SYMPOSIUM

Transforming the Future of Public Health Law Education through a Faculty Fellowship Program

GUEST EDITED BY Charity Scott

6  Transforming the Future of Public Health Law Education through a Faculty Fellowship Program  Charity Scott

18  Combining Accreditation and Education: An Interdisciplinary Public Health Law Course  Micah L. Berman

24  Promoting Diversity in Public Health Law through Online Education  Kimberly Cogdell Boies

30  Building a Public Health Law and Policy Curriculum to Promote Skills and Community Engagement  Amy T. Campbell

35  Educating the New Public Health Law Professional  Sarah Davis

41  Teaching Population Health Outcomes Research, Advocacy, and the Population Health Perspective in Public Health Law  Robert Gatter

45  Public Health Law as a Way to Explore and Develop Professional Identity  Jennifer L. Herbst

51  Expanding Interdisciplinary Learning Opportunities on a Shoestring through a Medical-Legal Partnership  Laura D. Hermer

56  Seminar in Public Health Law and Policy in an Interprofessional Setting: Preparing Practitioners for Collaborative Practice at the Macro Level  Heather A. McCabe

62  Teaching Prevention: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Improving Population Health through Law and Policy  Elizabeth Tobin Tyler

69  Tearing Down the Silos: An Interdisciplinary, Practice-Based Approach to Graduate School Education  Elizabeth (Bjerke) Van Nostrand

76  Reflections on Mentoring  Mary Crossley and Ross D. Silverman

81  The Importance of Including the Deans  Diane E. Hoffmann

87  Polishing the Apple: A Holistic Approach to Developing Public Health Law Educators as Leaders of Change  Debra Gerardi


97  Innovation in Higher Education: Lessons Learned from Creating a Faculty Fellowship Program  Nancy J. Kaufman and Charity Scott
Letter From The Editor

A
SLME has long supported professors in their efforts to improve their own teaching — whether through JLME’s column “Teaching Health Law,” the recently published supplement on “Teaching Public Health Law,” the Jay Healey Teaching Award presented at our Health Law Professors conference, or the endorsement of several educational programs and career opportunities at other universities. Our readers are no doubt familiar with our commitment to improving the education of students and encouraging professors in this endeavor. Particularly, we value the knowledge and insight gained by connecting law, medicine, (bio)ethics, and related fields. Thus, when ASLME President Charity Scott approached us with a proposal to publish a supplement about a year-long interdisciplinary teaching fellowship, we welcomed the opportunity to do so.

This supplement issue of JLME, “Transforming the Future of Public Health Law Education through a Faculty Fellowship Program,” is the cumulative work of fellows, deans, mentors, and project leaders, who participated in the faculty fellowship program during the 2014–2015 academic year. The goals of the program — funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation — were to create new ways of teaching public health law in various graduate- and professional-level schools and to create an online library of resources for these professors. Scott, in her role as faculty lead and project director, added a third important goal of this fellowship: “a community of practice,” which aimed to cultivate a sense of identity, support, and resources among the fellows. The fellowship program kicked off with a ten-day summer institute in Park City, Utah, which gave the fellows the opportunity to design the kinds of innovative courses they would ultimately teach at their respective institutions; it also laid the foundation for ongoing support from the other fellows and mentors during implementation of these courses. During that academic year, the courses were added to the curriculum and open to students in law, public health, medical, and social work schools. Each course aimed to apply the students’ various backgrounds, skill sets, and thinking to “real world” projects, such as hands-on work at local health departments. These projects were essential to the experiential-learning component of the course and exposed the students to the benefits of interdisciplinary education. Though it was challenging for the fellows to create a completely different kind of public health law course, the fellowship program contributed to how the field can be taught and practiced, and by whom. In the end, both the fellows and their students were rewarded with invaluable experience, exposure, and perspectives that will engage and attract a new generation of lawyers and academics to public health. We hope this supplement provides some helpful guidance for you and your students as well.

Courtney McClellan
Assistant Editor
JLME
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INTRODUCTION
Transforming the Future of Public Health Law Education through a Faculty Fellowship Program
Charity Scott
This special issue of the Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics is devoted to a unique faculty fellowship program, called The Future of Public Health Law Education, which promoted educational innovations in public health law during the 2014-2015 academic year. This article provides an overview of the fellowship program and a roadmap for understanding the common themes that cut across the ten faculty fellows’ diverse curricular projects.

18
Combining Accreditation and Education: An Interdisciplinary Public Health Law Course
Micah L. Berman
This article discusses an interdisciplinary and community-engaged public health law course that was developed as part of The Future of Public Health Law Education faculty fellowship program. Law and public health students worked collaboratively to assist a local health department in preparing for the law-related aspects of Public Health Accreditation Board review.

24
Promoting Diversity in Public Health Law through Online Education
Kimberly Cogdell Boies
This fellowship project addressed the need to increase diversity in public health law. Non-traditional delivery methods of education, such as synchronous online classes and offering courses during an intersession between regular semesters and in the evenings, expanded the opportunities for diverse students to learn about the field and have meaningful internship experiences in public health law. Synchronous distance education is the wave of the future for law teaching and has particular significance in the teaching of public health law.

30
Building a Public Health Law and Policy Curriculum to Promote Skills and Community Engagement
Amy T. Campbell
This article describes implementation of a longitudinal curriculum in public health law, building on doctrinal coursework with skills-based coursework and opportunities for interdisciplinary, community-based engagement and service learning. It specifically describes development of a Policy Practicum, giving an example of how law students can learn policy skills and skills of effective community coalition work through a healthy homes partnership, highlighting areas where the curriculum can incorporate interdisciplinary education. It offers lessons learned during the curriculum-building process, and concludes with a more intensive service-learning strategy through the development of a Policy Lab.

35
Educating the New Public Health Law Professional
Sarah Davis
This article outlines the author’s experience designing and implementing an asynchronous online course. Designed as a complement to public health law externships at any location, the course addresses professionalism and strategic lawyering. The article further describes the author’s fellowship journey, which emboldened her view that faculty must attempt to live the expectations we have for our students, and also declare our professional values, especially when teaching about policymaking which is fraught with value conflicts. It concludes with a call for others to pilot innovative teaching approaches to address both the crisis in legal education and pressing societal issues, thereby contributing to the health of our legal community.
41
Teaching Population Health Outcomes Research, Advocacy, and the Population Health Perspective in Public Health Law
Robert Gatter

The goal of this project was to expand an existing public health law curriculum to incorporate lessons on population health outcomes research, extra-legal advocacy, and the population health perspective. The project also created opportunities for students not only to read about and discuss concepts, but also to employ the lessons more practically through exercises and by writing white papers on public health law reform topics relevant to population health in Missouri. To do this, the project expanded an existing didactic course and created a new credit-bearing, experiential “Lab.”

45
Public Health Law as a Way to Explore and Develop Professional Identity
Jennifer L. Herbst

Lawyers are most often portrayed and understood to be zealous advocates for individual clients in adversarial litigation or zero-sum transactions. Law schools provide excellent preparation for this type of lawyer role, but lawyers’ unique understanding of the law is also needed for systemic advocacy, policymaking, and legal education to solve the most difficult societal problems. An interdisciplinary public health law class is one way for law schools to provide students an opportunity to explore and develop these other professional identities.

51
Expanding Interdisciplinary Learning Opportunities on a Shoestring through a Medical-Legal Partnership
Laura D. Hermer

This article describes why and how the author started a medical-legal partnership at her small law school, the curricula associated with the medical-legal partnership, and the experience she and her students have had with the curricula to date. It also provides “lessons learned” which may be useful for individuals interested in expanding interdisciplinary and experiential opportunities at institutions that presently lack traditional sources of such opportunities.

56
Seminar in Public Health Law and Policy in an Interprofessional Setting: Preparing Practitioners for Collaborative Practice at the Macro Level
Heather A. McCabe

The author created a new course, called “Seminar in Public Health Law and Policy in an Interprofessional Setting” to address the need for interprofessional education (IPE) to equip graduate and professional students for collaborative practice at the systemic and policy (i.e., macro) levels in the health care and public health fields. Despite important work being done at the clinical practice level, limited existing IPE models examine larger systemic issues. The course is designed specifically to enable students in social work, law, and public health to recognize the reciprocal relationships between policy and interprofessional collaborative practice, including the need for understanding of the impact of team-practice work at the system and policy levels.

62
Teaching Prevention: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Improving Population Health through Law and Policy
Elizabeth Tobin Tyler

This interdisciplinary course, which included students from medicine, public health, law, and public policy, explored the concept of “prevention” and the role of law and public policy preventing disease and injury and improving population health. In addition to interdisciplinary course content, students worked in interdisciplinary teams on public health law and policy projects at community organizations and agencies.

69
Tearing Down the Silos: An Interdisciplinary, Practice-Based Approach to Graduate School Education
Elizabeth (Bjerke) Van Nostrand

“Law in Public Health Practice” is an interdisciplinary, practice-based course in which the University of Pittsburgh’s Graduate School of Public Health, its School of Law, and the Allegheny County Health Department work collaboratively to identify an issue needing the expertise of multiple disciplines. For the first iteration, students in over four disciplines explored the possible regulation of tattoo parlors. The lessons learned are adaptable to any topic that engages students in more than one discipline to address real-world public health problems.
Reflections on Mentoring
Mary Crossley and Ross D. Silverman
Reflecting on their service as mentors in the fellowship program, the authors describe their experiences and offer thoughts on lessons learned about mentoring, individuals’ roles in institutional changes, their own professional growth, and implications for and evaluation of legal and interprofessional education.

The Importance of Including the Deans
Diane E. Hoffmann
This article describes the benefits of including institutional leadership (the deans) in a faculty fellowship program where faculty were tasked with implementing a curricular innovation at their home institution. These benefits included: (1) serving as an ally, advocate, and defender for the faculty fellow; (2) seeing the bigger picture and how the fellowship can be leveraged to benefit the institution in other ways; and (3) assisting to ensure the fellowship project will be ongoing at their institution.

Polishing the Apple: A Holistic Approach to Developing Public Health Law Educators as Leaders of Change
Debra Gerardi
The RWJF public health law faculty fellowship provided an opportunity for legal and public health scholars to come together to develop innovative approaches for teaching public health law in schools of law, public health, medicine, and social work nationally. The fellowship program emphasized the importance of integrating individual change (personal and professional development) with organizational change as twin pillars of the core competencies necessary for advancing public health law education. This article describes the curriculum and learning formats used throughout the fellowship to guide the fellows’ development in the areas of leading change, managing conflict, building collaborative partnerships, and maintaining personal resilience.

