


# Cancer Patient Navigation Evaluation Findings



March 2004

# Cancer Patient Navigation Evaluation

---

## Final Report

**Confidential**

Reproduction in whole or in part is not  
permitted without the expressed permission of  
CCNS  
461-7005Q

*Prepared for:*

*Cancer Care Nova Scotia*

**March 2004**

© Crown copyright, Province of Nova Scotia,  
2004. May be reprinted with permission from  
*Cancer Care Nova Scotia* (1-866-599-2267).



1-888-414-1336

[www.cra.ca](http://www.cra.ca)

## Table of Contents

Page

### *Introduction*

|                                    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Background .....                   | 1  |
| Program Goals and Objectives ..... | 2  |
| Evaluation Overview .....          | 3  |
| Methodology and Analysis .....     | 3  |
| Executive Summary .....            | 15 |
| Key Findings .....                 | 18 |
| Conclusions .....                  | 26 |
| Recommendations .....              | 36 |

### *Patient and Family Focus Group*

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Detailed Findings.....                                 | 37 |
| Issues and Challenges .....                            | 37 |
| Key Supports in the Cancer Journey .....               | 42 |
| Communication Regarding Cancer Patient Navigation..... | 45 |
| Assistance Provided by Cancer Patient Navigators ..... | 47 |
| Areas in Need of Improvement .....                     | 50 |

### *Community Partner Focus Group*

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Detailed Findings.....                              | 53 |
| Issues in Navigating Cancer Care System.....        | 53 |
| Communication about Cancer Patient Navigation ..... | 57 |
| Understanding of Role .....                         | 59 |
| Benefits of Cancer Patient Navigation .....         | 61 |
| Limitations of Cancer Patient Navigation .....      | 64 |
| Moving Forward .....                                | 67 |

### *Health Professional Interview*

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Detailed Findings.....                                      | 68 |
| Communication on the Cancer Patient Navigation Program..... | 68 |
| Expectations of the Cancer Patient Navigation Program.....  | 69 |
| Referral Process .....                                      | 71 |
| Contact With Cancer Patient Navigators .....                | 73 |
| Benefits of the Cancer Patient Navigation Program.....      | 74 |
| Weaknesses of the Program .....                             | 79 |
| Moving Forward .....  | 80 |

*Cancer Patient Navigators, DHA Senior Leaders, and CCNS Interview* 33

Detailed Findings..... 83

    Cancer Patient Navigation Program Initiation..... 83

    Program Communications ..... 85

    Program Implementation..... 90

    CCNS Support ..... 93

    Team Fit..... 95

    Program Identity ..... 97

    Orientation and Education ..... 98

    The Cancer Patient Navigator Role ..... 99

    Overall Effectiveness of the Program ..... 108

    Benefits of the Program..... 110

    Limitations/Challenges of the Program ..... 114

    Moving Forward ..... 116

*Patient Survey* )

Detailed Findings..... 120

    Cancer Background ..... 120

    Overall Cancer Experience ..... 123

    Cancer Patient Navigation ..... 128

*Cancer Patient Navigation Database Review* 5

Detailed Findings..... 138

    Referral Overview..... 138

    Patient Contacts ..... 139

    Patient Characteristics..... 141

    Timeliness of Patient Referrals ..... 144

    Patient Referral Patterns ..... 147

    Source of Patient Referrals..... 149

    Patient Issues Categorization and Resolution..... 151

    Non-Patient Contacts..... 157

    Non-Patient Issues Categorization and Resolution ..... 160

*Appendices*

- Appendix A: Focus Group and Interview Guides
- Appendix B: Consent Forms
- Appendix C: Focus Group Screeners
- Appendix D: Patient Survey Questionnaire
- Appendix E: Patient Survey Data Tables
- Appendix F: Patient Navigation Database Tables

## Introduction

In Nova Scotia, more than 24,000 people are living with cancer, and approximately 5,200 new invasive cancers are being diagnosed each year.<sup>1</sup> Nova Scotia has one of the highest incidence rates of cancer in Canada<sup>2</sup> making it a predominant health issue for the province. A public opinion survey, conducted in 2001<sup>3</sup> for *Cancer Care Nova Scotia (CCNS)* indicates that cancer has touched most Nova Scotians directly or indirectly and is considered a primary health concern.

Across Canada, the development of an integrated, coordinated cancer system that insures optimum access and continuity has been identified as a serious challenge for cancer control.<sup>4</sup> There is a need to re-orient the system to comprehensive and coordinated care, improve continuity of care throughout the disease trajectory, integrate institutional and community based approaches, develop community resources to inform and support patients and balance patient and provider perspectives. Health service leaders are being challenged to develop an integrative model of care that provides access to a continuum of services, improves quality of care and reduces costs. Cancer Patient Navigation has been identified as an approach that may address problems related to integration, coordination and continuity in cancer care.

*Cancer Care Nova Scotia* identified the concept and need for Cancer Patient Navigation early in its mandate and commissioned research in 2000 to seek input from all stakeholders. The findings of the research<sup>5</sup> confirmed that patients and health professionals saw the need for a service coordinator like a Cancer Patient Navigator. The patient navigation study and round table discussions enabled *CCNS* to tailor its cancer patient navigation program to meet the expectations of patients, families and health professionals.



## Background

In February 2002 in collaboration with three “early adopter” health authorities, *CCNS* launched a Cancer Patient Navigation program. The three “early adopter” sites were: South West Health Authority (District 2), Pictou County Health Authority (District 6), and Guysborough Antigonish Strait Health Authority (GASHA, District 7).

<sup>1</sup> Saint-Jacques N, MacIntyre M, Dewar R, Johnston G. Cancer Statistics in Nova Scotia: An Focus on 1995-1999. Surveillance and Epidemiology Unit, Cancer Care Nova Scotia; 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Cancer Surveillance On-Line, Health Canada: 1999. <http://cythera.ic.gc.ca/slo/>

<sup>3</sup> Corporate Research Associates Inc., CCNS Public Opinion Study, 2001.

<sup>4</sup> Canadian Strategy for Cancer Control, Synthesis Document, Feb. 2001. Health Canada

<sup>5</sup> Corporate Research Associates Inc., CCNS Patient Navigation Study, 2000.





Cancer Patient Navigators are health professionals who are working in consultation with patients, families, physicians and the cancer centres to ensure cancer patients needs are appropriately and effectively addressed. They are assisting patients and their support networks by addressing challenges that may be unique to their particular situation or community. Patient Navigators strive to ensure both patients and their families have access to timely care and receive maximum community support.

## Program Goals and Objectives

The goals of the Cancer Patient Navigation Program are to:

- Ensure cancer patients and their families have the information, knowledge, and support they need as they journey through the cancer system;
- Assist family physicians, surgeons, community-based specialists, oncologists, and other health professionals provide optimal cancer care; and
- Enhance district health authorities capacity to care and support people with cancer and their caregivers.

The objectives of the program are to:

- Develop structures and processes necessary for timely access to patient navigators in the community;
- Better prepare cancer patients and families for their cancer journey by providing information and education about their disease;
- Decrease anxiety for patients/families with cancer;
- Coordinate access to care at the provincial cancer centres;
- Increase access to supportive, rehabilitative, and palliative care services for cancer patients and families in their own communities;
- Strengthen and support the role of family physicians and community-based specialists in cancer care;
- Improve collaborative/consultative relationships among cancer team members;
- Provide a single focus point for coordination and integration of cancer services;
- Provide cancer-related expertise to health professionals in the community;
- Gather evidence to make informed decisions about improvements to the patient navigation system; and
- Improve cancer education strategies and access to cancer services for a number of diverse communities.



## Evaluation Overview

An evaluation framework was developed early in the design of the program. Stakeholders were consulted to determine their expectations of the evaluation. In February 2003, the framework was peer reviewed by a panel of experts. In June 2003, Capital District Health Authority Research Ethics Board and ethic committees in two of the participating districts approved the study. Districts where ethic committees were not fully functioning, accepted the Capital District Health Authority Ethics Committee report. Following a competitive process, *CCNS* commissioned Corporate Research Associates Inc. (CRA) to conduct the evaluation.

