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Caring for older adults in their preferred location of care: An evidence based intervention study to support safe transition from long-term care back to rural and remote northern communities
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Background

“Quality Of Life (QOL) of older adults may be improved when the person is able to live and be supported in their preferred setting of care”

CIHR's Institute of Aging—

- Community based care can have:
  - Reduce physical symptoms and psychological distress
  - Improve wellbeing, independence, and access to formal care providers
  - Reduce health care expenditures

But…

What happens when older adults are in the wrong place???
Background

Assumptions

- Anecdotal evidence in northern BC up to half of LTCF residents do not exhibit clinical need for the level of care provided by LTCF
  - Community based “alternative setting of care” (ASC)
  - What is the resident’s preferred setting of care??
  - Lack of process and precedents for discharge to the community
- LTCF resident discharge to an ASC will free up occupied beds and thereby may relieve waitlist demands for LTCFs.
Background

• Assumptions
  ◦ Anecdotal evidence in northern BC up to half of LTCF residents do not exhibit clinical need for the level of care provided by LTCF
    • Community based “alternative setting of care” (ASC)
    • What is the resident’s preferred setting of care??
    • Lack of process and precedents for discharge to the community
  ◦ LTCF resident discharge to an ASC will free up occupied beds and thereby may relieve waitlist demands for LTCFs.

• Data already exists to start to create the evidence base
  ◦ Need to mobilize this knowledge in to action
Background

- Literature from the US
  - Short stay LTCF residents (<90 days)
  - Relationship to Medicare funding system and discharge

- Canadian research
  - LTCF to hospital and emergency departments (OPTIC study)
  - Lack of generalizability to rural, remote, or northern communities
  - Focus is often to divert persons before entry to LTC
Current Research Project

Objectives:

A. Create a comprehensive evidence based profile of LTCF residents eligible for discharge in NH;

B. Develop, implement, and evaluate a pilot supporting resident discharge back to community settings; and

C. Inform health care decision making processes and policy in NH to develop discharge protocols for LTCFs
interRAI

Who

International, not-for-profit network of ~60 researchers and health/social service professionals

What?

Comprehensive assessment of strengths, preferences, and needs for vulnerable populations

How?

Multinational collaborative research to develop, implement and evaluate instruments and their related applications
The interRAI Suite of Assessment Instruments

- **Home Care (MDS-HC)**
  - Contact Assessment

- **Complex Continuing Care, Long Term Care (MDS 2.0)**

- **Acute Care**
  - ED Screener

- **Mental Health**
  - Inpatient
  - Community
  - Emergency Screener
  - Plug-in Modules

- **Intellectual Disability**

- **Palliative Care**

- **Post-Acute Care-Rehabilitation**

- **Community Health Assessment**
  - Functional supplement
  - Assisted Living supplement
  - MH supplement
  - Deaf blind supplement
Using interRAI Assessment Instruments

Care Planning

Clinical Assessment Protocols

Outcomes

Quality indicators

Case-mix
Can Inform Systems Level Decisions: Are People in the Right Place?

What should be the “shape” of the health care system?

Distribution of the Cognitive Performance Scale in Various Care Settings
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How does NH determine the Selection Criteria?
Background on Selection Criteria in Northern Health

- Request from case managers
  - Needed an objective way to determine appropriate admission candidate
  - Based on clinical need
- Focus team (content experts) included case managers, RAI team & managers
- April - October 2010 majority of work completed
- May 2013 – New policy implemented
Purpose of Refining Decision Support Tool

- Identify:
  - “Right” person (population) for residential care
  - Services/care options (innovations) needed to support people to remain in the community

- Ensure consistency across Northern Health

- Enhancing community capacity
How Does Someone in Residential Care Look?

- Late stages of life span
- Frail
  - Significant functional losses
  - Significant cognitive losses
- Need 24 hour professional care
- Difficult behaviours
- Unable to be supported in the community
Client Criteria

Based on Ministry definitions (MoH 6.C. p.1)

- Severe continuous behavioural problems
- Moderate to severe cognitively impaired
- Physically dependent with medical needs that require professional nursing care
- Clinically complex that require professional nursing care/monitoring/specialized skilled care)
# Clinical Profile

## Assessment: RAI-Home Care 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Scales</th>
<th>Reference Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADL Long Form (0-28)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADL Short Form (0-16)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADL Self Performance Scale (0-6)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADL Difficulty Scale (0-6)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADL Involvement Scale (0-21)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Performance Scale (0-6)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression Rating Scale (0-14)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESS (0-5)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain Scale (0-3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPLE Score (1-5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reliance Algorithm</td>
<td>Level 2 - Not Self Reliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Care Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure Ulcer Risk (0-8)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Variables in Eligibility Criteria

- **Method for Assessing Priority Level (MAPLe)** indicates risk:
  - for caregiver burnout,
  - premature admission to residential care,
  - inappropriate admission to acute care
- **ADL Hierarchy** – disablement process
- **ADL Long Form** – how much help needed (dressing, toileting, eating, transfers, locomotion, bed mobility, hygiene)
- **Cognitive Performance Scale (CPS)** - Cognitive Losses
- **Behaviour Symptoms**
## Decision Support Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Criteria</th>
<th>Supporting Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All appropriate community based resources have been tried and exhausted.</td>
<td>There are five combinations of criteria that support placement. Work across the row.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCC policy description</th>
<th>RAI-HC description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAPLe</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to severe cognitively impaired</td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical dependent with medical needs that require professional nursing Needs a planned program to retain or improve functional ability</td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS, ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical complex – multiple disabilities and/or complex medical conditions</td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous severe behavioural problems</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any two of the following: E3a = 2 Wandering E3b = 2 verbally abusive E3c = 2 physically abusive E3d = 2 socially inappropriate E3e = 2 resists care E4 = 1 changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision Support Tool Exception
Dementia Alternative Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Criteria</th>
<th>All appropriate community based resources have been tried and exhausted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAPLe</td>
<td>CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- To prioritize this group consider:
  - Safety risks due to no informal care provider
  - Safety risks due to informal care provider expresses distress
Thank you very much
Questions or Comments?

Shannon Freeman
Post-Doctoral Fellow
Dept. of Health Sciences,
University of Northern BC

shannon.freeman@unbc.ca
(250)960-5154

Mary Henderson-Betkus
Lead, Clinical Program Standards,
Home and Community Care
Northern Health

Mary.Henderson-Betkus@northernhealth.ca