

Hospice UK National Conference

Example 3: Abstract likely to be accepted

Title: Advance Care Planning (ACP)

Background: A nursing care home, implementing the Gold Standards Framework for Care Homes [GSFCH] programme², approached their local hospice community palliative care team for Advance Care Planning [ACP] support. All the residents in the nursing home had dementia. They were requesting assistance with ACP conversations as undertaking these was a key component of the GSFCH programme they were implementing.

Aim: To enable all residents living in the nursing care home to have a documented individualised personalised care plan and evaluate the impact of these plans.

Method: The palliative care team reviewed the literature. An audit was co-created and undertaken with the nursing care home staff, and other professionals, supporting them. Staff in the care home also attended an education session on audit and ACP which included information on mental capacity and best interest decisions². ACP was role modelled. Data was collected monthly, for six months, on ACP documentation, including the residents preferred place of care [PPC] and death [PPD].

Results: Following the review of the literature as all residents had dementia, Future Care Planning [FCP] was undertaken not ACP. Care home staff attended training. During the six months FCP was completed for n=22/30 residents. Throughout the audit admissions to the hospital had occurred [n=15] as had deaths in the hospital [n=10]. Known FCP preferences guided these decisions. The audit showed preferences regarding PPC and PPD were met.

Conclusion: ACP made a difference to the residents living in the nursing care home as staff knew their preferences and could act on them.

251 words

References:

1. Gold Standards Framework Care Home Training Programme <https://www.goldstandardsframework.org.uk/care-homes-training-programme> accessed 21st February 2024.
2. Froggatt K. (2000) Palliative care education in nursing homes. Macmillan Cancer Relief, London.

Comment This is an innovative subject and interestingly described. I would have liked a bit more detail for example the number of staff attending training and were all residents preferences on ACP met or just some.		
Total abstract score is Section 1 + Section 2 =		13/18
Your recommendation (please indicate your 1st and 2nd choice)		
<u>2nd Choice = Oral presentation</u>	<u>1st Choice = Displayed poster</u>	Decline
Additional comment: <i>Please use this section to note anything else that you feel is of importance e.g.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Abstracts which you want to particularly recommend for oral presentation or poster - or to be declined.</i> ○ <i>Abstracts for which you want to explain more about why you have made a recommendation.</i> ○ <i>Anything else you want to say about your submitted scores and comments.</i> <p><i>Use this section also to note a score of zero for work in progress which does not have Results / Conclusions content.</i></p>		
The abstract is well structured. It would have benefitted from more detail in the methods and results especially as it is only 250 words. In addition FCP is recognised to be important not ACP. The heading and conclusion still say ACP.		

Study descriptions

- Audit: A quality improvement cycle where care delivered is measured against a pre-determined standard.
- Quality Improvement: The systematic use of tools to improve safety, effectiveness, and experience of care.
- Research: A systematic approach that uses scientific methods, and results in the creation of new knowledge.
- Unclear/Uncertain/Other: For anything else which is not covered by the categories above.

Acknowledgement: Based upon work by Julie Kinley and Melanie Taylor, 2024