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In 2005, the John A. Hartford Foundation, a leading philanthropy committed to improving the health care of older adults since 1929, made a $2.48 million grant to the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) to implement the Geriatric Nursing Education Consortium (GNEC). Carried out in collaboration with the Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing at New York University College of Nursing, the GNEC project supported the Foundation’s mission by working to achieve the following goals:

• Increase geriatric content in senior-level undergraduate nursing courses;

• Educate faculty at baccalaureate schools of nursing nationwide in both the fundamentals of geriatric nursing and in the use of geriatric curriculum resources;

• Support and empower trained faculty as they champion geriatric education to train colleagues and oversee curriculum revision at their home institutions; and

• Provide faculty with an array of innovative resources to prepare baccalaureate-educated nurses by inculcating them with the expertise, and nurturing their enthusiasm to care for older adults.

Driven by the urgent need to fill a troubling gap in undergraduate nursing education: that only some nursing students had significant exposure to information about the health needs of older adults1, GNEC’s core strategy involved reaching out to nursing faculty across the country and offering them a unique series of six Faculty Development Institutes (FDIs) that would enable them to incorporate evidence-based content into a wide range of senior-level nursing courses.

Through attendance at the FDIs, nursing faculty immersed themselves in the content — presented in the form of nine curricular modules — and brought back to their nursing programs both solid resources and a strong commitment to teaching the material. With the support of their deans, the participating faculty were charged to make significant curriculum changes, primarily by infusing evidence-based geriatric nursing knowledge and practice into a wide range of senior-level nursing courses.

This Evaluation Brief has three aims: (1) to document the remarkable success of the GNEC initiative; (2) to encourage GNEC: A Powerful Force for Curricular Change

The Geriatric Nursing Education Consortium, GNEC, was very effective. A total of 808 nursing faculty from 418 institutions — drawn from all 50 states — attended one of the six two-day Faculty Development Institutes that GNEC offered. The participating institutions represent 69 percent of nursing programs in the US at that time.

Of 344 institutions who reported to us at the end of two years, 281 institutions (81.7 percent) revised and enhanced 676 existing senior-level nursing courses with the evidence-based curricular material on caring for older adults. In addition, 115 new “stand-alone,” or purely geriatric courses, were created. Furthermore, there is firm evidence that at least 70 percent of the revised and enhanced courses are required by their institutional programs, as are 43 percent of the stand-alone courses2.

These achievements indicate that thousands of nursing students, in nearly half the nursing schools in the country, will be exposed to best practices in geriatric care across a wide range of course offerings. Since such a high proportion of patients are older adults, this success serves as a quality boost for the entire health care system.

nursing faculty and nursing program leaders to take advantage of the resources created for those not able to attend one of the FDIs; and (3) given that older adults are increasingly becoming a significant portion of most nurses’ core responsibility across the health care system, to encourage other funders to build on this strong foundation and ensure that all nursing students graduate with the ability to provide high quality care to older adults.

Baruch College’s School of Public Affairs evaluated the GNEC Project to assess both the process of curriculum change — e.g. “What was the FDI experience like?,” “How did participants assess the curricular modules?,” and “What facilitated or hindered change?” — and the outcomes, particularly, “How many courses were revised or enhanced?” To analyze the project’s results, the evaluation team surveyed FDI participants through an online portal one and then two years after their attendance at an institute. This Brief explores the results of that evaluation in more detail, but it first begins with the bottom line, which is clear, and a cause for celebration.

Creating a Multiplier Effect

The GNEC project followed a clear model for assisting faculty with changing the senior-level nursing curriculum in order to maximize the knowledge and skills of their nursing students in caring for older adults. The box summarizes six steps of this strategically designed process, which can also be thought of as a “train-the-trainer” model. When GNEC faculty returned home, some put together formal training sessions with their colleagues, while others used more informal and individualized contacts. Our data show that these follow-up steps made a considerable difference (see below) in faculty convincing their colleagues to design and teach revised courses with evidence-based geriatric content. This approach to disseminating the information created a powerful “multiplier” effect through which intensive training for a few faculty led to extensive curriculum change. Further, AACN continues to provide material from the modules through archived webinars, which has so far resulted in 25 new institutions being exposed to GNEC. Specifically, 271 faculty, of whom only 45 had previously attended an FDI, participated in the initial webinars. Several health care organizations were also in attendance. Over 80 faculty have already viewed the archived versions.

