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Objectives

• Define surrogate decision making and describe the ethical standards of surrogate decision making
• Examine the practical aspects of surrogate decision making at the bedside
• Analyze common ethical questions around surrogate decision making through clinical ethics consult analysis
Mr. S

72 year old male diagnosed with colon cancer 6 years ago
• Treated on initial diagnosis with surgery and chemotherapy, remission achieved
• 1 year ago, diagnosed with recurrent colon cancer with metastatic disease
• Not a surgical candidate, poor long term prognosis
• Trial of chemotherapy attempted but suffered severe side effects
Mr. S

72 year old male diagnosed with colon cancer 6 years ago

• Loving and intact family – wife of 42 years, 3 adult children, 5 grandchildren
  • 2 of 3 children live close to the patient and his wife

• Great insurance

• Established relationship with his PMD
Mr. S

72 year old male diagnosed with colon cancer 6 years ago

• After discussion with family, declined further chemotherapy due to toxicity to focus on quality of life

• Transitioned to palliative care with additional therapies based on burden / benefit analysis

• Advance directive naming his wife as his durable power of attorney (DPOA)
  • Request to not prolong life
Download Your State's Advance Directives

CaringInfo provides free advance directives and instructions for each state that can be opened as a PDF (Portable Document Format) file.

These materials are copyrighted by CaringInfo. Permission is granted to download a single copy of any portion of these texts. Use by individuals for personal and family benefit is specifically authorized and encouraged. Further copies or publication are prohibited without express written permission.

- HIPAA Privacy Rule Summary
- Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

CALIFORNIA PROBATE CODE SECTION 4700-4701

4700. The form provided in Section 4701 may, but need not, be used to create an advance health care directive. The other sections of this division govern the effect of the form or any other writing used to create an advance health care directive. An individual may complete or modify all or any part of the form in Section 4701.

4701. The statutory advance health care directive form is as follows:

ADVANCE HEALTH CARE DIRECTIVE (California Probate Section 4701) Explanation

☐ (a) Choice Not to Prolong Life

I do not want my life to be prolonged if (1) I have an incurable and irreversible condition that will result in my death within a relatively short time, (2) I become unconscious and, to a reasonable degree of medical certainty, I will not regain consciousness, or (3) the likely risks and burdens of treatment would outweigh the expected benefits, OR

Mr. S

72 year old male diagnosed with colon cancer 6 years ago

• After discussion with family, declined further chemotherapy due to toxicity to focus on quality of life

• Transitioned to palliative care with additional therapies based on burden / benefit analysis

• Advance directive naming his wife as his durable power of attorney (DPOA)
  • Request to not prolong life

• Physician Order for Life Sustaining Treatment (POLST) form filled out to request Do Not Attempt Resuscitation (DNAR), limited additional intervention, no artificial nutrition and hydration
Advance Care Planning Resources

What is "POLST"?
"POLST" is a national movement to promote patient autonomy regarding their end-of-life care preferences in a healthcare setting. The "P" used to mean "Physician," but it now stands for "Physician Orders for Life-Sustaining Treatment." POLST forms are designed to help patients and their families communicate their preferences to healthcare providers, and to help providers understand and respect those preferences in the event of an emergency. The goal is to ensure that patients receive care that aligns with their values and wishes, even when they are unable to speak for themselves.
Mr. S

72 year old male diagnosed with colon cancer 6 years ago
• Still enjoying a satisfactory quality of life with good functional status
• Sudden onset of severe abdominal pain, distention, nausea, and emesis
• Brought to the ED for evaluation and diagnosed with complete large bowel obstruction from a tumor
• Palliative surgical management recommended
  • Decompression of the bowel
  • Colostomy placement
Mr. S

• Confused mental status
  • Administration of opioid pain medications
  • Acute illness

• Mrs. S and a daughter at bedside
  • Physicians ask Mrs. S to make decision regarding whether to perform the surgical intervention
Clinical and Ethical Considerations

• As a named DPOA, when should Mrs. S start making decisions on behalf of Mr. S?

• Should Mrs. S decide to pursue surgery when Mr. S’s code status is DNAR?

• If Mr. S is started on IVF is this considered artificial nutrition and hydration?
Clinical and Ethical Considerations

• If Mrs. S decides to pursue surgery and IVF can a clinician decline to provide this type of medical care because it may appear to contradict Mr. S’s stated wishes on his POLST and AD?

