

Optimum Hospice at Home Services for End of Life Care: A Realist-Informed, Mixed-Methods Evaluation

Claire Butler,^{1*} Patricia Wilson,¹ Vanessa Abrahamson,¹ Rasa Mikelyte,¹ Heather Gage,² Peter Williams,³ Charlotte Brigden,^{1,8} Brooke Swash,⁴ Melanie Rees-Roberts,¹ Graham Silsbury,⁵ Mary Goodwin,⁵ Kay Greene,^{6,9} Bee Wee⁷ and Stephen Barclay.⁴

¹ Centre for Health Services Studies, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

² School of Biosciences and Medicine, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

³ School of Mathematics, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

⁴ School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

⁵ Lay author (member of the public)

⁶ Mary Ann Evans Hospice, Nuneaton, UK

⁷ NHS England, London, UK

⁸ Pilgrims Hospices, Canterbury, UK

⁹ National Association for Hospices at Home, Fareham, UK

*Corresponding author: c.butler-779@kent.ac.uk, [REDACTED]

Declared competing interests of authors: All authors were supported by funds from this project grant.

V Abrahamson has declared employment as a research associate at the University of Kent for the duration of this project and received funding from OPEL project to attend and present OPEL findings at the (on-line) 2021 International Conference for Realist Research, Evaluation and Synthesis. Feb 2021.

C Brigden has declared facilitating a support group for clinicians and academics involved in palliative care research projects, Kent & Medway Palliative care Research group.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Butler *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

B Swash has declared research funding for other projects from Macmillan Cancer Support and

Marie Curie and additional employment as Senior Lecturer at the University of Chester.

B Wee has declared her employer (Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust) is reimbursed for her time as National Clinical Director for End of Life Care, NHS England and NHS Improvement

Keywords: Hospice care, palliative care, community health services, terminal care, health services research, volunteers, bereavement care, charities, family caregivers

Important

A 'first look' scientific summary is created from the original author-supplied summary once the normal NIHR Journals Library peer and editorial review processes are complete. The summary has undergone full peer and editorial review as documented at NIHR Journals Library website and may undergo rewrite during the publication process. The order of authors was correct at editorial sign-off stage.

A final version (which has undergone a rigorous copy-edit and proofreading) will publish as part of a fuller account of the research in a forthcoming issue of the Health Services and Delivery Research journal.

Any queries about this 'first look' version of the scientific summary should be addressed to the NIHR Journals Library Editorial Office – journals.library@nhr.ac.uk

The research reported in this 'first look' scientific summary was funded by the HS&DR programme as project number 14/197/44. For more information visit

<https://www.journalslibrary.nhr.ac.uk/programmes/hsdr/1419744/#/>

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Butler *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HS&DR editors have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' work and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments however; they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this scientific summary.

This 'first look' scientific summary 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.

SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY

Background

The UK is a world leader in End of Life Care (EOLC) which has evolved from the hospice movement since the 1960s. Hospice at home (HAH) services aim to offer the quality and ethos of hospice care at home to support dying patients to have a “good death” and to provide patients with choice about where they receive their care at the end of life, which is central to UK policy. The majority of patients who express a preference state that they wish to die at home (although many do not express a preference for place) and the evidence indicates that the number of people expressing this wish is increasing. Establishing how care can be delivered and maintained at home was identified as a top ten research priority by the James Lind Alliance in 2015. Future projections demonstrate that the number of older people in the UK will increase over the next few decades and the number of deaths every year will rise. Provision of HAH services will be important to help meet this demand.

Prior to this study, the evidence for HAH services was mixed and demonstrated wide variation in service provision and the settings in which they operated. Published reports described individual services without comparators and reported a range of different outcome measures. Lack of clarity about what aspects of services produce which outcomes made sharing good practice between HAH services difficult and stifled efficient service development. It was therefore important to understand how best to deliver effective HAH services in a cost effective manner to achieve the outcomes desired.

Objectives

The study’s aim was to investigate the impact of different models of HAH on patient and carer outcomes and experiences of end of life care. Our over-arching research question was: What are the features of Hospice at Home models that work, for whom and under what circumstances?

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Butler *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This ‘first look’ scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

Objectives to address the primary research question were as follows:

1. Identify the range and variation of Hospice at Home models operating across England in terms of: patient criteria, organisation and delivery of services.
2. Categorise the models by type, setting and key features.¹
3. Select case studies of each model to enable an assessment of the impact of model type on patient and carer outcomes.
4. Investigate the resource implications and economic costs of patient care in each model.
5. Explore the experiences of patients, family carers, providers and commissioners of the different HAH models.
6. Identify the enablers and barriers to embedding HAH models as part of service delivery for end of life care.

