

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Catalyzing Implementation of Evidence-Based Interventions in Safety Net Settings: A Clinical-Community Partnership in South Los Angeles

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/07x5t1x8>

Journal

Health Promotion Practice, 18(4)

ISSN

1524-8399

Authors

Payán, Denise D
Sloane, David C
Illum, Jacqueline
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2017-07-01

DOI

10.1177/1524839917705418

Peer reviewed



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Health Promot Pract. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2018 July 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Health Promot Pract. 2017 July ; 18(4): 586–597. doi:10.1177/1524839917705418.

Catalyzing Implementation of Evidence-Based Interventions in Safety Net Settings: A Clinical-Community Partnership in South Los Angeles

Dr. Denise D. Payán, Ph.D., M.P.P.,

Health Services Research Post-Doctoral Fellow, UCLA, 650 Charles E. Young Drive South, Room A2-125 CHS, Los Angeles, California, 90095

Dr. David C. Sloane, Ph.D.,

Professor at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, California

Ms. Jacqueline Illum, M.P.L.,

Project Specialist for the REACH Demonstration Project at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, California

Dr. Roberto B. Vargas, M.D., M.P.H.,

Associate Professor of Medicine in the Division of General Internal Medicine and Health Services Research at the David Geffen School of Medicine at the University of California Los Angeles in Los Angeles, California

Ms. Donzella Lee, M.P.H.,

Health Policy Director at Community Health Councils, Inc. in Los Angeles, California

Ms. Lark Galloway-Gilliam, M.P.A., and

Executive Director of Community Health Councils, Inc. in Los Angeles, California

Dr. LaVonna B. Lewis, Ph.D., M.P.H.

Teaching Professor and the Director of Undergraduate Programs at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, California

Abstract

This study is a process evaluation of a clinical–community partnership that implemented evidence-based interventions in clinical safety net settings. Adoption and implementation of evidence-based interventions in these settings can help reduce health disparities by improving the quality of clinical preventive services in health care settings with underserved populations. A clinical–community partnership model is a possible avenue to catalyze adoption and implementation of interventions amid organizational barriers to change. Three Federally Qualified Health Centers in South Los Angeles participated in a partnership led by a local community-based organization (CBO) to implement hypertension interventions. Qualitative research methods were used to evaluate intervention selection and implementation processes between January 2014 and June

Correspondence to: Denise D. Payán.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

2015. Data collection tools included a key participant interview guide, health care provider interview guide, and protocol for taking meeting minutes. This case study demonstrates how a CBO acted as an external facilitator and employed a collaborative partnership model to catalyze implementation of evidence-based interventions in safety net settings. The study phases observed included initiation, planning, and implementation. Three emergent categories of organizational facilitators and barriers were identified (personnel capacity, professional development capacity, and technological capacity). Key participants and health care providers expressed a high level of satisfaction with the collaborative and the interventions, respectively. The CBO's role as a facilitator and catalyst is a replicable model to promote intervention adoption and implementation in safety net settings. Key lessons learned are provided for researchers and practitioners interested in partnering with Federally Qualified Health Centers to implement health promotion interventions.

Keywords

process evaluation; partnerships/coalitions; minority health; community-based participatory research; qualitative research; cardiovascular disease

INTRODUCTION

Reducing the gap between evidence-based clinical knowledge and practice is of paramount importance to improve health outcomes (Berwick, 2003; Kessler & Glasgow, 2011; Lenfant, 2003). Successfully implementing evidence-based practice in clinical settings is formidable (Charles, Gafni, & Freeman, 2011) and often results in wide variation (Greenhalgh, Howick, & Maskrey, 2014). Research is needed to understand how to effectively adopt and implement evidence-based interventions in clinical safety net settings (Cristofalo, 2013). Challenges to adoption and implementation of evidence-based interventions in these settings may include limited funding, insufficient resources, provider stress, and provider attrition (Hayashi, Selia, & McDonnell, 2009; Lewin & Baxter, 2007).

Clinical-community collaborations may help catalyze adoption and implementation of evidence-based interventions to improve the quality of clinical preventive services. Few studies have examined clinical-community collaborations (Anderson, Adeney, Shinn, Krause, & Safraneck, 2012) related to implementation of evidence-based practice (Rycroft-Malone & Bucknall, 2010). There is also a lack of literature on the collaborative relationships established and the clinical-community linkage itself (Porterfield et al., 2012).

Community health centers are clinical care settings that primarily serve poor and vulnerable populations under fluid conditions, whereby changes to the clinical, health care, and public policy ecosystems directly impact their operations. These and other health care delivery organizations have important organizational networks and linkages that influence the behavior of health care providers and patients, and they exist within cultural, legal/policy, and resource environments (Mendel, Meredith, Schoenbaum, Sherbourne, & Wells, 2008). New clinical guidelines or a shift in federal funding priorities are designed to influence provider and organizational level practice. However, an important implementation and dissemination question exists—who can coordinate implementation amidst multiple layers

of factors influencing the operations and practices of a health care organization? New research is needed to develop innovative clinical-community collaborative models and to evaluate their role and function in implementing evidence-based interventions that could address health disparities in safety net settings (Rust & Cooper, 2007). Safety net settings consist of health care delivery institutions and clinics who have a legal mandate or mission to care for patients regardless of their ability to pay and who predominantly serve vulnerable patients such as the uninsured or recipients of Medicaid (Institute of Medicine, 2000).

