Abstract: Medical education is rapidly evolving to meet the changing needs of learners and medical systems. Increasingly, institutions rely on distributed models and regional campuses to deliver education to their diverse students. Layered upon this complex environment, many institutions are incorporating healthcare systems science into their curriculum though many physician educators have had no formal training in these concepts.

In order to enhance faculty competence and confidence so that they are adequately prepared to teach these new concepts, faculty members must have a basic level of knowledge in this new field and be equipped with effective ways to teach these topics. Given the demands on faculty time and the distributed nature of medical education, this faculty development will likely occur using self-directed, online, or other asynchronous modes of training.

We developed a faculty development (FD) program to support faculty members teaching emerging topics in healthcare systems science to second year medical students at multiple regional campuses. Drawing upon outcomes data from this FD program, session participants will engage in facilitated discussions regarding both the framework and content of emerging FD programs that aim to prepare faculty to teach high value topics such as healthcare systems science to a diverse and widely-distributed faculty.

Conceptual Viewpoints: There is very little information regarding how to develop and present an effective FD program that involves new concepts as well as new techniques for delivery of that content when there is enormous variability in the knowledge, experience, and location of the teaching faculty. We developed our program utilizing several interrelated concepts to create a hybrid, in-person/asynchronous online and experiential FD program that was delivered over the course of 12 weeks.

Prior to development of the program, multiple concepts and models were reviewed. The curriculum was designed to meet Irby, O’Sullivan, and Steinert’s1 six general criteria for excellent FD programming. Baker and colleagues2 fishhook model of FD also helped to inform the program. This model builds upon social network theory as a way to create a network for FD. The authors contend building FD programs requires leaders to identify a mobilizer, recruit key stakeholders, grow their network, accumulate social capital, and manage legitimacy. While Baker and colleagues2 do not explicitly address the application of this model among regional campuses or via technology, we believe it is germane to these challenges.

In order to ensure that our program met these criteria, we employed Kirkpatrick’s evaluation model.3 Three of four levels served as a framework to analyze our program. A variety of tools were used to assess the participants’ satisfaction with the program (reaction), acquisition of concepts and principles, changes in perception and attitudes towards teaching (learning), and willingness to utilize the new information in the classroom setting (behavior). Data to inform the fourth level (results) are currently being analyzed.

While evidence-based FD is widely discussed, there is currently no model that address the intersection of teaching development, delivering new content, and variability in the type and location of the faculty (as is the case with regional campuses). We plan to utilize our experience with this FD program in combination with the knowledge and personal
experience of others to develop the framework for these types of programs.

**Session Plan:**
- How the models and guidelines were used to create, develop, and assess our FD program – 15 minutes
- Evaluation of engagement and effectiveness of the program using quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data collected – 15 minutes
- Workshop participants will be divided into small groups to explore:
  ----FD practices at their and other institutions
  ----Possible alternative, effective models
  ----Role of networks and established groups in encouraging engagement
- How to combine teaching of content and process in FD – 25 minutes
- Presentation of results obtained from each small group – 30 minutes
- Development of MedEd Portal working groups and next steps – 5 minutes

**Outcome:**
Participants will:
- Assess current FD practices on high value topics and distributed networks at their institutions
- Critically analyze the data from one FD program
- Collaborate with colleagues to test which delivery modes are most effective for particular high value topics
- Discuss possible assessment methods for these types of FD programs, focusing on outcomes and return on investment, including knowledge acquisition, improved self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness, and engagement.
- Divide into work groups to develop MedEdPortal submissions that synthesize best practices in two areas:
  ----Faculty development on high value, interdisciplinary topics
  ----Faculty development in distributed education systems
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