Stacie P. Kershner
Georgia State University College of Law, through the Center for Law, Health & Society, developed a pair of online libraries for faculty teaching public health law in schools of law or public health. Development of these libraries was funded by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation as part of The Future of Public Health Law Education: Faculty Fellowship Program. This article describes the goals of the program addressed by the libraries, the development process, the resources included, and how faculty may benefit from the materials and provide materials benefitting other faculty across the country.

Innovation in Higher Education: Lessons Learned from Creating a Faculty Fellowship Program
Nancy J. Kaufman and Charity Scott
This concluding essay offers reflections on core components of the faculty fellowship program, its outcomes and results, and program design and administration. Amid the current calls for reform in legal and other professional education, the lessons we learned and perspectives we gained during this fellowship program may be relevant to any faculty members and university administrations that are seeking to create more effective and engaged professional and graduate school programs, whatever may be their subject-matter discipline.
INTRODUCTION

Transforming the Future of Public Health Law Education through a Faculty Fellowship Program

Charity Scott

Introduction
This special supplement issue of the Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics is devoted to a unique faculty fellowship program that promoted educational innovations in public health law during the 2014-2015 academic year. Through a competitive national application process, ten faculty fellows were selected to design and implement innovative curricular projects (clinics, externships, and experiential-learning courses) in public health law at their home institutions.

The fellowship program was made possible by a grant that the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (“RWJF”), the country’s largest philanthropy dedicated solely to health, made to Georgia State University College of Law and its Center for Law, Health & Society, which I directed at the time. I served as the overall project director and lead faculty for the fellowship program, which was designed to enhance the teaching of public health law at schools of law, public health, and other health-related professions.

This article provides an overview of the fellowship program. It highlights the program’s goals, some of the underlying philosophies that shaped it, and the key activities that supported the fellows during their fellowship year as they implemented their innovations. It also provides a roadmap for understanding common themes as you read about the fellows’ curricular projects, which are presented in their individual essays that follow in this Journal issue.

Goals and Underlying Philosophies
During the past decade, RWJF has devoted considerable resources to developing new initiatives in public health law and furthering law’s role in promoting the public’s health. Its twin pillars of its investment in this area are the Network for Public Health Law (“Network”) and the Public Health Law Research program. RWJF has also recently funded several smaller pilot projects to test effective ways to engage lawyers and legal academics in the public health field. This faculty fellowship program is one of those pilot projects.

RWJF had two overarching goals in desiring to establish the fellowship program: (1) to promote the innovative teaching of public health law nationally by creating new curricular offerings in schools of law and public health (which was later expanded to include schools of medicine and social work), and (2) to build and share resources beyond the fellows’ home institutions through online libraries that would foster model approaches and best practices for teaching public health law. When I was brought in to lead the program, I created another goal for the program: (3) to create a dynamic and supportive “community of practice” in public health law that would foster the fellows’ personal growth and professional development.

As explained by one of the scholars, Etienne Wenger, who coined the phrase in the 1990s:

Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they
interact regularly…. A community of practice is not merely a club of friends or a network of connections between people. It has an identity defined by a shared domain of interest. Membership therefore implies a commitment to the domain, and therefore a shared competence that distinguishes members from other people…. In pursuing their interest in their domain, members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, and share information. They build relationships that enable them to learn from each other; they care about their standing with each other…. They develop a shared repertoire of resources: experiences, stories, tools, ways of addressing recurring problems — in short a shared practice. This takes time and sustained interaction.7

We wanted to create a fellowship program that would foster this robust sense of a “community of practice” among its participants.

**New Curricular Offerings**

When RWJF first conceived of the fellowship program, few law schools offered courses in public health law. If health law courses were offered, the emphasis was typically on laws related to health care providers and hospitals, bioethics, and medical malpractice. In schools of public health, a law-related course was taught, if it was taught at all, often by non-tenure-track faculty. RWJF sought to enhance the teaching of public health law by offering to full-time, tenure-track or tenured faculty the opportunity through the fellowship program to create new courses, clinics, externships, or other curricular offerings in public health law.

RWJF was particularly interested in promoting courses that would emphasize experiential and practice-oriented learning and would foster student engagement with public health practice organizations, including public health government agencies and non-profit community organizations concerned with public health. RWJF was also committed from the outset to seeing that the new curricular offerings would be sustained at the fellows’ home institutions after the fellowship year ended. To this end, the fellows’ deans were required take part in both the application process and the intensive summer institute that served as the kick-off to the year-long fellowship program.8

In line with RWJF's goals, I have long supported the creation of experiential and community-engaged learning environments.9 Engagement with community partners — whether through a clinic or externship or as part of a doctrinal course — offers students insights into the real world of professional practice that simply cannot be experienced in any classroom alone. RWJF’s support for practice-oriented education was also consistent with recent calls for reform in legal education generally.10

We also saw the fellowship program as an opportunity to advance interdisciplinary learning. Interdisciplinary education offers benefits, whatever the subject matter.11 At the level of graduate or professional education, students can become so immersed in their own disciplinary fields that they forget how specialized their knowledge, vocabulary, and ways of thinking have become. When they work with students from other disciplines, they are like travelers to foreign cultures who discover that there is a lot they do not understand or know or cannot do as well as they thought they could, and they may be intimidated by language barriers. When they return to their home countries, they often look at them through new eyes.

Like foreign travel, interdisciplinary education sparks curiosity, expands horizons, and offers the pleasures of new discoveries, surprising perspectives, and different beliefs and approaches to problems. RWJF and I saw the fellowship program as a perfect opportunity to introduce more faculty and thus more students across the country to the benefits of interdisciplinary and community-engaged learning through the field of public health law.

With these goals and educational perspectives providing the overall philosophical backdrop to the fellowship program, we gathered a multi-talented program team together to help design and implement it.12

**Professional Development**

Early on in the design of the fellowship program, the program team developed a set of core competencies (knowledge, skills, and attitudes or values) that we hoped the fellows would enhance during the fellowship year. We anticipated that the fellows would enter the program with some, albeit varying, degree of competency in the knowledge realm (e.g., knowledge of key public health laws, ethics, and policy issues). Because the fellows would be experienced faculty, we also knew we could largely rely on them teach themselves what they needed to know at this doctrinal level to implement their projects.

Spending less time on developing the fellows’ subject-matter expertise would allow us the freedom to experiment with supporting the skills and values of good teaching, as well as the skills and attitudes for success in navigating academic change. The fellowship program, and particularly the intensive ten-day summer institute that launched the fellowship year, would thus focus on developing those core competencies that faculty rarely get systematically exposed
to and yet are central to personal and professional growth as faculty members: best practices in teaching (including adult learning theory and effective experiential learning), leadership, conflict management, collaboration, and self-reflective practice. Emphasizing the attendees’ professional development rather than focusing on improving their expertise in a particular subject matter is unusual for an academic conference, and offering this unfamiliar agenda was initially thought by some on the program team to be a bit risky. It proved to be a critical component in the success of the fellowship program.

“It’s all about the relationship” became a watchword of the fellowship program. We knew that the cohort of fellows could learn as much from each other and their mentors as from outside experts, and the program was designed to foster those relationships. It also aimed to offer a network of connections for them with practitioners and other faculty in public health law who could provide support and guidance both in their projects and in their careers after the fellowship year. Building a strong community of practice within public health law was thus central to promoting the fellows’ professional development.

Selection of Fellows
To be eligible to apply, candidates had to have a full-time faculty appointment, a J.D. degree, and at least three years of teaching experience and had to demonstrate interest in teaching innovations, building new educational programs in public health law, and leading academic change. In line with the program’s goals, preference was given to candidates with an interest in interdisciplinary, experiential, and practice-oriented learning and a capacity for developing collaborations with public health agencies or organizations and interdisciplinary relationships across campus.

Six of the finalists selected as fellows had primary appointments in law schools; two had primary appointments in public health schools; one had a primary appointment in a medical school; and one had a primary appointment in a school of social work. All four of the candidates without primary appointments in a law school had strong affiliations with the law school on their campus or with a law school in the state. All of the projects proposed to incorporate experiential learning, and many sought to establish connections between the fellow’s school and community partners in public health law (either as part of the new course or through externships). Most of the projects had interdisciplinary dimensions with law, public health, medicine, social work, or other professional or graduate students. Two fellows’ proposals embraced distance learning through innovative online technology.

Mentors
Five distinguished senior faculty with expertise in public health law and academic program development were invited to be mentors to the fellows in the fellowship program. The mentors were selected for their diversity of backgrounds, perspectives, and academic settings in which they worked. They graciously agreed to join the fellowship program before they knew who the fellows would be, as they would be part of the application-review panel that included other public health law attorneys and faculty. Each mentor was paired with two fellows for the duration of the fellowship year, although mentors freely assisted other fellows who were not assigned to them as the opportunities arose to offer supporting advice or assistance. The mentors were integral to the development of every facet of the fellowship program: helping to design the agenda for the summer institute, attending and leading sessions at it, and engaging with their fellows throughout the year and providing ongoing support, guidance, and encouragement. They were central in helping the newly-developing community of practice to cohere at the summer institute, and to strengthening it throughout the fellowship year. They will doubt-
Summer Institute
A major component of the fellowship program was the summer institute, held from July 16-26, 2014 in Park City, Utah, which served as the kick-off to the fellowship year. Among the goals of summer institute was to foster the fellows’ capacity for innovative teaching using interdisciplinary relationships, reflective practice, and collaborative approaches to learning. Another goal was to foster their capacity for leading change in academic settings, navigating resistance, and building sustainable public health law programs.

Pre-Institute Preparation
In order to use the ten days of the summer institute to best advantage, the fellows were given a number of assignments during their orientation to the program to be completed before the institute. Fellows completed a self-assessment of core competencies in public health law education, which had been developed in conjunction with RWJF’s assessment processes for other pilot projects and were tailored to this fellowship program. (The fellows updated this self-assessment of competencies after the institute and at the end of the fellowship year to measure progress.) They also took a self-assessment of personal strengths, which would serve as a starting point for self-reflection on professional development during the fellowship program and would be discussed during the institute.

In addition, the fellows were given a professional development journal, tailored to the fellowship program, to allow them to determine their own learning goals and to track their progress throughout the fellowship year. They were also given a project plan template to track progress on the implementation of their projects. The fellows updated their journals and project plans both at the summer institute and periodically during the fellowship year. They also shared them periodically with their mentors and program team as a springboard for mentoring, help with navigating challenges, and ongoing advice, support, and encouragement.

Participants
As noted earlier, building a strong community of practice and cohesion among all the attendees was central to achieving the program’s goals. The fellows, their mentors, and the program team attended all ten days of the summer institute. The first two-and-a half days of the summer institute included the fellows’ deans and distinguished academic leaders and leading public health professionals and attorneys from federal, state, and local government and the private sector. In a variety of formal and informal settings, the participants began to build a strong network of connections in academia and professional practice that the fellows could call on during their fellowship year. Being a relatively small group with abundant opportunities for conversation, everyone quickly gained new insights into the others’ realms of professional life.