This study responds to the call for research on effective collaborative mechanisms to enact health system changes (Kreuter, Lezin, & Young, 2000) and the need to conduct micro evaluations of coalitions to advance the evidence-base on collaborative partnerships (El Ansari, Phillips, & Hammick, 2001). The purpose of this article is to present a case study of a clinical-community collaborative tasked with improving hypertension diagnosis rates and control outcomes in three Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) in South Los Angeles. Disparities in hypertension prevalence and control by income and race/ethnicity persist among U.S. adults and disproportionately burden vulnerable African American and Hispanic populations, leading to greater cardiovascular disease mortality and morbidity rates among these groups (Egan, Zhao, & Axon, 2010; Wong, Shapiro, Boscardin, & Ettner, 2002). Death from hypertension is estimated to account for 15% of the racial disparity in potential life-years lost between African Americans and whites (Wong et al., 2002). Improving hypertension screening, treatment, and control among vulnerable minority populations could help to address these disparities. In this article, we evaluate the role of a community-based organization (CBO) whose purpose was to facilitate implementation of multiple evidence-based interventions in safety net settings that serve a high percentage of low-income African American and Hispanic patients.

METHODOLOGY

Study Context

Community Health Councils (CHC) is a community-based health education and policy organization. Formed in 1992, the organization's mission is to promote social justice and achieve equity in community and environmental resources to improve the health of underserved populations. CHC employs a multi-pronged model for combating health disparities through community assessment and engagement, coalition building, and implementing innovative, evidence-based health interventions (Lewis et al., 2011).

In 2012, CHC received a Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) Demonstration Project grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to support implementation of evidence-based hypertension interventions in safety net settings. As the convening agent, CHC recruited three FQHCs from their existing health care system coalition network to participate. This coalition network was formed in 2008 to eliminate structural barriers to quality healthcare in South Los Angeles (Community Health Councils). The three FQHCs who participated in this study all operate in the same high disparity community of South Los Angeles.

South Los Angeles has high levels of hypertension and obesity. In 2011, nearly 40% of adults were uninsured and 30.3% were covered by the state's Medicaid program. The documented adult hypertension prevalence rate was among the highest in the region at 30.3%, however, the actual prevalence rate was likely higher since up to about 40% of hypertensive individuals are undiagnosed (Wall, Hannan, & Wright, 2014). Table 1 provides information on the health and coverage status of adults in South Los Angeles.

At the time of the study, FQHC 2 was the largest of the three sites with 14 operational sites and FQHC 1 was the smallest with two operational sites. Patient characteristics varied across the three clinics. Diagnosed hypertension rates ranged from 33.9% of patients at FQHC 3 to 20.7% at FQHC 2. Uncontrolled hypertension rates ranged from a high of 40.8% at FQHC 1 to a low of 26.4% at FQHC 3. The racial and ethnic composition of the patient population at each clinic also differed. While FQHCs 1 and 2 mostly served Hispanic patients (with a sizeable amount of non-English speakers), 86.7% of the patient population at FQHC 3 were Black/African American. All of the sites had a high percentage of low-income patients.

Collaborative Structure and Participation

Drawing upon the theoretical foundation of the Social Ecological Model (SEM) (McLeroy, Bibeau, Steckler, & Glanz, 1988), CHC's approach aims to create an iterative reciprocal relationship between coalition members that allows each member the opportunity to select their interventions while ensuring that each choice promotes organizational and systems change (Lewis et al., 2011).

CHC served as a facilitator and technical assistance partner and bridged learning gaps between the clinics by identifying strengths and needs. CHC has two full-time staff positions—a Health Care Systems Policy Director and a Project Coordinator—whose responsibilities include communicating with local safety net clinics and engaging in local health care policy issues. These staff members have at least five years of experience in administration, management, or public health research in underserved health care settings and a graduate degree in public health. They were tasked with coordinating and facilitating a monthly meeting with each FQHC throughout the duration of the study. The meetings' purpose was to discuss adoption and implementation processes. The meetings served as a vehicle for communication and planning activities as an important means of managing the relationship between CHC and the clinics on a regularly basis (Mendel et al., 2008). A range of 8 to 15 meetings were held at each FQHC during the 36-month cooperative agreement period.

Clinic leadership (e.g., Chief Medical Officers and Medical Directors), and staff (e.g., quality improvement coordinators and information technology personnel) attended the meetings and served as FQHC liaisons and change champions (Greenhalgh, Robert, Macfarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou, 2004). An average of three clinic representatives attended each meeting. These representatives had an average organizational tenure of 6.94 years (S.D. = 5.65); two clinics had at least one representative with 10 years of organizational tenure.

Interventions

The clinics decided to improve hypertension diagnosis rates and target poorly controlled hypertensive patients by: 1) increasing early follow-up of patients, 2) encouraging

intensification of therapies, and/or 3) increasing engagement in lifestyle interventions (see Table 2). These interventions were either evidence-based or practice-based strategies known to effectively improve hypertension control in clinical settings (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2013). Each clinic also selected a systems-level hypertension project. All of the FQHCs received health care provider-level educational training on the Eighth Joint National Committee's guidelines (JNC 8) around the management of high blood pressure in adults.