What Made GNEC Work: Our Findings

We administered surveys to all GNEC participants twice: one year after their FDI, and two years after. Of the 418 institutions that sent participants, 392 sent in a survey at least once. The findings below are based, however, on the achievements of the 344 institutions that completed the Year Two survey (response rate = 82.3 percent). According to our survey data, several factors, described below, had a statistically significant relationship to our key outcome — the number of existing senior-level courses revised and enhanced by a given institution.

• The Participating Organizations: Over 40 percent of the 281 organizations that responded to this survey question said they had offered a stand-alone course in geriatrics prior to FDI participation (p=.029). Clearly,

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The GNEC Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify evidence-based practice in the care of older adults for inclusion across the undergraduate senior-level nursing curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create nine distinct curricular modules that capture and reflect this evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Invite nursing programs around the country to send faculty to one of six Faculty Development Institutes to learn about the modules and how to use them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Require support of the dean for faculty participants, including time to work on curriculum revision with their colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Encourage FDI faculty to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. share their learning, resources and inspiration with other faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. work directly with other faculty to revise and enhance their senior-level courses and create new stand-alone geriatric nursing courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Offer these courses!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 We only received information on whether enhanced or new courses were required from about two-thirds of the nursing programs, so it is entirely possible that even more of the courses were required.
institutions with an existing commitment to the field of geriatrics may have been “primed” to look favorably on the idea of amending existing courses to make room for geriatric-focused material.

- **The Participating Faculty:** On average, it had been 11.48 years since participants received their highest degree in nursing; they had an average of 13.31 years of teaching experience in nursing. Attendees were most likely to have a Master’s degree (61.2 percent) or a Doctorate (38.6 percent). Nearly half of the participants were Assistant Professors (47.3 percent), 23.8 percent were Associate Professors, 9 percent were Full Professors and 18.8 percent were Lecturers or Instructors. About a quarter (25.8 percent) were tenured, 22.2 percent were in a tenure track position, but not yet tenured, and 52 percent were in non-tenure track jobs.

While participants reflected the full range of experience and rank in nursing schools, higher academic credentials did make a difference. The number of revised and enhanced senior-level nursing courses was positively related to the highest nursing degree of participating faculty (p=.025), as well as to their rank (p=.025). Additionally, revised and enhanced courses were more likely to be taught by other faculty when the GNEC participants were older (p=.039).

- **The Quality of the FDI Materials:** Another statistically significant factor was how feasible participants found it to incorporate GNEC materials into didactic and clinical course components. Nearly 60 percent (58.7 percent) of participants said it was either “very” or “mostly” feasible to incorporate the materials into both (p=.010), with about 22 percent of participants noting that it was “very” feasible (p=.002).

We asked participants to rate each of the nine curricular modules (see below) on a scale of “Excellent” to “Poor.” On average, participants rated 4.03 out of nine modules (SD 3.70) as “Excellent” and 7.51 modules as “Excellent” or “Very Good” (SD 2.51). Both module ratings were significantly and positively related to the number of courses revised and enhanced (p=.043/p=.018).

We also asked how strongly participants agreed with four different attributes of the GNEC materials: “Did they cover content areas that fit well into existing courses?,” “Did they incorporate effective teaching strategies and tools?,” “Were they usable with little or no adaptation?,” and “Were they usable with little or no additional training by faculty with a limited gerontology background?” We then created a composite to arrive at the number of attributes with which respondents said they agreed. Out of a total of four attributes with which participants “strongly agreed,” the mean was 1.28 attributes (SD=1.496), an outcome that was also positively related to the number of courses revised and enhanced (p=.039).

