Colorectal cancer screening aims to detect colorectal cancer at an early stage, when treatment is more likely to be curative. Lack of participation in such screening is a major issue in primary care practices, where nurse practitioners (NPs) often provide care. This study aimed to determine whether an educational intervention for NPs would increase their awareness of, and increase patients’ participation in, colorectal cancer screening.

AT A GLANCE
- Colorectal cancer screening guidelines recommend four methods of screening to meet the needs of adults aged older than 50 years.
- An educational intervention focused on increasing nurse practitioner knowledge of colorectal cancer screening guidelines is feasible.
- Primary care providers play an important role in educating patients regarding colorectal cancer screening.

Colorectal cancer continues to be the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths in the United States and the third most common cancer diagnosis in men and women (Baker et al., 2013; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2017c). In 2014, more than 139,000 people in the United States were diagnosed with colorectal cancer, and more than 51,000 died from the disease (CDC, 2017c). However, as of 2014, only 66% of U.S. adults reported being up-to-date with colorectal cancer screening (CDC, 2017a). Missed opportunities to prevent the disease, or to diagnose it prior to metastasis or its progression to a life-threatening condition, are responsible for morbidity and mortality in colorectal cancer. Research has shown a strong association between provider communication with patients about colorectal cancer screening and increased compliance with such screening (Underhill & Kiviniemi, 2012).

Accountable care organizations (ACOs) are healthcare organizations characterized by a payment and care delivery model that ties providers’ reimbursement to quality metrics. In 2013, ACOs made colorectal cancer screening a quality measure in individuals aged 50–75 years (Levy, Daly, Schmidt, & Xu, 2012). The goal for the colorectal cancer screening quality measure is to develop and deliver seamless, high-quality care for those aged 50–75 years.

The current colorectal cancer screening guideline recommends screening with one of the following tests: flexible sigmoidoscopy every 5 years, colonoscopy every 10 years, double-contrast barium enema every 5 years, or computed tomography colonography every 5 years (American Cancer Society, 2017). In recognizing that primary care is an essential access point for high-performing healthcare systems, Sarfaty et al. (2013) reported that colonoscopy is the most promising method to address the burden of chronic disease, improve health outcomes, and reduce healthcare spending. Given the ongoing changes in colorectal cancer technologies, colorectal cancer screening practice guidelines require monitoring and updating (Sarfaty et al., 2013). Consequently, providers must be knowledgeable about colorectal cancer screening guidelines and recommend screening to patients to improve health outcomes.

Because nurse practitioners (NPs) provide primary care services, they also should remain informed about current colorectal cancer screening guidelines to encourage timely screening, which may improve health outcomes. NPs in New Hampshire, a full licensure state, are permitted to practice independently and autonomously and are required to provide evidence-based care that is grounded in current guidelines for colorectal cancer screening, as well as in established preventive screening guidelines for other diseases. The percentage of adults aged 50–75 years who reported receiving colorectal cancer screening is generally higher in the northern states (70%) than in the southern states (60%).
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Research has shown an association between healthcare provider communication with patients about colorectal cancer screening and increased compliance. Changes in NP perception of effectiveness regarding the four screening options (colonoscopy, guaiac-based fecal occult blood test [gFOBT], immunochemical fecal test, sigmoidoscopy) were evaluated separately prior to the intervention, immediately after the intervention, and at 90 days after the intervention. A significant change was observed in NP perception regarding gFOBT screening (p = 0.002) and immunochemical fecal test screening (p > 0.001) from preintervention to 90 days postintervention. No significant differences were noted between preintervention and immediate postintervention scores. The mean score for gFOBT screening was 2.16 pre-intervention (SD = 0.57), 1.83 (SD = 0.38) immediately postintervention, and 1.16...
(SD = 0.3) 90 days postintervention. No significant change was observed in NPs’ perception of the effectiveness of colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy screening for colorectal cancer from preintervention, immediate postintervention, and 90-day postintervention. Of the 11,483 medical records reviewed, 8,230 patients (72%) had complied with colorectal cancer screening recommendations before the educational intervention. After the educational intervention, 3,851 of 5,160 patients (75%) complied with colorectal cancer screening recommendations. An improvement of 4% in colorectal cancer screening rates was observed (see Figure 1).

Colorectal Cancer Screening Rate Compliance by Nurse Practitioner Demographics

A 3% difference was observed in patient screening rates for NPs with less than 10 years of practice experience as compared to those with more than 10 years of experience (n = 2). However, the three NPs with 5–10 years of practice experience showed the highest increase in rates of colorectal cancer screening (seven NPs had fewer than five years of practice experience). A 3% difference in screening rates for NPs aged younger than 40 years as compared to those aged older than 40 years was also noted (no NPs were aged younger than 30 years, seven were aged 30–40 years, one was aged 41–50 years, and four were aged older than 50 years). Older and more experienced NPs had the highest screening rates and met or exceeded the medical center goal rate of 80%. There was no difference in the number of patients screened across all NPs’ age groups.

Discussion

This pilot study demonstrated that a colorectal cancer screening educational intervention increased participants’ knowledge and subsequently increased their patients’ screening rates. Specifically, NP participants retained knowledge that the four screening procedures are effective options, per CDC guidelines. With this focused intervention, NPs discussed screening with patients; as a result, patient compliance increased, as demonstrated by a 4% rise in colorectal cancer screening rates.

Retention of knowledge can be explained by the cognitive theory of meaningful learning, as opposed to rote verbal learning (Ausubel, 2000). This theory defines meaningful learning as the process of integrating new information into an existing knowledge system and when actions become automatic. This project demonstrated that an educational intervention involving NP review of CDC guidelines for colorectal cancer screening can improve knowledge and actual screening rates. An increase in colorectal cancer screening rates was noted across all ages of NPs and all levels of experience. Although the reason is not clear, age and experience may have an effect on encouraging patients to become compliant with screening recommendations.

Limitations

A major limitation for generalizability is that the study was conducted at one medical center in New Hampshire, with a focus on its primary care practices. Postintervention colorectal cancer screening data for patient screening rates were collected over a short duration; additional data collection may provide better insight regarding compliance rates. Additional limitations pertain to the small sample size and the allowance of NPs to explore all colorectal cancer screening recommendations rather than a single screening mechanism. Because

FIGURE 1.
COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING COMPLIANCE RATES PRE- AND POSTINTERVENTION BY QUARTER (Q)

Note. The intervention was delivered between Q2 and Q3 in 2015. Note. Total refers to the total number of patients seen by medical center nurse practitioners participating in the study. 80% refers to the stated goal of the medical center, and actual refers to the number of patients who completed colorectal cancer screening.
NPs in New Hampshire are permitted to practice autonomously, the educational intervention would benefit all primary care providers who discuss colorectal cancer screening with their patients; this would demonstrate generalizability and, ultimately, increase screening compliance rates.

**Implications for Practice and Conclusion**

This study can be used as a model to improve compliance with other preventive screening recommendations, such as mammography for breast cancer and Papanicolaou tests for cervical cancer, as well as immunizations. This educational model can also help to meet ACO quality measures, drive outcomes, and affect hospital reimbursement. Annual education about current colorectal cancer screening guidelines will support current standards and, as in this pilot study, increase participation in screening as a result of primary providers’ increased knowledge. This study determined that an educational intervention involving NPs who reviewed current colorectal cancer screening guidelines can improve knowledge and actual patient participation in colorectal cancer screening.
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