Methods

HAH is a complex intervention and part of a whole system of health and social care delivery. The research design was informed by realist evaluation, a theory-driven methodology increasingly used to evaluate complex interventions, including services for end of life care.

The study was in three phases:

Phase 1 – national telephone survey

HAH services across England were approached to provide data to enable the development of a typology of service models (categorising the services into types) in terms of: service size, setting, staffing, funding, patient eligibility, service operations.

Phase 2 – case studies

Representative services from the different service types identified in Phase 1 were recruited to allow in-depth exploration of contexts, mechanisms and outcomes (CMOs). Patient and

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Butler *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

carer dyads were recruited on admission to HAH at each site. A mixed methods approach collected *quantitative data* comprising information about the patient and informal / family carer on admission to HAH and outcome measures from carers post bereavement (Quality of Dying and Death Questionnaire, QODD; achievement of preferred place of death, service satisfaction); *qualitative interview* data (from carers post bereavement, service providers and commissioners), analysed by repeated refinement through research team consensus meetings over an 18-month period; and *health economics* data, carer reported, patient service utilisation data using the Ambulatory and Home Care Record (AHCR) administered by telephone interview every 2 weeks between recruitment to the study and death.

Phase 3 - Stakeholder consensus

Two national consensus workshops were held, in London and Leeds, in early 2020. Participants included service providers, commissioners, researchers and members of the public. Emerging findings from the study and relationships between contexts, mechanisms and outcomes were presented to the stakeholders in a variety of workshops and formats, for discussion, refinement and validation.

Findings

Phase 1

Seventy (55% response rate) HAH services in England reported varied settings, activity, staffing configurations and patient criteria. Whilst almost all HAH services provided personal care, psychosocial support and symptom management, not all provided this 24/7. Most services provided care for between 1 week and 2 months from referral to death and reported using more healthcare assistants (HCA) than registered nurses (RN). Two thirds of services reported they were financed largely from charitable sources.

Categorising the HAH services/the typology

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Butler *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

Based on Phase 1 findings and study team discussion, four service models were defined by size (large vs small services, with a cut off of 365 referrals/year) and provision (or not) of 24/7 care.

Case study sites and recruitment

Twelve case study sites were recruited across the four models. Services were selected to represent a range of other factors: different areas of England, admission criteria, urban/rural, deprived/affluent, staffing mix (RNs and HCAs). A total of 339 patient-carer dyads entered the study. Interviews were conducted with 76 service providers, 9 commissioners and 76 bereaved carers.

Data collected on admission to HAH

Most patients recruited to the study had a diagnosis of cancer (76.8%); most informal/family carers were female (70.2%) and the spouse/partner of the patient (60.4%). Patient admission criteria varied widely; 48.0% had a modified Karnofsky performance status ≥ 50 , [range 0 (dead) to 100 (normal function)]. The duration of time in the HAH service also varied from a few hours to > 1 year and services commonly struggled to achieve discharge or transfer of care to other providers. Participants in model 1 (larger, 24/7 services) differed from those in other models - they were in the study longer (accepted by HAH further from death) and patients had better health status at recruitment.

Qualitative interview data

The qualitative interview evidence was used to refine programme theories into Context-Mechanism-Outcome configurations and 6 main themes emerged which impacted significantly on patient and carer outcomes: **Sustainability** (of the HAH service); **Volunteers** (use of, in the HAH service); **Integration and Coordination** (with the wider health and social care system, including commissioners); **Marketing and Referral** (of the HAH service); **Knowledge, Skills and Ethos** (of HAH staff); **Support directed at the carer or patient-carer dyad at home.**

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Butler *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

Primary quantitative outcome measure, QODD findings

- Median QODD score 70.7 (range 0 – 100, with 70 a 'good' death)
- Higher (i.e. better) QODD scores were elicited from female carers, from University educated carers, when patients had known they were dying for a longer time, and especially when patients had died at home or in a hospice
- When all items were adjusted for, smaller services (models 2 and 4, with and without 24/7 services) delivered a significantly higher (around 12 points) QODD scores.

Other quantitative measures

- 73% of patients achieved their preferred place of death, with no statistically significant difference between the 4 service models; 82.3% in model 2 (smaller, 24/7 services).
- 9% of patients who had been referred to HAH died in hospital.
- Most participants reported they received as much support from health and social care services as they needed; female patients reported a lower level of support; carers in model 2 were 8 times more likely to report receiving all of the support they needed.
- Carers overall rated the help and support they received as excellent. Better ratings were associated with university educated carers; worse ratings were associated with patients dying in hospital. There was a trend for carers in model 2 to report a better quality of support.

