

**Palliative Care: A focus on identification – Workshop 2 – SPICT, AnticiPal and e-FI**

This workshop introduced delegates to 3 identification tools; SPICT, AnticiPal and e-FI. To view the presentation please follow the image below.



For further information about any of the tools within this workshop please contact:

Michelle Church (SPICT) – [michelle.church2@nhs.net](mailto:michelle.church2@nhs.net)

Bruce Mason (AnticiPal) – [bruce.mason@ed.ac.uk](mailto:bruce.mason@ed.ac.uk)

Graham Ellis (e-FI) - [g.ellis@nhs.net](mailto:g.ellis@nhs.net)

After the presentation delegates were ask to form into groups and discuss a number of questions, drawing out the facilitators and barriers to their implementation in practice, while also bearing in mind their own local contexts.

### How can we use the tools in practice?

<p><b>Facilitators:</b>          DNs – ACP – interventions              Reduce inappropriate admission              - Frailty screening tool              Care staff          Care home liaison          Care at home services          Key professional            Conversation          3<sup>rd</sup> sector – support worker</p>	<p><b>Barriers:</b>          Time          Lack of integration              - Health / social care              - How to escalate decline              - How to articulate/record decline          Lack of care home liaison nurses          How to identify the gap between moderate to severe frailty          Language barrier / medical models          Too many tools</p>
<p><b>Local context:</b> -IJB decide tools to be used                            -MDT                            - Reduced documentation                            - Lead for individual patient</p>	

### How do we narrow the lists to individual people to support?

<p><b>Facilitators:</b>          Look for the change over time          HHG – top score          Need for common language to help people understand what is being said          Cancer focus is strong</p>	<p><b>Barriers:</b>          Loss of trust in electronic lists as it false positives in lists          Difficult to get a single diagnosis          Not trust in HHG          Cancer big focus, missing others          Lack of resources to focus on early identification</p>
<p><b>Local context:</b> People with frailty are missed most                            Palliative care register used for ID</p>	

**When should we be using the tools (if earlier identification is a goal)?**

<p><b>Facilitators:</b>          Not too late          Regularity of use (monthly)          Use of triggers          Engagement and involvement of all stakeholders including care at homes, care homes, carers</p>	<p><b>Barriers:</b>          Potential confusion ...when to use which tool          Lack of shared / common language (between individuals and families and between different agencies / professionals)           Wider benefits from this</p>
<p><b>Local context:</b> Variation across practices          Variation in which tools have been chosen/selected/used in given areas</p>	

**What do you do with the lists/people?**

<p><b>Facilitators:</b>          MDTs          Clinical assessment          Red/Amber/Green status used – determine who to discuss / focus on          Identification of key worker          Enables prioritisation          Supports signposting – getting right help/ support at the right time          Integration – HSCP – has enabled wider participation and support, more effective use of lists (variation in different areas)</p>	<p><b>Barriers:</b>          Storage          Privacy          Data protection?          Do patients need to be aware they are on a list?          Lack of integrated systems to support effective use of the lists          Care homes / hospices – not sure how they could access          Capacity in terms of time          Pilot had additional resources – for GPs – for first stage of work – not available in later stages          Lack of buy in – for roll out</p>
<p><b>Local context:</b> Enhanced community support team individual GP practices (P&amp;K) is an enabler (in addition to MDTs)          Variation in terms of engagement / investment with MDTs          Evidence (P&amp;K) – reduction in hospital admissions/ readmissions</p>	

**Who is going to follow it through (what do we do with the list)?**

<p><b>Facilitators:</b>          Educators          Identify an appropriate person to lead          Tools are more refined          Desire is there to improve          Integration and joint working          Increase knowledge of ACP and care planning          There is a cultural change about discussing death and dying          Realistic medicine          Multi professional involvement in discussions</p>	<p><b>Barriers:</b>          Time          GPs busy and hold list          Everyone is busy          GPs may not share list          Different languages          Systems          GDPR – what can we share          Health vs social care model          Unrealistic expectations of what is possible          Uncomfortable talking about difficult issues</p>
<p><b>Local context:</b> Local leads in some areas are proactive          Common language</p>	

**How do we approach a patient from eFI person?**

<p><b>Facilitators:</b>          eFI          MDT          ACPs          Valuing partners</p>	<p><b>Barriers:</b>          Resource (people)          eKIS          Perceptions          Sharing information          Valuing partners</p>
---	--

For more information on identification tools please follow the link to view the Identification Tools comparator:

