

After each proximal/distal anastomosis

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

Confirmation the anastomosis is satisfactory — or a flag of a concern (bleeding, tension, poor tissue) before the surgeon moves on.

TRIGGER

8. Closure Readiness

THE MOMENT

Before chest closure

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

Confirmation that team-reported hemostasis and count status have been surfaced, plus any outstanding APP concerns — a structured final voice before the chest is closed.

TRIGGER

9. Handoff Content

THE MOMENT

At postoperative handoff

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

A structured summary of intraoperative decisions, concerns, and watch-items — so the ICU/floor team inherits the APP's judgment, not just the surgeon's.

TRIGGER

10. Escalation Trigger

THE MOMENT

On recognizing a pattern that exceeds APP scope

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

A defined escalation statement — "this exceeds my scope, I need you to look at this" — delivered immediately, not after the APP has tried to manage it.

TRIGGER

11. Pre-Case Preference Confirmation

THE MOMENT

Before a case with a surgeon the APP knows well

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

A structured confirmation of that surgeon's specific preferences — so the APP surfaces a discrepancy before it costs time.

TRIGGER

12. Post-Case Debrief Point

THE MOMENT

At the structured post-case debrief

THE CONTENT — WHAT THE APP STATES

The APP's own assessment of what worked and what to change — closing the loop so judgment improves the next case, not just this one.

Operating principle: A communication trigger defines when the APP is expected to surface an assessment within their role, training, and institutional scope. It does not transfer clinical responsibility from the surgeon, anesthesia team, perfusion, nursing, or other professionals whose responsibilities are governed by institutional policy.

Not every trigger fires in every case — a straightforward primary CABG may only fire triggers 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9. But every trigger is defined, so when the moment arrives, the APP knows it's their moment to speak, the team knows to expect the APP's voice, and the judgment doesn't wait for an invitation.

Why Defined Triggers Beat "Speak Up More"

Changing the choreography, not the personality.

Every program that tries to fix silent judgment starts with the same intervention: tell the APP to speak up more. It doesn't work — not because the APP is unwilling, but because "speak up more" is a personality request, not a system change. It asks the APP to override years of learned OR choreography — the same choreography that made them a good assistant in the first place — without telling them when the override is expected.

Defined triggers solve this by changing the choreography itself. The trigger doesn't ask the APP to interrupt. It redefines the moment so the APP's voice is part of the sequence, not an interruption of it. The APP isn't "speaking up" — they're executing a defined step in the case, the same way they'd pass an instrument or prepare a suture. The judgment surfaces not because the APP found the courage, but because the system made it the expected, normal, unremarkable thing to do.

A communication trigger is the difference between "you should have said something" — which is what programs say after the complication — and "here is the exact moment you are expected to say something" — which is what programs say before it. One assigns blame. The other builds a system.

Readiness Standards

A communication trigger tells the APP when to speak. It does nothing to make the team listen. The second layer answers the question that silently governs every APP's willingness to speak: if I voice this judgment, will anyone trust it?

In most programs, the answer is unknown — and unknown means discounted. The team has no documented, calibrated understanding of what a given APP is prepared and validated to assess at what level of independence. So every time an APP voices judgment, the surgeon has to decide, in real time, under pressure, how much weight to give the assessment. The default under pressure is to discount — and the experienced APP, correctly reading that default, stops offering judgment that costs credibility.

Readiness standards fix this by making APP judgment legible. They define, in writing, what competency looks like at each stage of an APP's development — so when the APP speaks at a trigger point, the team knows exactly what weight to assign to the voice.

The Competency Staging Model

Four stages — each carrying a defined, documented level of independence at each decision point.

STAGE

Stage 1 Supervised

DEFINITION

The APP observes and assists but does not independently assess. Their judgment is developing, not yet authoritative.

WHAT THE TEAM CAN TRUST

Observations are useful context, but their assessments are not yet decision inputs.

DECISION-POINT ACCESS

APP observes all triggers. Voices assessments only when asked. Judgment is compared against preceptor's assessment for calibration, not acted on.

