Final Report
Engaged Department Grant Program
Due: Friday, May 28, 2010

Department: Pharmaceutical Care and Health Systems

Contact Person's Name: Todd D. Sorensen, Pharm.D.

Phone Number: 612-625-8645

Email Address: soren042@umn.edu

1. In the spaces below, please identify each of your goals from the action plan and denote the extent to which the goal was accomplished. Please attach materials that support this assessment.

1=*not at all accomplished*, *2=minimally accomplished*,
3=somewhat accomplished, *4=fully accomplished*

Goals:	1	2	3	4
1. Establish a broad understanding of "engagement" across PCHS faculty.	☐	☐	x	☐
2. Inject conversation of "community engagement" into curricular reform discussions	☐	☐	x	☐
3. Establish a pilot service learning program in conjunction with local FQHCs.	☐	☐	☐	x
4. Increase understanding among partners regarding the medication use (and other) needs of local FQHCs and the teaching, research and service interests and capacity of the College of Pharmacy	☐	x	☐	☐
5. Ensure that the department's values with respect to community engaged work are appropriately reflected in the annual review and promotion and tenure processes.	☐	☐	x	☐
6.	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Choose one area of accomplishment and explain what factors contributed to that success.

Most of our time and energy was directed to establishing a curricular-based service learning pilot in collaboration with five local federally-qualified health centers, and by nearly all accounts, this

was very successful and will continue with expanded capacity in the future. One of the elements that greatly added to the success was deliberate work we engaged in during the summer of 2009 to visit key individuals at each of the FQHCs and interview them regarding how this initiative would best work from their perspective. They provided great insights that would not have necessarily been recognized by the campus based group had we not developed the program collaboratively with these partners. Success was also achieved by starting relatively small (we purposely decided to limit enrollment to a lower number than was originally anticipated), working closely with a small number of sites and a small number of students to ensure that the program was well designed before expanding to larger groups. Finally, another success was a small end-of-semester "celebration" we held that included students, community partners and PCHS faculty. This allowed students to recognize the importance of this pilot and their contributions to it, our partners felt recognized for their role in designing and deliverying the program and it allowed PCHS faculty who were not directly involved in this initiative to understand this area of engagement and see the value of it continuing in the future.

This pilot was an excellent learning experience for the Department and our community partners while also providing an important learning experience to our students. Success in the future will be enhance because of the way we managed the pilot.

3. Choose one area of struggle and explain the factors that prevented success at this point in time.

Fortunately, there were few truly significant challenges beyond simply finding ways to commit the time to all goals we originally set for our work group. One modest area of struggle was experienced within the service learning initiative where one of the partnering sites did not define activities for students that were consistent with a service learning philosophy, resulting in some disappointment on the part of the students assigned to that site. This resulted from a lack of communication between the course leaders and the site as that site went through a transition in program leadership. Tthe individual with whom we worked with during the summer/fall of 2009 left the organization in January, just as the service learning pilot was starting – staff who become responsible for this at the site were not fully appraised of what had been planned previously and did not have a full appreciation of the types of learning activities would best meet expectations for service learning. Once identified, this was partially resolved, however it was late in the semester and not much time was left to enhance the experience the students who were currently working with that organization.

4. What lessons did you learn in each of the following areas that would be beneficial information for future Engaged Department teams?

Team Formation	We had community partners involved right from the beginning and attended the first grantee meeting with us. This was tremendously helpful. The partners felt that they were equal participants, better understood the how engagement is valued by the University and it contributed to their investment in our work.
Meeting Coordination	While we met when appropriate, we relied more on asynchronous communication strategies among the team (email, 1:1 conversations between the group leader and individuals). There were 2 individuals responsible for overall coordination who worked closely together and met regularly, but others were engaged less formally but routinely. This worked because individuals didn't feel that there were unnecessarily committing time to meetings that were not entirely relevant to them individually. It struck a good balance between keeping everyone in the group engaged and allowed them to contribute where appropriate. While counterintuitive, we believe that trying to schedule more meetings of the whole group could have actually led several participants becoming disenfranchised because they could feel that their time was being used ineffectively.
Action Planning	The use of the action planning sheets provided by the Office of Engagement were very helpful and were useful to help keep work on track. They weren't simply used to document plans and report them to the Office of Engagement – they were helpful in communicating plans across the leaders of this initiative.
Implementation	As mentioned above, we decided to scale down the scope of the service learning initiative from what we had originally planned. This turned out to be an important decision that allowed the pilot to be more manageable and ultimately more successful. Had we gone ahead with original plans, we would have encountered greater problems that may have left participants feeling less inspired about the future of the program.
Budgeting	We used a sizable portion of our grant to hire on a limited hourly basis one of the staff from our partnering sites to assist with the service learning program. This demonstrated commitment that the initiative truly being designed in a collaborative manner and created a great conduit for communication between the department and the community partners.
Other	

5. What strategies will your team implement to continue its work toward becoming an Engaged Department?

The work team will continue to develop the service learning pilot into a permanent component of our curriculum – this work will occur Summer 2010. This effort will also influence broader discussions as part of curriculum revision planning across the College of Pharmacy.
PCHS is launching a new e-journal Summer 2010 (*INNOVATIONS in Pharmacy Practice*) and we have committed a section of the journal to community engagement in pharmacy, which will assist in making engagement a regularly recognized area of work valued by our department.

6. Please provide feedback about the Engaged Department grant program and your recommendations for future institutes.

The program, from beginning to end, was well designed and really served as an important impetus for change around engagement despite grant dollars being relatively small. Keeping the teams apprised of each other's work and connected to the Office of Engagement over the 15 month cycle was a key element of success and a good balance was struck between flexibility as teams found they needed to alter their course once implementation began with a sense of accountability for the work they were doing through this grant. It was a positive experience throughout.

7. Complete the final expenditure report below or attach your own document.

Amount of grant: $10,000

Description of expenditure:	Amount spent:
Student Research Associate (wages) – Community partner interviews Summer 2009	$2000
Community Staff Member (wages) – Service learning pilot development and implementation Winter/Spring 2010	$6500
Community Building Event fall 2009	$300
Travel Support (presentation of service learning initiative at national meeting Summer 2010)	$500
Misc supplies	$700

Total amount spent: $10,000 (not all expenses have been incurred at the time of this report)