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Goals of this Session:

• To describe the goals, research questions, and research methods of an evaluation study designed to understand the long-term sustainability and impact of SL in the health professions

• To share major findings, highlighting factors that influence these outcomes: facilitators, challenges, and strategies for success

• To relate these findings to the literature

• To provide some lessons learned
SL in the Health Professions

Endorsed by:
- Major national health philanthropies:
  - WK Kellogg Foundation (2005)
- Accreditation agencies:
  - Liaison Committee on Medical Education (2007)
  - Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (2006)
Goals of SL in Health Professions

**Students**
- Gain skills/competencies in community health
- Develop an ethic of civic professionalism

**Community Organizations**
- Build capacity to address health and social problems*

**Communities**
- Receive needed health services, population health benefits*

**Academic Institutions**
- Develop an organizational culture of civic engagement*
- Enhance their contributions to their communities*

Both Community and Academic Partners
- Build capacity for future community-academic partnerships (training, research, practice)*

*long term goal
*anecdotal evidence only
HPSISN

• Health Professions Schools in Service to the Nation (HPSISN)
• First and only national demonstration program in SL in health professional schools in the US
• Aims:
  1. Strengthen *partnerships* between health professional schools and communities which *address unmet community health needs*
  2. Instill an *ethic of community service and social responsibility* in health professional schools, students, and faculty
  3. Equip the next generation of health professionals with *community-oriented competencies* necessary to practice in a changing health care environment
HPSISN

• Provided sub-grants to 17 health professional schools or programs, 1995-1998
• Each Institution:
  1. Established SL *partnerships* with communities to address unmet health needs
  2. Developed SL *curriculum*
  3. Created *infrastructure* to support SL: program coordinator, advisory group
  4. Received *technical assistance & faculty development*
• Funders: Pew Charitable Trusts, Corporation for National Service
• Administered by: Center for the Health Professions, University of California-San Francisco
1. Georgetown University, Washington DC
2. George Washington University, Washington, DC & George Mason University, Arlington, VA
3. Northeastern University, Boston, MA
4. Ohio University, Athens, OH
5. Regis University, Denver, CO
6. San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA
7. University of Connecticut, Farmington, CT
8. University of Florida, Gainesville, FL
9. University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY
10. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC
11. University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA
12. University of Scranton, Scranton, PA
13. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA
14. University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT
15. University of Utah & Purdue University, Indianapolis, IN
16. Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA
17. West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckannon, WV
Grantees: Community Partners
(examples)

• AIDS task force
• American Red Cross
• Boys and Girls Club
• Middle Schools
• Free Clinics
• Head Start
• Hospice
• Churches

• Housing Authority
• Planned Parenthood
• Salvation Army
• Senior Center
• Youth Center
• WIC Program
Grantees: Project Focus
(examples)

• School-based health education and health services
• Healthcare for the poor and homeless
• Health promotion and disease prevention:
  – teenage pregnancy
  – domestic violence
  – oral health
  – HIV/AIDS
  – End of life decision making
• Worksite-based health education
• Companionship for homebound elderly
• Case management
• Mentoring and tutoring
• Rural access to care
HPSISN Ten Year Follow-up Study
Study Aims

Goals:

- To understand whether SL is a sustainable pedagogy in health professional schools
- To assess whether sustained SL in the health professions can achieve its hoped-for impacts on the school and community
- To identify what factors influence these outcomes, in order to produce practical recommendations for success

RQs:

- To what extent were the HPSISN SL programs sustained from 1998-2008?
- What have been the long-term impact of the HPSISN SL programs for all of the potential stakeholders?
- What factors have influenced these outcomes, as facilitators, challenges, or beneficial strategies?
Impact

1. Students
2. Community Organization
3. Academic Institution
4. Community health

Conceptual Framework

Factors in the Broader Environment
1. Accreditation
2. Funding
3. Community conditions

Program Design and Implementation
1. Partnership Structure, Process
2. Curriculum Design
3. Leadership

Sustainability
1. Durability
2. Routinization/Institutionalization
3. Adaptability

Organizational Traits
1. Organizational Culture
2. Organizational Stability
3. Normative Match
4. History of Collaboration