Teaching Formats
The summer institute was designed to model a wide range of teaching approaches and learning activities. Reflecting the phrase that “the medium is the message,” each format chosen for different institute sessions over the ten days offered an example of a different method, tool, activity, or practice for teaching and learning. The institute was deliberately structured to demonstrate how to experiment creatively with different teaching formats. In the context of good teaching, the institute applied the principle of good literary or film composition: “show, don’t tell.”

During the first few days when deans and others were in attendance, formats began with the more traditional power-point presentations by the fellows
of their projects, panel discussions, and small-group breakouts. The sessions also incorporated less conventional formats, such as “speed-dating”-like roun
table discussions (rotating all attendees among the public health and law practitioners) to explore career opportunities in public health law. After the mentors and a few program team members presented their own teaching innovations through posters or video, the participants were invited to a “program academy” where they could walk around the gallery of posters for more informal and in-depth conversations with the presenters. A semi-circle of all the deans at a conversational “deans’ forum” allowed them to offer their thoughts about the challenges that their fellows might face and how the deans could help to overcome them.23

After the deans and others departed, the formats became increasingly varied and provocative. The first day was an immersion day in experiential learning, and was perhaps the most powerful day of the summer institute. The fellows, mentors, and program team spent it at the National Ability Center in Park City, which is a leader in adaptive sports and recreation for people of all abilities.24 The morning was spent in a service-learning project to help rebuild disability-accessible trails across the Center’s grounds. There was also time to debrief the experience and the fellows’ service-learning opportunities in their own communities and to explore the results and significance of their pre-institute self-assessments of their personal strengths.

In the afternoon, the fellows, mentors, and program team undertook a demanding ropes-course challenge, which required them to climb tall poles and, working in teams of two high off the ground, to navigate their ways across uneven sets of ropes. This activity — a memorable one for the fear, anxiety, and, for some, thrill it engendered — represented what it is like to get out of one’s comfort zone, as we ask our students to do all the time. The group also experienced equine-facilitated learning: working with horses, they had to get horses to move from one place to another in the ring. Since they could not push or speak to the horses, this activity revealed insights into how non-verbal communication works and can impact one’s effectiveness as a leader and teacher.

Other games and problem-solving activities during the day drew on experiential intuitions more than rational thought and appealed to different learning styles. The day ended with dinner-in-the-dark, during which all participants were blindfolded and guided in their exploration of their meal by a blind man. A sometimes uncomfortable experience, it served to foster empathy for those who are differently abled, as many of our students are.

The rest of the week incorporated intensive, highly interactive workshops on ethics in public health policy and practice, master teaching strategies and methods, and managing conflict and navigating change. One of the authors of “What the Best Law Teachers Do” and his faculty colleague25 conducted two days of workshops on developing course objectives, designing a new course and an assessment plan for it, and incorporating a variety of experiential teaching methods, including cooperative learning, storytelling, cognitive think-aloud, discovery sequence instruction, and classroom assessment techniques. A workshop on navigating organizational change began with the participants’ self-assessments of their own personal styles for handling conflict, followed by discussion about managing change and dealing with resistance.

Field trips were also featured at the institute. There were field trips to the local medical center (whose executive chef was a remarkable model for making the hospital a local gathering spot for healthy, inexpensive, and delicious food) and the Summit County Health Department (whose director and legal counsel discussed the challenges and opportunities facing a local health department trying to promote the health of a community with wide income disparities). Field
Trips also included a visit to the local water treatment facility and a couple of restaurant inspections. Such excursions illustrated the real world of public health in the local Park City community, which could model for the fellows various options for engaging their students with public health agencies or organizations in their own communities.

Toward the end of the ten days, “open space” sessions allowed the fellows and mentors themselves to define the agenda for the morning and offer to lead sessions on topics of particular interest that had not been covered in the previous days. While it is virtually unheard of at an academic conference to not have a predetermined agenda, this self-organizing method of setting an agenda on the spot is an intriguing and effective way to allow participants to define what they want to learn about and to gather in small groups to share their respective expertise, perspectives, and questions about focused topics of common interest. The open-space format reflects one of the central principles of adult learning theory, which is for the learners themselves to identify their learning needs and priorities.

In addition, the fellows had the opportunity for targeted one-on-one coaching and counseling sessions. A professional coach and conflict-engagement specialist offered personal and confidential coaching sessions. Most fellows had never experienced professional coaching before, which provided them both an opportunity for addressing concerns about their own professional development (e.g., tenure, scholarship, and work-life balance) and a teaching model for coaching their own students. Three highly influential leaders in public health law, who had come for the last two days of the institute and participated in the open-space sessions with substantive workshops in public health law and policy, also formed an impromptu expert panel to give individual sessions with any of the fellows who desired these leaders’ personalized feedback on their projects. In addition to offering the fellows an opportunity to get expert advice on their projects, such one-on-one feedback reinforced the pedagogical value of the fellows’ providing individualized feedback to their own students on exams, papers, and other coursework.

**Intangible Rewards**

Finally, there was down time for recreation and relaxation, taking advantage of the beautiful Park City setting, as well as scheduled time for mentoring conversations and individual work on projects. Many who had come to the institute mildly apprehensive about spending ten days with strangers and fearing it would be too long to be productive found that its length was barely enough time to take it all in and be able to process all that the institute and the locality had to offer. It was simultaneously thought-provoking, energizing, overwhelming, exhausting, and a lot of fun.

While it might not have been sufficiently mind-expanding or culture-changing to qualify as the “Woodstock of Legal Education,” the summer institute came close (albeit without the drugs and free love) and reflected a seminal moment in the fellows’ and mentors’ professional lives. The group bonded in a way that academics rarely have the chance to savor beyond their home institutions, and the friendships that began there have endured through the fellowship year and beyond.

**Fellowship Year**

After the summer institute came the fellows’ hard work of refining and implementing their projects at their home institutions over the course of the fellowship year. The mentors provided ongoing support through monthly calls with their respective fellows, and the fellows held their own periodic calls among themselves, offering support, advice, encouragement, and the opportunity to engage in collaborative work resulting in class materials, scholarship ideas, and invitations to present at each other’s campuses. I also held periodic individual calls with the fellows and group calls with the mentors, received interim written reports from the fellows and mentors, and helped the fellows to organize presentations at national professional conferences during the year.

A two-day conference held in Atlanta in May 2015 to close the fellowship year was both celebratory and bittersweet. It afforded an opportunity for the fellows, mentors, and program team to reconnect in person, to hear the final outcomes of all the fellows’ projects, and to honor one another for their perseverance, educational successes, and personal and professional growth. A tour of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention gave an opportunity to explore up-close this signature federal agency’s current and historical work to protect the public’s health. A meet-and-greet gathering of attorneys from across the CDC campus, including the general counsel’s office and the public health law program, continued the strengthening of professional connections and contributed to sustaining the program’s community of practice. Utilizing the open-space format they had learned at the summer institute, the fellows and mentors set their own agenda on the final afternoon to explore ways they might further cement their relationships and engage in future collaborations after the fellowship year. Even as they regretted that the fellowship year was ending, they rejoiced in their achievements and shared experiences and how far they all had travelled professionally and personally during the year.
Online Resources
To meet the program’s goal to build and share resources that foster model approaches and best practices for teaching public health law as well as to support the fellows and help sustain their innovations, the program created two new online libraries of extensive resources related to public health law and best practices in teaching.30 Stacie Kershner, associate director of the Center for Law, Health & Society and co-project director for the fellowship program, developed an initial set of materials that were available as a resource at the summer institute. The fellows and mentors contributed additional materials during the fellowship year, often resulting from work on their projects.

One online library is available to the public and hosts a set of up-to-date resources on substantive public health law content, including links to key public health law information generally (e.g., cases, books, articles, videos, government agencies and organizations related to public health) as well as resources on specific topic categories in public health law.31 The second library offers a range of teaching resources, including public health law course syllabi, case studies and class exercises, video clips and other audiovisual resources, Power Point slides, and bibliographies of materials on teaching and learning, adult learning principles and practices, leadership development, organizational change, interdisciplinary education, and skills development. This library is available to faculty nationwide (password accessible) and is hosted on the Network’s website.32

These libraries contribute to creating a wider community of practice, not just among the fellowship program participants, but also with faculty and practitioners elsewhere who are interested in developing teaching reforms generally or public health law expertise specifically. The libraries are designed to be widely disseminated and utilized, and ongoing contributions to them are welcomed.33

Common Themes
From the fellows’ reports, conversational exchanges, and reflections over the course of the fellowship year, common themes have emerged which provide both background and context for appreciating their projects. All of the fellows were creating something entirely new and virtually out of whole cloth, intrinsically motivated by an entrepreneurial spirit and purpose-driven enthusiasm and supported by the fellowship program, and yet without a trodden path or even a roadmap at their school or elsewhere to guide them. Here are some common themes from their experiences, challenges, and surprises, many of which are reflected in their individual essays that follow in this volume.

Project Management
Some fellows were surprised (and dismayed) by how much time and effort was required to get their new course up and running at their schools, particularly where interdisciplinary enrollment was sought. When cross-registration logistics were coupled with coordination efforts with new community partners and start-up preparation of new experiential activities and other class materials, many fellows experienced work overload, especially if they had not been given a release from a course or committee assignments to undertake the fellowship. Without the ongoing support and encouragement of their mentors, program team, and each other, many might have experienced serious burnout (none did).

The fellows found it helpful to manage their projects by creating clear structures. Particularly when working with students from different disciplines, they found it important to define and express clearly at the outset of the course what their learning objectives, expectations, and grading rubrics were. With respect to community partners, it was equally important to agree upon a set of mutual expectations and work products in advance and to choose course projects that met the course objectives. Some potential community agencies or organizations may not be good candidates for collaboration if their mission, needs, or interests do not align with the faculty member’s educational goals, or if they do not have personnel who can commit to providing adequate supervision of and feedback to the students during the semester. Fellows quickly realized that any temptation either to oversell what the students could offer a community partner or to avoid confronting the partner’s potentially unrealistic expectations had to be quelled, as it could only lead to headaches and disappointment on all sides down the road.

The fellows also benefitted from remaining flexible when inevitable curve balls were thrown their way. These surprises could come, for example, in the form of unanticipated bureaucratic or political obstacles across campus or lack of timely resources or staffing on which the project was dependent. Many had to rethink, revise, or reschedule at least some components of their project because of what they either learned at the summer institute or came to realize during the year. These mid-course corrections reinforced learning to accept and take advantage of the unexpected.
Personal and Professional Development

One of the enduring themes of the fellowship year, beginning with the ropes-course challenge at the summer institute, was the importance of risk-taking and getting out of one’s comfort zone. All of the fellows were highly successful faculty in their own rights before the fellowship year began. The program challenged them to enlarge their personal boundaries and take on new challenges.

In some cases, challenging the fellows’ limits meant their becoming as much learners as teachers as they introduced new material not previously in their wheelhouse of expertise or as they collaborated with faculty or professionals outside their disciplines. This caused an unexpected but welcomed benefit of creating a team feeling for collaborative learning among the professor and students in the class as they co-created the learning environment.

In other cases, taking risks meant giving up control and the orderliness of a doctrinal classroom in favor of the unexpected turns and twists of student-led class projects or the changing needs or capacities of community partners. For successful type-A faculty, it can be hard to give up control and let the students take the lead in at least some aspects of the course’s evolution. Yet doing so led to the insight that when students take charge of their learning and help to design the course and their work product, the learning experience can be even deeper, more engaging, and more fun for all involved, including the professor. One fellow recounted that creating a new course with a local public health agency “forced me to let students take control of the course’s development while I played the role of advisor, mentor and guide….I guided. I gave opinion, I made suggestions. But I restrained myself from re-working the students’ deliverables” to the agency.34

The fellows have expressed how the fellowship experience has made them better teachers, and that the lessons they learned from developing their projects have had striking ripple effects of improvement in their teaching of their other courses as well. Personally, they developed resilience they may not have realized they had in themselves, which allowed them to persevere to accomplish their goals. Professionally, their successes boosted their self-confidence and heightened their visibility as leaders within their schools. Taking big risks resulted in big rewards for the fellows. Reflecting on the surprises that arose during the program, one fellow recalled:

Repetedly, the theme of risk-taking has resonated with me throughout my fellowship year. I have been rewarded for every risk I have taken this year, which means I should be taking more risks.... [The image of the ropes-course challenge] embodies what will be the lasting lesson for me from this year, and I am grateful for it.

Challenges

The challenges the fellows faced in the course of implementing their projects fell into three general categories: administrative, political, and practical.

The administrative challenges typically related to the logistics of gaining course approval through lengthy and different curriculum review processes for interdisciplinary courses; registering and scheduling students from different disciplines; and advertising the new courses to ensure adequate enrollment numbers. In some cases, the reality that tuition dollars may follow the various schools in which their students are enrolled, yet the faculty member may be paid out of the budget only of the school that offers the course, can be an obstacle to creating or continuing interdisciplinary courses.

The political challenges included faculty resistance at some fellows’ schools in the form of skepticism about the value of their projects in the face of declining student-body enrollments and increasingly limited resources. Particularly at law schools, there could be outside pressures (like bar-passage rates and employment rates of graduates) to maintain traditional doctrinal courses rather than support what may be perceived as niche electives benefitting fewer students or as not teaching “the law.” While the health-related professions have increasingly welcomed opportunities for interdisciplinary education, law schools have historically been more hesitant to embrace interdisciplinary subjects or skills, often believing them to be outside the scope of what lawyers need to know. Some fellows had to navigate their colleagues’ covert concerns that they were getting special treatment or status at the school because they were RWJF fellows. To meet these challenges, the understanding and support of the fellows’ deans for their projects proved critical.

Some practical challenges related to the fellows’ concerns about the impact that undertaking the fellowship year might have on their scholarly productivity, and hence on their prospects for tenure. Others grappled with the challenges that having students with different disciplinary backgrounds and uneven abilities created, such as how to grade them fairly, how to manage their group dynamics, and how to balance content coverage with time for more process-oriented
goals to learn the skills of team work and meeting real organizations’ real needs. All of these challenges were ameliorated by the constant support and feedback from the diverse members of the community of practice that began at the summer institute.

Benefits
Enthusiasm is contagious, and the fellows’ enthusiasm for their new courses infected their students, who were thoroughly engaged in the new learning opportunities they offered. The fellows said that one of the biggest benefits of the program was the renewed motivation they felt for fresh teaching experiences, which resulted in reciprocated enthusiasm and engagement in learning among their students. The fellows also conveyed their enthusiasm to colleagues at their schools, for they were required as part of the program to hold an informal presentation of their project in the spring semester of their fellowship year to their faculty and administration. This in turn could open up new lines of communication among their colleagues interested in innovative teaching and curricular reforms.

Some fellows discovered that their projects aligned well with strategic planning and other educational initiatives at their universities. Even if some colleagues at their own school did not fully understand their project’s educational value, a number of fellows found that at the university level there was a lot of interest and support for interdisciplinary and community-engaged learning opportunities. When a president or a provost stresses that a core part of the university’s mission is to serve its community or to foster interdisciplinary education, deans tend to take notice, and they could point to the fellows’ projects as demonstrations of their school’s commitment to that mission. Also, many of the fellows’ projects fit squarely within recent calls for legal education reform and trends in ABA accreditation standards.35

Fellows who taught interdisciplinary classes expressed how gratifying were the many “ah-ha” moments that their students had. Not only had students learned to appreciate the perspectives of other disciplines, they also had begun to understand how the different disciplinary skills and knowledge bases contributed to better problem-solving for their community organizations than could have been achieved with those of a single discipline.

Just as developing the capacity for self-reflection is a core dimension of developing professional skills and identity,36 developing this capacity was a key goal of the fellowship experience. Ultimately, it was the fellows who had to teach themselves what they needed to know and do to implement their projects successfully, just as their students will have to learn to become their own best teachers as they develop as professionals. Taking the time and opportunities to reflect on their experiences during the fellowship year through their professional development journals, conversations with peers and mentors, and professional coaching all contributed in varying degrees to their personal growth.

A number of fellows replicated this reflective experience in their courses, giving their students similar structured opportunities to reflect on their own learning, their own goals, and their own styles of coping, meeting challenges, and solving problems. For courses that include a community-based project and team work, one fellow recommended incorporating:

multiple opportunities for individual and team reflection and “check-ins” during class. The semester goes by very fast. These check-ins help to keep students on task and to avert problems in the group process. One way to do this is to have students complete a “Team Charter” which they can review periodically to determine if they are meeting their goals and expectations for the group. As I told my students, “teams are like marriages; leaving things unsaid does not make for a healthy team!”

Community of Practice
Some fellows had expressed, before their fellowship year, a sense of isolation at their schools as either the lone faculty member teaching health law or the lone faculty member with their particular research interests. The summer institute gave them a longed-for feeling of a community with professionals who understood their field and their challenges, had similar interests, and could offer the expertise and resources to further their professional work. It would be hard to overstate the value and importance of having such interpersonal relationships to sustain professional energy, motivation, and engagement. A consensus among the fellows was that the summer institute was one of the best features of the fellowship program.

Out of these relationships, the fellows developed a constellation of professional opportunities during the fellowship year. They invited each other and experts they had met at the summer institute to give presentations (either in person or remotely) at a class, workshop, or symposium. They collaborated on developing new course materials, such as case studies and assessment tools. They shared resources and model practices, and they explored their common research interests and ideas. In one case, two fellows and a mentor collaborated on an issue brief for the CDC. Another fellow, who previously had been unfamiliar with the medical-legal partnership (MLP) concept,
began working with four other fellows, faculty at other schools, and the National Center for Medical-Legal Partnership to design metrics for evaluating the impact of MLPs on patients’ health.

The fellows had found a community who could encourage, commiserate with, and support them and celebrate their achievements. As one fellow observed, “It feels like I have been finally able to connect with a larger community with tremendous expertise that would like to see my teaching and research improve, and will actively help me to improve it.”

Conclusion
The fellowship program was successful in meeting its goals to inspire enthusiasm and motivation to become engaged and self-reflective teachers and leaders in public health law education, and to leverage professional networks to promote the long-term sustainability of the fellows’ curricular innovations and begin to effect culture change in higher education. This essay has described the steps in creating the fellowship program, explored common themes among the fellows’ projects, and discussed many of components that contributed to the success of the program. It offers perspectives for anyone considering undertaking a similar fellowship program in other disciplinary fields in the future.

The fellows have created ten innovative curricular projects that represent best teaching practices in higher education and models for enhancing experiential, interdisciplinary, and community-engaged learning. Their challenges, surprises, and lessons learned find elaboration in the articles that follow, as do the observations and perspectives of the deans’ consultant, the professional coach and conflict specialist, and two of the program’s mentors. Finally, a companion article written by myself and the consultant who was engaged by RWJF to participate in strategic visioning, planning, and program evaluation closes this volume with some overall conclusions drawn from both the processes and outcomes of the fellowship program and recommendations for future consideration.
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Combining Accreditation and Education: An Interdisciplinary Public Health Law Course

Micah L. Berman

Introduction
Ohio is the only state in the country that requires local health departments to seek accreditation from the Public Health Accreditation Board (PHAB), a "non-profit organization dedicated to advancing the continuous quality improvement of Tribal, state, local, and territorial public health departments." PHAB’s accreditation requirements are built around the ten essential public health services, one of which is to “enforce public health laws that protect health and ensure safety.” With respect to this topic, PHAB’s requirements innovatively look beyond the mere enforcement of existing laws and require local health departments to (1) carefully evaluate how well current law is aligned with evidence-based public health recommendations, and (2) proactively consider how local or state laws could be modified and strengthened.

Specifically, local health departments are asked to “review existing laws and work with governing entities and elected/appointed officials to update as needed” (Domain 6/Standard 6.1). They must produce extensive documentation, including “evaluations of laws for consistency with public health evidence-based and/or promising practices...and consideration of the impact on health equity.” While local health departments in Ohio are working diligently to meet all of PHAB’s accreditation requirements, their staff members have indicated to me that the law-related portions of the accreditation process are particularly challenging because health departments typically have limited legal capacity and are not accustomed to conducting reviews of legal materials.

As part of the 2014-2015 Future of Public Health Law Education faculty fellowship program, I developed and taught a public health law course at Ohio State University in which the students supported a local health department in Ohio, Franklin County Public Health (FCPH), in preparing for the law-related aspects of PHAB accreditation. In addition to this experiential component, the course was also interdisciplinary. Enrollment was open to both law students and public health students, and the course centered on collaborative group projects that required law and public health students to work closely together. The design of this course was based in part on lessons learned from my previous experience teaching a “multi-collaborative” public health law course that included student interaction with a state health department.

Course Design

Learning Objectives
The fellowship program was designed to foster better teaching, and it helped me to focus on developing sound learning objectives (for the course overall and for each individual class session), and to hold myself accountable for meeting them. The objectives included both substantive knowledge and practical skills. By my own assessment and according to the students’ self-evaluations, the students were successful in achieving these learning objectives:

- Recognize that the development of public health law (and all law) is a dynamic and ongoing pro-
Understand how law can be used as a tool to transform the future of public health law education. Does the city’s code require bicycle lanes? If so, does it specify a width for the bicycle lanes? Does it require signage explaining their use? Does it provide a buffer separating the bicycle lanes from traffic?

Consider the ethical issues and tradeoffs involved in making public health policy; does the code require crosswalks for pedestrians? If so, what types (signalized/unsigned; at intersections/mid-block, etc.)? Does the code include a connectivity plan for pedestrians, ensuring that pedestrian routes connect with one another? A connectivity plan for bicyclists?

Develop practice-relevant skills relating to teamwork, professional communication, and public speaking; does the code require crosswalks for pedestrians? If so, what types (signalized/unsigned; at intersections/mid-block, etc.)? Does the code include a connectivity plan for pedestrians, ensuring that pedestrian routes connect with one another? A connectivity plan for bicyclists?

Strengthen writing and legal drafting skills; and

Understand the structure, function, and processes of public health entities — particularly local health departments.

Course Enrollment and Topics

Twelve students were enrolled in the course: eight law students, three public health students (including one who already held a law degree), and one joint-degree law/public health student. The students were divided up into four groups of three students, and each group was assigned a different topic area (after students ranked their preferences). The topic areas were developed in consultation with FCPH leadership, and the final topics were: (1) bicycle and motorcycle safety; (2) school wellness policies; (3) infectious disease preparedness; and (4) complete streets (policies to make streets “safe, comfortable, and convenient for people walking, bicycling, riding public transportation, and driving”).

Group Projects

There were two primary group assignments, which mirrored the types of documentation FCPH needed to assemble for the law-related aspects of PHAB accreditation. The first assignment required each group to conduct an assessment of Franklin County’s current laws on its assigned topic, and then compare the laws in Franklin County to model laws/best practices. For this analysis, students used the LawAtlas web-based software developed by Public Health Law Research (PHLR), a program funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) and based at Temple University’s Beasley School of Law.

The LawAtlas program allowed students to systematically collect local laws from the 14 cities within FCPH’s jurisdiction and then code them for the presence or absence of features identified in best practices guidance. For example, the complete streets group reviewed codified ordinances and systematically coded them for the presence or absence of recommended features such as:

- Does the city’s code require bicycle lanes? If so, does it specify a width for the bicycle lanes? Does
department’s priorities, structure, and operations, as well as “ride-alongs” with FCPH staff. For the ride-alongs, students joined FCPH staff for food inspections, housing inspections, indoor pool inspections, jail inspections, and a court hearing on hoarding violations. The students reported that these interactions gave them a much clearer picture of what local health departments do and the legal issues that they confront on a daily basis.

In addition to the learning objectives described above, my overall intent was for the two key components of the course — the interdisciplinary aspect and the partnership with FCPH — to work synergistically to heighten student engagement and provide students with a learning experience that would enhance their preparation for practice. In both informal and formal student evaluations, students indicated that this course design was successful in achieving these goals. For example, several students wrote that the real-world application of the project, i.e., the fact that their projects would be used to support FCPH’s PHAB accreditation application, provided strong motivation for them to produce high-quality work, and set this course apart from most courses where the professor is the only audience for student projects.

The course also included classroom instruction and discussion on a wide range of public health law issues, additional guest speakers, and several in-class simulation exercises (including one developed for this course focusing on responding to an infectious disease outbreak). I sought to select reading materials for the course that would be challenging yet accessible to both law and public health students; this consisted primarily of journal articles, although some key legal cases were assigned as well. Student grades were based on class preparation and participation, three individual written assignments (including a response paper following the ride-alongs), and the two group projects. For the group projects, a peer-assessment and self-assessment were factored into the grades.

Benefits

Student Engagement

In addition to the learning objectives described above, my overall intent was for the two key components of the course — the interdisciplinary aspect and the partnership with FCPH — to work synergistically to heighten student engagement and provide students with a learning experience that would enhance their preparation for practice. In both informal and formal student evaluations, students indicated that this course design was successful in achieving these goals. For example, several students wrote that the real-world application of the project, i.e., the fact that their projects would be used to support FCPH’s PHAB accreditation application, provided strong motivation for them to produce high-quality work, and set this course apart from most courses where the professor is the only audience for student projects.

Likewise, students felt that the combining law students and public health students in the same classroom worked very well and enhanced both class discussions and the group project work. In particular, the public health students were able to mentor the law students in research methods and the underlying public health issues, while the law students could explain the relevant legal concerns and legislative drafting considerations to the public health students. For both types of students, the written assignments and the presentations to FCPH provided numerous opportunities to work on their research, writing, and public speaking skills.

The use of LawAtlas, and exposure to the field of public health law research, was extremely beneficial to both the law and public health students. For law students, it exposed them to a new way of thinking about law. In law school, legal statutes (and cases) are typically studied in isolation. They are only rarely conceptualized as inputs for empirical research or compared to evidence-based best practices, and their impact on health is rarely examined.

Although this student project provided only a cross-sectional view of the current state of the public health law in Franklin County, we frequently discussed how LawAtlas (or other similar programs) could be used
over time to track changes in the law and, potentially, to evaluate whether such laws were having the anticipated impacts on public health. For the public health students, exposure to the field of “legal epidemiology” allowed them the opportunity to examine the critical role of law in shaping social norms, health behaviors, and ultimately health outcomes — and how, working with attorneys, they can use policy change as a tool to improve public health. These are lessons that, unfortunately, are often absent from public health curricula.

**University Benefit**

For the university, this course helped to deepen connections between the College of Law and College of Public Health, and it catalyzed further conversations about developing a robust and sustainable health law/public health law program that would encompass the two colleges (and perhaps others as well). It has also helped to further develop the culture of experiential learning and community engagement at the two colleges, and established what will hopefully be a continuing relationship with FCPH. Maintaining ongoing ties to FCPH (and potentially other local health departments, as discussed below) will create additional opportunities for experiential learning, applied research, and creative, multi-disciplinary problem solving that addresses local public health needs.

**Community Benefit**

The obvious benefit for FCPH is that the student projects can be used, after further review and refinement, as material to support its PHAB accreditation application. Beyond that, the student projects provided clear evidence and recommendations regarding how local public health laws can be updated and strengthened. For the most part, FCPH lacks the legal authority to implement these changes directly; rather, it must work with local city councils to implement the changes recommended by the students. I am hopeful that FCPH will use the information provided by the class to encourage local governments to adopt some of the students’ proposals. Indeed, PHAB requires local health departments not only to collect information about how public health laws could be updated, but also to communicate this information to elected or appointed officials who have the legal authority to act on it. I plan to continue working with FCPH as it engages in this process.

**Challenges**

The challenges in implementing this course were primarily logistical. My hope was to have equal enrollment of law and public health students, but there was limited enrollment from the public health side. Some public health students were unable to take the course because of scheduling conflicts, while others had few elective credits in their program and had already used them up on other courses. Locating the course at the law school (about a 10-15 minute walk from College of Public Health) may have also presented a barrier to enrollment. Leadership at both colleges are fully aware of these logistical challenges and are committed to addressing them the next time this course (or a similar course) is offered.

FCPH was an ideal partner to work with on this project. Their leadership, including the commissioner and the legal counsel, was very responsive, willing to commit a significant amount of time to the partnership, and highly interested in the outcome of the students’ research. The major challenge was in identifying research topics that were of interest to FCPH and also fit with the research design for the course. In order to allow the students to investigate city-by-city differences, we needed to identify public health law issues that were addressed primarily by the local jurisdictions in Franklin County. Because FCPH does not have the primary legal authority for these types of issues, they are not typically their areas of focus. Thus, with the exception of infectious disease preparedness, the topics areas addressed by the students were not the core areas of FCPH’s expertise. Nonetheless, FCPH was extremely flexible and accommodating; it was interested in learning more about the other areas (complete streets, bicycle/motorcycle safety, and school wellness) and saw them as areas in which it would like to become more educated and engaged.

In terms of teaching, it was a challenge to combine so many different elements — intensive group projects, interactions with FCPH staff, guest speakers, simulation exercises, and classroom discussion/instruction — into a coherent whole. Often times a discussion would have to be put on hold for a week or more and then wrapped up at a later date. I tried to address this challenge by structuring the doctrinal material in the course syllabus in a logical way and providing frequent reminders of where we were in the syllabus. I am confident that the many benefits of the diverse class components outweighed the occasional feeling of disjointedness.

**Lessons Learned**

Putting together and teaching this course took considerable time and effort. In order to make it feasible, I had to plan ahead and rely on resources and support provided by others. Ohio State provided support for a teaching assistant, who did preliminary research on potential project topics and helped to collect and develop course materials. This support, particularly in the semester before the course was taught, was critical.
Likewise, it was important to meet and coordinate with FCPH, finalize student research topics, and schedule interactions with FCPH staff before the semester began. The buy-in and commitment from FCPH leadership was crucial to making this project run smoothly. For others considering a similar project, I would recommend establishing early contact with a local health department to gauge the level of support and interest. Framing the project around PHAB accreditation helped to build high-level support for the project and also made it relatively easy to design student projects that would be of practical value to the department.

I also sought and received support from other sources, including PHLR and the other fellows. PHLR was generous in providing access to LawAtlas and technical support to the students. PHLR staff presented a training session to the class by videoconference, in which they explained how to use LawAtlas, and they responded to numerous e-mail queries from students. As LawAtlas was nonetheless challenging for students to use, in the future I might design a brief practice exercise so they could better familiarize themselves with the software before starting data collection. The other fellows were another important source of resources and support. One served as a guest speaker for my class on a topic of her expertise, and others generously shared simulation exercises, readings, and other teaching materials.

As for the interdisciplinary aspect of the class, I learned to trust that the students would be able to navigate the disciplinary divide if given enough time and space. I tried to let the students take the lead in class discussions and the simulation exercises, and I let the groups work through the difficulties they encountered without always trying to solve their problems for them. This strategy of “doing more by doing less” was a challenging adjustment for me, but aligns with best practices for adult learning, and the students were more than willing to engage with the material, challenge one another, and share their varied perspectives.

Impact
When the FCPH leadership visited our class for the students’ final presentations, one of the FCPH staff members asked the students what the key lessons were that they had learned over the course of the semester. Several students mentioned that they had come into the class without much awareness of the difference between health law and public health law, but that over the course of the semester, they had learned that public health law focuses on populations and prevention, while health law tends to focus on treatment for people who are already sick. They expressed amazement that they had not been exposed to public health law’s perspective before, given the importance of public health and the potential for public health law interventions to make a tremendous impact on the community’s health. It was gratifying to me to hear that the students had internalized some of the central themes of the course and, further, that several students were interested pursuing further opportunities relating to public health law.

As I have written previously, I believe that because it offers a distinct and important perspective, public health law should be an integral element of the curriculum in both law schools and public health programs. However, a considerable amount of academic infrastructural development — expanded course offerings, programs, journals, conferences, and the like — is needed before public health law will be fully recognized as a significant field of study. Along with the courses and programs developed by the other fellows, hopefully this course — and the template it provides for community-engaged, interdisciplinary learning — will help lay the foundation for further growth of the field.

At the local level, I will continue to work with FCPH to ensure that it is ready for the law-related aspects of accreditation and to see that the students’ research is shared with local jurisdictions that can act upon it. Central Ohio is an area in which many of the suburban cities market themselves as healthy places to live and work. I am optimistic that the information collected by the students will help spark some friendly competition between cities that will lead to positive changes in local public health laws.

Future
Looking forward, I hope to offer an interdisciplinary, community-engaged public health law course similar to this one again. The PHAB accreditation process requires ongoing review of public health laws, meaning that a similar course structure could be used in the future, even in partnership with a local health department that was not currently in the midst of an accreditation application. Partnering with FCPH in the future would give students the opportunity to track how public health laws change over time, but as every local health department in Ohio is required to undergo PHAB accreditation, it would also be possible to partner with other departments to avoid overburdening FCPH staff. Working with local health departments that are not in the immediate area of Ohio State would present new logistical challenges, but it could also provide an opportunity to explore the use of distance learning technologies and to work with underserved regions of the state. Over time, working
with different local health departments would help to establish connections that could be further developed in other ways, e.g., through externship placements and dissertation projects. Although other states do not have the accreditation mandate that Ohio has, many local and state health departments around the country are in the process of preparing for PHAB accreditation, and I hope the general outline of this course will be adapted and improved upon by others.

Personally, this fellowship program has helped me to focus more explicitly on outcome-based learning. Rather than focus solely on what I am communicating to students, I have shifted my effort toward ensuring that my course designs and evaluations are structured to achieve and then assess the course objectives. In the short term at least, this shift has also improved student satisfaction with my teaching (as measured by the very imprecise metric of student evaluations) in both this public health law course and my other courses.

Finally, the community of public health law teachers and scholars connected by this fellowship program has been a source of support, encouragement, and inspiration to me throughout the past year. I am grateful to RWJF for funding this program, and I look forward to collaborating with this talented and creative cohort of educators on future projects that will help to further build the field of public health law.
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Introduction
My curriculum project for the faculty fellowship program known as The Future of Public Health Law Education had three components: (1) a two-credit public health law survey course taught in spring semester 2015, (2) a one-credit course that was taught during intersessions before and after the spring semester and that specifically focused on public health issues involving health disparities in vulnerable populations, and (3) summer internships in public health law. In developing the two classroom courses, my primary goals were both to incorporate discussions of diversity in the teaching of public health law and to expand access to these courses for diverse students by offering them synchronously online and during our law school’s one-week intersessions. My goal in creating summer internship opportunities was to allow diverse students with a background in public health law after taking one or both of these courses to experience the real world of public health law practice and to share their diverse perspectives with established practitioners in the field.

The Need to Promote Diversity in Public Health Law
One of the greatest challenges in the public health law field is the lack of diversity among its practitioners. While I knew that there were few people of color actively involved in the field, it was brought home to me when participated in the summer institute for the fellowship program, where I was the only person of color. The lack of diversity in public health law adversely impacts public health policymaking and the implementation of health policy because the perspective of the communities served is often not represented in the process. This is especially important because many public health law and policy initiatives target diverse populations. The community of public health law scholars, practitioners, and fellows involved with this program are very dedicated to the goals of improving population health for all. This commitment was demonstrated time and time again throughout the fellowship. Yet, it may be nearly impossible to fully conceptualize the health and socioeconomic challenges faced by diverse populations if one has not personally experienced them.

Race is a particularly difficult subject to address in this country. Countless incidents of disparate treatment and discrimination against minorities, particularly Blacks and Latinos, occur each year. Health disparities and health inequity persist in minority groups as well. The national discussion of police aggression towards minorities illustrates that many times those outside of minority groups cannot comprehend how pervasive discriminatory acts are and how they influence the daily lives of minorities. For example, stop-and-frisk laws unequally enforced by targeting Black and Latino males create an ever-present stress in the lives of these men which negatively affects their health.

Similarly, seemingly innocuous public health policy may have unintended negative consequences to minorities as a class. For example, on a field trip during the fellowship program’s summer institute, we
learned that a local public health ordinance was more vigorously enforced against poor Latinos than was a public health ordinance that primarily affected affluent white tourists. The latter ordinance banned smoking within a certain distance of buildings in town. However, because of the layout of the main streets in relation to commercial buildings, the ordinance operated as a complete ban on smoking because the only place permissible to smoke would be in the middle of a high traffic street. This ordinance impacted affluent white vacationers who contributed to the local economy of the area. Second-hand smoke and the health effects of smoking were the public health concerns in this case. The other local ordinance dealt with the number of individuals who could live in one dwelling. This ordinance affected Latino workers in the hospitality industry who did not earn wages sufficient to live in the area where they worked. They lived together in poor conditions because in many cases, that was the only housing that was available in their price range. Sanitation and hygiene were major public health concerns here. The vacationing smokers received warnings and sometimes no punishment or enforcement against them of the smoking ban. The Latino workers, however, were displaced from their apartments and a remediation plan was pursued to clean up the apartments, making them less affordable.

Both ordinances had good intentions, yet the minority group had a more negative treatment and outcome. The lack of diversity among policymakers and public health practitioners can mean that in discussions before public health policies are adopted and enforced, potentially disparate or negative unintended consequences may not have been considered because no one in the discussions had the personal experiential context to recognize them.

Turning a Challenge into a Teaching Opportunity
Recognizing the challenge that there are not enough people of color involved in public health law early in my curriculum planning helped me to shape how I created and delivered the two classroom courses. I knew that I wanted my classes to be accessible to as many diverse students as possible, which would provide an opportunity for them to learn about the public health law field and to bring their diverse perspectives to it.
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Turning a Challenge into a Teaching Opportunity
Recognizing the challenge that there are not enough people of color involved in public health law early in my curriculum planning helped me to shape how I created and delivered the two classroom courses. I knew that I wanted my classes to be accessible to as many diverse students as possible, which would provide an opportunity for them to learn about the public health law field and to bring their diverse perspectives to it.

Some students work to support themselves and their families while attending law school. To fully address the needs of the student body, a wide range of academic and student support services are offered. The curriculum has a higher number of required courses than most law schools, which creates a challenge for students interested in specializing in a particular area.

Synchronous Distance Education
The first solution to the challenge of how to increase exposure to public health law for a diverse group of students was my decision to offer both courses online. Online courses provide increased accessibility for students with various time constraints and non-traditional schedules. As law schools face challenges with enrollment, curriculum, and changes in the model for legal education, distance education has become a growth area in the legal academy. There are two basic models of distance education: (1) asynchronous, in which students log on to the class individually and are not logged on together, and (2) synchronous, in which students log on to the class session at the same time.

Law school distance education courses involve either an asynchronous or a synchronous delivery.
model. Asynchronous courses involve the creation of online modules and/or pre-recorded lectures, discussion board with questions, and interaction with the professor. The courses sometimes include virtual office hours or special sessions where the professor can have live chat via typing. This model is flexible because faculty and students log on to make discussion board posts and ask and answer questions at their convenience within the parameters set by the course. However, this model does not fully support in-person discussions like those in live classrooms, which is essential to the learning process in legal education.

Accordingly, I used a synchronous model for my courses. This model provides the closest in-person experience to a live classroom that is currently available via distance education. There is a set course time. Students must log on and be present at the start of the course and throughout the class meeting period. The professor can see each student, and students can see the professor and their classmates on their computer screens. Each participant’s computer screen is divided into a number of boxes that matches the number of participants. The professor can also set up the course so that each student’s name is located in the box with his or her real-time picture.

Because this is a live course, the professor can see when students raise their hands. The professor can also see if students walk away from their computers. The students can see any content the professor shares, such as a presentation or video. If another student in the course is speaking, that student will be highlighted for everyone so that other students know who is the speaking student, which allows for students to get to know each other. In a seminar-sized class, the size of the student picture is large enough to see facial expressions, which allows the professor to read the class and determine if more explanation or discussion is needed about a particular topic. Overall, this synchronous model allows meaningful interaction among the professor and students comparable to an in-person classroom.

Engagement with Course Content through Students’ Personal Experiences

One of the biggest surprises of this project was the fact that the students had so many of the experiences that were discussed in the two courses. For example, our first case study in the public health law survey course involved a writing assignment on an Ebola-like outbreak. One of my students was from Liberia, and her family still lives there. She was able to give personal insights about her and her family’s experiences of an actual Ebola outbreak. The tone of the discussion changed immediately after the student talked about these experiences because the public health threat posed by a highly contagious and often-fatal disease had become more real to the other students. Although the students were not physically in the same location for this discussion, they felt comfortable sharing and really connected with me and each other. The rapid spread of Ebola these past few years has particularly affected minorities. The lack of diversity in the public health field has created challenges in implementing an effective strategy to combat the outbreak. Within my classroom, we were able to discuss the distrust of public health workers caused by past discrimination and questionable practices committed against minority communities.

During our discussion of tobacco regulation in the survey course, one group of students found an informative video clip of the development of e-cigarettes and other vapor products. At the conclusion of the discussion on the reading and the group presentation, two students in the class said that they actively used e-cigarettes. This led to an excellent discussion of perceptions about using these products as well as why regulation is needed. Sometimes online education is seen as disconnected, but in these courses, my students shared very personal experiences, and the class space was respected. Alcohol and tobacco are readily available in poor minority neighborhoods. The lack of public health policies to regulate e-cigarettes may disproportionately impact communities of color.

Another example from my survey course illustrates how course content and students’ personal experiences came together to deepen learning. The class focused on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Students conducted individual research and watched a video of someone participating in the SNAP Challenge, during which celebrities try to live healthily and eat healthy foods using only the amount of money that a SNAP recipient would receive to buy food. After discussing the program and allowing the students to discuss their research, a student in the class discussed her own experiences receiving SNAP benefits. Another student also discussed personal knowledge about abuse of the SNAP program in her home community. This was a particularly poignant class discussion. The first student talked about living in poverty and the challenges of relying on food assistance. This very powerful example demonstrated that important and difficult conversations can occur in an online class.