STAGE

Stage 2 Contributing

DEFINITION

The APP assesses independently but requires preceptor confirmation before the assessment is acted on.

WHAT THE TEAM CAN TRUST

The APP's assessment is trustworthy as an alert — worth pausing for — but not yet as a decision.

DECISION-POINT ACCESS

APP fires triggers at all assigned decision points. Preceptor confirms before the assessment routes into the decision.

STAGE

Stage 3 Authoritative / Independently Validated

DEFINITION

The APP performs the assessment independently. No preceptor confirmation is required before the assessment enters the formal decision loop.

WHAT THE TEAM CAN TRUST

The APP's assessment is trustworthy as a decision input at the staged decision points.

DECISION-POINT ACCESS

APP fires triggers and the assessment routes into the formal decision loop. The surgeon explicitly accepts, modifies, or overrides the recommendation according to clinical judgment, institutional policy, and scope.

STAGE

Stage 4 Teaching

DEFINITION

The APP is qualified and validated to calibrate and develop other APPs' assessment practice. This describes teaching readiness, not formal institutional credentialing unless separately granted.

WHAT THE TEAM CAN TRUST

Trustworthy as a decision input and as a standard against which to calibrate newer APPs.

DECISION-POINT ACCESS

APP fires all triggers, acts as the readiness-standard reference for the team, and precepts Stage 1–2 APPs.

The critical design principle: readiness is stated per decision point, not per APP. An APP isn't "Stage 3." They're "Stage 3 at conduit assessment, Stage 2 at bypass weaning, Stage 1 at mechanical support." The staging is granular because judgment is granular — an APP can have a thousand-harvest conduit assessment while still developing their bypass-weaning judgment. Treating readiness as a single global label is exactly the kind of coarseness that causes the team to both over-trust (at the APP's weak points) and under-trust (at their strong points).

The Readiness Standard Document

One page per APP — a calibration reference, not an evaluation.

Each APP carries a one-page Readiness Standard document — updated at defined intervals — that maps their current stage to each of the twelve decision points. It tells the team, at a glance, how the APP's assessment should enter the formal decision loop at each trigger.

Representative Readiness Standard — [APP Name]

DECISION POINT

Conduit Assessment

STAGE

3 — Independently Validated

APP ASSESSMENT

Performs the quality assessment independently and surfaces the recommendation.

TEAM INSTRUCTION

Enter the formal loop; surgeon accepts, modifies, or overrides.

DECISION POINT

Hemodynamic Instability

STAGE

2 — Contributing

APP ASSESSMENT

Surfaces a timed trend, likely cause, and recommendation.

TEAM INSTRUCTION

Pause and confirm with the preceptor/surgeon before deciding.

DECISION POINT

Closure Readiness

STAGE

4 — Teaching

APP ASSESSMENT

Surfaces the structured readiness assessment and helps calibrate others.

TEAM INSTRUCTION

Use as a teaching reference; surgeon retains closure decision authority.

Representative only: the full program document maps all twelve decision points. Stage 3 gives an assessment independent entry into the decision loop; it does not predetermine the surgeon's decision.

The Advancement Protocol

Evidence-based stage moves — not gut feelings.

Readiness standards only stay trustworthy if they're kept current — and they're only kept current if advancement is a defined, evidence-based process. Each stage advancement at each decision point requires documented evidence.

ADVANCEMENT

Stage 1 → 2

EVIDENCE REQUIRED

A defined number of observed assessments at the decision point, with the APP's assessment matching the preceptor's assessment at a defined accuracy rate (e.g., no missed "unacceptable" conduit in N consecutive cases).

WHO CONFIRMS

Preceptor + APP Lead

ADVANCEMENT

Stage 2 → 3

EVIDENCE REQUIRED

A defined number of contributing-stage assessments with documented calibration and review of how the APP's recommendations were handled, plus evidence that thresholds match program standards.

WHO CONFIRMS

Preceptor + APP Lead + Medical Director

ADVANCEMENT

Stage 3 → 4

EVIDENCE REQUIRED

Demonstrated ability to articulate the reasoning behind assessments (not just the conclusion), plus successful calibration of at least one Stage 1–2 APP at that decision point.

