

Unbefriended Elders: Matching Values with Decisions

Making a Difference. Changing Lives.™



Be the Change:
Innovative Models for an Aging Population
MGS Conference
April 30, 2010

Making a Difference. Changing Lives.™

I. Introduction The National Scope

Incapacitated and Alone:

Health Care Decision-Making for the Unbefriended Elderly

- Lacks decisional capacity to give informed consent to treatment at hand
- No executed advanced directive has no capacity to complete
- No legally authorized surrogate, no family or friends to assist in decision-making

Estimates: 3-4% of nursing home population

Naomi Karp & Erica Wood, American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging
(hereafter: *Incapacitated & Alone*)

Making a Difference. Changing Lives.™

Unbefriended Elders: The Hastings Center

Isolated and unbefriended persons in LTCF; may or may not retain decision making capacity

- Have no relative, guardian, or responsible party named in medical record
- Listed relative cannot be contacted
- Relative is unresponsive or uninvolved
- Not received a visitor during the past 2 years.

Estimates: up to 30% of LTCF population

Making a Difference. Changing Lives.™

Unbefriended Elders: Commission on End of Life Care

- "45% of next of kin listed in the chart could not be reached for participation in resuscitation status" (Fader et al. 1989)
- "One study found 47% of long term care residents lacked decision-making capacity and another 26% retained only partial capacity" (Miller & Cugliari, 1990)

The National Issue

- Legal framework for making treatment decisions mostly insufficient
- UE patients may be at risk for
 - Over-treatment
 - Under-treatment
 - Treatment decisions that do not reflect their values
- UE patients frequently socially isolated and suffer from multiple chronic conditions

Over-Treatment

- Aggressive treatment as a medical imperative
- Some MDs philosophically believe they can treat, so should treat
- Perverse economic incentives to treat
- Fear of regulators
- Fear of civil liability

Under-Treatment

- Some providers refuse treatment without informed consent
- Results:
 - Wait for emergency
 - Unnecessary delay
 - Added illness
 - Longer period of discomfort and indignity
 - Increased chance of morbidity, even if eventually treated

II. Adult Orphans and Unbefriended Elders in MN

Survey jointly administered by Protective Services Program of VOA – Minnesota and Andrea Palumbo, Elder Justice Scholar of Center for Elder Justice and Policy at William Mitchell College of Law

Survey Instrument

- Adult orphans
 - Do not have a health care directive
 - No surrogate decision maker
- Unbefriended
 - Adult orphans who also **lack capacity** to execute an advance directive

Sample Characteristics

Used MDH Health Care Facility and Provider Database:

- Mailed to 387 licensed NF in MN

Response Rate

- Overall statewide response rate: 32.3%
- Metro area response rate: 31.7%
- Greater Minnesota was slightly higher: 32.5%
- Regional response rates varied across the state from 50% to 19%

Adult Orphans and Unbefriended: MN LTCF Residents

- Metro area adult orphans: 4.94 % (166 of 3,365)
- Metro area unbefriended: 1.84 % (62 of 3,365)
- Greater MN adult orphans: 1.64 % (91 of 5,564)
- Greater MN unbefriended: 0.74% (43 of 5,564)

Gender Comparison

- MN LTCF
 - 66% female to 34% male
- Adult orphans MN LTCF:
 - 37% women, 63% male
- Adult orphans Metro LTCF:
 - 28% female, 72% male
- Adult orphans Greater MN LTCF:
 - 53% female, 47% male

Ethnicity and Adult Orphans/Unbefriended

- Cultural trends account for lower % of communities of color within resident population
 - May also account for disproportionate % of African Americans and American Indians among AOs across MN and within the Metro area.
- More research is warranted, as LTCF use is related to many factors, including:
 - Overall health seeking behaviors
 - Cultural beliefs around end of life care
 - Economics
 - Geography

Potential Unbefriended Elders in the Community

2000 US Census:

- 28% aged 65 and older lived alone
- 39% aged 85 and older lived alone

2005 Minnesota estimates:

- 31% of Minnesotans age 65+ lived alone

Isolated Elders

- 18% of seniors who live alone have no family to support them if they need help for a few days
- 28% if needing help for a few weeks

- Seniors in poverty:
 - 1/3 don't see friends or neighbors for 2 weeks
 - 1/5 don't have phone contact

Aging Alone, The Commonwealth Fund

III. Current Practice and Surrogacy Models Beyond Guardianship

Current Practice MN Incapacitated Without Surrogates

- Health Care Directive – Formal, POLST, Medical Record check list
- Ethics Committee
- Professional Practice
- Physician Determination “Futility” or “Harm”
- Institutional Policy –Hospital, LTCF
- Guardianship

Professional Practice: Those Without Surrogates

- Emergency Medical Care “Implied consent”
- AMA- Ethics committee or Judicial Review
- American College of Physicians – Judicial Review
- American Geriatrics Society
 - Advises against routine court involvement
 - Recommends decisions are made by clinicians caring for the patient
- Other Professionals Practice Guidelines

Models Beyond Guardianship

37 states identify a statutory process for making decisions absent an advance directive- Not MN

13 states have Surrogate Consent for Unbefriended in Absence of an Advance Directive – Not MN

Making a Difference. Changing Lives.™

ABA Consensus Statement on Health Care Decisions for Unbefriended

- Appropriately assess decisional capacity – use communication techniques to enhance capacity
- Diligently search for existing surrogates
- Identify those at risk of becoming unbefriended and incapacitated and intervene:
 - education
 - advance directives
 - identification of values

Making a Difference. Changing Lives.™

ABA Consensus Statement on Health Care Decisions for Unbefriended: Well Designed System

- Focus on the Patient – Substituted Judgment and Best Interest
- Independence and Freedom from Conflicts of Interest
- Continuity of Care
- Applicable to a Full Range of Decisions
- Emphasis on Least Restrictive Alternatives
- Prompt
- Cost Effective
- Accountable
- Expertise and Credibility

IV. A New Minnesota Model

Unbefriended Elders: Matching Values with Decisions

Project Support

The Unbefriended Elders: Matching Values with Decisions project is supported, in part, by a Community Service/Services Development (CS/SD) grant from the Minnesota Department of Human Services and by the Stevens Square Foundation

Project Purpose

- Create systems change
- Develop protocols to identify, locate and support potential family or other informal decision-makers

Formal Project Partners

- VOA National Health Care Facilities
- VOA MN Senior Services programs
- EverCare Health Systems
- Little Brothers Friends of the Elderly
- Anoka County
- Collaborations with U of MN 1st and 2nd year Medical Students and Wilder Research

Clients served

Referrals must meet all the following criteria:

- Resident of Hennepin, Anoka, Ramsey or Washington County
- Age 65+
- No Emergency Contact/Responsible Party Known

And, one or more of the following criteria must be met:

- No written Health Care Directive on file
- No verbal health care instructions
- At risk of Guardianship

Project Goals

- Avoid inappropriate/unwanted medical care
- Increase communication between physicians and patients who are at risk
- Identify and sustain support systems for AOs
- Increase capacity by providers to develop and enhance older adults' support systems
- Increase public policy attention on AOs' needs

Project Objectives

- Complete HCDs, with copies delivered to primary physician and other pertinent individuals
- Professionals from the participating organizations will be trained to work with adult orphans and surrogate decision-making issues
- Develop and share with community partners protocol partner programs can replicate

Activities of the Project

- Train partner organization professionals to work with AOs
- Facilitate communication between AOs and their primary care physicians/practitioners
- Work with the AOs to identify a surrogate decision maker when possible
- Facilitate and distribute completed Health Care Directives

V. Wilder Research Evaluation

- Launched simultaneously with pilot project
- Strong focus on process evaluation

Key evaluation questions

- Is project meeting its target goals and objectives?
- Is the project being implemented as planned?
- What types of individuals are being served by the program?
- What benefits are they receiving?
- What are the prospects for replication?

Evaluation methodology

“Mixed-method” evaluation:

- Analysis of client data
- Analysis of training evaluations
- Key informant interviews
- Interviews with VOA staff

Preliminary evaluation findings

Findings from client records

From October 2008 to February 2010, the project:

- Trained over 550 professionals on Unbefriended Elders issues
- Served 54 AOs
 - 43 cases closed
 - 11 still in process as of February 2010

Client outcomes

- Twenty-six clients completed HCDs (approx. 60% of closed cases)
- Twenty-two of these had follow-up conversations with their physicians
- Twenty-one also designated a healthcare agent/surrogate decision-maker

Client demographics

- Majority living at or below poverty level
- Majority have only a high school education or less
- Over 80% have no prior HCD/healthcare planning experience
- Mostly female (68%)
- At least 70 % white
- Thirty-eight percent widowed or divorced
- Range in age from 65-95

Clients' living situation

- 25 clients living in an assisted living facility or nursing home
- 23 living in own home or rental unit
- 6 “other” living situations reported (e.g., foster care)

Findings relating to surrogate decision-makers

- From 2008-February 2010, the project contacted 55 potential surrogates
- Some surrogates lived as far away as NY & Arizona
- Approximately half agreed to serve as designated health care agents
- Common HCA relationships included:
 - Children
 - Grandchildren
 - Nieces/nephews
 - Family friends
 - Clergy

Findings from Key Informant Interviews

Interviews gather information on:

- Elements for program success
- Significant barriers to program implementation
- Perceived benefits of the program for clients and providers
- Potential for program replication

Findings from the Key Informant Interviews

Key informants include:

- Partner organizations
- Referral sources
- Physicians
- Clients
- Surrogate decision-makers

Key informant interviews continued

Discussion of emerging themes

Next steps in Wilder's evaluation

- Review and analyze a random sample of client case files
- Review March – July 2010 client records and data
- Conduct final statistical analysis of all project data
- Prepare final evaluation report (August 2010)

Resources and References

- Minnesota Commission on End of Life Care 2000-2001 www.mn-palliativecare.org
- “Life Support for Patients without a Surrogate Decision Maker: Who Decides?”, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 2007; 147:34-40
- State Initiatives in End of Life Care www.practicalbioethics.org
- American Bar Association www.abanet.org/aging
- The Hastings Center, www.thehastingscenter.org
- American Medical Association, Ethics Finder www.ama-assn.org
- Values History http://hsc.unm.edu/ethics/advdir/vhform_eng.shtml

Permission for use of Material Granted, “Incapacitated and Alone: Health Care Decision-Making for the Unbefriended Elderly” by Naomi Karp and Erica Wood, published in Human Rights, Volume 31, No. 2, Spring 2004. Copyright 2004 by the American Bar Association. Reprinted with Permission.



Making a Difference. Changing Lives.™

Contact Information

Volunteers of America-Minnesota

Mary Bornong, LISW
Lead Staff, Unbefriended Elders Project
612-617-7815

mbornong@voamn.org

www.voamn.org

Wilder Research Team:

Jessica Meyerson: jam4@wilder.org

Greg Owen: greg@wilder.org

Karen Ulstad: karen@wilder.org