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Background - Interprofessional Health Care Education & Older Adults

- Public health problem/issue
  - A deficiency in interprofessional health care education on the unique needs of older adults
  - Barriers to the integration of geriatric content in health sciences training programs
    - Availability of practitioners
    - Scarcity of educators with specialized training
    - Lack of geriatric exposure in educational programs
    - Low level of student interest
• **Strategies to enhance geriatric expertise & awareness**
  • Clear requirements in training curricula
  • Certification examinations
  • Geriatric Education Centers
The Geriatric Education Centers (GEC)

- Supported by Health Resources Services Administration (HRSA) grants of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

- **Purpose**: To support the establishment or operation of GECs

- **Mission**:
  - Target students, faculty, & practitioners in geriatrics
  - Improve their education & training

- Nationally there are 45 GECs

- Typically located in Academic Settings
The Eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware Geriatric Center (EPaD GEC)

- Established in 2005
- Specific focus on interprofessional (IPE) geriatric education in SE & NE Pennsylvania & Delaware
- Academic partners represented on the Steering Committee
  - TJU, Marywood University, the Commonwealth Medical College, U of Delaware, & Christiana Care Health System
  - **Lead organization**: JFMA, Division of Geriatrics
- 21 members
- Physicians, nurses, public health professionals, pharmacists, Occupational & Physical Therapists, & social workers
The Eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware Geriatric Center (Cont.)

**Mission:**
- To improve geriatric expertise among interprofessional students, faculty and practitioners to achieve measurable improvements for older persons.
- The organization is committed to improving the health and quality of life of older adults and their caregivers, translating new evidence and innovative practice models into practical applications, and creating effective curricula and programs.
EPaD GEC Interprofessional Training Programs

- **Online educational videos**
  - “Interprofessional Home Visit”
  - “Interprofessional Hospital Visit and Discharge Planning,”
  - “Interprofessional Team Care of an Acute Stroke Patient.”

- **Online clinical skills scenario exercises**
  - Detail the specific tasks of members of the interprofessional team in the settings of the educational videos

- **IPE Geriatric Grand Rounds**
  - Audio and PowerPoint slide recordings from interprofessional grand rounds sessions held in the service area
EPaD GEC Interprofessional Training Programs (Cont.)

- **Self-directed online learning modules**
  - “Depression Management”
  - “End of Life Care”
  - “An Interprofessional Approach to Chronic Conditions”
  - “Interprofessional Geriatric Transitions of Care and Discharge Planning”
  - “Using an Interprofessional Family Centered Approach to Dementia Care”
  - “Interprofessional Geriatric Oncology Care”
Geriatric Cancer
Epidemiology

• The 2nd leading cause of death of persons age 65 and over

• Cancer poses a significant health & financial burden on patients, families & the US healthcare system.

• Costs: $201.5 billion for total cost, $77.4 billion for direct medical costs, & $124.0 billion for indirect cost of mortality

• Rates are higher in older adults ≥ 65 as compared with younger adult sub-groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups (years)</th>
<th>Crude incidence cancer rate (per 100,000)</th>
<th>Crude mortality cancer rate (per 100,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-44</td>
<td>565.8</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>1,915.1</td>
<td>472.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>1,285.2</td>
<td>383.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>1,812.0</td>
<td>583.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>2,106.7</td>
<td>812.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>2,298.1</td>
<td>1,080.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>2,324.5</td>
<td>1,353.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>2,105.0</td>
<td>1,619.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific Issues of Older Adults with Cancer

- Comorbidities
- Polypharmacy
- Physical Frailty and Cognitive Impairment
- Cancer trial data based on younger patients and do not take comorbidities into account
- Therapeutic decision-making poses a unique challenge for patient, family, & medical team
EPaD GEC Geriatric Oncology Online Module

• Geriatric Oncology Online Module curriculum
  • 3 content areas related to the specialized considerations in the treatment and care of older cancer patients

1. Geriatric Oncology Risk Assessment for Treatment Options in Older Adults with Cancer

2. Decision Making for Older Adults with Cancer

3. The Older Adult Oncology Patient and Nutrition
EPaD GEC Geriatric Oncology Toolkit (TK)

• A companion to the online modules
• To further the educational utility of the module series
• To expand upon module resources & tools
• Resources for providers, patients, & caregivers
Project Goal

- To develop the EPaD GEC’s Geriatric Oncology online toolkit & assess its benefits for enhancement of interdisciplinary health providers’ knowledge and ability to assist older adult cancer patients and their families.
Specific Aims

- **Aim 1**: To develop the EPaD GEC’s Geriatric Oncology online toolkit
- To evaluate from the perspective of healthcare providers and students
  - **Aim 2**: The "organizational utility" (organizational framework, aesthetics and utility) of the EPaD GEC online toolkit
  - **Aim 3**: The content of the EPaD GEC online toolkit, & its ability to improve knowledge of supportive resources for older adult cancer patients and their families
Methods- Toolkit Development

- During the finalization of the Geriatric Oncology Online Module
- In conjunction with the EPaD GEC Steering Committee
- Jefferson IT personnel consulted to transform into a downloadable PDF format
Background- Assessment of Professional Online Learning Materials

• Utility of online materials & Health providers & online learning
  • Designers must create online resources that give a good first impression in a short amount of time
  • “E-learning” is successful in medical education- individualized & collaborative learning
Assessment of Professional Online Learning Materials (Cont.)

