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ELC 2019 SESSION OBJECTIVES
During this session, participants will:

- Build on previous work to identify opportunities for improving communication through development of an effective CE network structure that:
  - Conforms to organizational principles (i.e., centralized vs decentralized, network management, formalization, trust,...)
  - Is efficient, cost-effective, user-friendly & sustainable
  - Could support other functions if needed in the future
- Suggest strategies for moving from discussion phase to development phase
THE WHY
The view from 30,000 feet

- Call for communication structure coming from:
  - National organizations
  - Task forces
  - Strategy meetings
  - Regional networking session

- Need to be mindful of other functions that could evolve in future:
  - Resource sharing (one-stop shop)
  - Research
  - Placement process
THINK BIG PICTURE
A clinical education ecosystem?

- Macro - national CE network
- Meso - regions/consortia
- Micro - academic program-clinic site relationships
THE WHO
Consider horizontal and vertical communication needs
### Horizontal Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National – National</td>
<td>Mixed (yellow &amp; green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional - Regional</td>
<td>Mostly red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local level:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Clinic Site – Clinic Site</td>
<td>Mostly red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Acad Prog – Acad Prog</td>
<td>Mostly green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Acad Prog – Clinic Site</td>
<td>Mixed (yellow &amp; green)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vertical Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National - Regional</td>
<td>Mixed (red, green &amp; yellow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National - Individual</td>
<td>All red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional – Acad Prog</td>
<td>Mostly green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional – Clinic Site</td>
<td>Mostly yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE WHO
Recognize both organizational and individual stakeholders

American Physical Therapy Association

American Council of Academic Physical Therapy

National Consortium of Clinical Educators

Academy of PT Education

Clinical Education Special Interest Group

Education Leadership Partnership

Institutional Membership

Individual Membership

NOTE: we need to also conceptualize organizational and individual stakeholder relationships at regional and local level

THE WHO

Consider organizational and individual needs/value at all levels

- Organization needs/value
  - APTA, ACAPT, APTE
  - NCCE, CESIG
  - Regional Consortia
  - Academic programs
  - Clinical sites

- Individual needs/value
  - SCCEs
  - CIs
  - Managers/Administrators
  - Program Directors/Deans
  - DCEs
  - Students
THE WHO - REGIONAL LEVEL
Membership make-up of regional consortia - ELC 2016
FACT FINDING POLL
Organizational vs individual membership/representation (current status)

Organizational representation

- Is your consortium representative of all programs in your region?
- Is your consortia representative of all contracted clinical sites in your region?

Individual representation

- Does your consortium represent all individual CE stakeholders in your region (ie: DCEs, SCCEs, CIs, etc)?
FACT FINDING POLL RESULTS

Is your consortium representative of all programs in your region?

- Yes: 54%
- No: 46%
- Unknown
FACT FINDING POLL RESULTS

Is your consortia representative of all contracted clinical sites in your region?

- Yes: 13%
- No: 80%
- Unknown: 7%
FACT FINDING POLL RESULTS

Does your consortium represent all individual CE stakeholders in your region (ie: DCEs, SCCEs, CIs, etc)?

- Yes: 12%
- No: 88%
- Unknown: N/A
BREAK OUT #1 - discussion and top 2 themes
Organizational vs individual membership/representation
(ideal representation)

Organizational representation
- Should consortia represent ALL programs/clinic sites in their region?

Individual representation
- Should consortia represent ALL individual stakeholders in their region?

What are the benefits and challenges to inclusive membership and/or representation?
BREAK OUT #1 WRAP UP
Organizational vs individual membership/representation
(impact moving forward)

- How does organizational and individual membership/representation impact the potential for developing a communication network with ALL stakeholders in a region?
  - How do we balance organizational and individual needs/value?
THE WHAT
Functions of a clinical education network (examples)

- **COMMUNICATION**
  - Routine information sharing, giving/receiving input, urgent notices, etc.

- Collaboration
  - Education, training, research, shared resources, placement process, etc.

- Decision-making
  - Sharing data, mentorship, etc.

- Outreach
  - Connect to those not engaged, to managers/administrators, etc.
  - While reducing redundancy

- Others??
# THE WHAT

Regional consortia functions - ELC 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of consortia collaborating on:</th>
<th>Peer Network</th>
<th>Clinical Faculty Development</th>
<th>Disseminate CE Resources</th>
<th>Clinical Faculty Recognition</th>
<th>Collaborative Research Projects</th>
<th>Mentor Clinical Faculty</th>
<th>Regional Policy-Setting</th>
<th>Student Placements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BREAK OUT #2**

Consider individual and organizational needs

- What functions can be served or enhanced by improved vertical communication?
- What functions can be served or enhanced by improved horizontal communication?

Using color-coded post-it notes
- Identify functions that may be served or enhanced in each quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dark Blue</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE STAKEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE HOW
Network structures

Centralized
- Hierarchical governance
- More network management
- Less formal P&P
- More informal relationship

Decentralized
- Shared governance
- Less management, more power sharing
- More formalization
- Strong trust
STRUCTURE
Blending centralized & decentralized features

- Best of both worlds?
  - Centralized units promote consistency, compliance, “one-stop shop”
  - Decentralization allows autonomy, room for individualization, unique cultures
STRUCTURE IDEAS FROM ELC 2018
Circular design - centralized or blended
STRUCTURE IDEAS FROM ELC 2018
Linear design - centralized or blended
BREAK OUT #3 - discussion and top 2 themes
Centralized, de-centralized, or blended
Considerations

From a regional consortia perspective:

- What issues and/or needs should be considered to determine the best structure for a CE network?
- What information should be gathered to determine the best structure for a CE network?
OPINION POLL
Centralized, de-centralized, or blended
Impressions

- Opinion poll: What is your initial impression of structure based on discussion/pictures?
  - Centralized
  - De-centralized
  - Blended
OPINION POLL RESULTS

What is your initial impression of structure based on discussion/pictures?