WHO CONFIRMS

APP Lead + Medical Director

The readiness standard is what makes a communication trigger worth firing. Without it, the trigger produces noise the team discounts. With it, the trigger produces an assessment the team knows how to weigh. The APP speaks because the trigger says "now." The team listens because the standard says "this assessment has defined weight at this point." The surgeon still decides. All three elements are required — trigger, calibrated assessment, and surgeon-led decision loop.

Layer 3

Decision-Use Systems

The first two layers get the judgment out of the APP's head and into the room — voiced at a defined moment, trusted at a defined weight. The third layer is what makes it count: a formal decision loop at each trigger point that routes the assessment into the actual plan, captures it, and records it — so judgment changes the outcome instead of just the conversation.

The failure this layer addresses is the open loop. The APP voices a concern. The surgeon considers it. The case continues. And the concern — correct, voiced, even acknowledged — evaporates, because there's no defined point where it must become a decision.

The Decision Loop — Four Steps at Every Trigger

The same four steps at every trigger point; only the content changes.

Surface — owned by the APP

The APP states the assessment at the trigger point, in the defined format.

Acknowledge — owned by the surgeon

The surgeon explicitly acknowledges the assessment — not with a nod, but with a defined response that confirms the judgment was received and weighed.

Decide — surgeon, with APP input

A decision is made at a defined point in the sequence: use / discard / alter / escalate / note-and-proceed. The decision is explicit, not defaulted.



Record — APP (documentation)

The assessment, the decision, and the rationale are captured in the case record and the post-case debrief — so the judgment is traceable and the loop is closed.

The key word is explicit. The loop doesn't require that every concern changes the plan. It requires that every concern is explicitly resolved — with a decision, made deliberately, that either incorporates the judgment or consciously overrides it. "The surgeon heard it and moved on" is not a decision. It's a default. And defaults are where judgment goes to die.

The Conduit Decision Loop — The Flagship Example

The decision point where an APP's judgment is most obviously valuable — and most commonly wasted.

The Open Loop — Most Programs Today

- APP visualizes a marginal conduit. Thinks: "I wouldn't use this segment." Says nothing (no trigger).
- Or says something and is overridden or ignored (no readiness standard).
- Or says something, surgeon nods, and the case proceeds on the default path (no decision-use system).
- The marginal segment is harvested and used, or the case stalls while the problem is discovered late — in every version, the judgment was present and the outcome was unchanged.

The Closed Loop — Decision-Use Framework

- 1. Surface — At the conduit assessment trigger, the APP states: "Dr. [Name], conduit assessment: the proximal greater saphenous segment is marginal — thin-walled, varicose. I'd recommend the [alternative segment] instead."
- 2. Acknowledge — The surgeon responds with the defined acknowledgment: "Noted. Show me the segment."
- 3. Decide — At the defined decision point — before harvest begins — the surgeon decides: "Agreed, discard the proximal segment. Harvest the [alternative]. Add [additional conduit] to the plan." The decision is explicit and happens before the room gets behind.
- 4. Record — The APP documents the assessment, the decision, and the rationale in the case record and flags it in the post-case debrief.

The difference between the two versions is not the APP's talent. It's identical. The difference is the system — the trigger that says "speak here," the standard that says "we'll listen," and the loop that says "and here's where it becomes a decision." With all three, the same APP's same judgment changes the plan before the room gets behind. Without them, the same APP's same judgment sits unused while the room works through a problem that was predictable two minutes earlier.

Generalizing the Loop — The Decision Point Is the Unit of Value

Every one of the twelve triggers gets the same four-step loop, adapted to its content.