• If Mrs. S decides to pursue surgery is she fulfilling her duty as Mr. S’s surrogate or making decisions based on her own wishes for her husband?
Standards of Surrogate Decision Making

• Stated wishes
  • Written
  • Oral statements

• Substituted Judgement
  • Make the decision the patient would have made based on knowledge of the patient’s goals and values

• Best interests
  • Decide for the patient taking into account information specific to the situation based on commonly held societal values
Stated Wishes Standard

• Direct information from the patient
• Can be formal (AD, POLST, etc.) or informal (conversations with family / friends)
• Written vs oral
  • Courts give legal document more weight than oral statements
  • Written documents inherently are more accountable than oral statements
• All advance directives will need some degree of interpretation to ensure that the current situation fulfills the intent of the patient’s stated wishes
Stated Wishes Standard

• Problems
  • Patients are not as informed as they should be
  • Patients change their mind and forget to tell their family/friends or forget to write it down
  • Wording of the AD is vague and requires a great deal of interpretation
  • Stated request may conflict with the patient’s best interest
  • Not very many people have AD or POLST

• The most reliable AD, POLST or stated wishes are consistent over time and with the patient’s lived and stated values
Stated Wishes Standard – Avoiding Problems

• Talk about goals of treatment first, then talk about specific interventions
  • Technology is value neutral
  • E.g – “I value my ability to be independent and do not want to live if I had to permanently live with the aid of a machine” NOT “never intubate me” or “never start me on dialysis”

• Discuss mostly likely scenarios in depth
  • Goals of treatment then specific interventions

• Have serial conversations over time

• Encourage written documentation of goals, values, wishes
Substituted Judgement Standard

• Indirect information
  • Extrapolated from current knowledge about the patient

• Problems
  • Little to enforce consistency
  • May not accurately reflect the patient’s wishes
  • Really hard to do
  • Can conflict the patient’s best interests
# Substituted Interests and Best Judgments

## An Integrated Model of Surrogate Decision Making

Daniel P. Sulmasy, MD, PhD  
Lois Snyder, JD

## How Should Decisions Be Made?

Decision making should honor the wide variability in patient beliefs about how decisions ought to be made. Some value au-

| Table. The Substituted Interests Model of Surrogate Decision Making |
|---|---|
| **Step** | **Sample Conversation Starters and Points** |
| Empathy and connection: Acknowledge stresses of the situation and difficulty of the task and attend to needs of the surrogate | “It must be very difficult to see your loved one so sick.” |
| Authentic values: Understand the patient as a person  
Values: interpersonal, moral, religious, familial, psychological  
Directives: substantive treatment preferences and process considerations, such as who should decide and how | “Tell us about your loved one.”  
“Has anyone else in the family ever experienced a situation like this?” |
| Clinical data: Share understanding of the patient’s clinical circumstances and prognosis | “All of that is important for us to know as we face the current situation.”  
“Here is what is wrong. . .”  
“This is what is likely to happen. . .” |
| Substituted interests: Determine what the patient’s real interests are, given the patient’s values and these circumstances | “Knowing your loved one, what do you think would be the most important for him/her right now? Avoiding pain? Having family members here?” |
| Clinical judgment: Share understanding of the options and offer recommendation based on clinical experience, tailored to the particular patient’s real interests. | “Here’s what could be done.”  
“This is what we would recommend, based on what we know and what you’ve told us about your loved one.” |
| Best judgment for the patient: Best path to promote the good of this patient as a unique person, in the context of his or her relationships, authentic values, known wishes, and real interests, given the circumstances and options | “Knowing your loved one, does our recommendation seem right for him or her? Do you think another plan would be better, given his or her values, preferences, relationships?” |
Substituted Judgement Standard - Avoiding Problems

• Get the know the patient
  • Elicit the patient’s goals and values from the surrogate
  • Obtain multiple viewpoints
  • Evaluates fitness of the surrogate to serve

• Keep the focus on the patient
  • Avoid putting the focus on the surrogate
  • Avoid “You don’t want your loved one to suffer, do you?”

• Establish (and re-establish) common ground with the surrogate
  • This is not a “war” to win with the surrogate

• Make a medical recommendation for treatment
Best Interest Judgement Standard

- Best interest based on medical judgement and commonly held societal values
  - Free from pain
  - Quality of life over quantity
- Problems
  - Subject to clinician bias
  - Uncomfortable to be the “decider”
Best Interest Judgement Standard – Avoiding Problems

• Obtain a clear medical picture
  • Accurate information regarding prognosis and reversibility
• Elicit multiple viewpoints
• Addresses biases
• Trial of therapy to allow time to clarify the situation
Who Can Be A Surrogate?

• Moral Qualifications
  • Willing to serve
  • Able to interact with the medical team
  • Best to have direct knowledge of the patient’s goals, values, and wishes
    • “Knows the patient the best and loves the patient the most”

• Legal Qualifications
  • “Agent” – named in legal document
  • “Surrogate” – presumed to be in a position to serve
  • Hierarchy, if any, determined by state law
Surrogate Decision Making for Mr. S

- Moral qualification
  - Wife of 42 years
- Legal qualification
  - Named as Mr. S’s agent
- Standard to be used
  - Stated wishes
  - Substituted judgement
Surrogate Decision Making for Mr. S

- Start with goals and values
  - Define quality of life
  - What are the most important values?

- Prognosis and reversibility

- How to best get the patient to his treatment goal given the medical reality?

- Consistent with previously expressed wishes?
Surrogate Decision Making for Mr. S

• Start with goals and values
  • Define quality of life – able to recognize family and friends, able to live at home, able to live without aid of technology, no long term artificial nutrition / hydration
  • What are the most important values? Time with family and friends

• Prognosis and reversibility

• How to best get the patient to his treatment goal given the medical reality?