- Centralized: A (17%)
- Decentralized: B (4%)
- Blended: C (78%)
THE HOW
Role of regions in network - ELC 2018 results

More Positives
- Stronger partnerships
- More connections
- Improved uniformity
- More sharing
- Improved efficiency

But Some Concerns Expressed
- Competitiveness
- Equal representation
- Trust issues
- National oversight
- More “layers”
THE HOW - ELC 2016 RESULTS
Regional variability - structure & geographic distribution

Organizational structure

- Written by laws: Yes (17), No (3), In process (2)
- Non-profit status: Yes (10), No (10)
- Dues required: Yes (15), No (7), In process (0)
- Elect officers: Yes (19), No (3), In process (0)
BREAK OUT #4 - discussion and top 2 themes
Precursors to developing a network

- Is more uniformity in structure and distribution of regional consortia needed before a national network can be developed?
  - If so, how do individual and organizational stakeholders maintain their uniqueness while embracing the opportunity for increasing uniformity?

- What are the opportunities and challenges to developing inter-consortia collaboration and communication?
PART II: OPEN SESSION
THE WHY
The view from 30,000 feet

- Call for communication structure coming from:
  - National organizations
  - Task forces
  - Strategy meetings
  - Regional networking session

- Need to be mindful of other functions that could evolve in future
  - Resource sharing (one-stop shop)
  - Research
  - Placement process
THINK BIG PICTURE
A clinical education ecosystem?

- Macro - national CE network
- Meso - regions/consortia
- Micro - academic program-clinic site relationships
THE WHO
Consider horizontal and vertical communication needs

Bottom-up communication

National
Regional
Local

Top-down communication

National
Regional
Local

Horizontal communication

Vertical communication
SUMMARY FROM EARLIER DISCUSSIONS WITH CONSORTIA LEADERSHIP

- Consortial representation of organizations (academic programs, clinic sites) and individuals (DCEs, SCCEs, CIs, managers, etc.) in their region - top themes:
  - Geography / Mechanics for Engagement
  - Defining Value and Purpose
  - Inclusivity of Stakeholders/ Having a Voice - Climate Change
  - Resources / Academic Programs
SUMMARY FROM EARLIER DISCUSSIONS WITH CONSORTIA LEADERSHIP

- Considerations/information needed to determine best structure for CE network - top themes:
  - Infrastructure - Resources and Centralization
  - Ownership / Stakeholders - Trust and Locus of Control
  - Communication - Engaging and Sharing Bi-directionally

- Initial impressions of structure needed:
  - Centralized = 19%
  - Decentralized = 5%
  - Blended = 76%
SUMMARY FROM EARLIER DISCUSSIONS WITH CONSORTIA LEADERSHIP

- Considerations about uniformity among consortia; opportunities and challenges - top themes:
  - Uniqueness and Uniformity
  - Culture Change
  - Ensuring Representation
  - Relying on Work of Others
IMPROVING CE COMMUNICATION (network or not)
Use of information and communication technology (ICT)

 ICT = all technologies used to record, store and communicate information (ie: internet, cell phones, computers, video conferencing, social networking, etc.)

Effective ICT in a CE network will:

- Increase/improve communication among all stakeholders
- Will support a “one-stop shop” (thus increasing access to and efficiency in obtaining resources)
WHAT WE KNOW FROM ELC 2016
Use of ICT for consortium document storage

- officer keeps
- website
- google docs
- Yahoo
WHAT WE KNOW FROM ELC 2016
Use of ICT for consortium communication

- email
- website
- phone
- video conference
- Blackboard
- Facebook group
- web blasts
WHAT WE KNOW FROM ELC 2018
Use of ICT for CE communication

- email
- face-to-face meetings
- phone/video conferencing
- web-based databases
- website
- regional and/or national listserves
- informal social gatherings
- social media
- Other
**BREAK OUT #5**

**Brainstorming ICT needs of network**

- **Using color-coded post-its**
  - What ICT challenges need to be addressed at the different network levels?
  - What ICT/platforms are best suited for the different network levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dark Blue</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>VERTICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE STAKEHOLDERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SUMMARY FROM EARLIER DISCUSSIONS WITH CONSORTIA LEADERSHIP**

- Functions that can be served or enhanced by CE network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dark Blue</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Efficiencies / Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Sharing</td>
<td>Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Relationship Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility and Trust</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Perspective</td>
<td>Transparency and Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Roles and</td>
<td>Knowledge and Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CE STAKEHOLDERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICT WRAP UP DISCUSSION
Brainstorming ICT needs of network

- How/what ICT can help us reach those individuals and organizations not currently engaged?
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT STEPS

- What do we need to do to move from discussing development of CE communication network to actually begin developing the network and ICT foundation?
  - What expertise is needed?
  - What financial support is needed?
  - What stakeholders need to be involved?
THANKS FOR NETWORKING WITH US!!
ENJOY THE REST OF YOUR ADVENTURES AT ELC

NCCE Business Meeting
- Fri 5:15-7:15 pm in Hyatt Regency Bellevue - Regency EFG

Clin Ed SIG meeting
- Sat 8-10am in Hyatt Regency Bellevue - Evergreen A-F