The evaluation was a retrospective study conducted to:

- Clarify the role of Cancer Patient Navigator and best approaches to improve coordination and continuity of care;
- Determine effectiveness of processes used in navigation;
- Measure the impact cancer patient navigation has had on patients/families and health professionals particularly the family physician and medical oncologist;
- Measure the impact on the development, organization, and utilization of cancer services within the “early adopter” sites; and
- Describe issues relevant to implementation that should be considered as cancer patient navigation is phased into remaining health districts.

The evaluation had two key components. A process evaluation focused on understanding how Cancer Patient Navigation was implemented and operates. This involved an in-depth assessment of program activities during the development stages and operation of patient navigation during its first 18 months. The effectiveness of the structures, communication plan, referral process, orientation and continuing education schedule and reporting mechanisms that support patient navigation were reviewed.

An impact evaluation was also conducted to address whether patient navigation achieved its goals and objectives. It measured the value added to patients and families, health professionals and district cancer program development and utilization.

## Methodology and Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used to address the process and impact evaluation questions posed in this study. Multiple stakeholder groups participated in the evaluation, including patients and families, community partners, such as continuing care services, Canadian Cancer Society staff/volunteers, physicians, other community health professionals, staff at the three tertiary cancer centers, Patient Navigators, senior leaders in the “early adopter” districts, and key *CCNS* staff. The evaluation incorporated both



qualitative and quantitative research methods. Data for the evaluation was collected through 16 focus groups, 57 one-on-one interviews, 162 patient surveys, and a review of 808 records in the patient navigation database.

The mixture of qualitative and quantitative data sources strengthened the overall research design by allowing for in-depth insight in the qualitative components and more precise statistical measurement in the quantitative components. Multiple data sources allow for the determination of consistency, which strengthened the evaluation's conclusions.

Focus group discussions and in-depth interviews allow for in-depth probing with participants on a subject matter. This qualitative research method allows for more complete understanding of the segment in that the thoughts or feelings are expressed in the participants' "own language" and at their "own level of passion." Qualitative research is used as a means of developing insight and direction, rather than collecting quantitatively precise data or absolute measures. Due to the inherent biases in the technique, the data should not be projected to other populations.

Conversely, quantitative data is able to provide more absolute measures. The survey was conducted with a random sample of participants, which permits projection to the population of patients under study. Review of the patient navigation database, which consisted of records from all referrals, allowed for absolute measures.

The methodology and analysis is divided into several key sections including:

- Focus groups with patients and families;
- Focus groups with community partners;
- Health professional interviews (community-based specialists, family physicians, medical oncologists, community health care workers, and staff of the provincial cancer programs);
- Cancer Patient Navigators, DHA senior leaders, and CCNS staff interviews;
- A patient survey; and
- A review of the cancer patient navigation database.

To ensure all pertinent information was collected, focus group guides, interview protocols, and a survey questionnaire were developed by CRA in consultation with CCNS. Details on these different methodological components and the accompanying analysis follow.

## Ethics Review

In June 2003, Capital District Health Authority Research Ethics Board approved a peer reviewed evaluation protocol for scientific validity and ethical acceptability. Ethics reviews were also conducted in two of the "early adopter" sites where regional ethics committees



were established. In districts without formal ethics committees, the Capital District Health Authority Research Ethics Board review was accepted.

## Focus Groups with Patients and Families

### Design

Focus groups were held with patients and families in each of the “early adopter” sites. These focus groups investigated patients and families’ experiences with the cancer care system, including their issues, sources of support, and their experiences with patient navigation. Two focus groups were held in a comparison district without a Patient Navigator. The comparison focus groups examined patients and families’ experiences with the cancer system, including their issues and sources of support.

A total of seven focus groups were held in the “early adopter” sites during June and July 2003. The location of the patient focus groups is as follows: two in Pictou County Health Authority, three in South West Health, and two in GASHA. Three family focus groups were also held in “early adopter” sites. In the comparison site, one patient focus group and one family focus group were held in September 2003. Table 1 provides a summary of where the patient and family focus groups were conducted by group type.

| Table 1. Patient / Family Focus Group Locations |                |            |                  |                        |
|---|----------------|------------|------------------|------------------------|
| DHA   | Community      | Group Type | Number of Groups | Number of Participants |
| Pictou County Health                            | New Glasgow    | Patient    | 1                | 17                     |
|   | New Glasgow    | Family     | 1                |                        |
|   | Pictou         | Patient    | 1                |                        |
| South West Health                               | Digby          | Patient    | 1                | 27                     |
|   | Yarmouth       | Patient    | 2                |                        |
|   | Yarmouth       | Family     | 1                |                        |
| GASHA   | Port Hawksbury | Patient    | 1                | 16                     |
|   | Antigonish     | Patient    | 1                |                        |
|   | Antigonish     | Family     | 1                |                        |
| Comparison District                             | -              | Patient    | 1                | 11                     |
|   |                | Family     | 1                |                        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                    |                |            | <b>12</b>        | <b>71</b>              |



**Recruitment**

Patients in “early adopter” sites were recruited through lists generated from the patient navigation database. Patients were sent a letter from CCNS informing them of the study and requesting that they notify their patient navigator if they did not want to participate. Patients not wanting to be recruited were removed from the list. Family members in the “early adopter” sites were recruited through a mixture of referrals from the navigators, patients and local advertisements. Patients and family members in the comparison site were recruited through referrals from community health professionals and advertisements. CRA developed a screener (Appendix B) and recruited all participants.

Participants came from a variety of communities throughout the district. They were presented with background information on the research study and required to sign a consent form. Patient and family participants attending focus groups were given a \$50 honorarium to cover any expenses, such as travel or babysitting.

Altogether, 49 people participated in patient focus groups, 22 in family focus groups. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of patients who participated.

| Table 2. Patient Demographic Characteristics |                  |     |
|--|------------------|-----|
| Gender                                       | Male             | 33% |
|  | Female           | 67% |
| Age  | 18-30            | 2%  |
|  | 31-40            | 14% |
|  | 41-50            | 20% |
|  | 51-64            | 37% |
|  | 65 plus          | 27% |
| Type of Cancer                               | Breast           | 45% |
|  | Colorectal       | 12% |
|  | Brain            | 6%  |
|  | Lung             | 4%  |
|  | Prostate         | 4%  |
|  | Melanoma         | 4%  |
|  | Lymphoma         | 4%  |
|  | Kidney           | 2%  |
|  | Bone             | 2%  |
|  | Throat/Larynx    | 2%  |
| Other  | 15%              |     |
| When Diagnosed                               | Less than 1 year | 35% |
|  | 1 to 2 years     | 22% |
|  | 2 or more years  | 43% |



Table 3 summarizes the demographic characteristics of family members who participated.

| Table 3. Family Members Demographic Characteristics |                  |     |
|---|------------------|-----|
| Gender  | Male             | 23% |
|   | Female           | 77% |
| Age   | 18-30            | 0%  |
|   | 31-40            | 10% |
|   | 41-50            | 5%  |
|   | 51-64            | 62% |
|   | 65 plus          | 24% |
| Type of Cancer                                      | Breast           | 27% |
|   | Lung             | 23% |
|   | Brain            | 9%  |
|   | Throat/Larynx    | 9%  |
|   | Colorectal       | 5%  |
|   | Melanoma         | 5%  |
|   | Kidney           | 5%  |
|   | Bone             | 5%  |
|   | Lymphoma         | 5%  |
|   | Leukemia         | 5%  |
| Other   | 5%               |     |
| When Family Member Diagnosed                        | Less than 1 year | 45% |
|   | 1 to 2 years     | 27% |
|   | 2 or more years  | 27% |
| Relationship to Person With Cancer                  | Spouse           | 55% |
|   | Parent           | 18% |
|   | Child            | 9%  |
|   | Other            | 18% |

**Analysis**

All focus groups were tape recorded and later reviewed by focus group moderators. The tapes were reviewed to identify emerging themes, which were subsequently classified into specific categories. Once reviewed in their entirety, the proceedings from the focus groups were then compared with the same group type (patient or family) to identify consistent themes, and determine differences. To validate these findings, two senior researchers independently analyzed focus group proceedings and where differences in interpretation occurred, discussions were held until consensus was achieved. Interpretations are supported by direct quotes from focus group proceedings throughout the key findings.