Study Design

We used a qualitative process evaluation approach to capture the complexity of the knowledge translational and collaborative processes and to illuminate the black box of implementation for each clinical environment (Cristofalo, 2013; Hulscher, Laurant, & Grol, 2003; Mendel et al., 2008; Ovretveit, 2011). The study focused on the: 1) *structure* or attributes of the care settings, 2) *process* of the services provided for hypertensive patients, and 3) key participants' interactions (Sofaer, 1999). Drawing from the Community Coalition Action Theory (CCAT), investigators' prior experience with CHC coalition strategies, and existing literature on effective coalition building, we included key process measures (e.g., barriers and facilitators to implementation) and key metrics of the collaborative (i.e., coalition leadership, goals, member characteristics, engagement level, planning activities, decision making processes, relationship and availability/use of resources) (Butterfoss, 2006; Butterfoss & Kegler, 2002, 2009; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001). For instance, since the CCAT identifies three stages of coalition development—formation, maintenance, and institutionalization—and related constructs for the formation stage include the community context, lead agency/convener group, and coalition membership (Butterfoss & Kegler, 2009), these constructs and others guided the development of the interview tools and subsequent analyses.

Qualitative Measures and Data Collection

Qualitative data collection tools included a key participant interview guide, health care provider interview guide, and protocol for taking meeting minutes. Key participants consisted of the clinical personnel and management staff involved in the selection and adoption of interventions. Health care provider refers to medical providers tasked with implementation in the clinics. Both of the interview guides included questions about barriers to implementation and engagement (El Ansari et al., 2001). Attendance data was collected for the meetings and trainings. The University of Southern California's institutional review board approved all of the study protocols and instruments prior to their use in the field, and each participant provided written informed consent.

All of the interviews lasted between 30 to 45 minutes. Interviews were not audio-recorded and, instead, a trained two-person team (i.e., an interviewer and a note taker) were responsible for conducting the interview and collecting detailed field notes with verbatim quotes. Each team reviewed and confirmed the accuracy of the notes in a post-interview debriefing. Each note taker underwent a rigorous instruction and supervised qualitative research training period (10 hours) with a quality assessment component prior to conducting fieldwork for this study.

Key Participant Interviews—CHC facilitated a monthly meeting with each clinic. We conducted key participant interviews (N=8) with clinical personnel and management staff who attended these meetings between December 2014 and February 2015 (n=3 respondents from FQHC 1 and 2, and n=2 from FQHC 3). Respondents represented a range of health care positions (i.e., Chief Medical Officer, Medical Director, Wellness Center Coordinator, etc.). Key participants were asked about their experience working with the collaborative, recommendations for improvement, and the value of the partnership.

Health Care Provider Interviews—We conducted post-implementation interviews with a range of health care providers tasked with implementing the interventions (i.e., physicians, nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and a dietician). Each clinic had three respondents (N=9). Interviews were conducted between July and August 2015 to assess provider awareness, experience, and satisfaction with the interventions.

Meeting Minutes—Between January 2014 and June 2015, CHC held 34 clinical preventive services meetings. Most meetings were about two hours in duration and held at the FQHCs. A trained evaluation staff member took detailed meeting minutes, capturing intra-group dialogue. A second researcher who attended the meeting reviewed the minutes for internal consistency.

Data Analysis

The evaluation team developed a universal codebook that served as a formal organizing system for all coding processes. The initial version included codes identified *a priori* (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The collaboration and coalition literature served as the primary foundation for the codebook (Butterfoss, 2006; Butterfoss & Kegler, 2002; Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001). Categories of codes included *setting codes* (outreach activities, policy/political climate, intervention awareness and exposure, etc.), *conceptual codes* (barriers to health, barriers to implementation, implementation facilitators, successes, strengths, etc.), *relationship codes* (partnerships), and *participant perspective codes* (level of participation, social support, sense of ownership, turnover, perceived benefits) (Bradley & Curry, 2006).

Each type of data source corresponded to a different data file and a total of three data files were managed. Three researchers each coded a minimum of two key participant interviews, two health care provider interviews, and three meeting minutes as part of the pilot coding process to test the coding structure and identify emergent codes (Corbin & Strauss, 2014). While no new primary codes emerged during the piloting phase, we identified important sub-categories. For example, the perceived benefits construct was divided into two sub-categories—the perceived benefits of the project for the organization and the perceived benefits for the community.

Once finalized, the codebook served as a training tool for research assistants. Research assistants used NVivo 10 to code all of the qualitative data (QSR International, 2012). Two of the authors (DDP and JI) reviewed the coded data and generated thematic descriptions related to the study's process evaluation questions; these descriptions were iteratively reviewed and discussed until consensus was reached.

RESULTS

The process evaluation revealed CHC successfully served as an external facilitator to catalyze implementation of evidence-based interventions in the three FQHCs. Specifically, CHC staff members leveraged their existing resource knowledge (i.e., community-level knowledge, networks, and capacity) to address barriers that emerged while maintaining effective collaborative relationships with each participating site for the entirety of the project. Below is a detailed description of the barriers and facilitators to implementation by phase, key participant and health care provider engagement and satisfaction, and patient-level considerations.

Barriers and Facilitators by Implementation Phase

Table 3 lists key barriers and facilitators related to the clinics' structural and organizational capacity to implement hypertension interventions during the study period. We included barriers and facilitators in the table that emerged in at least two of the study's data sources. The findings are organized by each observed phase of implementation: Initiation, Planning, and Implementation.

Initiation—The initiation phase consisted of initial discussions around the selection of evidence-based interventions through a capacity and needs assessment process. Capacity and needs assessments are a useful means of understanding specific organizational and stakeholder capacity, practice, and preferences for evidence-based interventions (Mendel et al., 2008).

