Financial Navigation: An Intervention for Reducing Cancer-Related Financial Toxicity in NC Oncology Care Settings



Michelle L. Manning, MPH Deputy Director, Administration Comprehensive Cancer Support Program Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center

Email: mmanning@unc.edu

### Learning Objective

Use new knowledge to support cost-effective decision-making without compromising the quality of patient care and to support patients in navigating financial impact of cancer care.

### Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

Michelle L. Manning, MPH has no real or apparent financial relationships to disclose.

**DEVENUES** U.S. International Politics Lifestyle Entertainment Health ---

The Washington Post

**Health & Science** 

HEALTH

Medicare Pays \$415M Annually For Breast Cancer Screenings in Women Over 75



364 Medicare spends almost as much money screening for breast cancer as it does treating it,

CANCER BASICS

#### **Economic Impact of Cancer**

The financial costs of cancer are high for both the person with cancer and for society as a whole.

The Agency for Healthcare research and Quality (AHRQ) estimates that the direct medical costs (total of all health care costs) for cancer in the US in 2015 were **\$80.2 billion**.

• 52% of this cost is for hospital outpatient or doctor office visits

• 38% of this cost is for inpatient hospital stays



IN DEPTH

#### **Patients Struggle With High Drug Prices**

Cancer treatment costs can be prohibitive, even with insurance

Michelle Andrews October 10, 2011

The Washington Post

Health & Science

Tackling the financial toll of cancer, one patient at a time

By GARDINER HARRIS MARCH 1, 2016



Waste in Cancer Drugs Costs \$3 Billion a Year, a Study Says

The New Hork Times https://nyti.ms/OA0x88

The Opinion Pages | OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR

#### In Cancer Care, Cost Matters

By PETER B. BACH, LEONARD B. SALTZ and ROBERT E. WITTES OCT. 14, 2012 AT Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, we recently made a decision that should have been a no-brainer: we are not going to give a phenomenally expensive new cancer drug to our patients.

The reasons are simple: The drug, Zaltrap, has proved to be no better than a similar medicine we already have for advanced colorectal cancer, while its price - at \$11,063 on average for a month of treatment - is more than twice as high.

Out-of-pocket costs for pricey new drugs leave even some insured and relatively affluent patients with hard choices on how to afford them

April 9, 2016

## **Financial Toxicity**



The adverse financial impact of cancer is a source of significant harm to patients, also known as *financial toxicity*, and affects ~30% of cancer patients (Kent et al, 2013, *Cancer*)

The financial burden of cancer has been linked to:

- Lower quality of life (Lathan et al, 2015, JCO; Zafar et al, 2015, JOP)
- Greater psychological distress (Yabroff et al, 2015, JCO)
- Delayed or discontinued treatment (Zafar et al, 2013, Oncologist)
- Bankruptcy (Yabroff et al, 2015, JCO; Ramsey et al, 2013, Health Affairs)
- Mortality (Ramsey et al, 2016, JCO)

## Summary of Cancer-Related Financial Challenges

- Heavier burden of financial toxicity in metastatic, black, and rural populations
- Lack of **systematic and ongoing identification** of financial need
- Identifying those who report the **most distress** may not capture those with **highest material need (greater financial insecurity).**
- Lack of coordinated, streamlined applications once need is identified
- Lack of resources for **underinsured**
- Lack of a **dedicated navigator** to assist patients and families through financial aspects of care



### What should "financial navigation" look like?

Patient with cancer-related financial needs



Meaningful financial and clinical outcomes



# UNC-CH Innovation Grant to Pilot Financial Navigation

- <u>Goal 1</u>. To develop a financial distress screening strategy for NCCH patients
- <u>Goal 2</u>. To design, implement, and evaluate a new financial navigation clinic for 50 NCCH patients who screen positive for high levels of financial distress
- Funded by UNC Center for Health Innovation (1 year; \$49,749)

#### COST (Comprehensive Score for Financial Toxicity)

	Not at All	A Little Bit	Some- what	Quite a Bit	Very Much
I know that I have enough money in savings, retirement or assets to cover the cost of my treatment.	0	1	2	3	4
My out-of-pocket medical expenses are more than I thought they would be.	0	1	2	3	4
I worry about the financial problems I will have in the future as a result of my illness or treatment.	0	1	2	3	4
I feel I have no choice about the amount of money I spend on care.	0	1	2	3	4
I am frustrated that I cannot work or contribute as much as I usually do.	0	1	2	3	4
I am satisfied with my current financial situation.	0	1	2	3	4
I am able to meet my monthly expenses.	0	1	2	3	4
I feel financially stressed.	0	1	2	3	4
I am concerned about keeping my job and income, including work at home.	0	1	2	3	4
My cancer or treatment has reduced my satisfaction with my present financial situation.	0	1	2	3	4
I feel in control of my financial situation.	0	1	2	3	4