Taken together, these findings demonstrate that the quality of the modules themselves contributed to the participants’ ability to enhance courses using the materials. That this was possible for both clinical and didactic courses was particularly important. As noted by a faculty member from

### Nine Curricular Modules

- Critical Thinking Related to Complex Care of Older Adults
- Assessment and Management of Dementia/Delirium Related to Older Adults with Complex Care Needs
- Modification of Assessment and Atypical Presentation and Geriatric Syndromes in Older Adults with Complex Illness
- Assessment and Management of Heart Disease Related to Complex Care of Older Adults
- Assessment and Management of Cancer Related to Older Adults with Complex Care Needs
- Assessment and Management of Diabetes Type 2 in Older Adults with Complex Care Needs
- Assessment and Management of Older Adults with Complex Illness in the Critical Care Unit
- Assessment and Management of Mental Health Related to Complex and Specialized Care of Older Adults
- Models of Care and Interdisciplinary Care Related to Complex Care of Older Adults
Where to Find GNEC Resources

The complete set of GNEC materials — modules, associated resources and webinars — can be found at:

• http://www.aacn.nche.edu/geriatric-nursing/gnec.

In addition, podcasts of these modules can be found at:

• http://consultgerirn.org/resources/gnec_podcasts/.

Salisbury University [see pages 7–8] “…the incorporation of materials into clinical course components is a less concrete, more conceptual process — faculty are integrating an approach to care, not PowerPoint slides.”

• The Overall Helpfulness of the FDI Experience:
When asked to rate overall helpfulness, just over one third of responding participants (34.4 percent) gave the experience the top value of “extremely helpful,” while another third (37.2 percent) deemed the experience “very helpful.” Perhaps, not surprisingly, this was highly and positively related to the number of courses revised/enhanced (p=.000).

• Steps Participants Took When They Got Home:
Following an FDI, most participants shared the content with their colleagues, as well as provided hands-on help with infusing the new content into existing courses. The more personal the interaction participants had with their colleagues, the stronger the statistical relationship was between the type of action and the number of revised and enhanced senior-level nursing courses.

- Reporting back: About 61 percent of participants reported back to their faculty colleagues about the curricular materials they received. This action step was significantly and positively related to the number of senior-level nursing courses revised and enhanced following the FDI (p=.022).

- Conducting a formal training: About 20 percent of participants conducted a formal training session with their colleagues on at least one of the nine modules. This action step was also significantly and positively related to the number of revised and enhanced courses (p=.011).

- Working with faculty to incorporate content: Nearly two-thirds (62.2 percent) of the participants worked directly with one or more faculty members to help incorporate FDI content into existing senior-level classes. This step had the most significant and positive relationship with the number of courses revised and enhanced since the FDI (p=.000).

• Facilitators for Achieving Curricular Change: We asked faculty which of nine different factors participants thought were helpful in getting modules used to enhance courses. Of the three factors most often rated as “very positive,” two reflect the external environment of nursing schools, while the third reflects internal leadership. Thus, with regard to the external environment, 55.9 percent of participants said that the “inclusion of gerontology content in AACN’s Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice,” and 48.8 percent said that the “inclusion of gerontology content in the NCLEX-RN or Registered Nurse licensure exam” were “very positive” factors. As for the internal leadership factor, over half, 51.7 percent of participants, said that “strong support from their dean, chair or program head” was a “very positive” factor. The latter was positively related to the number of senior-level courses revised or enhanced (p=.037).

• Barriers to Curricular Change: All of the factors that participants identified as “serious” barriers to enhancing courses were internal. About a third (30.4 percent) of participants identified “increases in teaching demands on all faculty” and 26.8 percent said “increases in teaching demands on faculty attending the FDI” were “very serious” barriers. The factor, “insufficient time to focus on curricular change,” was also identified as a “very serious” barrier by 26.7 percent of respondents.

These most frequently cited barriers were not statistically related to the number of courses enhanced or revised. The following barriers, however, were: participants’ perception that other faculty members’ “resistance to being influenced over their course content” and “a lack of institutional recognition of older adults as a ‘core business’ of nursing” were both barriers that were negatively related to the number of courses revised and enhanced (p=.009 and p=.012 respectively). Thus, where these two barriers were strongest, or viewed as “very serious,” fewer courses were enhanced.