## Community Partner Focus Groups

### Design

Community partners are organizations involved in providing services to cancer patients. These include various organizations such as the Canadian Cancer Society (CCS), other charities, Victorian Order of Nurses (VON), Community Health Boards, and support groups. In order to obtain the opinions of community partners, focus groups were held in each “early adopter” site. A focus group was held with staff of the Canadian Cancer Society in Halifax.

These focus groups investigated community partners’ perspectives on the cancer care system in general, and more specifically on patient navigation. Participants were questioned on how the cancer patient navigation program has impacted patients and family members and their organization. Three community partner focus groups were held during June and July 2003. Each group was approximately two hours in duration. Differences in views or experiences between CCS and other focus group participants are noted in the report.

### Recruitment

The Cancer Patient Navigators in each of the “early adopter” sites provided CRA with a list of potential community groups and organizations along with contact names and numbers that would be suitable for participation. Invitations were extended to these organizations via telephone. Participants were presented with background information on the research study and were required to sign a consent form.

Participants included a mixture from different organizations. Altogether, 31 people participated in community partner groups.

### Analysis

Focus group proceedings were tape recorded and later reviewed by focus group moderators. In addition, participants were asked to complete a written exercise to independently record their views on the patient navigation program. The same process of identifying common themes and subsequently developing categories was undertaken. Findings of each focus group were compared with one another and commonalities and differences noted. Where differences in interpretation occurred between the two researchers, discussions were held until consensus was achieved. Interpretations are supported by direct quotes from focus group proceedings throughout the key findings.



## Health Professional Interviews

Interviews were conducted with 40 health care professionals who provide services and care to cancer patients and their families in the districts. Input was received from health care professionals who provide care and services at the three provincial cancer centres; Nova Scotia Cancer Centre, Queen Elizabeth Health Science Centre, IWK Health Centre and the Cape Breton Cancer Centre. CRA recruited for the interviews from a list of potential participants provided by CCNS.

These interviews focused on health professionals’ experiences and perceptions of the patient navigation program. It examined the program’s impact on health care providers, the utilization and organization of cancer care services at the district level, and its ultimate influence on patient care and satisfaction.

Interviews were conducted in person when possible, otherwise they were conducted via telephone by one of two senior researchers at CRA. All interviews were conducted between June and September 2003. The interviews were generally between 10 and 20 minutes and were completed with a wide range of health professionals across “early adopter” sites. Table 4 provides a summary of health care professionals by occupational type.

| Table 4. Profile of Health Professional Interview Participants |                                  |        |           |
|--|----------------------------------|--------|-----------|
| Area   | Type                             | Number | Total     |
| Provincial Cancer Centres                                      | Oncologists                      | 3      | 10        |
|  | Nurse                            | 1      |           |
|  | Manager/Other                    | 6      |           |
| Pictou County Health   | General practitioner             | 2      | 12        |
|  | Specialist/Surgeon               | 2      |           |
|  | Nurses/Other health professional | 8      |           |
| South West Health  | General practitioner             | 3      | 11        |
|  | Nurses/Other health professional | 8      |           |
| GASHA  | General practitioner             | 2      | 7         |
|  | Specialist                       | 1      |           |
|  | Nurses/Other health professional | 4      |           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   |                                  |        | <b>40</b> |

All interviews were tape recorded with consent of participants and later reviewed. Additionally, notes were recorded from interviews. The review of these tapes and notes permitted identification of commonalities and differences between different health care professionals, as well as between districts. Findings from all interviews were compared to identify similarities and differences. Two senior researchers reviewed the tapes and notes and where differences in interpretation occurred, discussions were held until agreement was achieved. In order to demonstrate the conclusions derived from this evaluation, direct



comments expressed by those who were interviewed are included in the detailed findings of this report.

### Cancer Patient Navigators, District Senior Leaders, and CCNS Interviews

Interviews were conducted with patient navigators and senior leaders in “early adopter” sites. In addition, interviews were held with CCNS personnel involved in patient navigation. The purpose of these interviews was to understand how each district handled communications about the program and how patient navigation program had been implemented. Participants were also asked their opinions on the impact and success of the program to date, and its limitations and challenges.

Where possible, interviews were conducted in person; otherwise they were conducted via telephone. A senior researcher at CRA conducted all interviews during June and August 2003. Interviews with Cancer Patient Navigators and the Project Manager took approximately two hours per interview, while those with senior leaders and other CCNS staff ranged between 30 minutes to an hour. Table 5 provides a summary of district personnel interviews conducted.

| <b>Table 5. District Personnel Interviews</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>GASHA</b>   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cancer Patient Navigator</li> <li>• VP Community</li> <li>• VP Patient Care</li> <li>• Manager CA &amp; SC /PC HITH, Manager/MED Team, Coordinator of Cancer and Support Care Services</li> </ul> |  |
| <b>Pictou County Health Authority</b>  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cancer Patient Navigator</li> <li>• VP Community</li> <li>• VP Patient Services</li> <li>• VP Medicine</li> <li>• Head Nurse</li> </ul>   |  |
| <b>South West Health</b>   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cancer Patient Navigator</li> <li>• VP Community</li> <li>• VP Continuing Care</li> <li>• Site Manager-Shelburne</li> <li>• Site Manager-Digby</li> </ul>   |  |
| <b>CCNS</b>  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chief Operating Officer</li> <li>• Coordinator, Education and Patient Navigation</li> <li>• Cancer Patient Navigation Project Manager</li> </ul>  |  |



All interviews were taped recorded and later reviewed by a senior researcher and notes recorded for the interviews. The same analysis procedure was employed for interviews with health professionals, senior leaders and *CCNS* staff. Direct quotes obtained during this analysis are presented in the body of this report to demonstrate the conclusions drawn.

## Patient Survey

The survey consisted of 162 telephone interviews with patients, conducted between September 15 and October 2, 2003.

## Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was designed by CRA in consultation with *CCNS*. Prior to being finalized, the survey was pre-tested on a small number of respondents to ensure the appropriateness of the questions and response categories.

## Sample Design and Selection

The sample was drawn from a list provided to CRA by *CCNS* from the patient navigation database. The list consisted of all patients who had received the services of a patient navigator from program initiation to June 30, 2003. Patient Navigators reviewed the lists and excluded patients who have since deceased, were identified as seriously ill or had indicated they were unwilling to participate in the study. In total, 361 eligible records were provided.

An overall sample of 162 drawn from the population would be expected to provide results accurate within plus or minus 5.7 percentage points in 19 out of 20 samples. The margin of error would be larger for analysis by subgroups (i.e., analyzing the findings by health district, age, gender, etc.) due to the smaller sample size for these subgroups.

## Survey Administration

The survey was conducted by telephone from Corporate Research Associates' data collection facilities in Halifax. Fully trained and supervised interviewers conducted all interviewing, and a minimum of ten percent of all completed interviews was subsequently verified. Up to eight callbacks were used to reach selected respondents who were not available at the time of the call to ensure an appropriate representation of patients. The average length of time required to complete an interview was 17 minutes.