TRIGGER

Conduit Assessment

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Use / discard / harvest alternative conduit

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Technical failure at anastomosis, extended pump time, harvest-site morbidity

TRIGGER

Cannulation Readiness

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Proceed / alter site / alert

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Cannulation complication, dissection, bleeding

TRIGGER

Plan-Change Acknowledgment

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Confirm APP re-scoped to the new plan

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

APP operating on a stale plan, missed step, miscommunication

TRIGGER

Hemodynamic Instability

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Intervene / escalate / continue to observe

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Delayed response, prolonged low cardiac output

TRIGGER

Bleeding Assessment

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Address source / escalate / continue to observe

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Blood loss, re-exploration, transfusion

TRIGGER

Bypass Weaning Readiness

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Wean / hold / intervene

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Failed wean, prolonged bypass, hemodynamic instability

TRIGGER

Anastomosis Quality

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Accept / revise / reinforce

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Anastomotic failure, bleeding, re-do

TRIGGER

Closure Readiness

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Close / address outstanding concern

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Post-closure bleeding, retained item, missed concern

TRIGGER

Handoff Content

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Transfer complete / flag watch-items

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Postoperative complications from uncommunicated intraoperative concerns

TRIGGER

Escalation

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Attending intervenes / APP continues

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Out-of-scope management, delayed escalation

TRIGGER

Pre-Case Preference

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Proceed on confirmed preferences / adjust

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Intraoperative correction, surgeon frustration, wasted time

TRIGGER

Post-Case Debrief

THE DECISION THE LOOP PRODUCES

Adopt improvement / note for next case

THE COST OF THE OPEN LOOP

Repeated error, no learning loop

The program that builds the loop at the conduit point and stops has improved exactly one decision. The program that builds the loop across all twelve has converted its APP judgment into a decision system — and that's the difference between a good APP and a good program.

Judgment that is voiced and trusted but never routed into a decision is still wasted judgment — it's just wasted more politely. The decision-use system is the difference between an OR where APPs "contribute" and an OR where APP judgment reliably changes the plan. The first is a feeling. The second is a system. Only the second survives the pressure, the turnover, and the inevitable bad day.

Part 3 — The Cardiac OR Decision-Point Map:

Putting All Three Layers Together

The three layers don't operate as abstract principles. They operate as a single, integrated map that the whole team shares: for each of the twelve decision points, the map shows when the APP speaks (trigger), how much weight the voice carries (readiness standard), and where the judgment becomes a decision (decision loop).

Representative Decision-Point Map — [Program Name]

DECISION POINT

Conduit Assessment

TRIGGER

After visualization, before harvest; APP states segment quality and recommendation.

READINESS WEIGHT

Per-APP stage; Stage 3 enters the loop independently.

DECIDE / RECORD

Surgeon accepts, modifies, or overrides; record assessment, decision, rationale.

DECISION POINT

Cannulation Readiness

TRIGGER

Before cannulation; APP surfaces site suitability or concern.

READINESS WEIGHT

Per-APP stage; Stage 2 requires confirmation.

DECIDE / RECORD

Surgeon decides proceed, alter site, or escalate; record the decision.

DECISION POINT

Closure Readiness

TRIGGER

Before closure; APP surfaces team-reported status and outstanding concerns.

READINESS WEIGHT

Per-APP stage; scope and team roles remain explicit.

DECIDE / RECORD

Surgeon leads closure decision; record concerns and resolution.

Representative only: the full map applies the same architecture across all twelve triggers. It demonstrates the structure without reproducing the complete implementation template.

Implementation Sequence — What to Build First

Three waves. Building all twelve loops at once is how programs fail.

Wave 1 — The Conduit Assessment Loop (Weeks 1–2)

Build the full three-layer system at a single, high-value decision point — the conduit assessment. Define the trigger, draft the readiness standard for conduit assessment, and close the decision loop. Run it for two weeks, observe, and refine. This is the proof of concept: one decision point, fully wired, demonstrating that APP judgment changes outcomes when the system is in place.

Wave 2 — The High-Cost Loops (Weeks 3–6)

Extend to the decision points with the highest cost of failure — cannulation readiness, hemodynamic instability, bleeding assessment, bypass weaning, and anastomosis quality. These are the loops where a missed judgment translates most directly into complications, minutes on pump, and re-explorations. Each follows the same pattern: define the trigger, stage the readiness standard, close the loop.

Wave 3 — The Communication and Continuity Loops (Weeks 7–10)

Complete the map with the decision points that govern communication and continuity — plan-change acknowledgment, closure readiness, handoff content, escalation, pre-case preference, and post-case debrief. These loops don't prevent intraoperative complications directly; they prevent the miscommunication, stale plans, and lost judgment that cause them indirectly.

