


Efficacy of Advance Care Planning and Goals of Care Designations Discussions: A Randomized Controlled Trial and Video Intervention

Maureen Douglas
Advance Care Planning Collaborative Research &
Innovation Opportunities Program
University of Alberta, Canada
September 6, 2017

On behalf of the authors:
Sara Davison, Jessica Simon, Sunita Ghosh,
Konrad Fassbender




What was known before (2013)

- ✓ **Evidence of benefits of ACP**
- ✓ **CDN/ABs' ACP engagement low**
 - HQCA poll (2007): 9% of ABs had spoken with HCP about their wishes for life-sustaining therapy
 - Ipsos Reid poll (2012): 9% of average CDNs had discussions with HCP
 - ACCEPT (2011 cycle): 45% of sick, elderly hospitalized patients had no discussions with HCP
- ✓ **Efficacy of ACP videos for patients (Vollandes)**


ACP CRIO
Advance Care Planning Collaborative Research & Innovation Opportunities Program

Still relevant . . .



3 Prior Cycles 2011-2015

Canadian, multi-center, prospective study of sick, older hospitalized patients' and family members' engagement and perceptions of Advance Care Planning and Goals of Care conversations.




Alberta
446 participants

National
1447 participants

Key Alberta Findings


No meaningful improvement was seen over time in the frequency or quality of ACP in Alberta or nationally.



27%

Concordance between patients' preferences for use of life sustaining therapies and their documented medical orders


Nationally: 30%



87-100%

Patients discussed wishes regarding life sustaining therapies with family members


Nationally: 88-92%




53%

Patients discussed wishes regarding life sustaining therapies with any health care provider but low levels of key discussion elements were reported


Nationally: 50%



Biggest mismatch was frequency of patients preferring comfort care who did not have medical orders reflecting that preference



The more conversation elements that were discussed in-hospital, the more likely a patient's preferences and medical orders were concordant



Low levels of satisfaction found with discussions about future location of care, use of life sustaining technologies, and what to expect at end stages of illness

Heyland DK, Barwich D, Pichora D, Dodek P, Lamontagne F, You JJ, Taylor C, Porterfield P, Sinuff T, Simon J
JAMA Intern Med. 2013;173(9):778-787.

ACP CRIO
Advance Care Planning Collaborative Research & Innovation Opportunities Program

What this study adds

- Evaluation of 2 AHS patient education videos
- Broader:
 - In AB context, what is optimal approach to implement policy and change practice
 - Data re: ABs' ACP/GCD behaviours in numerous contexts
 - Behaviours in Advance Care Planning and Actions Survey (BACPACS) development and validation

POLICY LEVEL 1

Alberta Health Services

TITLE
ADVANCE CARE PLANNING AND GOALS OF CARE DESIGNATION

DOCUMENT #
HCS-38

APPROVAL LEVEL
Chief Executive Officer

INITIAL APPROVAL DATE
January 21, 2014

INITIAL EFFECTIVE DATE
April 1, 2014

REVISION EFFECTIVE DATE
NA

NEXT REVIEW
January 21, 2015

For more information, please contact the Clinical Policy Department at [phone number]

ACP CRIO
Advanced Care Planning, Palliative Research
& Innovation Opportunities Program

Study Objectives

- #1: Determine the efficacy of the Videos by comparing the number of participants who have had a conversation with a HCP about ACP or GCD between two groups:



Participants who receive no intervention (usual care)


Patients who watch the Videos
- #2: Economic evaluation alongside clinical trial

ACP CRIO
Advanced Care Planning, Palliative Research
& Innovation Opportunities Program

Design

- Parallel-group RCT
- Contexts:
 - heart failure & transplant (n=57)
 - renal failure (n=119)
 - metastatic lung, colorectal (later expanded to GI) and gynecological cancer (n=65)
 - outpatient clinics & dialysis units
- 22 sites, Edmonton and Calgary
- Time frame:
 - Recruitment for 11 months, 2015-2016
 - Follow-up visits completed 3 months later



