

Supporting shared decision-making for older people with multiple health and social care needs: a realist synthesis

Frances Bunn,^{1*} Claire Goodman,¹ Bridget Russell,¹
Patricia Wilson,² Jill Manthorpe,³ Greta Rait,⁴
Isabel Hodgkinson⁵ and Marie-Anne Durand⁶

¹Centre for Research in Primary and Community Care, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, UK

²Centre for Health Service Studies, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

³Social Care Workforce Research Unit, King's College London, London, UK

⁴Research Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London Medical School (Royal Free Campus), London, UK

⁵Tower Hamlets Clinical Commissioning Group, The Tredegar Practice, London, UK

⁶The Preference Laboratory, The Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy & Clinical Practice, Lebanon, NH, USA

*Corresponding author f.bunn@herts.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: Greta Rait is a member of the Health Technology Assessment (HTA) Commissioning Board and HTA Mental Health Panel and Methods Group. Claire Goodman is a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) senior investigator and a trustee of The Orders of St John Care Trust. Marie-Anne Durand reports personal fees from EBSCO Health and the ACCESS Community Health Network outside the submitted work. There are no other financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years.

Published August 2018

DOI: 10.3310/hsdr06280

Scientific summary

Shared decision-making for older people with multiple care needs

Health Services and Delivery Research 2018; Vol. 6: No. 28

DOI: 10.3310/hsdr06280

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Scientific summary

Background

Shared decision-making (SDM) involves patients and health and social care professionals (HSCPs) jointly selecting treatment, care and support packages to reflect and accommodate patients' preferences, priorities and goals. SDM is seen as a central organising principle of integrated care. SDM may be particularly difficult in integrated care sites where decision-making and communication need to be negotiated between, and communicated to, multiple HSCPs, as well as patients and their family carers. Moreover, for those most reliant on health and social care support, such as people who are very frail and those with severe disabilities arising from long-term conditions, decision-making may be particularly complex involving matters such as resource availability, polypharmacy, consent, concordance, the capacity of patients to attend to health-care demands, support networks, safeguarding and the appropriateness of treatment in people with multimorbidity.

Aims

The overall aim of this synthesis was to provide a context-relevant understanding of how models to facilitate SDM might work for older people with multiple health and care needs, and how they might be applied to integrated care models.

Methods

The synthesis drew on the principles of realist inquiry to explain how, in what contexts and for whom, interventions that aim to strengthen SDM between older patients, carers and practitioners are effective. We used an iterative, stakeholder-driven, three-phase approach.

Phase 1: development of initial programme theory/ies

The purpose of phase 1 was to develop candidate theories about why programmes that seek to promote SDM do, or do not, work. This involved scoping the SDM literature (39 reviews and 35 primary studies) and interviews with 13 stakeholders. Stakeholders included user/patient representatives, commissioners and service providers in vanguard sites and health-care professionals (HCPs). The purposes of the stakeholder consultation were to explore key assumptions about what needs to be in place for effective SDM and identify relevant outcomes. The initial programme theory was discussed at a workshop attended by research team members and at the first Project Advisory Group (PAG) meeting.

Phase 2: retrieval, review and synthesis

In phase 2 we undertook systematic electronic and lateral searches of the evidence to test and develop the theories identified in phase 1. There were 11 separate searches, which were focused on areas relevant to the theory identified in phase 1 [e.g. person-centred care (PCC) and coaching]. The following data sources were searched: MEDLINE (via PubMed), SCOPUS, The Cochrane Library (including the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews), Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE), Health Technology Assessment (HTA) database, NHS Economic Evaluation Database (NHS EED), Google and Google Scholar (Google Inc., Mountain View, CA, USA). Data were extracted into a specially developed Microsoft Access® (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA, USA) database. The database was used to identify prominent recurrent patterns of contexts and outcomes in the data and the possible means (mechanisms) by which they occurred.

Phase 3: testing and refining of programme theory

In phase 3 we tested the programme theory in interviews with 11 stakeholders and through discussions with the research team and PAG.

The review was supported by two well-established public involvement groups based at the University of Hertfordshire and King's College London. Members of these groups were involved in the PAG, took part in stakeholder interviews and attended project team workshops. As such, they contributed to the development of our programme theory.

Results

We included 88 items, which included 26 evidence reviews, 46 primary research studies, seven guidelines, case studies or reports and nine discussion or opinion papers. Twenty-nine items focused on older people or participants with complex health and care needs (e.g. multimorbidity). The literature focused either specifically on SDM or on aspects of care, such as PCC or personalised care planning (PCP), in which SDM has an essential if not specified role to play with the patient or their proxy.