Intersection

My second solution to the challenge of bringing public health law issues, particularly issues of health equity affecting minority communities, to a diverse student
body was to hold the vulnerable populations course during an intersession. My law school had never before offered an intersession between regular semesters, nor had the university offered an intersession in any other program. In my capacity as the distance education coordinator for the law school, I wrote the proposal for the creation of an intersession and worked with various entities at the university level (Provost’s office, financial aid, student accounting, registrar, etc.) to systematically bring each unit on board with creating the intersession. This process occurred during the summer and fall semesters of the fellowship year. The first intersession began during the week before the spring semester of 2015, and the second intersession was held during the week after that spring semester. I offered the vulnerable populations course during both intersessions.

Creating an intersession addressed the problem of many students not having room in their schedules to take specialty courses. The courses were geared to second-year students to prepare them for internship placements in public health law. In the second year of law school at NCCU, students often load their schedules with bar exam-tested courses to provide a firm foundation going into the third year. Many of their second-year courses are required. NCCU School of Law offers numerous clinical opportunities, and prerequisites for these clinics must be taken during the second year to enroll in the year-long clinic courses during the students’ third year. If a student takes one four-credit required course and three three-credit required courses, including both substantive and professional skills courses, this leaves little time for other courses.

Another advantage of the intersession course is that I taught it, on an intensive basis, in the evening over the course of one week. Additional flexibility by offering the vulnerable populations course during the intersession was gained for some students who could reduce their spring course load by taking an elective course before the spring semester started. Allowing the students to take the course during one of the intersessions also meant that those students whose schedules were completely full during the spring semester would be able to take the course.

One of the challenges with having a course during the intersession is that it must be fully completed before the semester begins. Intersession courses cannot interfere with the next semester. This limited the types of assessments that could be done. The vulnerable populations course would have lent itself well to a research paper, but that could not be completed in the weekend after the course was offered. Consequently, students were assessed during the course through each two-hour class period related to the assigned reading. In addition, the students worked in groups, and each group gave a presentation one night of the course that factored into their grades. The final assessment of student performance was an online exam. Despite this limitation in assessment options, the accessibility of the course for a wide variety of students and the benefits it provided made it a minor sacrifice.

Offering courses outside of the general curriculum format of three credits over 14 weeks creates flexibility for non-law students to enroll in courses. The one-week duration of an intersession course opens up possibilities for future multi-disciplinary and cross-institutional enrollment, as I am hoping to have in the future. The short time frame can also bring students into the discipline who would be hesitant to sign up for a full-semester course.

**Diversity in Public Health Law Teaching**

Providing the opportunity for discussions of diversity in public health law was central to each of the fellowship courses. The vulnerable populations course addressed diversity directly. The course began with defining who are the vulnerable.

Once students had a firm understanding of what groups we were referring to, the discussion moved to why these groups are vulnerable. We engaged in robust discussions about the social determinants of health, actual and perceived discrimination, and environmental racism throughout the course. We also identified the health outcomes associated with being a member of a vulnerable population. Finally, we explored legal and public health policy strategies to reduce health disparities experienced by vulnerable populations. These discussions occurred after students had read substantive material related to each section of the course.

I created a case study focused on the Affordable Care Act and focused on patient-centered medical homes and accountable care organizations. Although it is a health insurance problem, the questions associated with the case study targeted vulnerable populations (diabetes patients and children with asthma) and addressed the public health perspective on the provision of health care. The students enjoyed advising the client through the memo about how the case study organization should proceed in order to maximize population health and provide preventive care.

**Benefits of the Curriculum Project**

*For Students in the Two New Courses*

Public health law encompasses many different substantive areas. The two classroom courses were refreshing for the students because they could see how different areas of the law are connected and can
work together to address issues that are important to them. The discussions of diversity and vulnerable populations using public health law in the context of federalism, civil rights, international law, and insurance allowed the students to interact with these difficult concepts in a new way. This sometimes does not happen in other courses because studying the subject matter in one legal field may not force students to consider how other legal fields may also contribute to solving a client’s problems. The in-class experiential learning activities provided the students an opportunity to utilize the variety of skills and subject-matter knowledge they have been learning throughout their law school education.

Secondly, the project was beneficial to NCCU students because it allowed them to take a course during the intersession that satisfies a requirement for the “Justice in the Practice of Law” certificate program. Many students come to NCCU School of Law because of our mission to provide opportunities for law school students and lawyers to serve the underserved. Therefore, many of my students want to learn about how the law impacts marginalized populations. The vulnerable populations course gave the students an opportunity to study issues that are important to them outside of the normal semester. Some students took the class to have a lighter course load in the spring or to add to their number of credits to graduate early.

**Internships**
The project also provided two internships for current students to take during the summer. Initially, I intended to seek to establish internships in health departments around the state. However, after meeting with public health experts during the summer institute and conducting additional research, I learned that most public health departments in North Carolina do not have their own on-site attorneys. This made it problematic for the health departments to serve as field placements with academic credit for law student interns because ABA accreditation standards could be interpreted as requiring or preferring that students in field placements be supervised by on-site attorneys. Flexibility was important in developing these internships, and I sought to find internship sites that did provide supervision by attorneys. With information I gained and the professional connections I developed through the fellowship program, I was able to secure internships in the general counsel’s office at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in Atlanta, Georgia, and with a lawyer/bioethicist at the National Institute of Environment Health Science in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. These internships were not for academic credit, and the students received stipends from NCCU to support their internships.

After taking the public health law courses, these students were equipped with the substantive public health knowledge to work in a public health law setting. They brought their individual diverse perspectives, which were acknowledged and honed in the classes, to their internships. These internships allowed students with a foundation in public health law from the classes to go directly into a public health agency and gain meaningful experience. I am also planning another internship with the CDC’s Public Health Law Program, expanding the opportunities for my students in the future.

**Future Plans and Next Steps**
There are significant opportunities at our law school for both community partnerships and interdisciplinary collaboration. This year was dedicated to my developing the courses and moving them through the process of approval so that they could be offered during the spring semester and during the winter and summer intersessions. In the future, given the time and opportunity to submit the courses for approval through the university process for non-law programs, the courses could be offered to master’s level students in the nursing department.

My goal was to increase diversity in public health law. The first step to increasing diversity in public health law is to educate and train more people with diverse backgrounds. My students have the personal, substantive, and experiential background to make the most of these internships and provide meaningful contributions to the public health law community from diverse perspectives. I have no doubt that each student who participated in one of the classes was changed by the experience. Though they may not all go on to practice public health law, their perspectives have been broadened and their voices are a little stronger about issues that matter. The content they learned in the courses makes them more effective at advocating for the vulnerable and diverse groups that public health law often serves.

I encourage my colleagues and readers of this essay to look around your classrooms and boardrooms and law practices engaged in the work of public health law. If the group lacks racial diversity, be the change agent that corrects this. I believe that making this small change will increase the impact of your work. I was changed by the fellowship experience and implementing my curriculum project for it. I recognize that instead of waiting for someone else to be the voice in the room, many times that voice is my own and that I must embrace this. Diversity matters.
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Building a Public Health Law and Policy Curriculum to Promote Skills and Community Engagement

Amy T. Campbell

Introduction
As a fellow in the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation-supported faculty fellowship program on the future of public health law education, I began the development of a specialized track for a public health law longitudinal curriculum that would cut across disciplines as it moved from foundational knowledge to skills development to community-engaged service learning. This curriculum develops five dimensions over time.

First, the core foundation course is a new public health law course offered through the law school, which provides the doctrinal base on which to build the other dimensions. This foundational public health law course was offered for the first time in spring 2014 and again in the spring of 2015 to law students, with plans to open up the course to public health students in spring 2016. Second, a new Health Policy Practicum, created and piloted in fall 2014, emphasizes skills development. Discussed in more detail below, the Practicum pairs teams of students with community partners to help address policy barriers to community health and includes a weekly seminar (classroom) component.

Third, a community-immersion component will be developed to enhance our health-related externships in non-profit legal agencies or legal departments. A weekly seminar will combine law students in these health-related externships with public health students taking their practicums in order to promote interdisciplinary learning and discussion. Fourth, to offer students the opportunity to see how to make systemic changes in law and policy related to public health, a Policy Lab is envisioned to be a community/regional resource for policy research, advising, and drafting in support of health, as broadly conceived. It will be housed at the law school but draw on other university and external experts (e.g., public health, urban planning, public administration, anthropology, social work, and health care economics). Fifth, an overall goal of my fellowship project was to foster more understanding and collaborative work across our university campus with respect to the role that the law school can play in interdisciplinary education related to health and to develop channels to build future interdisciplinary courses.

While laying the foundations for the third and fourth curricular dimensions, I focused during my fellowship year both on successfully implementing the second curricular component, the Health Policy Practicum, and on paving the way for fostering the fifth dimension, interdisciplinary education between law and health-related disciplines at the university. The Practicum was piloted in fall 2014 with nine law students. Its emphasis was to serve the newly-formed Healthy Homes Partnership (the “Partnership”) in the City of Memphis. The Partnership had evolved from discussions among the Institute for Health Law and Policy (the “Institute”), which I direct, the experiential learning program at the law school, and Le Bonheur Children’s Hospital, a major children’s hospital within the City of Memphis. Le Bonheur has a federally-funded CHAMP (Changing High-Risk Asthma in Memphis through Partnership) Program to serve children with high-risk asthma who routinely go to the emergency department for acute care of their asthma.

Amy T. Campbell, J.D., M.B.E., is the Director of the Institute for Health Law & Policy and an Associate Professor at the Cecil C. Humphreys School of Law at the University of Memphis. She was a Fellow in the 2014-2015 faculty fellowship program known as The Future of Public Health Law Education, which was supported by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to Georgia State University College of Law and its Center for Law, Health & Society.
Through CHAMP, community health workers now conduct in-home visits to provide training and support for families. While in these homes, primarily rental properties within certain city zip codes, the workers witnessed mold and other substandard housing issues frustrating their clinical and community-based interventions’ success, and necessitating legal interventions to achieve health goals. A goal of the Practicum is to allow students to explore how legal/policy expertise could address these sorts of housing-code and other policy-related issues impeding health.

During fall 2014, the students served as research assistants to the Partnership, which now includes city and county health, housing, and planning representatives, local HUD representatives, and representatives from across sectors, including urban planning, community development, and nonprofit health and housing advocates. Teams of three students served the three different working groups: (1) policy/code amendment and development, (2) health in housing survey, and (3) community education/advocacy. Each team was assisted by a community point person who helped develop real-world projects for students as related to their workgroup areas, e.g., drafting a memo detailing best practices around rental permit registries, developing a report joining data to potential policy recommendations, and developing advocacy materials. Two-hour seminars were also held each week, supplying background context, expert speakers, policy-making skills sessions, and opportunities for brainstorming and discussion within and across teams.

