

**Summary of Results
Advance Care Planning
Resource Teams:
Education Sessions and Activities**

**Initiative #7 – Advance Directives on Care Choices
Ontario's Strategy for Alzheimer Disease and Related
Dementias**

2004

**Carrie McAiney, Ph.D.
& Arron Service, M.A.**

INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION OVERVIEW

One of the goals of Initiative 7 – Advance Directives on Care Choices, part of Ontario’s Strategy for Alzheimer Disease and Related Dementias, was to train individuals in order for them to serve on one of 40 Advance Care Planning (ACP) Resource Teams that were to be located across the province. Once trained, these teams were responsible for providing education sessions in the area of ACP to two target groups: (1) members of the general public and (2) service providers. The teams were asked to conduct at least one session with each group.

An educational workshop was held in April 2002 for individuals who were to serve as ACP Resource Team members. As part of the evaluation of Initiative #7, the ACP Resource Teams were asked to complete two questionnaires: one prior to the workshop and one at the end of the workshop. The purpose of these questionnaires was to gather background information on the individuals serving as ACP resource members and to gather feedback on the workshop and its impact on Resource Team member knowledge and confidence related to ACP. This report provides a summary of the results from these questionnaires (Part I) as well as an overview of the educational sessions conducted by the ACP Resource Teams between May 2002 and June 2003 (Part II).

A total of 90 individuals attended the ACP educational workshop. Of these 90 individuals, 83 completed the pre-workshop questionnaire and 76 completed the post-workshop questionnaire (see Table 1). In all but two cases the pre and post workshop questionnaires could be matched by individual, allowing for paired sample t-tests to be conducted (where appropriate).

Table 1: Response Rate

Number of Individuals who Participated in the Workshop	Percent (Number) who completed the Pre-workshop Questionnaire	Percent (Number) who completed the Post-workshop Questionnaire
90	92.2% (83)	84.4% (76)

PART I: RESULTS FROM THE PRE AND POST WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRES

Pre-Workshop Questionnaire

The first set of questions on the pre-workshop questionnaire focused on the characteristics of the individuals participating in the workshop as well as their agencies/organizations.

The majority of the agencies in which the participants worked (59%) were identified as being in a mixed urban/rural area (see Table 2).

Table 2: Area where Agency Located

Area where Agency Located	Percentage (Number) of Respondents (N=83)
Urban Area	20.5% (17)
Rural Area	22.9% (19)
Urban/Rural Mix Area	59.0% (49)
Isolated Area	4.8% (4)

The educational background of the participants varied, with the majority (46%) having completed a university undergraduate degree (see Table 3).

Table 3: Educational Background

Highest Level of Education Attained	Percentage (Number) of Respondents (N=83)
Completed College	13.3% (11)
Completed some university (undergraduate)	8.4% (7)
Completed university (undergraduate)	45.8% (38)
Completed university (graduate)	12.0% (10)
Other	13.3% (11)

The majority of the participants were members of a registered profession (64%), mostly as registered nurses (57%). Other registered professions included social workers, occupational therapists, RPN, and lawyers (see Table 4).

Table 4: Registered Profession

Registered Profession	Percentage (Number) of Respondents (N=83)
Are you a member of a registered profession?	
Yes	63.9% (53)
No	31.3% (26)
If YES, which profession?	(N=53)
RN	56.6% (30)
Social Worker	20.8% (11)
OT	1.9% (1)
Other	20.8% (11)

An initial ACP educational workshop was held in June 2001. However, after the workshop the implementation of the educational sessions to members of the public and service providers was delayed. As a result, in April 2002 a second workshop was held for the new ACP Resource Team members. Some of these individuals attended the June 2001 workshop; others did not. Two questions were asked of those attending the April 2002 workshop in order to ascertain how many of these individuals attended the original workshop and to assess the impact of the education they received.

The majority of the participants (68%) participated in the ACP workshop held in June 2001 (see Table 5a). Of those that participated in the previous training session (N=56), 50% felt more confident in dealing with ACP issues; another 34% felt “somewhat” more confident (see Table 5b).

Table 5a: Participation in the ACP Training held in June 2001

Did you participate in the ACP training in June 2001?	
Yes	67.5% (56)
No	32.5% (27)

Table 5b: Confidence in Dealing with ACP Issues after Training in June 2001

More confidence after training?	Percentage (Number) of Respondents (N=56)
No	0
Somewhat	33.9% (19)
Yes	50.0% (28)
Not applicable/have not had these issues	12.5% (7)

Participants were asked if they had had any other training in ACP. Most participants (80%) had no other training in ACP (see Table 6). Of those who had training, the training was usually provided Judith Wahl (a lawyer with the Advocacy Centre for the Elderly). This training took place between 1992 and 2002, and covered a range of topics including information on Power of Attorney for Personal Care, Power of Attorney finances, substitute decision makers, the Mental Health Act, ethics and legalities, do not resuscitate orders, consent to treatment, and the role of family.

