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• Learner Objectives
  o Describe an academia-service partnership between a school of nursing and Magnet designated hospital
  o Value the use of Kirkpatrick’s Evaluation Model to guide and report outcomes of an academia-service partnership
Definition Academic-Service (Practice) Partnership

• Agreed partnership between an academic organization and a healthcare organization to place a faculty member in the practice setting to accomplish mutually defined outcomes
  ○ Researcher and teacher in practice
Background: Benefits of ASPs

• Shares knowledge, enhances lifelong learning, potentiates professional practice (Everett, 2012)

• Transfers knowledge from expert, experienced nurses to novice & midcareer nurses (Bleich, Orsolini & Gonzalez-Guarda, 2011)

• Encourages graduate education (Horns, Czaplijski, Engelke, Mashburn, McAuliffe & Baker, 2007; Warner & Burton, 2009)

• Facilitates EBP, research & grant applications (Xippolitos, Marino, Edelman, 2011)

• Enhances writing & publication (Xippolitos, Marino, Edelman, 2011)

• Improves patient outcomes (Xippolitos, Marino, Edelman, 2011)

• Minimizes academic/service silos (Warner & Burton, 2009)
Background: Strategies for Successful Partnerships

• Relationships are at the highest levels of leadership & academe (Karshmer, 2010)
  o Agreements defined for hours, compensation

• A mutual need is recognized (MacPhee, 2009; McVey, Vessey, Kenner & Pressler, 2014)

• Formal relationships were developed (Kashmer, 2010; McVey, Vessey, Kenner & Pressler, 2014)
  o Mutual agreement on roles & expected outcomes
  o Mutual interests were discussed
  o Full partnerships established (Zierler, 2014)

• Shared philosophies, resources & accountabilities (MacPhee, 2009; McVey, Vessey, Kenner & Pressler, 2014)

• Relationships based on trust/respect (MacPhee, 2009; Olshansky, 2011)
STRUCTURE → Process → Outcome
Sharp Experience

• Contractual agreement between SDSU Foundation & Sharp HealthCare
  o Consultation services of a faculty member as an employee of SDSU; independent contractor with SMH
  o To “Enhance The Professional Practice Environment Through EBP & Research: Implementation & Dissemination”

• Compliance requirements for Sharp:
  o Code of Conduct, requirements for privacy, confidentiality, health and safety
Sharp Experience

• Contractual agreement includes:
  o Role description
  o Role responsibilities & expected outcomes
  o Financial agreement
    ▪ Buyout of faculty time (50% of teaching units) including salary, benefits & OH markup
    ▪ Payments are made to SDSU Foundation
  o Terms of agreement & dissolution
    ▪ Negotiated annually
    ▪ Dates of service
Role Description

• The faculty consultant (Academic Partner) will be a Professor in the SDSU School of Nursing and will collaborate with Sharp Memorial Hospital’s nursing staff on research, publications and other projects in the design, implementation, analysis, and dissemination of research findings.

• Will be an active member of the Sharp System-wide Research & Innovation Council and the Sharp Memorial New Knowledge and Innovation council.

• The faculty consultant will mentor staff in the research process and evidence-based practice, and participate in educational activities as requested by the leadership.

• The role reports to the Director of Research, Education, Professional Practice
Sharp Experience

• Academic Partner is EMBEDDED in the organization
  o Workplace with computer & software
    ▪ SPSS, EndNote
    ▪ Library access & full access to Sharp resources
    ▪ Sharp Identity
  o Member of Collaborative Governance Councils
    ▪ New Knowledge & Innovation
    ▪ Sharp-wide Research & Innovation Council
    ▪ SMB – Research & Innovation Council, Professional Development Council, Magnet Steering Council, Leadership Council
Mutual Goals

• SMH
  o Enhance research knowledge, attitudes & competencies of nurses
  o Advance nursing research and EBP
  o Increase dissemination of findings to internal and external audiences

• SDSU
  o Increase practice presence
  o Provide site for research priorities
  o Enhance knowledge and competency of faculty member
Reciprocal and Collaborative Roles

• Mutual sharing of knowledge and information
• Trust
• Respect and valuing
• Mutual investment in each partner’s success
• Growth of both sides of partnership
Academic Partner Roles: Consultation and Professional Development

- **Individual**
  - EBP change projects
  - Research studies
  - Instrument development
  - Writing for publication
  - Presentations at conferences
  - Career/educational counseling

- **Group**
  - Interprofessional writing workshops
  - Toolkit research series
  - Statistical analysis and measurement for classes for EBP Institute
  - Center of Nsg Excellence
  - Mini-grant review
  - Concept analysis and instrument development
Knowles 4 Principles of Andragogy

1. Involved Adult Learners
   - Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction

2. Adult Learner’s Experience
   - Experience including mistakes provides the basis for learning activities

3. Relevance & Impact to Learners’ Lives
   - Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate impact on their job or life

4. Problem Centered
   - Adult learning is problem centered rather than content oriented
Measuring Outcomes
“if it is worth doing, it is worth measuring…”

Program Evaluation (quantitative/qualitative survey)

- Demographics (Highest degree earned & current position)
- Context of working with academic partner
- Level of agreement that academic partner increased knowledge, helped you to appreciate or taught you skills that you applied (30 items)
- Extent that academic partner influenced your personal/professional advancement (11 items)
- Personal benefits gained from academic partner; free text
- Other consultative services that an academic partner could provide to assist you personally