The Rollout Rules

Three rules that keep the rollout from collapsing into another abandoned initiative.

- **1. One loop at a time, fully wired. Don't start the next loop until the current one is firing reliably — trigger defined, standard staged, decision loop closed, and documented. A half-built loop is worse than no loop, because it creates the expectation of a voice without the infrastructure to trust or use it.**
- **2. The APP Lead owns the map. One person owns the Decision-Point Map, the readiness standards, and the advancement protocol. Without a single owner, every loop becomes everyone's responsibility and no one's job — and the map decays back into "speak up when you feel like it."**

- **3. Measure the loop, not the vibe.** Each loop has a defined metric — how often the trigger fired, how often the judgment changed the plan, how often a concern that wasn't surfaced became a complication. If the loop isn't measurably changing decisions, it isn't working — regardless of how collaborative the OR feels.

The map is what makes the framework operational instead of aspirational. "Build a speak-up culture" is a slogan. "At the conduit assessment trigger, the Stage 3 APP states a quality assessment in the defined format, the surgeon makes an explicit use/discard decision before harvest, and the APP records both" is a system. Programs that build the second one get the judgment their APPs already have. Programs that only adopt the slogan get the silence they already have — and pay for it in outcomes.

Part 4 — The Economics of Wasted Judgment: What Silence Actually Costs

The cost of unused APP judgment is easy to dismiss because it's invisible. A downstream problem that might have been avoided never appears as a line item, and the assessment that could have created an earlier intervention opportunity never appears in the debrief. The silence looks free. It isn't.

What an Open Loop Costs — Directly and Indirectly

Qualitative economic mechanisms; local costs vary by institution and case mix.

COST CATEGORY

Avoidable Technical Complications

MECHANISM

A marginal conduit concern is surfaced late or not at all; possible anastomosis failure, re-do, extended pump time

CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE

Variable direct and downstream cost: OR time, blood products, ICU days, length of stay, and morbidity.

COST CATEGORY

Extended Pump and Case Time

MECHANISM

Delayed recognition of bleeding, instability, or weaning concerns — because the judgment surfaced late or not at all

CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE

Institution-specific cost per OR minute, compounded across cases where recognition is delayed.

COST CATEGORY

Re-exploration and Transfusion

MECHANISM

Postoperative bleeding and tamponade that an intraoperative bleeding-assessment loop would have caught

CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE

Material, institution-specific cost plus transfusion-related morbidity and downstream utilization.

COST CATEGORY

Handoff Failures

MECHANISM

Intraoperative concerns that never reached the ICU/floor team because there was no structured handoff loop

CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE

Potential ICU complications, readmissions, and extended stays; financial impact varies by event and institution.

COST CATEGORY

Surgeon Trust Erosion

MECHANISM

The surgeon, correctly or not, concludes the APP "didn't see it coming" — when the APP saw it coming and had no trigger to say so

CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE

Unquantified but real: reduced willingness to grant autonomy, slower advancement, tighter supervision

COST CATEGORY

Experienced APP Turnover

MECHANISM

Experienced APPs may leave programs that hire them for judgment but provide no reliable way to use it.

CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE

Material but variable: recruitment, onboarding, lost productivity, coverage, and team disruption.

COST CATEGORY

Silent Judgment, Wasted

MECHANISM

The irreducible loss: years of accumulated pattern recognition present in the room but contributing nothing

CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE

Not assigned a universal dollar value; its opportunity cost is visible only through the decisions, delays, and retention outcomes the program tracks.

The Judgment-Utilization ROI

The asset the framework activates is already on payroll.

COMPONENT

Communication trigger definition (12 decision points, documented)

INVESTMENT

APP Lead time for trigger-definition work

COMPONENT

Readiness standard drafting + staging (per APP)

INVESTMENT

APP Lead time for per-APP staging work

COMPONENT

Advancement protocol design

INVESTMENT

APP Lead + Medical Director review time

COMPONENT

Decision-loop rollout (3 waves, 10 weeks)

INVESTMENT

APP Lead oversight across rollout waves

COMPONENT

Documentation and tracking infrastructure

INVESTMENT

Setup and ongoing per-case documentation time

Implementation investment is primarily internal leadership time — APP Lead and Medical Director attention, documentation work, team calibration, and ongoing review. The actual investment varies with program size, staffing model, scope, and the number of decision loops implemented.