## Completion Results

Among all eligible respondents contacted during the interview period, the response rate was 81 percent. This represents an exceptionally high response rate. The response rate is



calculated as the number of completed interviews (162), divided by the total number of numbers dialed (361) minus ineligible numbers (25), those respondents who could not be reached during the interview period (118), and non-qualifying respondents (18). The final disposition of all telephone numbers dialed is shown in Table 6. Please note that 6 pre-test interviews were excluded, after a change was made in the questionnaire design.

| <b>Table 6. Completion Results</b>                                   |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>A. Total Numbers Attempted</b>                                    | <b>361</b> |
| Not in service   | 12         |
| Fax/Modem  | 1          |
| Wrong number   | 11         |
| Duplicate/Blocked number   | 1          |
| <b>TOTAL INELIGIBLE NUMBERS</b>                                      | <b>25</b>  |
| <b>B. Total Eligible Numbers</b>                                     | <b>336</b> |
| Busy   | 5          |
| Answering machine  | 32         |
| No answer  | 21         |
| Language   | 1          |
| Illness/incapable  | 18         |
| Qualified respondent not available/call-backs                        | 41         |
| <b>TOTAL RESPONDENTS THAT COULD NOT BE REACHED DURING THE PERIOD</b> | <b>118</b> |
| <b>C. Total asked</b>  | <b>218</b> |
| Household refusal  | 4          |
| Respondent refusal   | 26         |
| Mid-Terminate  | 8          |
| <b>TOTAL REFUSALS</b>  | <b>38</b>  |
| <b>D. Cooperative Contacts</b>                                       | <b>180</b> |
| Not familiar with navigator  | 6          |
| Deceased   | 9          |
| No cancer  | 3          |
| <b>TOTAL NON-QUALIFYING RESPONDENTS</b>                              | <b>18</b>  |
| <b>Completed interviews</b>  | <b>162</b> |
|  |            |
| <b>Response Rate</b>   | <b>81%</b> |



## Analysis

Analysis was conducted using SPSS. In addition to overall percentages, results were compared across key characteristics. Any demographic differences are noted throughout this report. However, these differences are not necessarily statistically significant, but may be directional in nature. These differences have been highlighted because, while they may not be statistically significant, they demonstrate important trends and differences that warrant mention.

Except where noted, all results are presented in percentages and have been rounded to the nearest whole number (in some cases, the total percentage may not add up exactly to 100 percent).

## Cancer Patient Navigation Database Review

At the beginning of the patient navigation program, CCNS developed a database to track all referrals made to the Navigators. Referrals tracked included those directly related to patients, as well as requests for assistance from non-patients such as family members, health professionals, support groups, or community organizations like schools. Information tracked included details on reasons for referral, the referral source, date of referral and diagnosis, cancer site, ICD oncology diagnostic code, patient characteristics (age, gender, location, address), family physician, and specialist. Issues were classified as one of three types information/education, coordination/integration or continuity. The actions taken to resolve issues was a check off box and more than one action could be taken to resolve an issue. The length of time to resolve issues was noted for workload purposes.

A data dictionary was developed and a data entry clerk completed data entry. Patient Navigators submitted completed patient data and issue logs to the Project Manager. Patient data logs recorded all pertinent demographic information about the client including reason for the referral and referral source. Issue logs tracked issues and actions required on initial referral as well as any follow up visits.

In total, 808 records were in the database provided to CRA for analysis. The analysis was conducted by CRA using SPSS. The database review covered the period from January 2002 to June 2003. In reviewing the analysis from the database, it is important to note some limitations of the database. Foremost, due to a data collection error in South West Health, non-patient client counts are inaccurate. Most non-patients were classified as patients. Furthermore, there were some inconsistencies noted during the analysis, which suggested there might be inconsistencies in the record keeping. Where problems appeared, the data was classified as missing. For some variables, namely patient type, issue type and referral type, design did not allow for multiple categorizations when multiple categorizations would have been appropriate. Therefore, these variables did not capture the full extent of the issues presented.



## Report Overview

The remainder of this report includes an executive summary, summary of key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The detailed findings of the Cancer Patient Navigation Evaluation are broken down into the following sections:

- Focus groups with patients and families;
- Focus groups with community partners;
- Health professional interviews (community-based specialists, family physicians, medical oncologists, community health care workers, and staff of the provincial cancer programs);
- Cancer Patient Navigators, district senior leaders and *CCNS* staff interviews;
- Patient survey; and
- Cancer patient navigation database review.



## Executive Summary

Results of the **Cancer Patient Navigation Evaluation** confirm that the program has significantly benefited cancer patients and their families in dealing with the emotional turmoil, informational needs and logistical challenges associated with having cancer. It has resulted in more efficient use of clinical time for physicians and more appropriate use of community health professionals. The program has contributed to overall improvements in the cancer care system itself by addressing problems related to integration, coordination and continuity of care. There is strong evidence to support the implementation of Patient Navigation in the remaining health districts.

This evaluation integrated information from a variety of different sources. It included 16 focus groups, 57 one-on-one interviews, 162 patient surveys, and a review of 808 records in the patient navigation database. Multiple stakeholder groups participated in the evaluation, including patients and families, community partners, such as, home care, Canadian Cancer Society staff/volunteers, physicians, other health professionals in the districts and at the cancer centers, Patient Navigators, senior leaders in the “early adopter” districts, and key *Cancer Care Nova Scotia (CCNS)* staff.

The evaluation confirmed that Patient Navigators have significant knowledge and awareness of the provincial cancer system and community supports and resources. Using this knowledge has played a key role in improving overall quality and consistency of cancer care in the district which has resulted in; more awareness and utilization of community supports, identification of community service gaps, increased collaboration among health care members, improved coordination between community services and tertiary centres, more consistency in cancer care, earlier referrals to oncologists and providing a new source of oncology expertise to the community. In addition to the introduction of the patient navigation program, many felt that the establishment of district cancer committees and *CCNS*’ direct involvement within both of these programs has served to give cancer care a high priority at the district level.

The program is meeting the expectations of health professionals, community partners, and senior leaders in the district. Patient Navigators are described as providing consistency in care by having one person from their area that is a constant for patients, health professionals and community partners throughout the cancer journey. This fulfils a supportive role for the patient, and helps provide better coordination and consistency of care in the district. Most district health professionals cannot imagine cancer care in the districts without a Patient Navigator and there is widespread support from senior leaders, health professionals and the community for the program’s continuation.

The consistently recognized benefits of navigation for patients and families include; providing emotional support, preparing them for their cancer journey, referrals to



appropriate health professionals, increasing their knowledge about cancer, helping with coordinating appointments, referral to community supports, assisting with the logistics of getting to cancer centers and finding sources of funding for medications and supplies. The results show that the Patient Navigators have become, for many patients and their families, a central contact and this assistance is highly valued. A comparison between patients' expectations and satisfaction with the services provided indicates that the Navigators are closely matching expectations in assisting patients and families with multiple issues.

Health professionals value the patient navigation program and credit the program with; better patient preparedness, providing more support for patients, improved collaboration among health professionals, more efficient clinical involvement with patients, and identification of service gaps. Navigators have become one of the primary sources of assistance for patients, along with family doctors, oncologists, and staff at the cancer centres. It was identified that the Patient Navigator does not replace other sources of support, but rather complements and reinforces the support, information and education provided especially by physicians.

Patient Navigators were acknowledged as a source of information for health professionals, and patients and families. Navigators are identified as the linkage among different components of the health and cancer system and as educating the cancer team to be more aware of services and actions other team members are providing. This is reducing duplication of services resulting in efficient and cost effective care. The increased collaboration that has occurred was attributed to the Navigator role and physicians noted that further strengthening these linkages would serve to improve efficiencies in patient care.

Various factors have contributed to the program's success. These include; commitment of district senior leaders, health professionals and all those involved in cancer care, extensive communications and having the right professionals in the Navigator positions. Patient Navigators need to have an understanding of cancer, extensive people skills, and be self-directed. The Navigators must also have or be able to develop an in-depth knowledge of the multitude resources available to assist cancer patients. Additionally, support from *Cancer Care Nova Scotia* was considered instrumental by district staff to the success of the program. *CCNS's* role includes not only financial support, but also the overall vision and direction for the program, providing and directing orientation and continuing education opportunities for Navigators and coordinating the network among them.