- Health providers and preferences regarding online learning
  - Health professionals are connected to the Internet
  - Not necessarily using the Internet for database research
  - Even with access to many forms of information, nurses and physicians turn to colleagues for recommendations
  - Unequal access among medical communities
    - Rural vs. urban; students vs. clinicians
    - Physical access, time available, skill sets
• Divided into 6 main sections based on the curricula of the three online modules
  • “Assessment”
  • “Decision Making”
  • “Nutrition”
  • “Ethnogeriatrics” (culture, beliefs, individual practices)
  • “Home & Community Supports”
  • “Public Benefits Programs”
Assessment

- **Target Population: Interprofessional Healthcare Students and Practitioners**
  - Convenience sample
  - Recruited via:
    - The EPaD GEC staff & steering committee
    - The Geriatric Oncology Multidisciplinary Group
Survey Development

- Created using Survey Monkey Software
- 18 questions
- Quantitative & qualitative: using Likert scale & open-ended questions
Survey Development (Cont.)

• **5 domains** created to represent project’s 2\textsuperscript{nd} & 3\textsuperscript{rd} aims

• **Domains 1-3: Organizational Utility**
  • Organizational framework (topic order, overall organization)
  • Aesthetics (layout, professionalism)
  • Utility (ease of use, skill needed)

• **Domains 4 & 5: Content**
  • Perceived usefulness
  • Respondent understanding of Geri-Onc treatment decisions
Analysis

• Survey data were collected and analyzed using Survey Monkey software

• Responses were further analyzed by participant discipline & level of training
  • The TK in conjunction with the modules
  • More neutral and/ or negative responses
Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Level of Training</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Examples of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medicine (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geriatrics (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Staff (TJU)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family Medicine (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Practitioner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Family Medicine (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geriatrics (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nutritionist (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oncologist (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychologist (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neurologist (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clinical Research Coordinator (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health/MPH – undefined level of training (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No response (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TK sections completed by respondents

3. Which sections of the Geriatric Oncology Toolkit did you review? (check ALL that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnogeriatrics</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home &amp; Community Supports</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Benefits Programs</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TK organizational utility

(N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: Professional &amp; Aesthetics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well organized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Content of TK
(N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend to students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Content of TK (Cont.)

(N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommend to healthcare professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share with patients &amp; family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time well spent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would use again</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TK content is new information for me

- **Level of training (N=22):**
  - Student: 5 agree, 1 neutral, 0 disagree
  - House Staff or LP: 3 agree, 2 neutral, 5 disagree
  - Other: 5 agree, 1 neutral, 0 disagree

- **Discipline (N=22):**
  - Geriatrics or Oncology: 1 agree, 0 neutral, 3 disagree
  - Family Med: 0 agree, 1 neutral, 2 disagree
  - Other: 12 agree, 3 neutral, 0 disagree
Should additional resources be added to the TK? (N=22)

- **Yes:** 18.2% (4)
- **No:** 81.8% (18)

**Example of Suggestions:**
- “More links to resources for specific types of cancers - locally and nationally”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents who Reviewed Modules &amp; Toolkit (7/23)</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Nutrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Student (Geriatrics)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geriatrician</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritionist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncologist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Medicine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Content- Understanding of Geriatric-Oncology Treatment Decisions (N=7)

- Can the TK enhance understanding of the modules?
  - **Risk Assessment & Decision Making**
    - Only agree/ strongly agree
  - **Nutrition**
    - **5 agree/ strongly agree, 2 neutrals**

- The TK in *conjunction* with the module increased understanding of **role** in treating older cancer patients
  - **5 agree/ strongly agree**
  - 2 neutral (both students)
Discussion

- **Strengths**
  - Aims achieved
  - Toolkit design
  - Participants represented disciplines that work with older adult cancer patients
Main themes & lessons learned

- Practitioners working in geriatrics & geriatric oncology were more likely to be familiar with TK content
- TK can improve efficiency & effectiveness
- TK may be an effective resource to educate graduate level medical students
- TK is effective as a stand alone resource
Limitations

• **Small Sample Size**
  • Members of desired sub-specialties not reached
  • **Students:** NP, Pharmacy, Social work, PA, PT, OT
  • **Practitioners:** Internal Medicine, Heme/Onc, NP, Pharmacist, or Social Worker
  • No patients or caregivers

• **Link to the EPaD GEC Online Learning Modules**
  • 15/23 respondents did not review the modules
  • Survey was created to understand the utility of the TK in conjunction with the Modules
  • Is difficult to adequately evaluate without additional input from individuals who reviewed both the TK & modules
Recommendations for the EPaD GEC

• Targeted Dissemination of TK
  • Oncology, Geriatrics, Family Medicine
  • Single location for resources
  • Locations options:
    • PDF version in office- print out appropriate sections when needed
    • University’s Intranet
    • Electronic Medical Records
Recommendations for the EPaD GEC (Cont.)

- **Training Tool**
  - Target residents and fellows
  - Oncology, Geriatrics, and Family Medicine
  - Use EPaD GEC members as trainers
  - Remain on EPaD GEC website

- **Include in TK’s Introduction:**
  - “A person will achieve the most benefit when reviewing the TK in conjunction with the online learning modules”
Conclusions

• The EPaD GEC should continue to develop online TKs to enhance resource knowledge & access of the online modules

• With the continued growth in the older adult population, & the greater prevalence of cancer in older adults, there is a continuing need to educate interprofessional health care providers on the specialized needs of older cancer patients
References


References (Cont.)

Thank you!