Impact
1. Students
2. Community Organization
3. Academic Institution
4. Community health

Adapted from Shediac-Rizkallah MC and Bone LR. 1998.
Study Design

Embedded Comparative Case Study

Factors Influencing SL Nationally in US

Case Study: HPSISN Program

Embedded Case: S-L Program 1

Embedded Case: S-L Program 2

Research Methods

Phase 1: HPSISN Case Study
Goals: To get an overview of all grantee SL programs’ sustainability, impact, and influencing factors, 1998-present
Data Collection:
• Interviews: original PIs, successors
• Document review

Phase 2: Embedded Case Studies (forthcoming)
Goals:
• To learn about pathways to sustainability and impact, focusing on program implementation, strategies for success
• To learn the perspectives of community partners re: program impact, influencing factors on sustainability and impact
Data Collection:
• Site visits
• Interviews with academic and community partners
• Document review
Sample, Phase 1

• Interviews, n = 24
  – HPSISN Principal Investigators: 16/17
  – Successors: 7
• Document review: 17/17 -- publications, websites
Findings
Degree of Sustainability: Indicators

n = 17

NOT SUSTAINED

DURABILITY
• SL continues in the curriculum
• Maintained through individual faculty rather than system-level efforts
• Does not display any traits of routinization

Common trait:
- SL replaced by practicums on a school level

Less Sustainable

ROUTINIZATION
• SL is a “stable and regular part” of activities of a department/School
• Related resources are invested

Common trait: SL in required core courses

INDICATORS:
- Program planning
- Program objectives
- Rules of operation
- Program evaluated

INSTITUTIONALIZATION
• SL is “infused with value” and supported by infrastructure, policies and procedures of School, community partners

Common trait: adaptations

INDICATORS:
- Mission, vision support SL
- T&P recognizes SL
- Student SL rewarded
- SL centrally coordinated, supported (staff, TA, $)
- SL faculty trained
- SL advisory group

Less Sustainable → More Sustainable

Less Sustainable → More Sustainable → Less Sustainable
Institutionalization

During the HPSISN grant “I was teaching the [elective SL] class every week, and... any student in the College that wanted to be in SL... would come to my class. But after the grant, we evolved into an integrated system where... with the support of... our university-wide SL center we identified five courses in the College of Nursing that were willing to become identified SL courses. That means they had to apply to the [Center] and describe how their... curriculum would facilitate SL. And by having these five classes, we were able to integrate SL throughout the College of Nursing.”
Institutionalization Associated with Program Quality

- As the SL program’s level of integration into the organization increased, so did its quality
  - SL curriculum
  - SL partnerships
- Why? Increasing resources invested in SL
  - Routinized programs had rules of operation, program evaluation
  - Institutionalized programs received faculty training in SL, support for partnership maintenance and development
Conceptualizing Program Impact: Locations and Populations

Broader environments: academia, the health profession, the communities served by community organizations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Long-term Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Institution</td>
<td>Contributed to broader trend of increasing community engagement (organizational culture change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Created permanent pedagogical innovations: this SL curriculum; diffusion of SL to other depts, schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased student enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved public relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q: What did that the mentor-mentee relationship yield for your institution?

A: Well, it solidified our links with the [other University] which have been very beneficial to our students. A lot of our students go there to do both community health research projects and… clinical experiences…. And we have had their students come here, which has been an important experience for them in terms of learning more about the … United States…. And then, just our faculty’s ability to collaborate which, again, has led to other linkages and potential research. So the last two years, I’ve been working on bringing together the public health school at the [other University] and the public health program here and the state health department…. looking, again, at the cross-cultural … skills that people need.
Spin-offs: Policy Development

“A graduate student, … her service-learning was helping me develop the [HPSISN] grant. She helped develop the curriculum [on domestic violence] and did the lit. search and all that, and helped implement the curriculum. And then [she] took all that experience, and when she graduated, got a job in the Department of Public Health, developing the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner Program and getting that passed through the legislature…”
What is the Association between Sustainability and Impact?