CHC staff and members of the evaluation team worked with the clinics to develop an assessment questionnaire spanning areas related to hypertension practice (i.e., blood pressure measurement protocols, adherence to JNC 7 guidelines, assessment of co-morbidities, laboratory tests, lifestyle modifications, and pharmacological measures). Initial discussions revealed key personnel capacity facilitators among the FQHCs, which consisted of having providers and staff who were committed to serving vulnerable populations, and leadership who prioritized culturally appropriate and competent practices.

CHC met with clinical representatives in May and June 2013 to discuss clinical operations and identify service gaps that could be addressed by the project. These meetings produced a menu of potential hypertension interventions for each clinic. Throughout January 2014, the clinical-community partners continued to discuss potential areas of improvement. Key participants shared organizational goals to more effectively use their technology systems to inform practice. One shared their interest in comparing hypertension rates by provider, “[We] have previously looked at the [hypertension] rates by site, but not by provider. We hope to do that this year as part of our 2014 quality control goals.”

All of the FQHCs expressed an interest in improving their EHR system and were interested in developing a hypertension patient registry, installing hypertension diagnosis prompts, or adding new patient education and counseling fields.

Personnel and professional development facilitators to enact change were also identified. Facilitators included having: a designated quality improvement coordinator or committee structure to facilitate project activities. These facilitators proved beneficial in subsequent implementation phases.

Planning—When the clinical-community partners turned to planning in February 2014, this phase was stalled by the release of JNC 8 guidelines on February 5, 2014. JNC 8 provided nine evidence-based recommendations for hypertension treatment among adults and primarily focused on specifying pharmacological treatment for specific groups (James et al., 2014). Intervention selection discussions were renewed after the guidelines were released. A key participant stated their concern about the release of the new guidelines during a meeting, “It’s outdated now because we have new guidelines. I need to look at this to confirm. When we started last year, it was JNC 7 and recently, there were some changes.” Another respondent articulated the need for provider awareness and education, “There is room for improvement in the clinics and certainly for increased provider education or documentation.” In the third clinic, although the medical director had recently emailed the new JNC 8 guidelines to providers, a key participant felt that a live training was needed to promote adherence.

During the planning phase, a lack of time to train personnel on the new guidelines was an implementation barrier for all of the clinics. To address this barrier, CHC staff offered to facilitate and coordinate an internist-led provider education training to review JNC 8 guidelines and present general information on preventive hypertension practices. All three clinics agreed and the training became a shared intervention (see Table 2). An in-person session was selected since it is more effective than a passive approach, particularly for prescription practice (Grimshaw et al., 2001).

The clinics hoped a provider training would address some of their personnel and professional development capacity barriers. One clinic noted a lack of consensus among providers around medication practices—“There isn’t consensus around medication. If there’s guidance on that, that would be helpful.” Another clinic mentioned provider inertia in treatment practices—“I think sometimes older providers have the way they treat it, and sometimes they are stuck. They do it their way versus new ways or learning how others do it.”

The remaining interventions selected were related to technology, patient behavior, and practice protocols. A key participant from FQHC 2 perceived the project as an opportunity to prioritize prevention and acted as a champion for preventive hypertension control. The individual said the following during a meeting, “Adult hypertension is a silent killer... We currently identify acute and symptomatic, but we would like the clinical intervention to draw out the non-symptomatic and non-acute preventive cases and expand our existing electronic medical record capacity.” As a result, the clinic included a pre-hypertension alert in their work plan.

Several technological capacity barriers emerged during the planning phase, including a lack of qualified information technology personnel and knowledge about EHR capacity and

functionality. Some discussion items were postponed so that key participants could ask their EHR vendor about the specific capacities of their system.

Implementation—All of the interventions were implemented during the implementation phase, but not without challenges. Key barriers included provider and administrator turnover and technological capacity issues. Turnover occurred across sites, yet it was particularly problematic at FQHC 1. A key participant from FQHC 1 noted, “We personally have had issues because of transition with leadership so it’s been hard to implement programs when there’s a constant flux in leadership so that has been one of our personal barriers.” Turnover at this clinic led to the recruitment of new participants who expressed frustration about their limited involvement with the project:

These projects are great, my own personal thing is I am frustrated because I wish I had more time ... I wish I [had been] involved in the initial planning so we could have implemented sooner. I just don’t think I’m doing the project service with my time restriction.

Turnover coupled with interoperability challenges between the EHR system and a population health management program led to delays in developing and disseminating reports and feedback to clinical providers at FQHC 1.

At FQHC 2, the EHR update process delayed implementation of the decision supports, as illustrated by a key participant:

I think that because of tremendous unforeseen problems with our EMR system, there have been long delays in the implementation of the hypertension specific decision support measures and that both of those factors have made it hard to expand the project to the volume of patients that would have made it more meaningful during the months of the study period.

Ultimately, the clinic’s vendor delayed implementation of the clinical decision supports by six months and the alerts were not fully operational until June 2015.

Key Participant and Health Care Provider Engagement and Satisfaction

Key participants and health care providers generally expressed satisfaction with the interventions and mentioned specific benefits from participating in the REACH Demonstration Project. A key participant from FQHC 2 described the value of adding an automated provider alert system for hypertensive and pre-hypertensive patients to their EHR, “It’s improved the quality of patient care and preventive medicine. And it’s assisted us, the enhancement of our electronic medical record...in a way that will be enduring. It’s not temporary.” At FQHC 1, a key participant identified implementation of their interventions as a “success” and said it led to more accurate blood pressure measurement and record keeping. Moreover, various FQHC 3 health care providers reported being satisfied with the revised visit summaries and action plans.