There are a number of challenges to be addressed by the program including; encouraging a greater number of referrals; increasing the timeliness of the referrals received; and more continuous communication about navigation with health professionals. For the districts with large geographical areas, strategies to ensure equal access to the navigator should be considered. As the program moves forward, careful monitoring of the roles and priorities of Patient Navigators, along with their workloads is recommended.



Navigation has been successful at integrating institutional and community based care and effective at balancing health professional and patient perspectives. Navigators have been able to improve patients' ability to cope with a critical illness which research has concluded is ultimately more cost effective care. Patient navigation has met its goals and the findings provide strong evidence to support cancer patient navigation implementation in the remaining health districts. All key processes and structures are in place to ensure program success and *CCNS* is prepared to take the program forward.



## Key Findings

### Key Finding 1

#### **Cancer Patient Navigation has improved the quality and consistency of cancer care in the districts.**

Community partners reported that having one person from their area that is a constant for patients, health professionals and community partners has improved consistency and quality of cancer care. This fulfills a supportive role for the patient, and helps to provide better coordination of care for health professionals. Patient Navigators serve as a linkage or interface between patients and families and the cancer care system. Community partners indicated that having a Navigator results in appropriate and timelier referrals to services for patients. They also indicated the Navigator is often the linkage for patients with provincial services.

A number of district service providers reported that their level of involvement with patients has increased especially for nurses working in continuing and palliative care settings. They reported being more aware of cancer patients' needs and thereby providing more services to a greater number of patients.

*“I have seen an improvement in care and communication with cancer patients and families from several points of view: 1) They have access to someone who will provide them with information and support as they go through their illness; 2) The Navigator has an excellent knowledge of available resources and has been providing good follow-up and referrals to appropriate people.” Community Partner*

Most community partners, senior leaders and health professionals, noted Navigation has improved development and utilization of cancer care in the districts. All participants who had the opportunity to work with Patient Navigators indicated they could not imagine the district without such a position. Improvements to the district cancer system as the result of navigation include; better awareness and utilization of community supports, greater consistency and coordination of care, increased and earlier referrals to oncology, increased contact between district and cancer centre, and more referrals to home care and palliative care.

*“Because she is there we are delivering better cancer care, we are providing more services to patients and there is an increased use of services.” Senior Leader*

Findings from Patient Navigators, senior leaders, and CCNS staff indicate that Navigators are identifying needed community cancer resources and services, such as patient education materials, counseling, home care and palliative care. Patient Navigators bring their



knowledge and experiences to various committees and clinical rounds, extending the knowledge about quality cancer care to the community team. Findings also indicate that the Patient Navigator has become the cancer professional with the most centralized knowledge of available community resources and services. This has facilitated appropriate referrals to other health professionals and services in the community. The database confirmed 92 new referrals made to home care, 62 referrals to palliative care, 134 referrals to CCS, and 124 referrals to support groups during the first 18 months.

Senior leaders and a number of health professionals indicated, that since the establishment of patient navigation, they perceive a greater awareness and collaboration among health professionals at the district level. Health professionals are referring patients to the right resources.

*“I find I am more involved than ever since the Patient Navigator because we are more aware now of all the new cancer diagnoses. The Patient Navigator has helped a lot...It has opened our eyes to the fact that these people have needs that are not being met, so we have looked at that, I have brought that up to my supervisor and the Patient Navigator and I meet with them and now we are offering supportive visits through home care Nova Scotia. The way that we do it is we give them teaching visits regarding their new cancer diagnosis. Before they weren’t offered that.” Nurse*

## Key Finding 2

**Cancer Patient Navigation is viewed as an integral component of district cancer services and there is widespread support for the program among health professionals, patients and families, and administrators.**

Participants overwhelmingly supported the continuation of the patient navigation program. In fact, when asked to rate how important it is to continue with a patient navigation program on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 was not at all important and 10 was very important, community partners almost exclusively gave ratings of 10 (although some indicated 10 plus), while a few individuals indicated a rating of 9. The program is now viewed as an integral component of cancer services in the “early adopter” districts bringing considerable benefits to cancer patients, their families and health professionals working with cancer patients. Patient navigation is viewed by the senior leaders and health professionals in the districts not only as essential, but critical.

*“It (Patient Navigation) is so fundamental to the goals of quality, evidence-based cancer services, client satisfaction and improved primary health care in the community.” Senior Leader*



*“A Patient Navigator is extremely essential to this area. Patients need this one on one support to go through their cancer journey. She relieves a lot of stress that most patients don’t need. The Patient Navigator pilot project is the best thing that has happened in this area for cancer patients.” Community Partner*

### Key Finding 3

**Cancer Patient Navigation is fostering collaboration and communication among health professionals and reducing duplication of services, which is attributed with more efficient and cost effective care.**

Forty interviews conducted with a wide range of health professionals working in the districts and at the cancer centers in Halifax and Sydney, found that the Navigators have met the majority of their expectations and in many ways have exceeded them. Health professionals expect Patient Navigators to provide assistance to cancer patients and their families as they journey through the cancer system, as well as foster communication and collaboration among health professionals. Health professionals indicated that the impacts of Patient Navigation include: better patient preparedness, more support for patients, improved collaboration among health professionals, and more efficient clinical involvement with patients.

Patient Navigators were acknowledged as a **source of information for health professionals**, as well as for patients and families. According to the database, health professionals and community groups looking for oncology information or education made up 24 percent of the 208 non-patient requests for assistance from the Navigators. A number of health professionals talked about Patient Navigators **linking together the different components of the health and cancer system**. Most felt that the cancer team was more aware of the services and actions other team members are providing. This helps to ensure that all members of the patient treatment team are aware of the patient’s status and treatments each member is providing. This can help avoid duplication of services resulting in efficient and cost effective care. This increased knowledge was attributed to the Navigator role and the physicians interviewed noted that further strengthening these linkages would serve to improve efficiencies in patient care.

*“Basically I see them as a liaison between myself, the family doctor and other health professionals ensuring that the patient has a smooth ride through the cancer system and when necessary arranging transitions to other services such as palliative care.”  
Oncologist*

Another positive outcome of the patient navigation program is the increased **collaboration and communication** that has taken place between health professionals, cancer patients and their families. A number of participants referred to the Navigator as the link among health professionals, especially the family physician and the staff at the cancer centres. Each



Navigator serves as part of a cancer care team in their respective district and attends clinical rounds as part of that team. Nursing staff and other professionals including home care staff, dietitians, physiotherapists, and occupational therapists are essential contacts for the Patient Navigators to gain information and to refer patients to when required. In turn, these health professionals are sources of referrals for Navigators. Health professionals expressed the view that when a patient's treatment team is aware of the patient's status and the services or treatments each team member is providing, there is reduced duplication of services and more optimal care. As the program continues, collaboration and communication can be further developed.

*“There is a lot more talk among health care professionals, between doctors and the staff with the Patient Navigator, there is more communication that way.” Nurse*

Navigators are viewed by many as the centralized source of cancer information and education that has resulted in better use of clinical time for physicians and reduced anxiety and distress for patients/families. Family physicians and specialists reported that patient navigation has allowed family physicians and oncologists to focus on the medical issues, knowing that someone else is looking after the logistical issues.

*“Since it started there is more coordination between surgeons, patients, family physicians, oncologists the whole team. There is more information sharing and families are more involved.” Nurse*

## Key Finding 4

**Cancer Patient Navigation has become an important source of support for patients and families in dealing with the emotional turmoil, informational needs and logistical challenges associated with cancer.**

Ten focus groups were held with patients/families in the “early adopter” districts to: discuss issues and challenges faced by cancer patients, identify their key supports, and share their knowledge and experiences with patient navigation. Two focus groups were also held in a comparison district, where patient navigation is not available, to identify patient and family issues and sources of supports. All patient/family focus groups identified the same issues and similar sources of supports. Patients in the comparison group felt their cancer journey might have been better if they had access to a central contact. These issues were confirmed by 162 patient surveys and findings from four focus groups held with community partners. The top four issues and concerns identified were (a) emotional impact /fear and stress, (b) dealing with physical symptoms/complications, (c) getting to cancer centers in Halifax and Sydney, and (d) coping with financial impacts.

