

Policy Proposal for Standardized Health Literacy Practice

Barbara L. Ferguson, RN., MSN, MHA, MBA

James Laditka D.A., Ph.D., M.P.A.

Suzanne Boyd, PhD, ACSW, CMSW



Background

The foundation of the healthcare system includes healthcare providers' communications with patients who need to understand health information to correctly follow a plan of care.

Adequate literacy skills are a critical link to both maintaining and improving health. However, when patients lack adequate literacy skills there is often a breakdown in this communication system.

Thus, it is crucial that the healthcare system enact policies to assist persons with low health literacy, and not assume that it is the educational system's task or even worse, the patient's responsibility. The healthcare system must take ownership of the health literacy problem to ensure equity of care for all patients.

Objectives

Present a policy analysis that provides goals for a standardized health literacy practice particularly for low literate individuals

Policy Analysis Includes

- Policy alternatives rationale
- Criteria for evaluating each goal
- Rationale for each goal
- Implementation barriers
- Perceived capacity
- Stakeholders
- Recommendation for a national health literacy policy in clinical settings

Table 1: Summary and Assessment of Three Health Literacy Assessments

Description	Health Literacy Assessments		
	Rapid Estimate of Adult Literacy in Medicine (REALM)	Test of Functional Health Literacy in Adults-Short Form (TOFHLAS)	Newest Vital Sign (NVS)
Medical word recognition test	Reading comprehension and numerical ability test	Reading and comprehension ability test	
Directions	Patient is asked to read aloud from a list of 66 medical terms	Patient is given sample medical instructions and asked to fill in the missing word, choosing from a list of 3-4 words	Patient is given a nutritional label and asked six questions related to the label
Admin. Time	< 3 minutes	~12 minutes	~3 minutes
Scoring	Four levels - Approximated grade level equivalent: ≤ 3 rd grade 4 th -6 th grade 7 th -8 th grade ≥ 9 th grade	Three levels: Inadequate health literacy Marginal health literacy Adequate health literacy	Three levels: Inadequate health literacy Possible low health literacy Adequate health literacy
Available in Spanish	No	Yes	Yes
Advantages	+ Quick + Easy to use in a clinical setting	+ Is self-administered-after directions are given + Evaluates reading and comprehension skills	+ Quick + Uses a common tool (nutritional label) + Patient may learn nutritional facts while being tested

Goals

1. Improve healthcare provider identification of low literate patients
2. Provide quality healthcare for low literate patients
3. Maintain human dignity
4. Provide a practical plan for healthcare providers

Conclusions

- A policy matrix was created as a means to quantify the results of this analysis. The results found that the Teach Back method was the best alternative for health literacy reform.
- The Teach Back method is simple, yet action oriented. Communication during a clinic visit, while using the Teach Back method, can be tailored to ensure patient understanding.
- The Teach Back method is more likely to meet patients' approval.

Table 2: Health Literacy Policy Alternatives Matrix

1. Policy Goal: Improve Healthcare Provider Identification of Low-Literate Patients			2. Policy Goal: Provide Quality Healthcare for Low Literate Patients		
Teach-Back Method	Ask Me 3 Method	Standardized Assessment	Teach-Back Method	Ask Me 3 Method	Standardized Assessment
I. Evaluation Criteria: Level of care matched to patient's needs Provider is encouraged to rephrase information	+ No provision to match care with needs	+ Health literacy is identified and same level of care can be given	I. Evaluation Criteria: Verify patient understanding of health information Program verifies pt understanding. Can be culturally sensitive	+ No provision to verify pt understanding. Can be used in native language if interpreter is available	+ Program has the ability to verify pt understanding, but may not. Some assessments are available in Spanish
II. Evaluation Criteria: Provider aware of patient health literacy level Provider knows ability of pt to reposit information	+ No provision for making providers aware of literacy	+ Health literacy is assessed	II. Evaluation Criteria: Universality of program Adaptable to various clinic settings	+ Universality of program Adaptable to various clinic settings	+ Information targeted to low literate pts
III. Evaluation Criteria: Provide a means to track health literacy No means to track	- No means to track	+ A means to track			
3. Policy Goal: Maintain Human Dignity			4. Policy Goal: Provide a Practical Plan for Healthcare Providers		
Teach-Back Method	Ask Me 3 Method	Standardized Assessment	Teach-Back Method	Ask Me 3 Method	Standardized Assessment
I. Evaluation Criteria: Public acceptability Accepted if discrete	+ Easily accepted	+ A major concern	I. Evaluation Criteria: Administration efficiency Minimal time & training Program is flexible	+ Minimal time & training Program is flexible	+ Minimal time & training Program is flexible
II. Evaluation Criteria: Confidentiality Easily accomplished in private setting	+ Pt can ask questions in private setting	+ Care must be taken in documentation	II. Evaluation Criteria: Cost effectiveness Similar start-up costs to the other programs being evaluated	+ Similar start-up costs to the other programs being evaluated	+ Similar start-up costs to the other programs being evaluated
III. Evaluation Criteria: Provide a shame-free environment Care must be taken to make pt feel comfortable	+ Easily accepted	+ Pts are often embarrassed of their low literacy skills			

All three programs should be matched to the patient's literacy level

Grading Scale:

- + = the policy rates positively with regard to the evaluation criteria
- = the policy does not fulfill the evaluation criteria
- ± = the policy rating is mixed with regard to the evaluation criteria

NET GAIN/LOSS of Policy Matrix:

Teach Back Method	+ = 8	± = 1	- = 1
Ask Me 3 Method	+ = 6		- = 4
Standardized Assessment	+ = 6	± = 1	- = 3