Health Economics findings

Home nursing or personal caring were the services most frequently accessed by participants. Service utilisation increased closer to death. In the last 2 weeks of life, the median number of nursing and personal caring visits was 1.76 /day and informal/family carers provided an average of 20 hours / day. Service utilisation and costs were lower in model 1 (larger, 24/7 services) than in the other models, but reasons for this could not be identified. Costs of

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Butler *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

informal care (valued by replacement cost methods) exceeded formal care costs in all models. More intensive in-home nursing and personal caring in model 2 (smaller, 24/7 services) coincided with better QODD scores, more patients dying in their preferred place (not significant) and higher carer satisfaction scores than in other models.

Synthesis of findings from the mixed-methods data

Achieving preferred place of death and reducing hospital admissions. HAH enabled the majority of patients to achieve their preferred place of death and patients who had been in HAH services had a very low chance of dying in the acute hospital setting compared to the national average.

Time to Care and expertise. Family/informal carers placed a high value on HAH staff in comparison with others (care agency staff, community nursing). HAH staff made them feel they had “time to care” and were clearly experienced in and comfortable with dying and death.

Caring for the Carer. Successful care at home depends heavily on the informal/family care set up. Services providing assessment, care and support directed at the family carer and taking into account the needs of the “home dyad” were highly valued. HAH services could usefully review their bereavement services as current provision was on the whole not providing what bereaved carers wanted; support from staff who had been involved in the care.

Hands on Care. - One way of understanding different models of HAH services that emerged was to place them on a spectrum from “medical” (higher grades of skilled, registered staff giving advice and prescribing medications) to “social” (focus on hands-on care). Hands on, relational care was particularly valued by carers in the period close to death.

HAH integration with health and social care systems; balancing internal and external investment. In terms of HAH service sustainability (of both funding and workforce), it emerged

that it was important in which direction HAH tended to have a predominant focus; either internally focussed (on staff support and development) or externally focussed (on external relations, reputation, educating others). A significant investment in either direction to the detriment of the other was unfavourable to service sustainability.

Service size and outcomes. Smaller services tended to deliver better outcomes, but the key features which any service could replicate were around speed of response to need, intensity of care provided and working closely with other services. Larger services provided other benefits worth imitating, in terms of earlier interventions and breadth of services. However, making early contact and then placing the responsibility for seeking further help onto carers was not found to be supportive.

Utilising volunteers. Whilst recognising the enormous contribution of volunteers to wider hospice services, volunteers were an underutilised resource in HAH. Most organisations were reticent about using volunteers to support patients at home who were close to death and suffering significant physical disability; linked to this were worries about safety and accountability. However, volunteers could be utilised in different ways: to provide support with domestic tasks in the home (as in the Covid-19 pandemic), to provide direct patient care where the volunteer has a professional background or in a looser model whereby hospices facilitate an approach more along the lines of compassionate communities and neighbourliness rather than “professionalising” volunteers and over-bureaucratising the arrangements.

Limitations

The data collection for the study relied heavily on informal/family carers both before and after the patient’s death, and we were therefore unable to recruit patients who did not have such a carer involved on a daily basis. We were not able to provide translation services and could not therefore recruit participants unable to complete questionnaires in English. We

omitted to gather data on the ethnicity of patients and carers which was a significant oversight and one that was highlighted at the consensus meetings.

A significant number of patients admitted to HAH services lived for longer than we had anticipated when the study was designed. As a result, not as many patients as estimated died during the study and thus post bereavement data was missing; in addition, the post bereavement response rate was lower than predicted. The QODD tool proved difficult and arduous for carers to complete resulting in missing items. This also had an impact on recruitment for post-bereavement interviews which were lower than expected.

Recruitment was slower than expected and more HAH services had to be included in the study to achieve the target patient sample size. As a result, there was heterogeneity of services within each model (except model 3: larger, not 24/7 services) and also variation in the numbers of recruits from different services. These factors meant that summed or averaged descriptors from each model (e.g. case mix descriptors or costs) were difficult to interpret. Services contributing a lot of recruits to a model tended to dominate in the quantitative and health economic analyses. Precision of estimates of service model effects was impeded by missing data, including service use. The allocation algorithm used to allocate service use reported by carers to time periods before death may have introduced some inaccuracies.

Conclusion and implications

For people approaching the end of their lives who wanted to die at home, HAH services provided care which was likely to deliver “a good death” and was highly valued by its recipients. Patients admitted to HAH services were likely to achieve their preferred place of death and unlikely to die in hospital. Learning from different models of HAH could be utilised to develop and improve services. Carers in one model (model 2: smaller, 24/7 services) reported receiving more ‘in home’ services and better outcomes. There was evidence that commissioners could improve the quality of end of life care for their populations by engaging with HAH services in future funding and development plans.

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Butler *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This ‘first look’ scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

Research recommendations

The study suggested areas for further research: HAH bereavement services, HAH utilisation of volunteers, timing and intensity of HAH input, further development of the QODD which was used for the first time in large numbers in the UK in this study.

Funding

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