Patient Navigators were identified as significantly benefiting patients and families by providing emotional support, preparing them for their cancer journey, increasing the



knowledge about their disease, helping with coordination of appointments, referring to community supports, assisting with the logistics of getting to cancer centers and finding sources of funding for medications and supplies. In the district without navigation, the comparison group identified the need for a central contact person as important. The database recorded 873 issues with a 94 percent successful resolution rate. The most common issues not resolved were financial assistance (25 percent) and emotional support (18 percent). No other specific issue comprised more than six percent. Patients and health professionals reported that those who were in contact with the Navigators were often better informed and less stressed. Database results indicate that 41 percent of actions taken by Patient Navigators in assisting patients involved the provision of information.

*“If we had had a Navigator, it would have taken some of the pressure off because here you are trying to get information and you don’t know what avenues you have open to you, you don’t know where to go and you don’t know what’s available.” Patient, Comparison Site*

*“I went through it (cancer diagnosis) without the Navigator and with a Navigator and definitely with the Navigator it is easier to get through. The first time there was no support, no Navigator or anything, fear takes hold of you and you can’t get a lot of your questions answered and it is a lot more stressful, not only on the patient, but on the family and everyone.” Patient*

Patients and health professionals reported that patients who were in contact with Navigators were often better informed, knowledgeable and supported. The patient survey and patient and family focus group discussions indicate that for many, the Patient Navigator has become one of the primary sources of assistance, along with family doctors, oncologists, and staff at the cancer treatment centres. It was identified that the Patient Navigator does not replace these other sources of support, but rather complements and reinforces the support, information and education provided especially by physicians.

*“She’s such an advocate for people, such a vital part of care of the patients.” Nurse*

*“I think patients who had come to see me having already worked with the Navigator were much better prepared...because a lot of the emotional, valid concerns had been aired to some degree. They were much more ready to listen, hear, and accept the treatment plan because they had done that work already and quite frankly, they can do that work with an oncologist, that is not the problem. The problem is a cost effective one.” Oncologist*



## Key Finding 5

**The referral process is open ended and flexible and is progressively moving forward as an automatic contact for patients with cancer.**

The program developed a written referral process with options remaining open for verbal referrals. Referral sources included patients themselves, family members and health professionals. Referrals came from different sources, which indicates program awareness is spreading across key groups. As indicated by the database reviews 63 percent of referrals came from health professionals, including family physicians, 20 percent were self-referrals while family members referred 13 percent. While not all cancer patients will need a Navigator or want to see a Navigator, it is an objective of the Navigation program to have all cancer patients aware of the service. Several health professionals report that they are progressively looking toward the Patient Navigator as the automatic contact for cancer-related issues.

Navigators reported satisfaction with the referral process, indicating that as long as they get the referrals it does not matter if it is written or verbal. The ability for patients or their families to self refer is an important aspect of the referral process. In the period reviewed one-third of all referrals were made by patients or their families

## Key Finding 6

**Communication initiatives about the Navigator role must be continuous and hard-hitting to ensure all are aware of cancer patient navigation.**

There were extensive communication efforts undertaken to inform the public and health professionals about navigation and its services including letters to (a) all physicians, (b) community presentations, (c) one-to-one contacts, (d) an official launch in each district, and (e) development of branding materials including a logo for patient brochures and posters.

Health professionals, particularly physicians, indicated that more continuous information about the role of Patient Navigators is needed. Physicians interviewed indicated they recalled seeing information early in the program. However, most family physicians have small numbers of newly diagnosed patients per year and do not automatically think of patient navigation.



*“The nature of the role (patient navigation) is such that it does require continuous advertising and you have to recognize that the average family doctor only has one to three cancer patients in their practice at any given time, so they may hear about or use the Patient Navigator service in February, but then not have any occasion to think about it for a year and so when out of sight out of mind. You can’t do a one off advertising/education process, it has to be continuous.” Specialist*

*“Substantial progress has been made in building program awareness. While the initial efforts were indeed intensive, this process needs to be ongoing and hard hitting to ensure it remains top of mind to everyone.” Family Physician*

A key challenge is to increase program awareness so all cancer patients can experience this support. Continuous communications will be required to health professionals in particular to ensure that all cancer patients and their families are aware of Patient Navigation and are accessing the program.

## Key Finding 7

**Comprehensive orientation and ongoing educational opportunities are necessary for the success of the program.**

The Navigator’s orientation plan is considered to be a key element in the ability of Navigators to better assist and support patients. Navigators reported it provided them with a better understanding of the process patients go through during their cancer experience and thus they are better able to provide necessary assistance to patients. The comprehensive orientation and ongoing education program established for the Navigators provided them with the opportunity to increase their oncology expertise and knowledge of the cancer system and process needed for coordination. It was an important way to be kept up to date on treatment protocols, care paths and establish credibility with the cancer team. The navigators presence at the cancer centres facilitated positive relationships with oncology staff and established buy in for the program.

## Key Finding 8

**A network of Cancer Patient Navigators, coordinated by CCNS, is collectively a strong asset to the cancer system.**

Consensus among district personnel was that patient navigation was effective in each district. They indicated that patient navigation has been one of the most effectively implemented programs. Strong commitment from the district and appropriate support and guidance from CCNS is integral to its success.



*“It is one of the most successful programs that I have ever been involved in...we thought it was going to be good, but it is better than our anticipated goals and objectives. Any other program that we have tried to do, there has been a catch, and there is a gap, or we haven’t been able to recruit the right people. In this case, none of that happened.” Senior Leader*

District personnel considered the connection and support from *CCNS* as an essential component. They unanimously desired a strong involvement on the part of *CCNS*. The role of *CCNS* ensures that standards of practice are established and followed in each district and that accountability within each district continues. *CCNS* coordination and management ensures quality of care, standards of practice, and access to provincial expertise and resources to the districts. A network of Patient Navigators, coordinated by *CCNS*, is collectively a stronger asset to the cancer system. *CCNS* can assist the Navigators with education and problem solving. Navigators rely on this support network in performing their job. Education of Patient Navigators was also considered a part of *CCNS*’ role and one that the Navigators personally thought was particularly valuable. The guidance and standards provided by *CCNS* and linkages to other districts was felt to help keep the program consistent throughout the province. Having the support of *CCNS* staff, the other Navigators, and district staff is an important source of support to Navigators. As a provincial body, *CCNS* should synthesize information from each district in order to provide evidence of issues in the cancer care system that need to be addressed by government.



## Conclusions

The following conclusions have been made relevant to each of the five key evaluation questions. The conclusions are supported by key findings.

### Conclusion 1

**The current role is matching expectations of patients, families, physicians and health professionals and there is a high level of satisfaction with the role.**

#### Expectations for Patients and Families


In the view of patients, families, physicians, health professionals, district leaders, community partners and the Navigators, the top priority for the patient navigation role is providing education, assistance and support to patients and families. Patients/families expect Navigators to; provide emotional support, increase the understanding about their disease, inform them on what to expect, coordinate and improve access to treatment, help with the logistics of getting to appointments and finding accommodations, and assist with dealing with financial impacts such as the costs of drugs and loss of income. The patient and family focus group discussions, patient survey, and database review, consistently identify the Patient Navigator as providing support in meeting these needs. Many patients report that the Navigator's support resulted in decreased anxiety, stress and fear.