Against that, preventing even one material downstream event or retaining an experienced APP may justify the internal effort — but the business case should be calculated from the program's own finance, utilization, retention, and quality data. The framework doesn't require the program to hire anyone new or buy anything. It requires the program to build infrastructure around an asset it already has — and is already paying for — but is currently letting sit silent.

The program that says "we don't have time to build decision loops" is already carrying the consequences of open loops — complications, delays, re-work, and the quiet departure of experienced APPs. The silence is not free. The framework moves the discussion from intuition to a locally measured business case, shifting effort toward infrastructure that can compound in the right direction.

Part 5 — Self-Assessment: Is Your Program Using APP Judgment, or Just Hiring It?

Score each statement 0, 1, or 2. Be honest — the goal is to identify the gap between where you are and where you need to be.

1. Your program has defined, documented communication triggers — the specific decision points in a cardiac case where the APP is expected to verbalize a clinical assessment unprompted

0 — No defined triggers — APPs speak up "when they think they should," which means when asked or when the situation is already bad · 1 — A few informal moments are understood (e.g., the APP flags obvious problems) but no defined trigger set exists · 2 — A documented trigger set covers the major cardiac case decision points (conduit, cannulation, plan changes, instability, bleeding, weaning, closure, handoff). Each trigger names the moment, content, format, and owner.

2. The APP's voice carries a defined, documented weight at each decision point — the team knows exactly what to trust from each APP at each trigger

0 — No readiness standards — the team evaluates every APP comment from scratch, in real time, and discounts under pressure · 1 — Informal sense of who's experienced, but no documented staging · 2 — A Readiness Standard document maps each APP to a competency stage (Supervised / Contributing / Authoritative / Teaching) at each decision point, and the team is instructed to weight the APP's voice accordingly.

3. Readiness staging is granular per decision point, not a single global label per APP

0 — Readiness is a single label ("experienced" or "new") applied to the whole APP · 1 — Readiness is staged but coarsely — one stage for the whole APP · 2 — Readiness is staged per decision point, so an APP can be Authoritative at conduit assessment while still Contributing at bypass weaning.

4. Readiness advancement is evidence-based — stage moves require documented accuracy and calibration evidence, not gut feeling

0 — Advancement happens informally, by time served or manager opinion · 1 — Advancement is discussed but not standardized or documented · 2 — A defined Advancement Protocol requires documented evidence (observed accuracy, calibration review) before any stage move, confirmed by preceptor/APP Lead/Medical Director.

5. Every communication trigger is paired with a formal decision loop — the APP's assessment is explicitly resolved into a decision (use/discard/alter/escalate), not just heard

0 — No decision loop — judgment is voiced and the case continues on its default path; "heard and moved on" is treated as a decision · 1 — Decision loops exist informally for some points but aren't defined or documented · 2 — A four-step decision loop (Surface / Acknowledge / Decide / Record) is defined and documented at each trigger. Every assessment is explicitly resolved, and the decision + rationale are recorded.

6. The conduit assessment is a defined, closed decision loop — the APP states a quality assessment at a defined moment, and an explicit use/discard decision is made before harvest

0 — The conduit assessment is passive — the APP evaluates silently and the surgeon proceeds without a defined surface point · 1 — The APP sometimes flags marginal conduit but there's no defined moment, format, or decision step · 2 — The conduit assessment is a fully wired loop: defined trigger moment, defined assessment format, explicit use/discard decision before harvest, documented in the case record.

7. The APP's judgment is routed into documentation and handoff — intraoperative concerns and decisions reach the ICU/floor team

0 — No structured handoff — intraoperative concerns die with the case · 1 — Handoff exists but is informal and surgeon-driven, not a defined APP handoff loop · 2 — A structured handoff trigger requires the APP to summarize intraoperative decisions, concerns, and watch-items to the receiving team, so the APP's judgment survives the case.