 **ACP CRIO**
Advance Care Planning Collaborative Research
& Innovation Opportunities Program

Study Instruments (baseline visit)

- Quality of Life: EQ 5D 5L, EQ VAS
- Function: Australia-modified Karnofsky Performance Status Scale
- ACP/GCD: Behaviours in Advance Care Planning and Actions Survey (BACPACS)

 **ACP CRIO**
Advance Care Planning Collaborative Research
& Innovation Opportunities Program

Intervention

- AHS Conversations Matter ACP & GCD Videos




Conversations Matter: Advance Care Planning

Step 1

Think about your wishes and values about health care

1:07 / 8:36



ACP CRIO
Advanced Care Planning Collaborative Research & Innovation Opportunities Program

Results: Baseline Participant Characteristics

	n (%)	
	Usual Care n=123	Videos n =118
Age, mean (SD)	64.8 (12.3)	67.4 (12.5)
Female	48 (39)	39 (33)
Married (legally married, common law, separated)	84 (68)	73 (62)
≥ High school diploma	104 (84)	99 (84)
Regularly speaks language besides English	26 (21)	19 (16)
White	97(79)	98(83)
South Asian	6(5)	9(8)
Aboriginal	4(3)	1(1)
Religion, importance		
Very to extremely	57 (46)	52 (44)
Somewhat	30 (24)	29 (25)
Not very to Not	36 (29)	37 (31)
Live alone	29 (24)	27 (23)
Health care provider comes to residence	22 (18)	18 (15)
Quality of Life , EQ-5D-5L ,self-rated score 0-100 mean (range)	70.3(2-100)	66.6(0-100)
Function, Karnofsky, ≤ 70	79 (64)	74 (63)

Results: "Prior ACP" at baseline

	n(%)	
	Usual care n=123	Videos n=118
Decided on agent (Q16)	108(88)	107(91)
Asked agent (Q16b)	83(78)	85(79)
Told agent re: preferences (Q19)	68(55)	73(62)
Documentation of agent (Q16c)	60(56)	63(59)
Told HCP re: preferences (Q19a, 20)	31(25)	40(34)
HCP discussed options (Q25)*	33(27)	49(42)
PD re: healthcare preferences (19c)	59(48)	54(46)
Completed GCD (Q23)	25(23)	22(20)
Told family/friend preferences (Q19b, 20b)	55(45)	52(44)


* Statistically significant difference between groups

Results on Primary Outcome: Told HCP about type of health care. . .

At 3 months, **43.3%** of patients in the video arm reported having an ACP conversation with a HCP compared to **31%** in the control group

At baseline n= 241, at 3 months n=217

		intervention	control	P value
Baseline	Yes	40(33.90%)	31 (25.30%)	0.1388
	No	78(66.10%)	92 (74.80%)	
3 months	Yes	45(43.27%)	35(30.97%)	0.0607
	No	59(56.73)	78(69.03%)	



ACP CRIO
Advanced Care Planning Collaborative Research
& Innovation Opportunities Program

Discussion/Conclusion

- These videos – not statistically significant result ($p < 0.061$), but is trending toward significant
- Discussion:
 1. Contrast with studies of ACP/GCD patient videos:
 - Specific to disease
 - Primary outcome - preferred goal of care vs. evidence of ACP action
 - Terminology – ACP/GCD vs. “seriously ill”
 2. Many ACP programs use patient videos as a core component. Watching these videos – without more – may impact readiness but does not prompt patients to have ACP conversations with HCP
 - integrate into intentional, comprehensive ACP conversations with a HCP, to prepare patients for conversations

- **Secondary analysis:**
 - Collected data from a diversity of healthcare settings (patients who ideally should be doing ACP & GCD)
 - Next step: Analysis by subgroups – by disease
 - Did Videos impact patient readiness?
 - BACPACS scoring

Questions/comments?

Maureen Douglas

maureen.douglas@ualberta.ca

www.acpcrio.org



Thank you to our partners:

