UCSF UC San Francisco Previously Published Works

Title

Feasibility of a Video-Based Advance Care Planning Website to Facilitate Group Visits among Diverse Adults from a Safety-Net Health System

Permalink https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1qt7g3j6

Journal Journal of Palliative Medicine, 21(6)

ISSN 1096-6218

Authors

Zapata, Carly Lum, Hillary D Wistar, Emily <u>et al.</u>

Publication Date 2018-06-01

DOI

10.1089/jpm.2017.0476

Peer reviewed

Feasibility of a Video-Based Advance Care Planning Website to Facilitate Group Visits among Diverse Adults from a Safety-Net Health System

Carly Zapata, MD, MPH,¹ Hillary D. Lum, MD, PhD,^{2,3} Emily Wistar, MD,^{4,5} Claire Horton, MD, MPH⁵ and Rebecca L. Sudore, MD^{6,7}

Abstract

Background: Primary care providers in safety-net settings often do not have time to discuss advance care planning (ACP). Group visits (GV) may be an efficient means to provide ACP education.

Objectives: To assess the feasibility and impact of a video-based website to facilitate GVs to engage diverse adults in ACP.

Design: Feasibility pilot among patients who were \geq 55 years of age from two primary care clinics in a Northern California safety-net setting. Participants attended two 90-minute GVs and viewed the five steps of the movie version of the PREPARE website (www.prepareforyourcare.org) concerning surrogates, values, and discussing wishes in video format. Two clinician facilitators were available to encourage participation.

Measurements: We assessed pre-to-post ACP knowledge, whether participants designated a surrogate or completed an advance directive (AD), and acceptability of GVs and PREPARE materials.

Results: We conducted two GVs with 22 participants. Mean age was 64 years (\pm 7), 55% were women, 73% nonwhite, and 55% had limited literacy. Knowledge improved about surrogate designation (46% correct pre vs. 85% post, p=0.01) and discussing decisions with others (59% vs. 90%, p=0.01). Surrogate designation increased (48% vs. 85%, p=0.01) and there was a trend toward AD completion (9% vs. 24%, p=0.21). Participants rated the GVs and PREPARE materials a mean of 8 (±3.1) on a 10-point acceptability scale.

Conclusions: Using the PREPARE movie to facilitate ACP GVs for diverse adults in safety net, primary care settings is feasible and shows potential for increasing ACP engagement.

Keywords: advance care planning; group visits; safety net; videos

Background

THE GOAL OF ADVANCE CARE PLANNING (ACP) is to en-THE GOAL OF ADVANCE CARE FLANMING (1997) sure medical care consistent with people's values, goals, and preferences during serious and chronic illness.¹ However, many patients from disenfranchised populations do not en-gage in ACP.²⁻⁴ Multiple system barriers to ACP exist, including lack of culturally appropriate materials, limited time, and discomfort discussing the topic among physicians.^{5–10}

Group visits (GVs) have shown promise for ACP education. $^{11-14}$ In a GV, patients with a shared condition or

interest receive medical care and education in a group setting, guided by a clinician. GVs also provide peer support from other patients.^{15,16} Conducting ACP in safety-net settings, where patients are uninsured, on Medicaid, or otherwise vulnerable, is limited by resources for trained facilitators to provide educational content. Videos may provide ACP education without significant facilitator resources and have been shown to promote ACP behavioral change.^{17,18} However, evidence of the feasibility and impact of using video decision aids to provide ACP education in GVs is limited.

¹Division of Hospital Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, California.

²VA Eastern Colorado Geriatric Research Education and Clinical Center (GRECC), Denver, Colorado.

³Division of Geriatric Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Colorado, Aurora, Colorado. ⁴Caleb G. Clark Potrero Hill Health Center, Department of Public Health, San Francisco, California.

⁵Division of General Internal Medicine, Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, University of California, San Francisco, California.

⁶Division of Geriatrics, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, California.

⁷San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center, San Francisco, California.

Accepted January 12, 2018.

The PREPARE website (www.prepareforyourcare.org) is a patient-centered, evidenced-based, multimedia website designed to engage patients in the process of ACP. PRE-PARE can be viewed in an interactive or movie format. PREPARE has been shown to engage diverse older adults in ACP,⁸ but has not been studied in a GV setting. Preliminary usability testing suggested that a movie version would be more conducive to viewing in a group, especially for computer-naive individuals. Therefore, we conducted a feasibility pilot of the PREPARE movie in GVs and assessed whether the PREPARE GV improved ACP knowledge, surrogate designation, and advance directive (AD) completion in a safety net, primary care setting.

Methods

Setting

PREPARE GVs were conducted between December 2013 and January 2014 at two primary care clinics in an urban safety-net health system in Northern California. Study approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board.

Participants

Participants were English-speaking, 55 years of age and older, had at least two chronic medical conditions based on ICD-9 codes, and at least two primary care visits in the past year.¹⁹ Subjects were excluded if they self-reported, had ICD-9 codes or chart review evidence of blindness, deafness, dementia or psychosis, active drug or alcohol abuse, an alert of disruptive behavior, or screened positive for moderate-to-severe cognitive impairment.^{20,21}

Recruitment

Flyers were posted in clinics, mailed to eligible participants, and followed by a phone call with a target of 30 enrolled patients and at least 10 attendees per GV. Informed consent was obtained for all participants, and baseline demographic information was collected, including health literacy.²²

Intervention

Participants attended two 90-minute PREPARE GVs one week apart at the clinic. They viewed the PREPARE movie, which provides multimodal educational content, including voice-overs of all website text, videos modeling ACP communication and decision-making, and questions asked within the videos about viewers' values. Participants viewed PRE-PARE steps 1–3 during the first visit and steps 4 and 5 during the second visit. Video viewing time was approximately 80 minutes. Participants also received a validated easy-to-read AD and a PREPARE workbook.²³ Two clinician facilitators set up the movie and encouraged discussion among patients, but all educational content was provided from the PREPARE movie. At the end of the GV, facilitators encouraged participants to complete their AD and discuss wishes with family and friends. However, no assistance with ACP documentation was provided.

Measurements

We assessed ACP knowledge before the first GV and one week after the second GV with multiple-choice questions about who can be a surrogate, who is an optimal surrogate, whether a potential surrogate needs to be formally asked to serve in the role, when to ask someone to be a surrogate, how to choose flexibility in surrogate decision making, and who needs to be notified of an appointed surrogate and their preferences for medical care.

Participants also completed an adapted version of the validated ACP Engagement Survey before and after the GVs that included 15 behavior-change process items assessing knowledge, contemplation, self-efficacy, and readiness on a 5-point Likert scale about identifying and asking someone to be a surrogate and talking with a surrogate and a doctor about preferences for medical care. We included four validated action items about whether participants had designated a surrogate decision maker, communicated this information to clinicians, or completed an AD. Participants completed validated acceptability surveys that assessed the ease-of-use of PREPARE on a 10-point scale, and, on a 5-point Likert scale, comfort with and the helpfulness of the PREPARE workbook and the likelihood they would recommend the GV to others.⁸

Analysis

All pre-to-post response options were calculated as percentages or means and compared using Fisher's exact tests or t-tests. Statistical analyses were conducted using Intercooled Stata, version 13 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

Results

Participants

We mailed 163 patients recruitment fliers followed by 124 phone calls to reach our enrollment target of 30 participants in total, 15 per GV (18% participation rate). Twenty-two of the 30 enrollees attended both GV sessions (73%), including 9 and 13 participants, respectively. Mean age was 64 years (\pm 7), 55% were female, 73% were racial or ethnic minorities, 23% reported English as a second language, 41% reported fair-to-poor health, and 46% had limited health literacy (Table 1).

