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Conference Resources

Slides and handouts shared by our conference presenters are available on the CFHA website at https://www.cfha.net/page/Resources_2019 and on the conference mobile app.
At the conclusion of this session, the participant will be able to:

- Identify **implementation science frameworks** that guide development of interdisciplinary workforce development programs

- Articulate differences in **workforce training outcomes** by delivery modality (e.g. online, hybrid, in-person)

- Describe **implications** of an SBIRT training program on the interprofessional workforce
Learning Assessment

• A learning assessment is required for CE credit.
• A question and answer period will be conducted at the end of this presentation.
The Challenge...

• 24% of the general population engages in risky substance use  
  *(Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2017)*

But...

• 60% of psychology programs lack addictions faculty; 46% maintain no addictions courses  
  *(Dimoff, et al., 2017)*

• 83% of Psy.D. programs lack faculty expertise in addictions  
  *(Dimoff, et al., 2017)*

• 1/58 reviewed Social Work programs included a required addictions course  
  *(Russett & Williams, 2015)*

• Nursing programs maintain an average of 11 hours of addictions-related instruction; advanced practice nursing - 8 hours  
  *(Savage, et al., 2014; Savage, Daniels, Johnson, Finnell, & Seale, 2018)*
## ASU SBIRT Training Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU SBIRT Collaborative Model</th>
<th>Theories of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Lifecycle Dimensions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diffusion of Innovations (Rogers, 1962, 2002)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Trialability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Dissemination</td>
<td>Knowledge Persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Roadmap of Project Lifecycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Lifecycle Phases</th>
<th>Inquiries</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase 1: Needs Assessment | Does this fit for us?  
How?                                          | Council of Directors (COD) model  
Site visits  
Crosswalk of program vernacular |
| Phase 2: Information Dissemination | How will we get the information to the people who need it?    | Program website  
BRIDGE meetings  
Web-based simulations |
| Phase 3: Implementation | How will we determine that the innovation is available @ ASU?      | Course infusion  
On-campus clinics |
| Phase 4: Sustainability  | What is needed for the innovation to continue @ ASU?              | SBIRT-infused syllabi  
Online simulation & modules  
Campus clinics |
# Student Outcomes: Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of training</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of training materials</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training experience</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = very dissatisfied
5 = very satisfied
Student Outcomes: Knowledge and Self-Efficacy

Students felt most knowledgeable and effective in screening and referral practices; students felt less knowledgeable and effective in brief intervention techniques.
Student Outcomes: Use Outside of Classroom

- 81% agreed or strongly agreed that they would use lessons learned in SBIRT modules
- 42.3% of graduates surveyed reported using SBIRT in their jobs
Faculty/University Outcomes

- SBIRT was **implemented** by 89.47% of trained faculty

- 33 course sessions were **delivered** in 3 years (21 unique courses) (n=438 students)

- SBIRT was implemented at 4 campus-based **training clinics** (sustained at 3)

- At the close of the project, SBIRT course content was **sustained** in 90.47% of syllabi
Implications and Lessons Learned

- **accreditation/licensing requirements** limit curricular innovations; accreditation requirements need to be adjusted to better incorporate substance use intervention training.

- Developing **accessible online materials** addresses barriers (faculty turnover, time burden on instructors, etc.).

- Students require **applied learning opportunities** (simulations for online learners; role plays for in-person students).
  - but... **costs** associated with simulation licensing are prohibitive.

- Successful implementation requires strong **department leadership support** (i.e. department chairs).
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