Seven of eight key participants believed working with the collaborative was very helpful or useful. Many reported asking for help—six asked CHC for help, three asked other collaborative partners, and two asked other clinic/program providers. Key participants said

the collaborative improved the quality of patient care and preventive medicine, increased resource awareness, and provided a structured plan for sustainable improvements.

Lastly, the hypertension and JNC 8 guidelines training offered by CHC was well attended (N=33) and well received by many of the health care providers. The training was 90% lecture and 10% discussion. A concern noted by interviewed respondents was that those absent would not be well-equipped to achieve hypertension control among their patients. Thus, a disadvantage of the training was that it was not recorded and disseminated among providers who did not attend the training.

Patient-Level Considerations

Several FQHC health care providers acknowledged the importance of the social determinants of health and cited health care access barriers that may limit the impact of evidence-based interventions in safety net settings. Multiple clinicians acknowledged barriers that impede improvement of cardiovascular outcomes among their patients. A physician mentioned lack of transportation as an issue: “Lots of people, for example, if they are referred to a cardiologist, then they can’t go because they don’t have transportation.” Another provider mentioned the challenges of medication adherence:

...if you have hypertension, diabetes, gout...[listed three other chronic illnesses].
That’s six different issues and if you are on six medications, you can’t get your seventh medication until next month so, if you have the flu or bronchitis or something, you can’t get the additional medication.

Two providers also believed patient-level knowledge and behaviors were more significant barriers to achieving hypertension control than some of the barriers mentioned in this study. A provider acknowledged the importance and need for health promotion and educational interventions in safety net settings and said, “The biggest barriers are not in clinic. They’re from the patients in that there is a behavior and lifestyle modification barrier.” These barriers are similar to those identified in prior studies as challenges faced by safety net patients (Cristofalo, 2013).

DISCUSSION

Our study demonstrates how a CBO can act as a convening agent to catalyze implementation of evidence-based interventions in clinical safety net settings using a collaborative partnership model. Previous studies have not provided detailed information on coalition structure and related processes (Anderson et al., 2012). The findings provide valuable lessons for emerging and existing clinical-community collaboratives interested in addressing health disparities through adoption and implementation of evidence-based interventions.

First, the capacity and needs assessment conducted during the initiation phase was an important foundational component for the partnership. The assessment helped to identify specific organizational and stakeholder capacity, practice, and intervention preferences (Mendel et al., 2008). The key participant interviews showed that clinic participants recognized the assessment provided a framework for them to evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses related to hypertension practice and contributed to an intervention selection

process that was tailored according to the competencies and preferences of each FQHC. The discussions also revealed a mutual interest among the clinics to improve their EHR systems to advance clinical processes, which may be a reflection of federal regulations and policies to actively promote meaningful use of EHR technology (Blumenthal & Tavenner 2010). Similar assessments have been conducted by community coalitions elsewhere and have been recognized as valuable assets (Anderson et al., 2012; Kreuter et al., 2000).

Second, an advantage of this type of clinical-community partnership is that it can generate shared resources among participants. The key participant interviews and meeting minutes confirmed that the resources needed for dissemination and implementation go beyond funding and expertise and include relationship-building and community organization skills (Mendel et al., 2008; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001). Both CHC and clinic participants stated that much of the relationship building occurred during monthly partner meetings. These structured meetings were an important means of communicating, building trust, and maintaining engagement throughout the project. Thus, lead conveners/facilitators should designate time and effort in their project timeline to regularly meet with key participants and to use tools (i.e., agendas, needs assessments, etc.) to promote discussion and advance decision making. The coalition's structure and these components can increase the likelihood of achieving the type of collaborative synergy described in the CCAT (Butterfoss & Kegler, 2002).

Third, external facilitators of such collaborative partnerships should be aware of potential disruptions and barriers that can delay or derail implementation and be willing to adapt. For example, CHC responded to clinical representatives' concerns about the release of new clinical guidelines by offering to host a provider-level educational training. The data revealed that CHC's willingness to adapt and integrate new objectives helped to transition the collaborative from the planning phase to implementation and contributed to key participants' high satisfaction levels. External partners and researchers interested in partnering with community health clinics should also be aware of potential personnel and professional development capacity issues. Administrative and provider turnover are important barriers associated with safety net settings and partners should devise strategies in anticipation of these challenges. Recruiting clinical representatives with greater organizational tenure to participate in a clinical-community partnership proved beneficial to the partnership in this study. Engaging multiple clinical representatives per site during the initiation phase of a collaborative project may also reduce the impact of turnover if it were to occur.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The findings are limited to the experience of three FQHCs operating in South Los Angeles therefore the findings may not be generalizable to other clinical settings or regions. Second, initial discussions between CHC and the clinics occurred without evaluation personnel, thus limiting our evaluation of the initiation phase. Lastly, clinic personnel who left during the study period were not interviewed. Future studies could measure implementation fidelity and changes in knowledge due to exposure to a provider-level educational intervention.

Implications for Future Research and Practice

A future direction is to evaluate whether or not implementation of the evidence-based interventions improved patient hypertension diagnoses, treatment, and control outcomes. Measuring the impact of evidence-based interventions on underserved patients in safety net settings is needed to better understand whether this type of partnership approach can lead to reductions in health disparities. Previous studies on coalitions to enact health and social care system level changes have mostly resulted in small positive benefits to intervention communities for other health areas (Anderson et al., 2012). Future research should also examine the long-term structure and effects of clinical-community collaborations on underserved communities (Butterfoss & Francisco, 2004; El Ansari et al., 2001).

The findings reveal current challenges for safety net settings and suggest that these types of health care delivery organizations need additional health information technology support, guidance, and training. A decade ago, the lack of technological capacity and IT development in clinical settings was considered an important impediment to the clinical research continuum (Sung et al., 2003). Although the clinical IT environment has rapidly evolved, lack of knowledge and capacity barriers persist, particularly in safety net settings which may face more complexities compared to private health care organizations due to their patient population and focus on QI (Miller & West, 2007). In this study, CHC did not provide technical assistance to address technological capacity barriers at the clinics although these issues emerged throughout implementation at all three clinics.

Future clinical-community partnerships should include a technical assistance component for health information technology, and funders of such partnerships should be aware of the need to pay for improvements in these systems or training to effectively use these systems. These challenges must be addressed since health promotion interventions are increasingly incorporating health information technology. Cooperative learning groups for the dissemination of best practices can be a valuable strategy to increase EHR-related quality improvement (Miller & West, 2007) and are an important research area for researchers and practitioners interested in promoting adoption and implementation of technology-based interventions.

CONCLUSION

Emerging collaborative and coalition models are promising initiatives to bridge translational research gaps and to reduce health disparities. Understanding individual- and organizational-level participation and engagement throughout adoption and implementation is important to identify what occurred and to distinguish phases of the diffusion process in real-world settings. Evaluating cross-sectoral community coalitions and partnerships, processes, infrastructure, and outcomes is important to document how they function, exist, and impact the public's health in a community (Butterfoss & Francisco, 2004), particularly in health care delivery settings that serve ethnic and racial minority populations.

Improving hypertension control among priority populations who suffer from disparate rates requires innovative approaches and strategies to reduce the translational research gap. Creating and supporting innovative clinical-community collaborations may catalyze

adoption and implementation of improved organizational and provider practices in underserved communities. This qualitative process evaluation reveals the resilience of the partnership in achieving their objectives in three FQHCs, amidst various organizational barriers. Key components of the collaborative structure include the capacity and needs assessment, an experienced external facilitator with capable staff, resource knowledge, and willingness to adapt. Key lessons learned are provided for researchers and practitioners interested in partnering with community facilitators and FQHCs to implement evidence-based interventions. Further research is needed to examine how clinical-community partnerships can contribute to implementation of evidence-based interventions in areas facing disparate cardiovascular and chronic disease morbidity and mortality rates, as well as the impact of these collaborations.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge and thank the University of Southern California evaluation team (Tahirah Farris, Breanna Morrison, Alison Spindler, Rigoberto Bejarano, Gabrielle Green, Leigh Ann Haley, Judy Huang, and Stephanie Hedt) who helped with data collection and CHC staff who facilitated the clinical preventive services meetings (Lucy Montoya, Catherine Sepulveda, and Annie Park). The authors are also grateful to the participants of the Federally Qualified Health Centers for their time and effort and appreciate the invaluable feedback provided by Isabela Lucas and other ICF International staff on an earlier draft of the manuscript.

Funding

This study was supported by a Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health Demonstration Grant (002126-00001) from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The writing of this article was also supported by a grant (T32HS00046) from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not represent the official views of the CDC or AHRQ.

References

- Anderson LM, Adeney KL, Shinn C, Krause LK, Safranek S. Community coalition-driven interventions to reduce health disparities among racial and ethnic minority populations. The Cochrane Library. 2012
- Berwick DM. Disseminating innovations in health care. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2003; 289(15):1969–1975. DOI: 10.1001/jama.289.15.1969 [PubMed: 12697800]
- Blumenthal D, Tavenner M. The “meaningful use” regulation for electronic health records. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2010; 363(6):501–504. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1006114 [PubMed: 20647183]
- Bradley, EH., Curry, LA. Codes to theory: a critical stage in qualitative analysis. In: Curry, L.Shield, RR., Wetle, TT., editors. *Improving Aging and Public Health Research: Qualitative and Mixed Methods*. Washington, DC: American Public Health Association; 2006. p. 91-102.
- Butterfoss FD. Process evaluation for community participation. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2006; 27:323–340. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.27.021405.102207
- Butterfoss FD, Francisco VT. Evaluating community partnerships and coalitions with practitioners in mind. *Health Promotion Practice*. 2004; 5(2):108–114. DOI: 10.1177/1524839903260844 [PubMed: 15090164]
- Butterfoss, FD., Kegler, MC. Toward a comprehensive understanding of community coalitions. In: DiClemente, RJ.Crosby, RA., Kegler, MC., editors. *Emerging Theories in Health Promotion Practice and Research: Strategies for Improving Public Health*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 2002. p. 157-193.
- Butterfoss, FD., Kegler, MC. The community coalition action theory. In: DiClemente, RJ.Crosby, RA., Kegler, MC., editors. *Emerging Theories in Health Promotion Practice and Research*. 2. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 2009. p. 237-276.

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC]. Hypertension Control: Action Steps for Clinicians. Atlanta, GA: CDC, US Dept of Health and Human Services; 2013.
- Charles C, Gafni A, Freeman E. The evidence-based medicine model of clinical practice: scientific teaching or belief-based preaching? *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*. 2011; 17(4):597–605. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01562.x [PubMed: 21087367]
- Community Health Councils. South LA Healthcare Leadership Roundtable. Retrieved from <http://chc-inc.org/sla-leadership>
- Corbin, J., Strauss, A. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications; 2014.
- Cristofalo MA. Implementation of health and mental health evidence-based practices in safety net settings. *Social Work in Health Care*. 2013; 52(8):728–740. DOI: 10.1080/00981389.2013.813003 [PubMed: 24028737]
- Egan BM, Zhao Y, Axon RN. US trends in prevalence, awareness, treatment, and control of hypertension, 1988–2008. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2010; 303(20):2043–2050. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2010.650 [PubMed: 20501926]
- El Ansari W, Phillips CJ, Hammick M. Collaboration and partnerships: developing the evidence base. *Health & Social Care in the Community*. 2001; 9(4):215–227. [PubMed: 11560737]
- Greenhalgh T, Howick J, Maskrey N. Evidence based medicine: a movement in crisis? *BMJ*. 2014; 348:g3725.doi: 10.1136/bmj.g3725 [PubMed: 24927763]
- Greenhalgh T, Robert G, Macfarlane F, Bate P, Kyriakidou O. Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: systematic review and recommendations. *Milbank Quarterly*. 2004; 82(4):581–629. DOI: 10.1111/j.0887-378X.2004.00325.x [PubMed: 15595944]
- Grimshaw JM, Shirran L, Thomas R, Mowatt G, Fraser C, Bero L, ... O'Brien MA. Changing provider behavior: an overview of systematic reviews of interventions. *Medical Care*. 2001; 39(8 Suppl 2):Ii2–45. [PubMed: 11583120]
- Hayashi AS, Selia E, McDonnell K. Stress and provider retention in underserved communities. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*. 2009; 20(3):597–604. DOI: 10.1353/hpu.0.0163 [PubMed: 19648691]
- Hulscher ME, Laurant MG, Grol RP. Process evaluation on quality improvement interventions. *Quality & Safety in Health Care*. 2003; 12(1):40–46. [PubMed: 12571344]
- Institute of Medicine. *America's Health Care Safety Net: Intact but Endangered*. Washington, DC: 2000. Retrieved from <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/9612/americas-health-care-safety-net-intact-but-endangered>
- James PA, Oparil S, Carter BL, Cushman WC, Dennison-Himmelfarb C, Handler J, ... Ortiz E. 2014 evidence-based guideline for the management of high blood pressure in adults: report from the panel members appointed to the Eighth Joint National Committee (JNC 8). *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2014; 311(5):507–520. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2013.284427 [PubMed: 24352797]
- Kessler R, Glasgow RE. A proposal to speed translation of healthcare research into practice: dramatic change is needed. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2011; 40(6):637–644. DOI: 10.1016/j.amepre.2011.02.023 [PubMed: 21565657]
- Kreuter MW, Lezin NA, Young LA. Evaluating community-based collaborative mechanisms: Implications for practitioners. *Health Promotion Practice*. 2000; 1(1):49–63.
- Lenfant C. Shattuck lecture--clinical research to clinical practice--lost in translation? *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2003; 349(9):868–874. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMs035507 [PubMed: 12944573]
- Lewin ME, Baxter RJ. America's health care safety net: revisiting the 2000 IOM report. *Health Affairs*. 2007; 26(5):1490–1494. DOI: 10.1377/hlthaff.26.5.1490 [PubMed: 17848461]
- Lewis LB, Galloway-Gilliam L, Flynn G, Nomachi J, Keener LC, Sloane DC. Transforming the urban food desert from the grassroots up: a model for community change. *Family & Community Health*. 2011; 34(Suppl 1):S92–s101. DOI: 10.1097/FCH.0b013e318202a87f [PubMed: 21160336]
- Mattessich, PW., Murray-Close, M., Monsey, BR. *Collaboration: What Makes It Work*. 2. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation; 2001.
- McLeroy KR, Bibeau D, Steckler A, Glanz K. An ecological perspective on health promotion programs. *Health Education Quarterly*. 1988; 15(4):351–377. [PubMed: 3068205]

- Mendel P, Meredith LS, Schoenbaum M, Sherbourne CD, Wells KB. Interventions in organizational and community context: a framework for building evidence on dissemination and implementation in health services research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*. 2008; 35(1–2):21–37. DOI: 10.1007/s10488-007-0144-9 [PubMed: 17990095]
- Miles, MB., Huberman, AM. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. 2. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc; 1994.
- Miller RH, West CE. The value of electronic health records in community health centers: policy implications. *Health Affairs*. 2007; 26(1):206–214. DOI: 10.1377/hlthaff.26.1.206 [PubMed: 17211030]
- Mizrahi T, Rosenthal BB. Complexities of coalition building: leaders' successes, strategies, struggles, and solutions. *Social Work*. 2001; 46(1):63–78. [PubMed: 11217495]
- Ovretveit J. Understanding the conditions for improvement: research to discover which context influences affect improvement success. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2011; 20(Suppl 1):i18–23. DOI: 10.1136/bmjqs.2010.045955
- Porterfield DS, Hinnant LW, Kane H, Horne J, McAleer K, Roussel A. Linkages between clinical practices and community organizations for prevention: a literature review and environmental scan. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2012; 42(6 Suppl 2):S163–171. DOI: 10.1016/j.amepre.2012.03.018 [PubMed: 22704433]
- Rust G, Cooper LA. How can practice-based research contribute to the elimination of health disparities? *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2007; 20(2):105–114. DOI: 10.3122/jabfm.2007.02.060131 [PubMed: 17341746]
- Rycroft-Malone, J., Bucknall, T., editors. *Models and Frameworks for Implementing Evidence-Based Practice: Linking Evidence to Action*. United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell; 2010.
- Sofaer S. Qualitative methods: what are they and why use them? *Health Services Research*. 1999; 34(5 Pt 2):1101–1118. [PubMed: 10591275]
- Sung NS, Crowley WF Jr, Genel M, Salber P, Sandy L, Sherwood LM, ... Rimoin D. Central challenges facing the national clinical research enterprise. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2003; 289(10):1278–1287. [PubMed: 12633190]
- Wall HK, Hannan JA, Wright JS. Patients with undiagnosed hypertension: hiding in plain sight. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2014; 312(19):1973–1974. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2014.15388 [PubMed: 25399269]
- Wong MD, Shapiro MF, Boscardin WJ, Ettner SL. Contribution of major diseases to disparities in mortality. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2002; 347(20):1585–1592. [PubMed: 12432046]