Despite the constraints of the current evidence base we were able to develop an explanatory account of what SDM should look like for older people with complex health and care needs. Our theory draws on four context–mechanism–outcome (CMO) configurations that together provide an account of what needs to be in place for SDM to work for older people with complex needs. These highlight the importance of understanding patient and carer values, the organisation of systems to support SDM, the need to support and prepare patients and family carers to engage in SDM and the need for wider cultural changes of which SDM is a part. The CMOs are grounded in evidence from the literature and stakeholder perspectives.

Context–mechanism–outcome 1: reflecting patient and carer values

The evidence shows how systems that enable health and care professionals to develop relationships with patients/service users and their family carers trigger feelings of trust, engagement and respect that can lead to improved outcomes, such as patient and carer satisfaction with services and decisions. The quality of individual clinicians' communication skills, and their ability to foster trusting relationships with older people and their families, is fundamental to SDM. In addition, there is also a need for systems that foster continuity of care both through ongoing relationships with one clinician (relationship continuity) and through system-based approaches that develop ways of working whereby the patient is linked to multiple professionals (management and informational continuity). SDM with older people with complex needs is likely to increase appointment length; although this is thought to improve adherence to treatment regimens, there is currently little evidence to suggest a link to health outcomes or service use.

Context–mechanism–outcome 2: systems to support shared decision-making

There is evidence that organisational support, appropriate training and system-based aspects, such as longer appointments, lead to HCPs feeling more supported and having the confidence to engage with SDM. It can also lead to increased patient satisfaction with decision-making because patients feel that service providers are attentive to them and their concerns. There is a lack of studies addressing interprofessional approaches to SDM or the training needs of providers other than doctors.

Context–mechanism–outcome 3: preparing for the shared decision-making encounter

Older people with complex health needs are likely to need support to participate in SDM. Although the evidence suggested that interventions, such as decision aids and coaching, can improve involvement in SDM, the impact on adherence or health outcomes is not proven. Moreover, most tools were not designed (and have not been tested) for the oldest older person. Evidence suggests that if tools are used they need to be brief, designed for use within a consultation and focused on facilitating discussion between the patient, family carer and professionals involved in their care. The right culture, which allows people time to

ask questions and to discuss options, and staff with positive attitudes towards SDM are likely to be more important than tools for older people with complex health and care needs.

Context–mechanism–outcome 4: shared decision-making as part of a wider culture change

Shared decision-making is likely to be most effective when it involves service providers who have the right skills, attitudes and tools, working in systems that are structured to support service providers and users to engage in SDM. Key to this is a culture that involves person- (and family-) centred approaches. This CMO incorporates components from the previous CMOs, such as organisational resources (time and space), systems to support SDM and skills development through continuous practice development. These wider changes are important to trigger mechanisms, such as familiarity and confidence. This familiarity, which develops over time, is necessary for both HCPs and patients and their families and includes an understanding that patients and (when appropriate) their family carers have responsibility for their health and the decisions that affect them. The evidence suggests that such approaches may lead to improved service user and provider satisfaction with services and with the quality of decisions, but there is currently little research on the impact on health-related outcomes.

Conclusions

Programmes that are likely to be successful in creating shared understanding and SDM between service users and providers are those that create trust between those involved, allow service users to feel that they are respected and understood and engender confidence to engage in SDM. We suggest that confidence is likely to take time to develop as it is related to the development of a shared understanding and expectation of SDM between service users and service providers. The cultural shift that is needed to embed SDM in practice may require new ways of working for HCPs and a shift away from a biomedical focus to a more person-centred ethos that goes beyond the individual patient encounter. To achieve this, HCPs are likely to need support, both in terms of the way services are organised and delivered and in terms of their own continuing professional development. This cultural shift also involves an expectation that patients and their family carers will take a greater responsibility for their health and the decisions that affect them, and they too may need support to engage in SDM. How this support might best be provided needs to be further explored, although face-to-face interactions and ongoing patient–professional relationships are clearly key. In terms of support, it is important that well-meaning attempts to focus on patient goals do not increase health inequalities.

Models of SDM for older people with complex health and care needs should move away from thinking about SDM purely in terms of one encounter between a doctor and a patient. Rather, SDM should be conceptualised as a series of conversations that patients, and their family carers, may have with a variety of different health and care professionals. Such an approach relies on continuity of care fostered through good relationships between service providers and users, and systems that facilitate the communication of information, including about patient goals and preferences, between different health and care professionals.

The literature on SDM involving older people or those with complex needs is largely qualitative or descriptive; there are very few evaluations of interventions specifically designed to promote SDM with this group and with their family carers. This review suggests that there is need for further work to establish how organisational structures can be better aligned to the requirements of older people with complex needs. This includes defining and evaluating the contribution that different members of the health and care team can make to SDM for older people with complex health and care needs.

Implications for practice

The following implications for practice have emerged from the review.