*“While I was waiting to find out whether I had to have chemo, the Navigator contacted me.... Gave me information as to what will happen, came to my home. It was very satisfactory. The literature was up to date, very informative and basic to what I needed...My contact with her was reassuring I knew that there was someone to reach out to, someone to give me information if I needed it or wanted it.” Patient*



Figure 1 demonstrates the variety of assistance patients received from the Patient Navigator, as outlined by the patient survey. The survey results, along with findings from the focus groups, indicate that actual assistance received is meeting expectations.


Figure 1. Assistance Received From the Cancer Patient Navigator  
% Saying Yes



Source: Patient Survey


In the survey, patients were asked to evaluate the importance of various aspects of assistance from Patient Navigators. This is presented in figures 2 and 3 below. It is clear that patients expect the Patient Navigator’s role to be multi-dimensional. The high level of satisfaction further supports that the current role is matching expectations of patients. However, dealing with financial issues and logistical arrangements are areas where assistance is not rated as strong. These are areas where Patient Navigators have little control.

Figure 2. Important Aspects of the Cancer Patient Navigator  
% Saying Very Important



Source: Patient Survey

Figure 3. Satisfaction With Aspects of the Cancer Patient Navigator  
% Saying Very Satisfied



Source: Patient Survey



## Expectation of Health Professionals

The Cancer Patient Navigator role also encompasses assistance to health professionals. Based on the evaluation findings, health professionals' expectations for the Navigator position have a high correlation with the role. The role is credited with; better preparing patients for their visits to cancer centres, helping patients with logistical issues, allowing physicians to make more efficient use of time, working with cancer centres to coordinate patients' appointments and tests, and assisting with coordinating follow-up appointments locally. Because the role is a central contact person, health professionals have an expectation that the role could foster collaboration and communication among health professionals. Health professionals report that they are progressively looking toward the Patient Navigator as the automatic contact for cancer-related issues.

Health professionals frequently reported that patients who have received the services of the Patient Navigator were more prepared for their treatment visits. They reported that patients appear to be more aware of what to expect and what questions they should be asking. This required knowledge was seen as equipping patients with the skills and confidence they require navigating the cancer care system. Participants interviewed felt having this awareness prior to medical appointments and procedures helped to relieve some of the stress and anxiety patients frequently experience. Participants reported that navigated patients who wanted to take an active role in the selection of their treatment process appeared to be more knowledgeable. Simply knowing they have a specific person to turn to if any issues arise or if they have questions provided patients with an important sense of being supported.

*“Patients and families feel they are well supported in terms of accessing the system from initial diagnosis right through.” Nurse*

*“I think patients are definitely more aware of what to expect, what they should be looking for, what they should be asking for, time frames for various things that should happen. I think the patients overall are much better informed.” Community Health Professional*

Navigators felt their roles matched the intended functions of the position, however, a number of spin-off expectations had evolved. Navigators are frequently requested to be a member of any cancer related committee or initiative, both within the district and provincially. As the cancer care system in the districts gain momentum this could mean additional demands on Navigators' time for activities other than direct patient care. The program needs to be a balance between committee work and patient care, given that patient care is considered the most important component of the role.



The evaluation has concluded that the Navigator role is viewed as integral to the district cancer team. The role is seen as complementary and not a duplication. Key challenges for the role are heavy workload, burnout and covering extensive geographic areas. The database information suggests that proximity to the Patient Navigators' offices is linked to the likelihood of receiving referrals. Innovations that allow the Navigator to partner with community resources in more remote areas need to be formalized.

## Conclusion 2

### **Appropriate processes have been established in the cancer patient navigation program.**

The key processes involved in patient navigation are: communications, referrals, orientation/education, project management, data collection, and reporting. All of these processes were developed during the early stages of the program, in collaboration with CCNS, the districts and the Patient Navigators.

### **Communications**

A broad program communication plan is fundamental to establish broad awareness, uptake, acceptance and credibility. Interviews with Patient Navigators, senior leaders, and CCNS staff confirm that communication was a key priority. There were extensive communication efforts undertaken to inform the public and health professionals about navigation and its services including letters to (a) all physicians, (b) community presentations, (c) one-to-one contacts, (d) an official launch in each district, and (e) development of branding materials including a logo for patient brochures and posters. Both community partners and health professionals report they felt well informed of the program, having learned of it through various and sometimes multiple avenues.

*“The information is very well presented, it is very well written, it is very easy to understand for families and patients and it kind of gives them, especially when they are in crisis, it gives them something that is written that shows them that they are not alone nor will they be through this whole process.” Nurse*

### **Referral Process**

The program developed a written referral process with options remaining open for verbal referrals. Referral sources included the patients themselves or their families, health professionals, and community partners. Family physician referral was encouraged to enable the navigators to better support the family physician role. Patient Navigators indicated that most referrals are verbal. Attendance at various clinical rounds and chemotherapy clinics help Navigators identify potential patients. In some cases referrals sources are clinic nurses who notify navigators at the request from surgeons for automatic referral of all cancer



patients. Eighty-four percent of the 598 patients referred were newly diagnosed; fifteen percent had a recurring cancer, one percent was for other reasons. The Navigators have reached patients with various cancer types, however, patients with certain cancers are accessing the Navigators more often. Patients with breast cancer accounted for 28 percent of referrals, cancer of the digestive system 22 percent, and respiratory cancers 12 percent. Patients with genitourinary cancer appear least likely to be referred to the patient navigation program.

The average number of days between diagnosis and referral was 49. This remained relatively unchanged over the 18 months. Efforts to stabilize the consistency and timeliness of referrals are warranted. Patients reported in the focus groups they could have benefited even more from the service had they been in contact with the Patient Navigator at the time of diagnosis.

### **Orientation and Education**

Patient Navigators and senior leaders view the orientation and educational opportunities for the Navigators as both comprehensive and important. The orientation included an introduction to the cancer centres, a two-day oncology workshop at the QEII, and an overview of CCNS directions in cancer care. Ongoing education includes an eight-month continuing education program in oncology through the University of Alberta, participation in conferences, and ongoing sharing of current material, primarily through CCNS.

### **Program Management**

In terms of program management and accountability, each of the districts established different reporting structures. It was noted the Patient Navigators are generally self-directed and independent regardless to whom they report. They turn to various senior staff in their districts for consultation depending on particular issues and concerns. They also work closely with various medical and oncology staff to ensure appropriate care. The channels of reporting do not limit the role and working relationships. The role should be integrated with acute care, medical care and continuing care.

It is evident that there are multiple demands on Navigators' time. Workload and time management is important and there appears to be room for efficiencies. The Navigators in each district indicated the amount of paperwork required in their role is a frustrating aspect of their job, as there is a lot of duplication. Their suggestion is to reduce duplication or to have appropriate clerical assistance.



## Database


A database was developed for the program to track information on referrals and actions taken to resolve issues. This database provides an important source of continuous information that can be used for quality improvement for the program over time. The lessons learned from the early stages of the database design and use should be used to develop a more robust system.

## Conclusion 3

**Cancer Patient Navigators have had a positive impact on patients/families, health professionals and has resulted in improved community cancer care.**

Survey and focus group results confirm that patients are experiencing a multitude of challenges following a cancer diagnosis. The emotional impact and fear of the diagnosis are the primary concerns. Other issues and concerns identified through the patient telephone survey and focus groups include physical symptoms/complications, travel to cancer centres, and financial concerns, among others. Figure 4 captures the issues and concerns of patients, as outlined in the patient survey.

Figure 4. Issues and Concerns During Cancer Experience  
% Saying Yes



Source: Patient Survey

Health professionals identified a number of improvements that have occurred with the implementation of patient navigation. These include: (a) better patient preparedness, (b) more patient support, (c) improved communication and collaboration among professionals, (d) more efficient physician involvement with patients, and (e) identification of service gaps.

A number of family physicians and oncologists reported that the patient navigation program has **helped them focus on cancer patients' medical issues**. They explained that they are



not necessarily more or less involved with a patient, but rather the focus of their involvement has changed. They can focus more on the medical aspects of cancer patients' diagnosis and spend less time discussing logistics such as how to book appointments or where to go for tests. These physicians indicated Navigators help patients deal with the psychological aspects of having cancer, as well as assists them with such things as booking appointments, finding transportation and accommodations, and finding financial aid where necessary. This allows physicians to focus specifically on their medical area of expertise and was seen as being significantly more cost and time effective.