8. The program measures judgment utilization — how often triggers fire, how often judgment changes the plan, and how often an unsurfaced concern becomes a complication

0 — Judgment utilization isn't measured — there's no visibility into whether APP judgment is being used · 1 — Informal awareness that "good APPs contribute" but no metrics · 2 — Defined metrics per decision loop (trigger fire rate, plan-change rate, unsurfaced-concern-to-complication rate) tracked over time and reviewed with leadership.

9. The program treats APP judgment as a decision asset with an owner and infrastructure — not a personality trait to be encouraged

0 — Judgment is treated as an individual trait — "our APPs are good" or "we should encourage speaking up" — with no system behind it · 1 — Some infrastructure exists (e.g., debriefs) but no single owner and no integrated framework · 2 — The Decision-Point Map has a named owner (APP Lead), covers the major decision points with trigger/standard/loop, and is reviewed on a defined cadence.

10. Experienced APPs are retained in part because their judgment is actively used — the program's best people stay because their judgment changes outcomes

0 — Experienced APPs leave because their judgment isn't used, and the program treats each departure as an individual event, not a system failure · 1 — The program is aware that using judgment matters for retention but hasn't built the system · 2 — Judgment utilization is explicitly linked to retention — the program measures it, and the Decision-Use Framework is part of the retention strategy for experienced APPs.

Score Interpretation

Where does your program sit — 0 to 20?

0–6

Hiring Judgment, Not Using It

Your program hires APPs for their clinical judgment and then builds nothing to use it. Experienced APPs may recognize concerns early — yet their assessments stay silent, untrusted, or unheard at the moments they could help. A conduit concern may surface late. An instability signal may be recognized only after the team has fewer options. And an experienced APP may eventually leave for a program that gives their judgment a defined place in the work. Every case carries the possibility of avoidable friction, delay, or downstream cost, and the program lacks the visibility to learn from the judgment it is already paying for.

7–13

Awareness Without Architecture

You've recognized that APP judgment matters — you might have a few informal moments where APPs speak up, a sense of who's experienced, a debrief here and there. But the judgment still depends on individual personalities: the APP who's naturally outspoken, the surgeon who's naturally receptive, the preceptor who's naturally good at drawing out input. There's no trigger set, no readiness standards, no decision loops. Some judgment surfaces and some doesn't, and you can't predict which — because you haven't built the infrastructure that makes judgment surfacing the default rather than the exception.

Judgment as a Decision System

Your program treats APP judgment as an asset with infrastructure. Communication triggers define the exact moments an APP is expected to speak. Readiness standards tell the team how to weigh each assessment. Decision loops route every assessment into an explicit, surgeon-led decision that may change the plan and gets recorded. Your APPs know when to speak and know what happens next. Your surgeons know what to evaluate and where the decision happens. And experienced APPs have a stronger reason to stay — because the judgment they spent a career building has a defined opportunity to inform the work instead of sitting silent in the OR.

Next Step | The MBA PA

Move From Diagnostic to Implementation

The diagnostic is free. Implementation support is available through consulting. This framework is a diagnostic and operating model — not a claim that a complete downloadable implementation toolkit already exists.

- **Diagnostic:** shared language for triggers, readiness, and the Surface → Acknowledge → Decide → Record loop.
- **Implementation:** local definitions, documentation, ownership, multidisciplinary review, and measurement adapted to your program's policy and scope.
- **Consulting:** maps the framework to your team, validates boundaries, and builds the operating materials with the program.

EXPLORE THE RESOURCE HUB

Browse the free frameworks and diagnostic resources at the canonical MBA PA site. Explore themba-pa.com →

BOOK A DISCOVERY CALL

Discuss how the Decision-Use architecture could be adapted to your program's roles, policies, and priorities.

Book themba-pa.com/discovery-call →

Operational systems framework only — not clinical teaching or patient-care directives. It does not replace clinical judgment, credentialing requirements, institutional policy, or the surgeon's ultimate authority over intraoperative decisions.