Table 1

Health Profile of Adults in South Los Angeles and FQHC Characteristics

Health Profile of Adults (18+ years old) in South Los Angeles¹	% [95% C.I.]		
Ever Diagnosed with Hypertension	30.3% [19.2 – 41.4]		
Weight Condition			
Obese	38.1% [26.2 – 50]		
Overweight	32.2% [21.2 – 43.1]		
Insurance Status			
Medi-Cal	30.3% [17.3 – 43.3]		
Uninsured	38.5% [25.6 – 51.5]		
Reported Fair/Poor Health Status	27.8% [17.7 – 37.9]		
Reported Medical Care is Somewhat or Very Difficult to Obtain when Needed	49.1% [36.6 – 61.6]		
Patient Characteristics²	FQHC 1	FQHC 2	FQHC 3
Patients Served (n)	5,049	45,245	13,151
% Adults (18–65 years of age)	78.6%	67.1%	76.4%
% Black/African American	31.4%	30.7%	86.7%
% Hispanic/Latino	65.0%	75.7%	34.1%
Non-English Language Speakers	52.1%	57.6%	35.1%
% 200 of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL)	99.7%	99.7%	98.8%
% Uninsured	59.3%	55.0%	64.4%
% of Patients with Hypertension	26%	20.7%	33.9%
% with Uncontrolled Hypertension	40.8%	38.9%	26.4%
FQHC Characteristics³	FQHC 1	FQHC 2	FQHC 3
Operational Sites (n)	2	14	5
FTE Primary Care Providers (n)	6	13	N/A
PTE/per diem Primary Care Providers (n)	1	2	N/A
EHR Platforms/Systems	eCW®	Centricity®	eCW®

NOTE: FQHC = Federally Qualified Health Center; CI = confidence interval; FTE = Full-time equivalent; N/A = not available; PTE = Part-time equivalent; EHR = Electronic Health Record; eCW® = eClinicalWorks®

¹Los Angeles County Health Survey (2011), Los Angeles County Department of Public Health;

²Uniform Data System Reports (2013);

³Clinical Provider Survey (January 2015) and Meeting Minutes

Table 2

Description of Selected Hypertension Interventions by FQHC

FQHC	OBJECTIVES
ALL	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 To implement a provider-level educational training on JNC 8 Guidelines
FQHC 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 To develop a hypertension quality improvement committee 2 To redesign a health information system (EHR or registry) to produce population-based reports 3 To disseminate reports and feedback to clinical providers to improve panel management and ensure patient-centered medical home practices are followed 4 To provide a consistent peer review process for sharing best practices and quality assurance
FQHC 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 To develop and implement an automated alert system for patients with two consecutive readings of high blood pressures ($\geq 140/90$ mmHg) 2 To develop an automated prompt for the diagnosis of hypertension and pre-hypertension ($\geq 120/80$ mmHg) 3 To implement a decision support tool for managing common co-morbidities (e.g., diabetes) 4 To improve patient action plans and visit summaries (English/Spanish)
FQHC 3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 To standardize educational practice for patients for diagnosis, treatment, and medication adherence (i.e., educational materials and DVDs) 2 To improve action plans and visit summaries for patients 3 To implement a practice of providing regular feedback to clinical providers to support management and patient-centered medical home practices

NOTE: FQHC = federally qualified health center; JNC 8 = Eighth Joint National Committee; EHR = electronic health record

Table 3
Facilitators and Barriers to Implementation by Phase, 2013–2015 (N=3 FQHCs located in South Los Angeles)

THEMES	Initiation	Planning	Implementation
Personnel Capacity	F Commitment to serve vulnerable populations	F Intervention champions who communicated interest and ownership of the interventions	B Management, provider, and staff retention issues
	F Prioritize culturally appropriate and competent practices	B Provider inertia	B Delays in recruitment and hiring practices
	F Quality improvement coordinator or committee		B Competing responsibilities
Professional Development Capacity	F Train staff to systematically collect patient BP	F Activated medical directors who promote updated guidelines and practices	
	F Prioritize patient education, goal setting, and lifestyle modification strategies	B Lack of knowledge about and experience with revised clinical guidelines	---
	B Capped ancillary staff responsibilities	B Lack of time to train personnel	
	B Varied provider practices on patient education and lifestyle modification counseling	B Lack of consensus around medication practices	
Technological Capacity	F Interest in using technological systems to inform practice	F Professional development resources for providers and staff to improve technological knowledge	B Variable costs and delays associated with the EHR
	F Updated equipment to systematically capture data	B Lack of (qualified) information technology personnel	B Interoperability challenges between systems
	B Lack of a registry function in an EHR system	B Lack of knowledge about EHR capacity and functionality	

NOTE: FQHC = federally qualified health center; F = facilitator; B = barrier; BP = blood pressure; EHR = electronic health record.