Table 6: Other Training in ACP

Have you had any other training in ACP (other than the June 2001 session)?	Percentage (Number) of Respondents (N=83)
No	79.5% (66)
Yes	20.5% (17)

Participants were asked about their experience in providing education to various groups. First they were asked about their general experience in providing education. The majority of respondents (86%) indicated that they had experience providing education to service providers; on average these individuals had 7.6 years of experience. A higher percentage of respondents (94%) reported that they had experience in providing education to members of the public. The average number of years providing education to this group was 8.6 years (see Table 7).

Table 7: Education Provided and Years of Experience

Do you have experience providing education to ...	Percentage (Number) of Respondents (N=83)	If yes, average number of years providing education to this target group	
Service providers?		Mean	7.6 years
Yes	85.5% (71)	SD	5.9
No		Range	<1 – 30 years
Members of the public?		Mean	8.6 years
Yes	94.0% (78)	SD	6.9
No		Range	<1 – 30 years

* Percentages may not sum to 100% because of missing values.

Participants were asked if they had experience providing education in the area of ACP. Only 24% of the respondents had provided such education. Of those individuals, 45% had provided ACP education to service providers, 60% to members of public, and 35% to others including students, clients and caregivers (see Table 8).

Table 8: Experience Providing ACP Education

Do you have experience providing ACP education?	Percentage (Number) of Respondents (N=83)
Yes	24.1% (20)
No	75.9% (63)
If YES, have you provided education to ...	
Service providers?	
Yes	45.0% (9)
No	50.0% (10)
Members of the public?	
Yes	60.0% (12)
No	35.0% (7)
Others? *	
Yes	35.0% (7)
No	60.0% (12)

* “Others” include: students, clients and caregivers.

Participants who had experience providing ACP education were asked who developed the program or curriculum. In 40% of cases, the respondent reported that he/she had developed the program or curriculum for his/her own use. In another 20% of cases, the respondent reported developing the material for his/her own use as well as use by his/her organization (see Table 9).

Table 9: ACP Program (or Curriculum) Development

Who the ACP Program or Curriculum was Developed By	Percentage (Number) of Respondents (N=20)
By me for my own use	40.0% (8)
By my organization	10.0% (2)
By another organization	15.0% (3)
By me for both my own use and my organization's use	20.0% (4)

POST-WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE

On the post-workshop questionnaire, participants were asked the same set of questions related to confidence as they were asked in the pre-worked questionnaire. Participants were asked to rate their confidence on a 5-point scale (where 1=not confident, 2=slightly confident, 3=fairly confident, 4=quite confident and 5=very confident). Average confidence scores on the pre and post workshop questionnaires were compared using paired sample t-tests. The average confidence ratings were higher on the post-questionnaire than on the pre-questionnaire in each area; however, when the differences between pre- and post-questionnaire scores were not statistically significant (see Table 10).

Table 10: Confidence Levels Pre- and Post- Training

How Confident are you in...	Confidence Pre-Training	Confidence Post-Training
Your understanding of the legal issues involved in ACP?	2.99	3.52
Your knowledge of the resources available to assist others with ACP?	3.14	3.77
Your overall knowledge of ACP?	3.32	3.89
Your ability to facilitate learning and change?	3.73	3.87
Your ability to facilitate conflict resolution?	3.48	3.70
Educating service providers in ACP?	3.03	3.59
Educating members of the public in ACP?	3.34	4.02
Your understanding of your role as an ACP Resource?	3.27	3.96
Serving as a Resource in ACP to others in your community (e.g., service providers)?	3.30	3.79

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<.001

The participants were asked to identify topics from the workshop that they would use to assist them in facilitating future ACP education sessions. Responses to this open-ended question are summarized in Table 11. The majority of participants planned to use resources provided in the workshop to assist in facilitating future ACP sessions.

Table 11: Useful Information from the Workshop

- ACP resources provided in workshop (45)
- Comments regarding the session (36)
- General comments about the session (29)
- Other comments (15)

Participants were asked to suggest additional ways they could be supported in their role as an ACP resource. Responses to this open-ended question are summarized in Table 12. Many participants requested additional support through the provision of a medium for information exchange.

Table 12: Additional Support Suggestions

- Medium for information exchange (28)
- Resources (18)
- Legal issues (6)
- Other (14)

The participants were asked what opportunities they foresaw in educating service providers in ACP. A follow-up question asked participants where they anticipated needing support to carry out these activities. Responses to these questions are summarized in Tables 13 and 14. Participants recognized that there would be opportunities for ACP education with service providers in long-term care homes, networks, and with service professionals. Participants anticipated needing general support, support in dealing with legal issues, and resources.

Table 13: Opportunities in Educating Service Providers in ACP

▪ Service providers (25)
▪ Long-Term Care Homes (16)
▪ Networks (12)
▪ Service (9)
▪ Other (14)

Table 14: Areas where Participants Anticipate Needing Support in Educating Service Providers

▪ Support and references (19)
▪ Resources (15)
▪ Legal issues (11)
▪ Funding (5)
▪ More time (4)
▪ Promotion (2)
▪ Other (7)

Participants were asked about the opportunities they foresaw in educating members of the public in ACP. A follow-up question asked if they anticipated needing any support in these efforts. Results are summarized in Tables 15 and 16. In terms of opportunities, the participants indicated that there were specific homes and groups that could be targeted for education, that they would be providing a service to individuals by providing such education, and that the education provided would help to increase awareness of ACP issues. In terms of support, they anticipated needing resources, general support in dealing with issues that might arise, specific support in terms of legal issues, and assistance with the promotion of events.

Table 15: Opportunities in Educating the Public in ACP

▪ Specific homes or individuals to target (23)
▪ Service provided by educating member of the public (16)
▪ Improving awareness / information (13)
▪ Other (19)

Table 16: Areas where Participants Anticipate Needing Support in Educating the Public

▪ Resources (14)
▪ Support (10)
▪ Legal issues (5)
▪ Promotion (3)
▪ Funding (3)
▪ Other (16)

Finally, participants were asked if they would like to make any other comments about the training session or Initiative #7: Advance Directives on Care Choices. Responses are summarized in Table 17.

Table 17: Final Comments

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Generally positive comments about the session (23)▪ Other (7) |
|--|

PART II: SUMMARY OF ACP RESOURCE TEAM ACTIVITIES

The second part of this report provides a summary of the ACP educational sessions undertaken by the ACP Resource Teams between May 2002 and June 2003. The data in this section is based on the information that the Resource Teams submitted about each session they conducted.

Between May 2002 and June 2003, the ACP Resources Teams conducted a total of 143 education sessions. Of these, 88 were with members of the public and 55 with service providers (see Table 18).

Table 18: Number of Sessions

	Public	Service Providers	Total
Number of Sessions	88	55	143

Table 19 provides a summary of the number of sessions conducted in each MOHTLC region. The greatest number of sessions was held in the southwest, the fewest in Toronto.

Table 19: Sessions by MOHTLC Regions

	Public	Service Providers	Total
North	15	11	26
Central East	7	4	11
Southwest	22	26	48
East	20	5	25
Central South	9	3	12
Central West	7	5	12
Toronto	8	1	9

Education sessions for members of the public ranged in length from three-quarters of an hour to two hours. For service providers, session length ranged from one and one-quarter hours to seven hours. Because a large number of ACP Resource Teams did not provide information on the length of their sessions, average lengths were not calculated (see Table 20).

Table 20: Length of Sessions

	Public	Service Providers
0.75 hours	2	
1 hour	10	
1.25 hours		1
1.5 hours	39	9
1.75 hours	1	
2 hours	8	3
3 hours		8
4 hours		1
4.5 hours		1
6 hours		23
6.5 hours		1
7 hours		2
Unknown	28	6

In terms of the audience for the service provider sessions, information was available for 49 of the 55 sessions. For some of the sessions, more than one type of audience participated. Of the 49 sessions for which data were available, 32 sessions included LTC home staff, 22 included staff from community support services, 19 included hospital staff, and 19 included CCAC staff (see Table 21).

Table 21: Audience (Service Providers)

Audience	Service Providers (N=49 sessions)
LTC home	32
Community Support Services	22
Hospital	19
CCAC	18
Other *	17

* Examples of “other” include: day programs, retirement homes, volunteers, students, MOHLTC compliance advisors, palliative care staff, legal staff, etc.

** Numbers may sum to more than 49 because more than one type of staff/audience could participate in a session.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of individuals and groups who contributed to this evaluation. I would like to thank the Initiative #7 Work Group, the Alzheimer Society of Ontario, and the representatives from the Ontario Seniors' Secretariat for their assistance with the development and implementation of the evaluation. As well, thank you to those who participated in the educational activities and completed evaluation forms.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to the following individuals for their assistance with the administrative and data management aspects of the evaluation:

Kirstin Stubbing
Michelle O'Brien
Karen Lin

Teresa Leung
Laura Wheatley

For further information or questions about the Initiative #7 evaluation, please contact:

Carrie McAiney, PhD
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Psychiatry & Behavioural Neurosciences
McMaster University
&
Evaluator, Geriatric Psychiatry Service
St. Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton
Centre for Mountain Health Services
Email: mcaineyc@mcmaster.ca
Phone: (905) 388-2511, ext. 6722