### A Consumer Perspective on Newborn Screening

The Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders and Genetic Diseases in Newborns and Children

> Sharon Terry, President & CEO Genetic Alliance September 18, 2007



### The Information Age:

#### Models based on new economic constructs

#### Industrial Age (old)

Control means of production Based on scarcity Hierarchical / Command & Control Linear / Sequential Win / Lose Material/Object

#### Information Age (new)

Open means of production Based on abundance Network / Collaboration Organic/Dynamic Win / Win Information



# **Access to Services**

- Accessible
- Integrated/coordinated Medical Home
- Quality information Evidence based
- No discrimination: services, insurance, employment, underserved communities



### Perspective

### Affected

### (Advocates)

### Unaffected

## (general public)



### Appeals from Advocates of Newborn Screening

- Continuum from the universal panel to secondary panel to tests for all conditions
- Appreciate test benefits beyond the medical model (testing only for conditions with treatments)
- Full use of available technology



### **Concerns of general public**

### **'False Positives'**

- Receiving a newborn screening result that indicates the newborn should be tested for a condition, and the subsequent test shows the newborn does not have the condition
- Risks of trauma to the family
- "Parents more overprotective and more focused on physical symptoms of their child when a false-positive result occurred."

(Expanded Newborn Screening for Biochemical Disorders: The Effect of a false-Positive Result. Elizabeth A. Gurian, BSa, Daniel D. Kinnamon, MSb, Judith J. Henry, MSN, RNc and Susan E. Waisbren, PhD. PEDIATRICS. Vol. 117 No. 6 June 2006, pp. 1915-1921)



### **Concerns of general public**

Carrier Identification

- Less exchange of information compared to carrier screening
- Parental anxiety, cost of follow up testing, stigmatization, misattributed paternity
- Informed decision making

Education

- Timing
- Knowledge of healthcare professionals
- Informed decision making





Two cooperative agreements to determine consumer concerns and issues about:

- -Education needed
- -False positives

-Carriers





- Engage Consumer Task Force on NBS
- Engage National Advisory Committee
- Spectrum of viewpoints on screening
- Educate other consumers to be active in NBS
- Change in perception of NBS issues
- Attention to the proceedings of this committee



### Consumer Taskforce on Newborn Screening

#### **Partnering Advocacy Organizations**

- Cares Foundation
- Children's Sickle Cell Foundation
- Citizens for Quality Sickle Cell Care Foundation
- Hunter's Hope Foundation
- Save Babies through Screening Foundation

and

**Parents** who have experienced 'false positives', carrier identification and uneventful NBS





University of Maryland School of Medicine

Impact of false positive screens and carrier identification on:

- Newborn
- Family
- NBS system





#### Qualitative • Year 1

- Annotated bibliography
- **Unstructured interviews**
- Focus groups in three states
- Develop data collection instruments and processes that will be used in the second year
- Pilot the data collection instrument
- Identify gaps in information by reviewing the existing NBS communication strategies
- Initial phases of brainstorming possible models for improving NBS that would reduce harm





#### Qualitative • Year 2

Interviews -

False positive screens or carrier identification Control subjects who have experienced negative screens Referrals for heart murmur that proved to be "innocent" NBS Conference





#### **Qualitative • Year 3**

Analysis and development of models to resolve identified problems in the screening process

Strategies for family-centered and medical home-based communication or system design that will minimize harm as well as further avenues of study to better understand potential economic harms resulting from false+ screens and carrier identification





#### **Genetics and Public Policy Center**

Public's awareness of inherent issues in newborn screening

- Availability
- Expansion
- Follow up

Increased parental education





#### **Quantitative • Year 1**

Annotated bibliography National Council of State Legislatures Gap analysis Survey development Postulate consumer education models, reassessment





#### **Quantitative • Year 2**

Survey through Knowledge Networks Web-enabled Panel - gives computers to diverse cohort Men and Women, 18 - 44 yrs old Half child within last two years Half who plan to become pregnant NBS Conference





#### **Quantitative • Year 3**

Create models for intervention: for exchanging information with parents and addressing the public's awareness of NBS issues

- Develop a one-page checklist for primary care providers at the time of any positive screen
- Focus on using existing infrastructure to execute some of the recommended interventions
- Submit papers for peer-reviewed publications, and presenting at national meetings



### **Iowa Family Participation Project**

- Focus on populations who usually do not participate in NBS, understanding the barriers, and looking at systems that could help include these populations.
- Year 1: healthcare providers including members of AAP and ACOG will be engaged to see how they and patients be included in the NBS system.
- Year 2: Information and Education Committee will convene to develop appropriate educational materials as well as a communication model.
- Year 3: Distributed materials will be evaluated.

### NBS Financial, Ethical, Legal, and Social Issues

- Interviews regarding false positive results and key informants
- Collaboration with Western States
- RAND Corporation performing the evaluation.
- Include parents who have gone through a false positive screen as well as a control group.
- Parents (and future parents) of newborns will be surveyed to evaluate materials.