• Consistent with previously expressed wishes?
Surrogate Decision Making for Mr. S

• Start with goals and values
  • Define quality of life
  • What are the most important values? Time with family and friends

• Prognosis and reversibility
  • Adequate pre-surgical functional status, will need to be intubated for surgical intervention → likely will get extubated
  • Will likely need a nasogastric tube until bowel function returns
  • May need TPN for nutritional support if bowel dysfunction is prolonged
  • Will live with a colostomy bag until death
  • After hospitalization anticipate recovery for additional time before death
  • Likely acceptable functional status (not dependent on ventilator, tube feeds)
Surrogate Decision Making for Mr. S

• Start with goals and values
  • Define quality of life
  • What are the most important values?

• Prognosis and reversibility

• How to best get the patient to his treatment goal given the medical reality?
  • Goal – time with family with intact cognition
  • Discuss willingness to accept short term invasive technology for long term gain
  • Discuss acceptability of quality of life with a colostomy bag
  • Discuss worst case scenario → complications in OR or in the ICU
  • Discuss other treatment options

• Consistent with previously expressed wishes?
Surrogate Decision Making for Mr. S

• Start with goals and values
  • Define quality of life
  • What are the most important values?

• Prognosis and reversibility

• How to best get the patient to his treatment goal given the medical reality?

• Consistent with previously expressed wishes?
  • All AD and POLST need interpretation
  • Focus on treatment goals, not individual technology
  • Absolute resistance to a certain technology as the primary treatment goal may be at the expense of other goals
Summary Points

- Standards of surrogate decision making
  - Stated wishes
  - Substituted judgement
  - Best interest

- Surrogate decision making is hard
  - All stated wishes need some degree of interpretation
  - Focus on getting to know the patient
  - Focus on patient’s goals and values to guide treatment goals

- Requires best medical recommendation given medical reality
- Focus on treatment goals, not individual technology
- Reassess and adjust as needed → individualized road for the patient

Adventist Bioethics CONSORTIUM
Topics NOT Addressed

• Ethical nature of surrogate decision maker’s actions
• How to select the surrogate decision maker
• Conflict between family members of the patient
• Conflict between the clinical team and the patient’s family
• Decision making for unrepresented patients
• Shared medical decision making
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Three Roles of Nurses in End of Life Care

1. Information Broker
   - Giving Information to Physicians
     - Clinical status
     - Family’s emotional state
     - Expressed wishes
   - Giving Information to Family Members
     - Explaining equipment
     - Clinical Status
     - Translating medical terms to lay language
     - Educating
   - Mediation
     - Bringing physicians and family members together
     - Involving other disciplines
Three Roles of Nurses in End of Life Care

2. Supporter
   - Building trust
     - Introducing family to other staff members
     - Allowing family to participate in care
     - Finding out what is important to family
     - Helping maintain hope
     - Accepting their decisions
     - Preparing them for bad news
   - Showing Empathy
     - Attempting to understand how the family sees situation
     - Being present
     - Acknowledging feelings
Three Roles of Nurses in End of Life Care

3. Advocate
   • Advocating for patient to physicians
     • Questioning plan of care
     • “Planting seeds” to physician that palliative care may be best
     • Timing discussions so best physician will be present
   • Advocating for patient to family
     • Clarifying goals of care
     • Explaining implications of decisions
     • Presenting realistic picture of situation
     • Coaching families to make decisions consistent with patient’s goals
     • Helping accept the inevitability of death
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Adventist Bioethics CONSORTIUM
Religion/Spirituality & End of Life Decisions

• Reliance on R/S to cope with diagnosis
  • Potentially positive and negative consequences

• Relationship between Clergy and Care Recipients
  • Clergy uniquely positioned to help patients consider medical decisions at or near EOL within a R/S framework.

• Clergy’s knowledge of EOL is poor
  • Uncertain and passive approach to counseling congregants about decision making

Religion/Spirituality & End of Life Decisions

• Theological Framework for end-of-life decision making

- Age, Family, and community responsibility

- Prognosis and treatment burden

- Free Will
Religion/Spirituality & End of Life Decisions

- Patient Preferences for intensive EOL care
  - Optimistic prognostic perceptions, more intensive cancer care, and less frequent and shorter hospice use


- Seeking Life & Accepting Death- axis point
Spiritual Care & Surrogates: Mrs. M

- Chaplain’s spiritual support can serve as the bridge
  - Mrs. M has experienced brain death and the family has been approached by the organ donation procurement team. The family does not understand brain death and have many questions regarding the theological implications, specifically eschatologically; for Mrs. M if her organs are donated.

- Futility Disputes
- Eschatology
- Faith
- Medical Decision
Religion & Spirituality Takeaway

• Surrogate-Care Provider Relationship
  • Collaborative vs. Unilateral decision-making

  • Patients who have strong religious beliefs underlying their rationale will benefit from acknowledgment of their beliefs.