- Kirkpatrick’s Evaluation Model used as framework to assess outcomes
# Kirkpatrick’s Evaluation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Evaluation Type</th>
<th>Evaluation Description</th>
<th>Examples of Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction evaluation is what participants thought and felt about the education event.</td>
<td>Course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Learning evaluation is the measurement of the increase in knowledge and skills and changes in attitudes – ideally before and after the event.</td>
<td>Pre/post-tests, return demonstration, case study discussion, reflective learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Behavior evaluation is the extent of transfer of knowledge, skills, and attitudes from the educational event to the practice setting – implementation. Allow sufficient time for a change in behavior to occur.</td>
<td>Observation, demonstration, document review, rounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Results evaluation is the effect on outcomes as a result of participation in education event and behavior change.</td>
<td>Predetermined outcome measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1 Highest Degree Earned

- Doctoral Degree (Other field): 5.1%
- Doctoral Degree (Nursing): 10.3%
- Master's (Other field): 2.6%
- Master's (Nursing): 46.2%
- Baccalaureate (Other field): 17.9%
- Baccalaureate (Nursing): 12.8%
- Diploma: 0.0%
- Associate Degree: 5.1%
Q2 Current Position

- Other category: 12.8%
- Non-nurse Interprofessional Team Member (Physician, OT, PT, RD, Student, Chaplain, other): 7.7%
- Nurse Manager or above: 20.5%
- Clinical Nurse Specialist, Nurse Specialist, Clinical Nurse Educator or Researcher: 48.7%
- Clinical Nurse: 10.3%
Q3 In what context did you work with the Academic Partner?

- Other: 7.7%
- Consultancy for relationship development: 7.7%
- Consultancy for problem solving: 28.2%
- Consultancy for abstracts for conferences: 10.3%
- Group Consultation for writing for publication: 46.2%
- 1:1 Consultation for writing for publication: 35.9%
- Group Consultation for research study: 48.7%
- 1:1 Consultation for research study: 41.0%
- Collaborative Governance Council: 41.0%
- Formal class presentation: 38.5%
Kirkpatrick’s Evaluation Model

Level 1: Reaction
Level 2: Learning
Level 3: Behavior
Level 4: Results
Kirkpatrick’s Evaluation Model

Level 1: Reaction
Level 2: Learning
Level 3: Behavior
Level 4: Results
Q4 (1-14)- Level of Agreement that the academic partner increased your knowledge, helped you to appreciate or taught skills that you applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options (strongly agree-strongly disagree)</th>
<th>Mean (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure the effect of everything I do</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of research tools and instruments</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an instrument to measure concept of interest</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a review of the literature</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique a research article</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read a quantitative/qualitative research article</td>
<td>2.68/2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit a proposal for Institutional Review Board</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a quantitative/qualitative study</td>
<td>2.39/2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter data into SPSS</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SPSS to data analysis</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read statistics</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 (15-34) Level of Agreement that the academic partner increased your knowledge, helped you to appreciate or taught skills that you applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Mean (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply statistical measures</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a concept analysis</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct an EBP project</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use conceptual models</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use theories in practice/research</td>
<td>2.66/2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the publication process</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a manuscript for publication</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare an abstract for consideration at a conference</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a poster/prepare an oral presentation</td>
<td>1.58/1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct program evaluation</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write learning objectives/test items/SMART goals</td>
<td>2.22/1.49/1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Benefits to the Organization

- Her presence sends a clear message that Sharp values research and education.
- Having an academic partnership facilitates the integration of EBP, research and innovative initiatives into clinical and operational processes.
- Proximity to staff helps to bridge the gap between bedside care and research/EBP.
Q6- To what extent has the academic partner influenced you in your professional growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Mean (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned to school for advanced degree</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a certification course</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained certification</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a conference</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered to be an officer in a professional org</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced me to advance my position at SHC</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended EBP Institute</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for scholarship</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for a mini-grant</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 Influence on Personal or Professional Advancement

• Influenced me to publish
• Learned how to mentor staff in the research process – “paying it forward”
• Influenced me to value the Magnet® process and my knowledge of the Magnet® components
• Stimulated my interest in future research
• Influenced the need for real measurement
Q7 Personal Benefits Gained from Academic Partner

- Access for professional consultation – higher expectations for personal/professional growth
- More confidence, I went from 0 to a 4 out of 10 in self-rating my confidence to conduct research and publish
- I learned more from her that I did during my masters program
- Able to understand/apply theories into my practice
- Encouraged to return to school
As a result of my consultation with the academic partner, I accomplished the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducted a research study</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted an EBP project</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed a new instrument or checklist</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted a manuscript for publication</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted an abstract for a conference</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in school to earn an advanced degree</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed an advanced degree</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 Personal Accomplishments as of Result of Academic Partner

- Completed 5 Magnet® stories
- Wrote a manuscript and submitted for publication
- Submitted a research study to the IRB
- Worked on an EBP project
- Received feedback on a manual I was writing
- Became a member of an editorial board for peer-reviewed journal
Kirkpatrick’s Evaluation Model

Level 1
Reaction

Level 2
Learning

Level 3
Behavior

Level 4
Results
Level 4: Results – 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research studies</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBP projects</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Podium presentations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poster presentations</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publications in peer reviewed journals</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced graduate or doctoral level education</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic-Service Agreement</td>
<td>Renewed for 2015-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Attributes for Success

- Collaborative
- Role model
- Knowledgeable
- Generative
- On task – keeps others focused
- Respectful, encouraging and patient
- Fosters partnerships
- Inquisitive
- Derives satisfaction from other’s success
Recommendations

• Ensure well-written agreement and role description
• Develop mutually acceptable goals
• Embed the academic partner in the culture and structure of the organization
• Measure outcomes
• Communicate successes
• Make changes as necessary
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