3 American Association of Colleges of Nursing 2008 The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, Washington, D.C.
• **Faculty and Student Response to Curricular Materials:** Survey respondents perceived that faculty and student responses to the GNEC materials were overwhelmingly positive. Specifically, they reported that 73.4 percent of faculty and 72.8 percent of students reacted either “very” or “somewhat” positively when exposed to the materials. Just over a quarter of students, and almost a third of faculty, were reported to have responded “very positively.” No significant statistical relationship emerged between these perceived responses and the numbers of courses revised and enhanced. However, these data speak to the supportive climate in which the majority of participants felt they worked while attempting to integrate the GNEC resources into their curricula.

**GNEC’s Architects: AACC and The Hartford Institute**

Among the biggest contributors to GNEC’s success were its key players: the AACC and the Hartford Institute. Tasked with designing and carrying out the project, each entity not only provided strong credibility and a wide reach, but also contributed complementary sets of skills and strengths.

**Association of American Colleges of Nursing**

As the grant holder, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACC)’s access to and legitimacy with virtually all nursing programs across the country was key to the project’s success. Experienced in building consensus across multiple organizations and academics with often different, even conflicting, perspectives, the AACC prioritized involving key experts and stakeholders throughout the development of GNEC’s materials. AACC also had practice with using a “train-the-trainer” model, the End of Life Nursing Education Consortium (ELNEC), in a previous effort to improve nursing education. Additionally, it successfully led an effort to incorporate geriatric content into its educational standards, the Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, which were endorsed by the AACC membership in 2008. Both experiences strengthened AACC’s position in carrying out GNEC.

As for focusing the Association’s interest on the care of older adults, AACC CEO and Executive Director Geraldine ("Polly") Bednash, PhD, RN, FAAN, identified two drivers: First, the “demographic imperative” of a growing older adult population, and second, the need to make sure that new professionals are well prepared to serve this population. On a personal note, Dr. Bednash said “I see the care that older adult colleagues get; I see how bad the care can be. And it makes me crazy.”

For Dr. Bednash, attention to the care of older adults is not an extra, or an elective, but an essential core element of undergraduate nursing education. Stressing that science and the evidence base change over time, she said, “we all have responsibility to continually provide state-of-the-art, evidence-based tools” upon which to base nursing curricula. “It’s a societal responsibility,” she said, “creating a nation that cares for everyone and consistently thinking through the impact of what [the nation does] on older adults …We live this, every one of us, every day.”

In implementing the GNEC project, AACC staff, specifically Senior Director of Education Policy Joan Stanley, PhD, RN, CRNP, FAAN, FAANP, and Gerontology Program Director Laurie Wilson, MSN, RN, ANP-BC, GNP-BC, oversaw the operations. Drs. Stanley and Ms. Wilson planned and managed the logistics for the six FDIIs, worked with nursing program leaders nationwide to recruit faculty participants, and helped ensure that the Baruch evaluation team’s surveys were completed by high percentages of participants.

Finally, as Dr. Bednash said, the Hartford Foundation is to be congratulated that they have made a long-term commitment to improving how clinicians are trained to take care of older adults. Anything other than a prolonged commitment, she said, would not work.

**The Hartford Institute**

Then the Director of the Hartford Institute, Dr. Mathy Mezey, EdD, RN, FAAN, met the AACC with interests in multiple aspects of nursing education, including the need to stimulate innovation at the undergraduate level. Early on, she and her team set out to investigate geriatrics in baccalaureate nursing education, because, as she said and echoing Dr. Bednash, nursing students weren’t graduating “with a sound understanding of how to take care of older adults.”
A Dean’s Perspective

Leadership matters, as does the overall culture and environment of a nursing program. We talked with Dr. Ellen Olshansky, director of the nursing program at the University of California, Irvine (UCI). Having enhanced five of its existing courses with content from GNEC, UCI represented a larger institution that achieved significant curricular change. In particular, Dr. Olshansky’s perspective informed our understanding of what helped create and sustain an internal environment conducive to the intensive use of GNEC’s curricular materials.