ACP knowledge

One week after PREPARE GVs, participants demonstrated improved knowledge about surrogate designation (46% pretest versus 85% posttest, p = 0.01) and talking to others about their designated surrogate (59%–90%, p = 0.01). There was a nonsignificant trend toward improved knowledge about the optimal time to choose a surrogate (55%–75%, p=0.17); informing others of their wishes (73%–90%, p=0.15); surrogate definition (64%–70%, p=0.66), identifying the optimal surrogate (86%–95%, p=0.34), and medical decisionmaking flexibility (41%–55%, p=0.36).

ACP engagement

Behavior change processes. There was a significant increase in how informed participants felt about who can be a surrogate (3.2 vs. 4.1, p=0.02) and who is an ideal surrogate

TABLE 1.	CHARACTERISTICS OF PREPARE GROUP
	VISIT PARTICIPANTS $(N=22)$

Characteristic	Mean (SD)	
Mean Age, years	64 (7)	
Women	<i>n</i> (%) 12 (55)	
Race/ethnicity		
White, Non-Hispanic	6 (27)	
African American	9 (41)	
Asian or Pacific Islander	4 (18)	
Latino or Hispanic	3 (14)	
English as primary language	17 (77)	
Education		
<high graduate<="" school="" td=""><td>7 (32)</td></high>	7 (32)	
High school graduate/GED	4 (18)	
Some college	8 (36)	
College or beyond	3 (14)	
Self-rated health status ^a		
Fair-to-poor	9 (41)	
Limited health literacy ^b	10 (45)	
Comfort using Internet ^c		
Quite a bit to extremely comfortable	7 (32)	

^aSelf-rated health: 5-point Likert categories: "poor, fair, good, very good, excellent."

^bLimited health literacy: Categories of confidence with medical forms. Categories of "not at all, a little, somewhat, quite a bit, extremely" and "somewhat" to "not at all" categorized as limited literacy.

^cComfort using the internet: 5-point Likert categories of "not at all, a little, somewhat, quite a bit, extremely."

(3.3 vs. 4.1, p=0.03), with a trend toward being more informed about the types of decisions made by a surrogate (3.1 vs. 3.8, p=0.07) (Table 2). Participants also showed increased self-efficacy in their ability to ask someone to be a surrogate decision maker (3.0 vs. 3.9, p=0.03) and in their ability to share that information with their doctor (3.0 vs. 4.0, p=0.02). Confidence about discussing end-of-life care with their surrogate and their doctor also increased, but the improvement was not statistically significant. Furthermore, participants reported greater readiness after the GVs to choose a surrogate (2.5 vs. 4.6, p=<0.01) and to sign an AD (1.8 vs. 3.0, p=0.01).

Actions. One week after the GVs, more participants reported identifying a surrogate (48% vs. 85%, p = 0.01) with a trend toward increased AD completion (9% vs. 24%, p = 0.21) and talking with their doctor about their surrogate (14% vs. 23%, p = 0.21). Formally asking someone to be a surrogate did not increase.

Feasibility and acceptability

Participants rated the GVs a mean of 8.8 (± 2) on a 10-point acceptability scale. They rated their comfort with the PRE-PARE GV workbook a 4.4 (± 0.8) on a 5-point scale, help-fulness of the workbook a 4.7 (± 0.6) on a 5-point scale, and likelihood they would recommend the GV to others a 4.6 (± 0.7) on a 5-point scale.

TABLE 2. Advance Care Planning Engagement Before and After PREPARE Group Visits (n=22)

Topic	Pre-GV mean (SD)	Post-GV mean (SD)	p-value
Behavior change processes (5-pt Likert scale)			
Informed about			
Who can be a surrogate	3.2 (1.3)	4.1 (1.0)	0.02^{a}
Who is a good surrogate	3.3 (1.0)	4.1 (1.1)	0.03^{a}
Types of decisions made my surrogate	3.1 (1.2)	3.8 (1.1)	0.07
Thought about			
Who you would want as your surrogate	3.2 (1.4)	3.8 (1.3)	0.13
Asking that person to be your surrogate	2.5 (1.6)	3.2 (1.5)	0.21
Talking with you doctors about your surrogate preference	2.1(1.4)	2.2(1.5)	0.82
End of life care preferences	3.1 (1.6)	3.2(1.7)	0.92
Discussing these preferences with your surrogate	2.5(1.6)	3.0 (1.8)	0.41
Discussing these preferences with your doctor	3.4 (1.6)	3.8 (1.5)	0.42
Confidence you could			
Ask someone to be your surrogate	30(14)	39(12)	0.03^{a}
Talk with your doctors about your surrogate	3.0(1.1)	40(13)	$0.02^{\rm a}$
Discuss end of life care with your surrogate	33(16)	41(13)	0.09
Discuss end of life care with your doctor	34(16)	38(15)	0.0°
Discuss the of the care with your doctor	5.1 (1.0)	5.6 (1.5)	0.72
Sign on advance directive	1.9(1.0)	20(11)	0.01a
Sign an advance directive	1.0(1.0)	3.0(1.1)	0.01
Decide on a surrogate	2.3 (1.1)	4.0 (1.5)	<0.01
Topic	<i>Pre-GV n</i> (%)	Post-GV n (%)	p-value
ACP actions (ves/no)			
Identified surrogate	11 (48)	19 (85)	0.01^{a}
Asked someone to be surrogate	9(41)	11(50)	0.57
Talked with your doctor about your surrogate	3(14)	5(23)	0.21
Completed an advance directive	2(0)	5(23) 5(24)	0.21
	2 (9)	5 (24)	0.21

^aStatistically significant at the $p \le 0.05$ level.

ACP, advance care planning.

Discussion

Using PREPARE in a GV setting to facilitate ACP for diverse adults in a safety-net primary care setting was feasible and improved ACP engagement. Patients attended the visits, found the experience helpful and the materials easy to use. Participants showed improved knowledge, confidence, and readiness about ACP topics and took steps toward designating a decision maker and completing an AD.

Other studies of ACP GVs using videos to support ACP discussions and education have shown benefit.^{11,24} However, in those groups, most of the educational content was provided by clinician facilitators who ultimately facilitated ACP documentation. To our knowledge, this is the first study demonstrating feasibility of using the validated PREPARE website to deliver educational content in a GV setting. These findings suggest that the PREPARE movie may prove an efficient model for delivering ACP information in safety-net settings and in GVs.

Our study has several limitations. Generalizability may be limited, as the sample size was small, the study was in one geographic region, and the GVs were facilitated by two physicians and with support from a research assistant for recruitment. As this was a feasibility study, there was no control group. Participants were aware of the pilot project, and results may be subject to the Hawthorne effect and social desirability bias. Our visits excluded patients with cognitive impairment and those who did not speak English, but understanding the needs of these populations is important for future studies.

In conclusion, use of the movie version of the ACP PRE-PARE website can potentially be used in GVs to improve ACP engagement in resource-poor environments and for diverse populations with low health literacy. More research is needed to determine whether the PREPARE movie format can be used in other patient populations and settings and be conducted by nonclinicians.