Souza, Jonas A., et al. Cancer 120.20 (2014): 3245-3253

## Study Design

- Study opened Jan 5, 2019
- Eligible patients:
  - All cancer types
  - Referred by care team or social work
  - Scored less than 22 points (indicating significant FT) on the COmprehensive Score for financial Toxicity (COST) instrument
- All 50 patients approached screened positive for FT, were eligible for full navigation intervention, and enrolled within 6 months
- Outcome data collection included pre/post-intervention COST scores, patient satisfaction with the intervention, and intervention fidelity

### Intervention Components

- Intake assessment of financial needs and vulnerability
- Initial one-on-one consultation with a trained FN
- Triage to financial support services matching patients' needs
- Multiple follow up appointments (every 2 wks) with navigator assistance based upon:
  - Review of patients' employment status, income, assets, billing and insurance status
  - Referral to appropriate resources offered by the hospital, government, nonprofit and private corporations
  - Assistance with application completion and tracking of application status
  - Provision of checklist of resources they were eligible for and the required paperwork

#### **FN Pilot Intervention**



## Intake Form Sections

- A. Demographics and Treatment Questions
- **B.** Financial Information
- C. Expenses (bills/dept)
- D. Assets/Savings
- E. Employer Based Benefits/Income
- F. Health Insurance & Coverage
- G. Employer Based or Student Health Insurance
- H. Private/ACA Health Insurance
- I. Medicare
- J. Medicaid
- K. Uninsured

$\left[ \right]$	<b>4</b> :	* *	×	
C		•	4 T	

## **REDCap- Data Collection, Tracking**



rd information, such as a l Fany).	list of all users with acces
Project Statistics	
Records in project	17
Most recent activity	11/19/2020 3:40pm
Space usage for docs	1.19 MB

PID 2342

A Project Revision History

🗄 Upcoming	Calendar Eve	ents (next 7	days)

```
Time
                     Description
       Date
```

## Patient Demographics (n=46)

- Mean age: 48 years old
- 61% female
- Race -61% White, 30% Black, 9% Other
- 80% less than college degree
- 85% not currently working
- Health Insurance- 39% uninsured, 28% public, 33% private
- Median monthly income: \$800

### Impact of FN Intervention on COST Score



### Implementation Outcomes

100% completed intake form 98% (n=45) applied for financial assistance 96% (n=44) received financial assistance



#### Number of Patients Receiving Benefits

### Patient Acceptability



Agree Disagree Neither agree nor disagree

### Study Limitations

- Small sample size, no control group
- One site
- No data on treatment status

## NCI R01 & P30 Administrative Supplement

**Aim 1.** Characterize rural and non-rural oncology practice context to prepare for FN implementation

**Aim 2.** Assess FN implementation determinants and implementation outcomes in rural (& non-rural) oncology practices.

**Aim 3.** Evaluate the effectiveness of FN in improving patient outcomes of care in rural (& non-rural) oncology practices.

### Grant Conceptual Model

#### The Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR)



Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. Implement Sci. 2009;4:50.

### Study Schema



## Our Network- NC Cancer Survivorship Professionals Action Network (NC-CSPAN)



blue shaded counties are counties with active NC-CSPAN sites

\*indicates R01-engaged rural practices participating in FN; +indicates non-rural practices participating in FN through the new supplement

## Study Partners (n=9 sites)

#### **Rural Community Partners**

- Carteret Health Care Cancer Center
- Nash UNC Health Care
- The Outer Banks Hospital
- UNC Lenoir Health Care
- Pardee UNC Health Care

#### **Non-Rural Community Partners**

- CarolinaEast Health System
- Novant Health
- Vidant Medical Center
- Wake Forest University Health Sciences



## Lessening the Impact of Financial Toxicity

Stephanie Wheeler, PhD MPH Donald Rosenstein, MD Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

## Aim 1: Characterizing the Sites

- Aim 1 Measures (navigators and stakeholders):
  Stakeholder interview guide
  Organizational readiness survey (ORIC)
  Organization-specific process map
- Aim 1 Results:
  - 9 process maps
  - 78 Organizational Readiness for Implementing Change(ORIC) individual surveys across sites
  - 76 interviews over Zoom (transcribed and analyzed)

#### Aim 1: Process Maps



R

## Aim 1. Organizational Readiness for Change

	Overall	Rural	Non-rural
People who work here	(N = 71)	(N = 41)	(N = 30)
Change Efficacy Scale	n (%) Agree/Somewhat Agree		
feel confident that the org. can get people invested in implementing this change.	93% (64/69)	95% (39/41)	89% (25/28)
are committed to implementing this change.	93% (63/68)	95% (38/40)	89% (25/28)
feel confident that they can keep track of progress in implementing this change.	93% (64/69)	93% (38/41)	93% (26/28)
will do whatever it takes to implement this change.	94% (65/69)	95% (39/41)	93% (26/28)
feel confident that the organization can support people as they adjust to this change.	88% (60/68)	98% (40/41)	74% (20/27)
want to implement this change.	93% (64/69)	95% (39/41)	89% (25/28)
feel confident that they can keep the momentum going in implementing this change.	91% (62/68)	93% (37/40)	89% (25/28)

NOTES:

Scaled responses were dichotomized into 'agree/somewhat agree' and 'disagree/somewhat disagree/neither agree nor disagree'. Missing values excluded from percentage calculation.

## Aim 1. Organizational Readiness for Change

	Overall	Rural	Non-rural
People who work here	(N = 71)	(N = 41)	(N = 30)
Change Commitment Scale	n (%) Agree/Somewhat Agree		
feel confident that they can handle the challenges that might arise in implementing this change.	88% (61/69)	90% (37/41)	86% (24/28)
are determined to implement this change.	93% (63/68)	95% (38/40)	89% (25/28)
feel confident that they can coordinate tasks so that implementation goes smoothly.	91% (63/69)	93% (38/41)	89% (25/28)
are motivated to implement this change.	96% (66/69)	95% (39/41)	96% (27/28)
feel confident that they can manage the politics of implementing this change.	83% (57/69)	88% (36/41)	75% (21/28)

NOTES:

Scaled responses were dichotomized into 'agree/somewhat agree' and 'disagree/somewhat disagree/neither agree nor disagree'. Missing values excluded from percentage calculation.

### Aim 1. Intervention Fit

Several factors positively influenced the fit of the financial navigation intervention at oncology clinics:

- (1) Intervention is in alignment with clinic's values
- (2) Universal enthusiasm for an additional mechanism to help patients
- (3) Presence of existing structures and communication pathways to assist patients with financial needs

## Aim 1. Intervention Fit- Values & Enthusiasm

• Staff expressed a universal desire to help patients:

"I think we have a fantastic team, and they're very committed to this, committed to our patients, you know, people here love their work. The program is growing rapidly, we have a fabulous medical staff...that...you know, so **wholeheartedly support our patients, and our community, and our team**." (Clinic 2)

- Staff routinely expressed excitement about the FN intervention:
  - Help to reach more patients & reduce burden on staff currently helping patients
  - Ensure that patients follow-through with FA applications by having a single person dedicated to patient financial needs

## Aim 1. Intervention Fit-Existing Structures

Existing systems will provide structure within which to implement the FN intervention.

- Structured referral processes (i.e., distress screening)
- Multiple opportunities for staff to discuss or assess patient needs (due to small size of cancer center)

"So, there's lots of avenues of helping the patients as far as getting their treatments. But it starts from the very beginning of when we get the referral." (Clinic 2)

### Aim 1. Intervention Success Factors

#### **Patient Considerations**

- Sensitivity needed in approaching patients about finances
- Patients can have difficulties balancing the stress of their diagnosis and finances
- Flexibility

#### **Organizational Considerations**

- Identifying physical space in clinic for navigator
- Clearly define roles
- Ensure leadership and staff are supportive of FN



## Aim 2: Assess FN Implementation Determinants/Outcome

- Provided Comprehensive Financial Navigation Training (n=21)
  - ACCC Financial Bootcamp Levels I and II ~ 7 hours
  - Study-specific training ~5 hours
    - 3 day model
    - 5 day model
  - Human subjects training ~5 hours
- Developed a SOP manual
- Monthly Peer Support Calls and Site-Specific Technical Assistance Calls
- Pre/Post Interviews/Surveys with navigators and other stakeholders

## LIFT Website (cancercosts.org)





### LIFT Website (cancercosts.org)

FN Forum

PAF Referral

Study Background & Training

Pt. Resources

FORMS TO ANNOUNCE THE PROGRAM TO PROVIDERS & PATIENTS (ALSO IN



**PUBLICITY FORMS:** 

-Class Recruitment Script

-<u>Email Announcement for</u> \_<u>Site Providers</u>

-<u>Financial Navigation Flyer</u> <u>Template</u>

-<u>Educational Resource Handout Template</u> (Financial Resources for All Patients)

-Phone Script for Participant Recruit

PATIENT FORMS: SITE SPECIFIC CONSENT & HIPPA FORMS



[sp\_easyaccordion id="1882"]

+ CarolinaEastHealthSystem\_Consents&HIPPA

+ Carteret HealthCare\_Consents&HIPPA

+ NashUNCHealthCare\_ConsentsandHIPPA

+ NovantHealth\_ConsentsandHIPPA

+ OBXHospital\_ConsentsandHIPPA

+ UNCLenoirHealthCare\_ConsentsandHIPPA

#### PATIENT FORMS (ALSO IN REDCAP)



#### PATIENT FORMS:

Baseline Assessment Forms: -Pt. Consent Form Documentation Survey -LIFT Patient Quick Reference Study Guide \*add your own contact info to this -Cost Survey -Patient Outcomes Survey -Pre-Patient Experience Questionnaire

Initial Appointment Forms -Financial Intake Form survey -Initial Appointment Summary

#### Patient Resources



to their care. Let us help you find ways to address these concerns.\* FOR MORE INFORMATION CHOOSE FROM THE OPTIONS BELOW: *<b>IUNC* Health LINEREDGED Insurance COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER Here at UNC Health Insurance **Housing Assistance** Organizations that can **Medication & Treatment** Help Cost Assistance Transportation/Travel Work Seniors & Caregivers \*This list is meant to be used as a guide and is not comprehensive. The information provided was the most current information available at the time of the publication. Some material may change or become dated. The sponsors and individuals listed assume no responsibility for time

Website

Financial and Legal Assistance

A cancer diagnosis can affect so many parts of our lives, including finances. We all know that even

without cancer finances can cause stress in our lives. Many people have unplanned expenses related

Handout



### Aim 3: Patient Outcome Surveys

Survey	Description
Patient Outcomes Surveys- PROMIS global health, emotional distress-anxiety, depression scales; psychosocial illness impact scale	Total: 24 questions Asks patient about psychosocial issues, general health and symptoms over the last 7 days
Patient Experience Questionnaire	<b>Total: 33 questions</b> Asks patient about employment disruption, caregiver cost burden, food insecurity, and care altering behaviors
Patient Perspective Survey	<b>Total: 18 questions</b> Asks patient about satisfaction with the program and materials

## **REDCap- Data Collection, Tracking**



rd information, such as a l Fany).	list of all users with acces
Project Statistics	
Records in project	17
Most recent activity	11/19/2020 3:40pm
Space usage for docs	1.19 MB

PID 2342

A Project Revision History

🗄 Upcoming	Calendar Eve	ents (next 7	days)

```
Time
                     Description
       Date
```

### The Patient Advocate Foundation

- The Patient Advocate Foundation (PAF) is a national 501 (c)(3) non-profit charity that, for 25 years, has provided patient navigation and direct financial support to patients with chronic, life-threatening and debilitating diseases to help access recommended treatment regardless of their income or insurance status.
- PAF will provide external complex case management services for patients in the LIFT study, patients with severe and complex access to care and/or financial needs that extend beyond what can be supported by existing financial resources that you have tried.

## Aim 3. Evaluate Effectiveness

- COST screener to determine level of FT
- Patient outcomes surveys (health related QOL)
- Financial Intake Form
  - Includes patient-specific data: Individual financial situation, employment status, monthly income, billing information, insurance status, resources, referrals and benefits
- Initial Appointment Summary
  - Re-cap of eligible benefits/referrals along with paperwork needed
- Mid-Program Check-In Form (every 2 weeks re: progress)
- Patient Outcomes Surveys again with Pt. Perspective Survey (acceptability and satisfaction) surveys

## How It's Going...

- Started recruiting patients in Dec 2021/Jan 2022
- Recruitment ends June 2023
- 12 patients enrolled so far
- Patients are appreciative
- The intervention is time intensive
  - Consent/Baseline Surveys
  - Intake Process
- Navigators like the intervention structure

### Conclusions

- Health insurance expansion is *necessary, but insufficient* to address cancer-associated financial burden.

- Additional interventions, such as *financial navigation* (Shankaran, 2017, JCO), to prevent and mitigate financial harm are urgently needed.



- Important to identify patients with *psychosocial distress, high material burden, and potentially harmful coping strategies (not just one dimension of FT)* 

## Thank You to Our Study Team and Funders

#### **UNC Study Team**

- Stephanie Wheeler, PhD, MPH
- Donald L. Rosenstein, MD
- Sarah Birken, PhD
- Cleo A. Samuel-Ryals, PhD
- Katherine Reeder-Hayes, MD
- Michelle Manning, MPH
- Mindy Gellin, BSN
- Neda R. Padilla, BS
- Caitlin Biddell, MSPH, PhD student
- Victoria Petermann, RN, PhD student

#### **Advisory Board**

- Katie Gallager, Patient Advocate Foundation
- Rachel A. Greenup, MD
- Mark Holmes, PhD
- Jennifer Leeman, MPH, DrPH, Mdiv
- Catherine L. Rohweder, DrPh MDiV
- Chris Shea, PhD
- Patient member from each partner site

#### Funders

UNC Health Care Center for Innovation National Cancer Institute