Systems and culture

- The evidence suggests that SDM is likely to become embedded only if it is regarded as an essential component of 'good' health care and is linked to a culture of person-centred approaches throughout an organisation.
- The evidence suggests that a culture that allows people time to ask questions and to discuss options, and staff with positive attitudes towards SDM, are likely to be more important than decision support tools for older people with complex health and care needs.
- The evidence suggests that there is a need for visible organisational support in order for SDM to become embedded. This includes visibility in internal policy documents, financial and organisational support (e.g. enabling longer appointments when necessary, providing appropriate administrative support) and the inclusion of SDM in continuing professional development.
- The evidence suggests that systems that foster continuity of care both through ongoing relationships with one clinician (relationship continuity) and through system-based approaches that develop ways of working whereby the patient is linked to multiple professionals (management and informational continuity) are important for SDM.
- It appears likely that in instances in which choices are constrained by resource limitations, health-care policies or evidence-based recommendations, it is still valuable to explore a patient's choices and reasons.
- Although properly conducted SDM may increase the length of consultations (such as those in primary care), there is evidence to suggest that this may be ameliorated by involving other members of the multidisciplinary team (MDT) in the SDM process.
- The evidence suggests that it is important that service providers and service users have shared expectations of, and familiarity with, SDM for it to become properly embedded. This is likely to take time to develop.

Education and training

- Our findings suggest that SDM education and training should be focused on all members of the MDT and not just on doctors or lead clinicians. It should be part of undergraduate training programmes but also part of ongoing professional development.
- Evidence points to a need for SDM and communication skills training to include the task of exploring what matters to patients and how to elicit their goals and priorities.
- The evidence suggests that shared decision-making training should include information on risk communication.

Preparation for shared decision-making

- Evidence suggests that many older people with complex health and care needs, particularly those with lower health literacy or conditions, such as depression, are likely to need support to take part in consultations involving SDM.
- The evidence indicates that patient decision aids (PDAs) for older people with complex needs are likely to be most effective when used as part of a face-to-face interaction with a HCP, for example for facilitating discussion between the patient, family carer and professional.

Suggestions for future research

Several potential areas for future research were identified by the review. These are listed in order of priority:

- How can interventions be tailored to the SDM needs of older people with complex health and care needs and how effective are such approaches? For example, would longer consultations in primary care facilitate SDM and improve patient outcomes?
- How can family members be involved in SDM and what is the impact of this? For example, what is the impact of making it the default option (with consent from the older person) to involve designated family members in consultations and discussions about treatment options? What models work best, what would be the uptake and how would it impact on satisfaction and patient outcomes?
- What service models are most likely to support SDM? For example, does moving away from disease-related checks in primary care to a more holistic and team-based regular review increase SDM and improve patient outcomes?
- How can health and care professionals other than doctors be involved in SDM?
- What is the impact of training members of the MDT to act as decision coaches for older people with complex health and care needs? Who should act as a coach and at what stage should coaching be provided?
- What is happening in SDM conversations involving older people and how are PDAs being used and to what effect? Can modes of communication, other than face to face, be effective?
- Can decision aids be developed for use with older people with multiple health and care needs? For example, rather than focusing on individual conditions can SDM be used to look more generally at the overall treatment burden for older people and their family members?
- How can patient decisions, goals and preferences be best recorded and communicated between different team members in integrated care sites?
- What would be the impact of overt discussions about prognosis? Would knowing more about an individual's views about coming to the end of their life shape decisions?
- How does working in a more patient-centred way, with a focus on SDM, impact on health-care providers' experience and satisfaction?

Study registration

This study is registered as PROSPERO CRD42016039013.

Funding

Funding for this study was provided by the Health Services and Delivery Research programme of the National Institute for Health Research.

Health Services and Delivery Research

ISSN 2050-4349 (Print)

ISSN 2050-4357 (Online)

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HS&DR archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hsdr. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Services and Delivery Research* journal

Reports are published in *Health Services and Delivery Research* (HS&DR) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HS&DR programme or programmes which preceded the HS&DR programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

HS&DR programme

The Health Services and Delivery Research (HS&DR) programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was established to fund a broad range of research. It combines the strengths and contributions of two previous NIHR research programmes: the Health Services Research (HSR) programme and the Service Delivery and Organisation (SDO) programme, which were merged in January 2012.

The HS&DR programme aims to produce rigorous and relevant evidence on the quality, access and organisation of health services including costs and outcomes, as well as research on implementation. The programme will enhance the strategic focus on research that matters to the NHS and is keen to support ambitious evaluative research to improve health services.

For more information about the HS&DR programme please visit the website: <http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hsdr>

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HS&DR programme or one of its preceding programmes as project number 15/77/25. The contractual start date was in July 2016. The final report began editorial review in August 2017 and was accepted for publication in January 2018. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HS&DR editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Bunn *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the EME Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Director of the NIHR Dissemination Centre, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Director, Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk