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Learning objectives

After this course, participants should be able to identify

1) Technical elements of SDM from patient-clinician conversations, and

2) Aspects that can make SDM humanistic
Agenda

What is (not) SDM?

Background: technical vs humanistic SDM

How to assess technical vs humanistic SDM?

(Moving forward)
Shared decision making
Shared decision making

✓ Foster choice awareness

✓ Provide information

✓ Discuss patient preferences

✓ Make final decision
(Uncaring) Shared decision making
(Uncaring) Shared decision making
(Uncaring) Shared decision making
Review

Do SDM studies consider humanistic aspects of communication?

• All statements in papers
• All items from SDM measures used

Kunneman et al. (2019) Patient Educ Couns
Review

14 / 154 studies (9%)

included ≥1 statement on humanistic communication

7 / 192 SDM measures used (3.6%)

assessed aspects of humanistic communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanistic measure</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISQ <em>Doctors’ Interpersonal Skills Questionnaire</em></td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>‘Ability to listen to the patient’, ‘Respect shown to patient’, ‘Concern for patient as a person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE <em>Consultation and Relational Empathy Scale</em></td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>‘Letting you tell your “story’”, ‘Showing care and compassion’, ‘Really listening’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAHPS <em>Consumer Assessment of Health Plans and Systems</em></td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>‘Did your physician listen carefully to you?’, ‘Did this physician show respect for what you had to say?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4HCS <em>Four Habits Coding Scheme</em></td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>‘Shows interest in impact on patient’s life’, ‘Displays effective non-verbal behavior’, ‘Allows time for information to be absorbed’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM <em>Consultation Care Measure</em></td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>‘Was interested when I talked about my symptoms’, ‘Was sympathetic’, ‘Was interested in the effect of the problem on my family or personal life’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM measure</td>
<td>Perspectiv e</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION12</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>‘The clinician explores the patient’s concerns (fears) about how problem(s) are to be managed’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CollaboRATE</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>‘How much effort was made to listen to the things that matter most to you about your health issues?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPPIN’SDM</td>
<td>Observer/Self-report</td>
<td>‘Clinician and patient discuss the patient’s expectations (ideas) and concerns (fears) about how to manage the concrete problem’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM-scale</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>‘Interruptions’, ‘Rapport building’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS-O</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>‘Enquires about patient’s psychosocial status’, ‘Patient voice 1 – Opportunity for patient to discuss personal meanings and lifestyle factors relevant to decision about standard treatment’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessing SDM: Think, pair, share

Read the transcript

Which elements are present, and where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Foster choice awareness</th>
<th>No / Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Provide information</td>
<td>No / Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Discuss patient preferences</td>
<td>No / Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Make final decision</td>
<td>No / Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing ‘humanism’

“Words to judge quality of care” – Iona Heath

“Measurement with a wink”
What did we miss?

Does audiovisual affect

1) Scores?

2) How we feel about scores?
What did we miss?

Does this post-encounter evaluation affect

1) Scores?

2) How we feel about scores?
Next steps

Research

Practice

(Teaching)