The nursing program had just begun in 2007 when Dr. Olshansky arrived to assume its leadership. In addition to a major interest in women’s health issues, she was “passionate from the outset that they needed to include gerontological content in their curriculum” seeing it as “essential.”

After Dr. Olshansky learned of the opportunity to attend the GNEC FDIs, she reached out to a pair of assistant professors: Dr. Jung-Ah Lee, who was already immersed in the field of geriatrics, and Dr. Sarah Choi, whose research focused on diabetes in the Korean aging community. Dr. Olshansky noted that at UCI, “publish or perish” is still a reality, so Dr. Lee and Dr. Choi had to obtain explicit administrative support — from both Dr. Olshansky and from the head of the adult/gero nurse practitioner program — in order to implement curricular change. Dr. Olshansky thought it notable, however, that in an environment such as UCI, where faculty governance is a core commitment, no other leaders had to be involved in making course changes. Because UCI was using GNEC’s strategy of “infusing” existing curricula, and not changing the essential focus of a course, it was unnecessary to go through the usual layers of curriculum review.

Dr. Olshansky did not have to be “hands-on” in making course enhancements, as the faculty took the lead. However, she did validate the need for additional skilled nursing facilities to serve as clinical settings. Ironically, one of UCI’s challenges concerned the shortage of clinical sites at which to apply the material. Given the presence of four “competing” nursing programs, more nursing students were in need of placement than sites were available in their area.

External factors presented both barriers and facilitators to change, according to Dr. Olshansky. UCI is a major research university, but one which, as part of the overall University of California system, has seen more than its share of serious budget cutbacks since the 2008 economic downturn. While the new nursing program began with a commitment to a substantial number of faculty budget lines, the budget cutbacks in the UC system led that number to be cut in half, with no diminution of the work to be done or students trained, she said. On the plus side, the inclusion of geriatrics in AACN’s Essentials of Baccalaureate Nursing, and of gerontological questions on the NCLEX exam were, in her view, powerful positive forces.

The work of changing curricula is not easy. While smart strategies, solid resources (the modules), and an environment that creates forward motion in spite of barriers are useful, it is clear that inspired faculty and committed leaders are instrumental in achieving and institutionalizing these changes.
At the outset, the Dr. Mezey’s team focused on encouraging what she considers to be the ‘gold standard’ — both the creation of stand-alone courses and the integration of geriatric content across multiple courses. “The notion was that if you couldn’t get a stand-alone course,” which she believes institutionalize content, “then obviously you needed to strengthen integration.” To assist faculty with integration, therefore, she and her team sought to develop evidence-based geriatrics content that could be used to revise and enhance a wide range of senior-level nursing courses (see Box on page 3 for a list of the modules created).

The team developed nine learning modules with input from the GNEC advisory board, coordinated by the AACN and consisting of faculty from across the country. Modules were based on white papers that summarized topics in current evidence-based practices, and were designed to be used primarily in the classroom. Endorsed by a variety of nursing professional organizations — the Oncology Nursing Society, the American Association of Critical Care Nurses, the Mental Health Nursing Interest Group, the American Association of Diabetes Educators, and the National Gerontological Nursing Association — the modules were formatted to look similar, be easy to follow, and be applicable in a range of educational and clinical settings.

To help FDI participants adopt the “train-the-trainer approach” and both use and disseminate the modules, materials — modules, white papers, references, and relevant case studies, were made open source, or widely available with few barriers to access. The Institute created a plan to update the slides accompanying the white papers every three years (twice so far); and following a recent faculty survey, it added three modules on cultural competence and chronic disease, spirituality, and sexuality.

According to Dr. Mezey, the most important part of this experience is 1) “that faculty have the resources to actually integrate content easily,” and 2) that “there’s enough critical mass of faculty in the overwhelming number of baccalaureate programs that see the value of integrating, and therefore do it.” Furthermore, the baccalaureate nursing accrediting agencies — the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) and the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) require that content on the care of older adults be taught, which Dr. Mezey said is helpful “because now it makes everybody responsible; the curriculum committee, the deans, and all the faculty.”