Higher degree of Institutionalization

Higher QUALITY SL curriculum, partnerships

Higher Impact

Lower degree of Institutionalization/Program not Sustained at all

SPIN-OFFS

Higher Impact

Lower Impact

Highlight = ideal pathway
Influencing Factors

Factors in the Broader Environment
1. Accreditation
2. Funding
3. Community conditions

Program Design and Implementation
1. Partnership Structure, Process
2. Curriculum Design
3. Leadership

Sustainability
1. Durability
2. Routinization/Institutionalization
3. Adaptability

Organizational Traits
1. Organizational Culture
2. Organizational Stability
3. Normative Match
4. History of Collaboration

Impact
1. Students
2. Community Organization
3. Academic Institution
4. Community health

Adapted from Shediac-Rizkallah MC and Bone LR. 1998.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Common Facilitators of Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Traits of School</td>
<td>Organizational culture:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mission, vision, strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support of top leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Program Champions: faculty, students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Material support for SL:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Infrastructure for SL, e.g. coordinating center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Design, Implementation</td>
<td>Adaptability: program administration, program goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader Academic Environment</td>
<td>Program Champion as Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven Results</td>
<td>Improved community relations; meet accreditation criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Common Challenges to Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Traits of School</td>
<td>Competing institutional priorities: trends, public relations, curriculum/training goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and administrator turnover: loss of champions, culture of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competition for time: compressed academic schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Design, Implementation</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary collaboration: scheduling, buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty turnover: loss of faculty trained in SL; lack of faculty to facilitate key SL activities e.g. reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader Academic Environment</td>
<td>Changing trends have moved interest, grant funding away from SL and towards other educational methods, forms of engaged scholarship (e.g. engaged research)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenge: Competing Institutional Priorities

“[T]he School started research requirements for medical students, and I think what [the School] was talking about when it talked about research is probably… biomedical type front line research that gets you a lot of money and publicity and so on….

In order to… get students to get involved… they are given … a stipend to do research in who’s in who’s lab, and most of it is very biomedical, very science-based, very bench type research. And we don’t have any stipend to entice students to do more community-based projects. So the number of students [choosing SL] dried up.”
Strategies for Success

• **Program Design and Implementation:**
  – Adapt as necessary to promote program viability and enhance impacts
  – Integrate SL into core courses to ensure sustainability

• **School Organizational Culture:**
  – Appeal to organizational priorities, values
  – Cultivate champions at multiple levels
  – Offer faculty incentives to engage in SL

• **School Material Support for SL:**
  – Advocate for/create SL coordinating center
  – Leverage grants to get institutional funding
  – Provide ongoing faculty training in SL

• **Impact:** Pursue spin-offs
How do these Findings Speak to the Literature?

**SL Theoretical Impacts in Health Professions**

- ✔️ Goals being met: Influences schools’ organizational culture, faculty careers
- ❌ Still unknown: community health; CBO capacity

**Influencing Factors**

- ✔️ SL literature = focus on institutionalization and its component parts; focus on champions
- ✔️ Program innovations literature = policy/external environment is as important as organizational factors to influence sustainability
- ❌ CBPR literature = focus on partnership process
- ❌ Community health partnerships literature = focus on partnership structure
Lessons Learned: Sustainability and Impact

• A portion of the foundation for sustainability is laid during *implementation*, with program design
• Even without full institutionalization, SL can be sustained
• A greater degree of institutionalization supports higher *quality* SL curriculum and partnerships
• SL can produce innovative *spin-offs* in engaged scholarship, which can themselves have important impacts
Lessons Learned: Facilitating Factors

- Most challenges and facilitating factors were located in *academia, including the school and the external academic environment*, and most of these were not malleable: culture, priorities, attitudes
- *Adaptability* is an important strategy for success that SL program leaders can control
- *External resources*, including faculty training in SL, cross-school collaborations, and funding are important facilitators
Discussion

• Questions? Comments?
• How do these *findings* relate to your experiences/knowledge?
  – Similarities? Differences? Gaps?
• Do these *methods* reflect your understanding?
  – Similarities? Differences? Gaps?
Contact Information

For more information about HPSISN, and to access prior publications and presentation slides, enter the search term “HPSISN” on the CCPH website: www.ccph.info

Questions about this talk?

Amanda L. Vogel  
avogel@jhsph.edu  
PhD Candidate  
Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
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