*"It hasn't changed the level of involvement. What it has changed is the nature of the involvement of a given visit. So the involvement may be more focused on treatment related issues or relapse specific issues or disease specific issues, as opposed to practical issues. I can sit there and talk to them about how to arrange a drive to their appointment, but that is a very, very expensive use of my time." Specialist*

*"It certainly has eased the amount of time that I have to spend with a patient on non-clinical issues and my secretarial time with patients having to describe where to go, when to go, procedures for follow-up with the specialists. It's been a boom in terms of time efficiency." Family Physician*

The Navigators are the central linkage when dealing with concerns outside of the cancer diagnosis and treatment. Patient Navigators, with their extensive knowledge of the cancer care system, can better coordinate care for patients, eliminating unnecessary trips to the province's cancer centres. This has decreased the burden patients face in arranging transportation and accommodations when they must travel to receive treatment.

The financial impact of a cancer diagnosis is identified as an issue needing patient navigation assistance. Patient and family focus groups, patient surveys, and interviews conducted with health professionals and community partners identified that Patient Navigators have been effective in helping many patients and their families access available funding sources and lobbying on behalf of patients. They are credited with discovering methods of accessing financial assistance that were previously not known to health professionals and the general public. The patient survey, found that 67 percent of patients were satisfied with the level of assistance the Navigator provided with financial issues. According to the database, Navigators were unable to resolve financial issues 25 percent of the time.

The findings of this evaluation indicate that patient navigation has also helped increase access to supportive, rehabilitative, and palliative care services for cancer patients and families in their own community. The Patient Navigators referred 62 patients to palliative care, largely in Pictou County Health and in GASHA where formal palliative care programs are established. South West Health did not have a formal Palliative Care Program during the evaluation period.



Findings indicate Patient Navigators are effective at coordinating the logistics of accessing the cancer system. Results indicate physicians, in particular family physicians and oncologists, do not have the time to do so nor are they fully aware of all the resources which can assist patients.

## Conclusion 4

**The program has been successful at bringing notable benefits to the development and utilization of cancer care in the “early adopter” districts.**

The evaluation considered the impact patient navigation has had on the development, organization, and utilization of cancer services. Those who participated in the community partner focus groups, along with district personnel, and health professionals indicated the program has been successful at bringing notable benefits to overall cancer care in their districts, including more awareness and utilization of community supports, identification of service gaps, increased collaboration among health care members, improved coordination of community services, and a new source of oncology expertise to the community. In addition to the introduction of the patient navigation program, many felt that establishment of district cancer care committees and CCNS’ direct involvement within both of these programs has served to give cancer care a higher priority at the district level.

A spin-off benefit of patient navigation, highlighted by a number of health professionals and leaders, was the identification of service gaps that exist at the district level. Service gaps frequently cited by participants included the financial burden, from the cost of prescription drugs and medical supplies to the cost associated with travel and accommodations and lack of support groups and in one district the lack of a formal palliative care program. While many acknowledged that the Patient Navigators have been very resourceful in addressing these issues, it was felt that more system-wide attention is needed to address patient financial burdens and palliative care services. The districts have begun to explore identified service gaps and are working on solutions to address them.

*“They have been able to feed back into those district cancer committees some of the gaps in their own districts and from the general discussions that we have had at different venues, you can see where these districts are taking this information and trying to move forward in improving things within their district. So I think they have been very instrumental in their districts in identifying the gaps and the things they need to improve.” Community Health Professional*

Health professionals, senior leader participants as well as those who participated in the community partner focus groups acknowledged that the patient navigation program was still in the early stages. While many improvements have taken place in terms of the development and organization of cancer care services at the district, participants felt that as



the program grows, more services will be established to meet the needs identified and as a result, the system will become more cohesive.

## Conclusion 5

### **CCNS leadership, district commitment and good communication are needed for successful implementation across the province.**

The evaluation has served to highlight important considerations as the patient navigation program is implemented in other health districts. There is widespread support for continuation of the patient navigation program among district staff, health professionals, community partners, and patients and families. The patient navigation program is now viewed as an integral component of cancer care services in each of the districts that were involved in early implementation.

There are a number of key elements identified for program success. These elements include:

- Strong commitment from the district to the program including commitment from clinical, continuing care and medical services;
- Recruiting a professional with the right skills and personality;
- Ongoing communication;
- Good working relationships and linkages with health professionals;
- Comprehensive orientation and ongoing educational opportunities; and
- *CCNS* leadership and expertise.

District personnel explained that support for the program has to be established among senior leaders and the board. They indicated it is important to build support from various community partners, citing that buy-in contributes to program success. A number of district personnel observed that more champions for the program, in the physician community, would facilitate greater awareness and buy-in from this key target audience.

Finding the appropriate person to fill the position was also deemed critical. Patient Navigators need to have the right knowledge and skills to be effective in the position, but they also need to have the right personality fit and level of dedication to make the program effective. They also need to be knowledgeable about community resources, about cancer and its treatment and be an effective educator. The position requires the ability to be self-managing in terms of the potential workload issues.

There needs to be linkages and working relationships with others in the district involved in cancer care. Patient Navigators must understand other health professionals' roles and make appropriate referrals. Good relationships and familiarity with the Patient Navigator will facilitate referrals.



District personnel considered the connection and support from *CCNS* as an essential component. District personnel unanimously desired a strong involvement on the part of *CCNS*. This ensures the continued coordination and management of quality of care, standards of practice, and access to provincial expertise and resources to the districts. A network of Patient Navigators, coordinated by *CCNS*, is collectively a stronger asset to the cancer system. *CCNS* can assist the Navigators with education and problem solving. Navigators rely on this support network in performing their job. Education of Patient Navigators was also considered a part of *CCNS*' role and one that the Navigators personally thought was particularly valuable.

Key challenges for the program include increasing the number and timeliness of referrals. The flexible referral process from multiple sources reduces the chances of patients being missed. More automatic referrals are also recommended to circumvent this issue. For *GASHA* and *Southwest Health*, the sheer geographical size of their district is a challenge. Strategies to ensure access across districts to patient navigation services should be considered. As the program moves forward, careful monitoring of the roles and priorities of Patient Navigators, along with their workloads, is recommended.



## Recommendations

The following recommendations are put forth based on the findings from the Cancer Patient Navigation Evaluation.

- The Cancer Patient Navigation Program should be implemented in the remaining health districts taking into account the key issues identified.
- CCNS should continue to take the lead in supporting and coordinating the patient navigation network.
- The responsibilities and priorities of the Cancer Patient Navigator must be clearly defined.
- The workload of the Cancer Patient Navigator must be continuously measured to determine appropriate balance, reduce administrative duplication, and provide appropriate clerical support where possible.
- The Cancer Patient Navigation Program should continue to address the spectrum of patient concerns and issues.
- Actions to increase the referrals rates should be undertaken.
- Consideration should be given on how to increase access to patient navigation services that ensures availability across all areas within districts.
- Ways in which patients with less frequently referred diagnoses can be reached should be considered by identifying particular sources (e.g., clinics, support groups, etc.) that could be targeted to better inform patients with different cancer types.
- The database should be redesigned to be more robust.
- Data entry by the Navigators should be considered to ensure consistent classification and data entry and to reduce the paper work.
- Communications about patient navigation with family physicians, community-based specialists and oncologists should be an ongoing process to ensure all cancer patients are aware and can benefit from the services of a Navigator.
- There is a need to work closely with community groups, organizations and agencies to ensure that access to cancer care resources at the district and provincial level are being utilized to their maximum capacity.
- Information gathered through the patient navigation program about gaps in required services and assistance in cancer care should be compiled and shared with the appropriate authorities.