Author Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist

References

- 1. Sudore RL, Lum HD, You JJ, et al.: Defining Advance Care Planning for Adults: A Consensus Definition From a Multidisciplinary Delphi Panel. J Pain Symptom Manage 2017;53:821–832.
- 2. Zhao J, Barclay S, Farquhar M, et al.: The oldest old in the last year of life: Population-based findings from Cambridge city over-75 s cohort study participants aged 85 and older at death. J Am Geriatr Soc 2010;58:1–11.
- Emanuel LL, Barry MJ, Stoeckle JD, et al.: Advance directives for medical care—a case for greater use. New Engl J Med 1991;324:889–895.
- Miles SH, Koepp R, Weber EP: Advance end-of-life treatment planning. A research review. Arch Intern Med 1996;156:1062–1068.
- Krakauer EL, Crenner C, Fox K: Barriers to optimum endof-life care for minority patients. J Am Geriatr Soc 2002; 50:182–190.
- Kwak J, Haley WE: Current research findings on end-oflife decision making among racially or ethnically diverse groups. Gerontologist 2005;45:634–641.
- 7. Waite KR, Federman AD, McCarthy DM, et al.: Literacy and race as risk factors for low rates of advance directives in older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc 2013;61:403–406.

- Sudore RL, Knight SJ, McMahan RD, et al.: A novel website to prepare diverse older adults for decision making and advance care planning: A pilot study. J Pain Symptom Manage 2014;47:674–686.
- 9. Spoelhof GD, Elliott B: Implementing advance directive in office practice. Am Fam Physician 2012;85:461–466.
- Wright AA, Zhang B, Ray A, et al.: Associations between end-of-life discussions, patient mental health, medical care near death, and caregiver bereavement adjustment. JAMA 2008;300:1665–1673.
- Lum HD, Jones J, Matlock DD, et al.: Advance Care Planning Meets Group Medical Visits: The Feasibility of Promoting Conversations. Ann Fam Med 2016;14:125–132.
- Dipko LR, Xavier K, Kohlwes RJ: Advance directive group education in a VA outpatient clinic. Soc Work Health Care 2003;38:93–106.
- 13. Landry FJ, Kroenke K, Lucas C, Reeder J: Increasing the use of advance directives in medical outpatients. J Gen Intern Med 1997;12:412–415.
- Wissow LS, Belote A, Kramer W, et al.: Promoting advance directives among elderly primary care patients. J Gen Intern Med 2004;19:944–951.
- Yehle KS, Sands LP, Rhynders PA, Newton GD: The effect of shared medical visits on knowledge and self-care in patient with heart failure: A pilot study. Heart Lung 2009;38:25–33.
- Bronson DL, Maxwell RA: Shared medical appointments: Increasing patient access without increasing physician hours. Cleve Clin J Med 2004;71:369–374.
- Jain A, Corriveau S, Quinn K, et al.: Video decision aids to assist with advance care planning: A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open 2015;5:e007491.
- Volandes AE, Brandeis GH, Davis AD, et al.: A randomized controlled trial of a goals-of-care video for elderly patients admitted to skilled nursing facilities. J Palliat Med 2012;15:805–811.
- Sudore RL, Barnes DR, Le GM, et al.: Improving advance care planning for English-speaking and Spanish-speaking older adults: Study protocol for the PREPARE randomised controlled trial. BMJ Open 2016;6:e011705.
- Milne A, Culverwell A, Guss R, et al.: Screening for dementia in primary care: A review of the use, efficacy and quality of measures. Int Psychogeriatr 2008;20:911–926.
- Pfeiffer E: A short portable mental status questionnaire for the assessment of organic brain deficity in elderly patient. J Am Geriatr Soc 1975;23:433–441.
- Sarkar U, Schillinger D, Lopez A, Sudore R: Validation of selfreported health literacy questions among English and Spanishspeaking populations. J Gen Intern Med 2011;26:265–271.
- Sudore RL, Landefeld CS, Barnes DE, et al.: An advance directive redesigned to meet the literacy level of most adults: A randomized trial. Patient Educ Couns 2007;69:165–195.
- Heffner JE, Fahy B, Hilling L, Barbieri C: Outcomes of advance directive education on pulmonary rehabilitation patients. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1997;155:1055–1059.

Address correspondence to: Carly Zapata, MD, MPH Division of Hospital Medicine Department of Medicine University of California 533 Parnassus Avenue, Box 1031 San Francisco, CA 94122

E-mail: carly.zapata@ucsf.edu