Two Stories of the GNEC Impact

To supplement the survey data and provide a more personal perspective, we identified schools that excelled at enhancing courses. Based on the number of senior-level courses revised and enhanced, and whether both faculty participants were still at the institution, we chose to speak with two smaller institutions to illustrate how substantial change was achieved in a variety of settings. Close to the top of our list of high-performing institutions with regard to course enhancements, Salisbury University (Salisbury, Md.) revised nine courses and Lewis-Clark College (Lewiston, Idaho) revised eight. Their stories demonstrate how committed and supported faculty can use GNEC to make a difference.

In each college, an interdisciplinary pair of faculty attended an FDI. From Salisbury University, geriatric nurse specialist, Dr. Mary DiBartolo, teamed up with community health nursing specialist, Dr. Voncelia Brown; at Lewis-Clark College, geriatric nurse specialist Prof. Debora Lemon, participated with mental health nursing specialist Prof. Brian Fonnesbeck. Attending the FDI together in San Diego, Salisbury faculty found it to be “a very exciting conference… there was advocacy happening at all different levels,” they said, which stimulated their thinking.

With the dean from each institution providing unqualified support, faculty at both institutions found it easy to disseminate information about GNEC once they returned home. According to Prof. Fonnesbeck, any initial faculty resistance at Lewis-Clark was a classic first response to the prospect of assimilating something new into an already crowded curriculum. “We were really cognizant that it would be a process. So we emphasized starting with one [course] objective and seeing how the materials could augment that,” an approach which, he said, “made people more receptive.”
At Salisbury University, there were likewise few challenges. Those which arose occurred when integrating GNEC concepts into the clinical components, where change meant shifting gears both logistically — in switching long-time placement settings from nursing homes to senior centers — and pedagogically, in amending the teaching priorities of the courses. Purely clinical, technical assessments were de-emphasized; learning how to interact with older people in a community-rooted, non-medicalized setting became a new objective.

Reflecting on the impact of the curricular changes, Prof. Fonnesbeck said the deepest challenges at Lewis-Clark are faced not by faculty, but by their students: “We're getting people right out of high school — not as many people with life experience — and they don’t initially realize that they’re going to be dealing with a lot of geriatrics in whatever setting they’re in.”

All four faculty members emphasized that the most important changes they’re helping facilitate involve perceptions of older people. Prof. Fonnesbeck has found it critical to impress upon his students that, contrary to myth, mental health issues are not a normal part of the aging process but something to investigate. The revised clinical practicums within each institution have had profound effects on how older people are viewed in society. According to Dr. DiBartolo and Prof. Lemon, interacting with a person who wasn’t their age in a non-medical setting gave students important skills for appreciating “what a client might endure if they were sent home from the hospital — what resources they have and what they don’t.”

Looking Ahead: A Call to Action

Despite the grant’s completion, the work of GNEC carries on. AACN continues to offer its archived webinars to interested faculty further disseminating the modules, and is seeking partners with whom they can work to offer additional webinars. However, although a high percentage of nursing schools have had the opportunity to send their faculty to an institute or encourage them to view the webinars, many have not yet taken advantage of these resources.

Further, the fundamental value of the GNEC project has been that its proposed curricular changes are strongly evidence-based. As time goes on, more evidence will emerge from research on the care of older adults. This new evidence needs to be used both to revise existing and create new materials and modules in areas of growing concern.

In addition, there may be topics that are of particular importance not only at the baccalaureate level, but also at the graduate level, in both Master’s degree programs and in Doctor of Nursing Practice programs. These topics include issues such as working in inter-professional teams, improving care transitions across service settings, working to improve quality and safety, and maximizing the degree to which nurses function at the highest level given the scope of practice laws.

Finally, the demographic imperative is just as strong, if not stronger, than it was when the John A. Hartford Foundation partnered with AACN and the Hartford Institute to create GNEC. To ensure that all nursing students at all levels get the knowledge and skills they need to provide not just adequate, but excellent care to older adults:

• Nursing program leaders and faculty need to take advantage of both the existing resources and those that we hope will come in the future; and

• Other committed and far-seeing funders need to step up to the plate and support efforts to create and disseminate additional curricular materials and teaching strategies.