The students have gained the long-lasting benefits of recognizing the power and limits of law, as well as more confidence in knowing how to navigate interdisciplinary discussion coupled with greater humility about what they can singularly achieve. This sort of skillset has benefits far beyond public health and is fundamental to every interdisciplinary pursuit. As one student commented, “The value of the Practicum did not come from a casebook or outline. Instead, this course taught us to think from a more versatile perspective, considering the broader political and social factors at play when attempting to introduce and implement new legal policies.... To me, there is no better way to use your education than for the benefit of others and that was truly what the Health Policy Practicum was about.”

For Students
Through the weekly Practicum seminars, and most especially meetings with community stakeholders, the students gained appreciation for the invaluable sources of expertise on which to build and with whom to partner far beyond the legal community, including epidemiologists, code enforcement workers, community development coalition leaders, health workers, urban planners, and community-based nonprofit leaders. They also developed an invaluable perspective by talking with parents and families themselves, including during a required home site visit through which pairs of students went with our CHAMP Community Liaison to visit a CHAMP family and witness firsthand the housing- and neighborhood-based concerns. Students highlighted this visit as a particularly beneficial experience and an important way to ground what was to follow throughout the course. Meeting with and presenting to such a mix of disciplines and sources of expertise also pushed students to explain legal concepts in lay terms and to consider how this expertise could help inform the law’s approach. They also benefited from gaining understanding of the oft-times slow nature of
policy change, and witnessing how coalitions are built and sustained — and lawyers’ roles in such — to keep momentum towards that change.

More broadly, the students have gained the long-lasting benefits of recognizing the power and limits of law, as well as more confidence in knowing how to navigate interdisciplinary discussion coupled with greater humility about what they can singularly achieve. This sort of skillset has benefits far beyond public health and is fundamental to every interdisciplinary pursuit. As one student commented, “The value of the Practicum did not come from a casebook or outline. Instead, this course taught us to think from a more versatile perspective, considering the broader political and social factors at play when attempting to introduce and implement new legal policies....To me, there is no better way to use your education than for the benefit of others and that was truly what the Health Policy Practicum was about.”

For the Academy

The university has been strategically thinking about how to emphasize “health” across disciplines, and the Health Policy Practicum was good fit for this vision. There is also a renewed focus on how the University of Memphis can be for Memphis. This is reflected in the university’s Strengthening Communities Initiative (SCI) grant program, which funds faculty-community projects to enhance engaged scholarship and service learning. Working with Le Bonheur and our CHAMP colleagues, we secured for the Healthy Homes Partnership an 18-month SCI Grant, whose monies have facilitated initial meetings and advocacy and healthy homes environmentalist trainings. The Practicum served as the engaged learning part of this Initiative, and monies are also helping support two law student summer researchers. This fellowship project has thus built on an increasing university emphasis on health-related programs and has helped open the door to the law school’s engagement across the campus and into the community. Overall, the good will generated during the fellowship year through these efforts across a campus increasingly committed to interdisciplinary education, scholarship, and service has paved the way for meaningful interdisciplinary engagement that includes the law school and our faculty and students.

Ongoing strategic planning at the law school emphasizes the development of “practice-ready” lawyers, including through enhanced experiential offerings. The Practicum also builds on this goal, broadening the conception of how lawyers can engage beyond individual advocacy to systemic change (not unlike the goals of public health to move from individual to population health). This project has deepened the understanding of “practice-ready” to include, in addition to applied technical and analytic skills, the skills of interdisciplinary engagement, coalition-building, and shared partnership. A “process” benefit from the fellowship project has been in laying the groundwork for a curriculum that contains the building blocks toward “practice-ready” students — i.e., building from doctrinal courses to skills-development courses to embedded learning with reflective seminars.

Finally, the Healthy Homes Partnership has been a golden opportunity for engaging with and in the community. We have effectively partnered with Le Bonheur, especially its Community Health and Well-Being Division (on the health system side), as well as with the Shelby County Health Department (on the public health system side). Moreover, we have partnered with housing-code and other housing-related officials at the local, county, and federal levels to better understand and work through policy issues and barriers. Our faculty and students have listened to government officials discuss opportunities and barriers. And we have partnered with community development and related non-profit community-based entities to match policy knowledge with on-the-ground, real-world issues, needs, values, and assets to which to bring policy advising and support. The Institute’s leading role within the Partnership — which dovetails with City/County efforts to address blight and builds on interest in community development and a reorientation towards community and preventive health among health systems — has resulted in increased recognition of the Institute as a go-to resource for policy advising, law student research assistance, and convener of community conversations.

For the Community

Reflective of the community’s excitement over the formation of the Healthy Homes Partnership, a formal public kickoff event was held on January 15, 2015, featuring City of Memphis Mayor A C Wharton as the keynote speaker. To honor the Partnership, the Mayors of the City of Memphis and Shelby County issued a joint proclamation naming the day as “Healthy Homes Day” in Memphis. Students who had taken the Practicum during the previous fall semester were formally recognized at the kickoff, further cementing the Institute’s interest in service learning. One of our key community stakeholders observed afterwards, “There is no doubt in my mind that by going through the course, Professor Campbell is producing more socially conscious change agents that will serve the community with empathy, unbiased thought, and compassion.”
Challenges
A major challenge I faced while developing the Health Policy Practicum was how to ensure we do not oversell how much the students can accomplish and over what timespan, in order to not overcommit and disappoint and frustrate community stakeholders. I have increasingly recognized how important it is to have sustained conversations across stakeholder groups to get to the heart of what various groups need and seek, and to see whether and how this connects to community health and areas where we can, and should, be of assistance. I add the “should” recognizing the non-partisan nature of what we seek to achieve and the process we seek to follow. If we become seen as politically aligned, we undercut our “neutral platform” messaging and assistive role in navigating systemic change; partisanship could also negatively impact the sorts of projects and “outcomes” to which we can reasonably commit. As the Partnership has shown us, however, when the community’s health — especially of its children — is the motivation and desired ultimate outcome of collaborative efforts, this common goal can transcend political parties, different government sectors, different interest groups, and the like.

Another more technical challenge was educating students about how to effectively work with community partners who have multiple demands on their time (i.e., may be able to meet only at night or on weekends), and who have varying understandings of what the law is or policy’s role in meeting health-related needs. To this we continue to preach patience and the importance of working in coalitions like the Partnership, which can maintain momentum as students cycle through. A challenge for me will be to see how to most effectively handle the typically short-term (semester-long) nature of student assistance and the inevitable variation in skills and abilities across students.

Lessons Learned
What I have learned from my fellowship experience is how hungry a community like Memphis is for support, and also how, with patience and by serving in ways that match a community agenda, law can emerge as an invaluable resource to support the community. I have learned the power of the words “service learning,” and seen how embedding learning in a community can have rewards for students in ways far richer and deeper than solely traditional coursework. On the flip side, I have learned once the doors are open, how quickly ideas and opportunities may start to rise, which leads to challenges: balancing priorities, preserving space for an emphasis on student learning within community coalition efforts, and not overcommitting or overselling. It is exciting to be fully on the radar screen across campus and in our region; it is rather daunting to see how quickly that screen can fill in and start to get a bit blurry.

Another lesson learned is the importance of remaining a relatively neutral forum, as well as one able to promote conversations in such a way as to support meaningful, interdisciplinary collaboration in which we are all willing to cede a bit of authority and control for a greater good. An additional lesson learned is that this kind of successful interdisciplinary collaboration will require more training in negotiation and conflict management skills for our students.

A final lesson learned is that these various curricular dimensions take longer to build than I had at first imagined. During the summer institute at the outset of the fellowship program, my mentor and others encouraged me to focus on building a few dimensions during the fellowship year, and not try to achieve all of them at once. Rome wasn’t built in a day, as they say, and it was good advice to go a bit slower to ensure that every building block in the longitudinal curriculum will be laid with a solid and lasting foundation.

Impact: My Own Professional Development
Professionally, this fellowship program has brought about many positive developments for me. It has given me a solid identity within the law school, the university, the community, and beyond. It has been gratifying that this identity also fully embraces my own passions and pedagogical beliefs. Being in the fellowship program has given me the courage to stick to implementing the Practicum, when it was rather different from our other curricular offerings.

The fellowship program has also reinforced my commitment to formally launching our Institute as “iHeLP” (a descriptive acronym for our Institute for Health Law and Policy), with a mission of law and policy advancing health, and a core philosophy that students learn most by doing, and learn best by serving. I have had to develop, and benefited from developing, leadership skills to promote our work within and beyond the law school; to be part of multi-stakeholder leadership discussions about health and policy and begin to represent the law school at these meetings; and to more fully commit to my enduring passion for and strong belief in service learning as critical to health law education.

The Future: Plans and Next Steps
I am continuing to promote interdisciplinary education between law and health-related disciplines across our campus. With approval to launch a formal J.D./M.P.H. dual degree program, we are also now able to
open up our foundational public health law course and the Health Policy Practicum to both law and public health students, and hopefully will be able to incorporate students from other disciplines (e.g., social work, medicine) over time.

Also on my horizon for the future is the development of a Policy Lab, which will offer opportunities for interdisciplinary policy research, drafting, and advising related to health. This new Policy Lab will help achieve the Institute’s service mission, which extends the Institute’s reach into the community where the Institute endeavors to address unmet health law issues of local organizations and communities, host community forums on health law and policy issues, and work with community leaders to proactively address health policy needs. To manifest this mission, and link our service goals to unique possibilities for education and scholarship, the Policy Lab will spark an academic/public/private partnership in support of systemic change initiatives that seek to make Memphis a healthier community through policy. The Policy Lab’s increasingly frequent mention in community meetings and warm reception is reinforcing the need and potential for such an entity, as its structure and possible funding opportunities are developed. It also presents the opportunity for a select group of students to gain longer-term (a year or two) engagement, which will help to build the all-important trust between students and community stakeholders, something that does not come with a two-week or even semester-long student assignment.

I have recently been asked to be part of the Shelby County Health Department’s leadership team addressing infant mortality, a team which now more fully emphasizes the critical role for policy and how lawyers can help drive health promotion. Also, recent discussions with the Institute’s Advisory Board members have led to additional opportunities to bring a systemic change perspective and skillset to issues in the forefront of local discussions, such as youth violence, adverse childhood experiences, childhood obesity, and food insecurity. These developments may lead to Policy Lab projects for law students and faculty, in consultation with other disciplinary experts. I envision the Policy Lab as an ongoing support and bedrock for the public health law longitudinal curriculum, as well as a critical resource locally and regionally around systemic change, with a natural focus on urban issues.

The successful launch of the Partnership and the student engagement through the Practicum this past year also served as powerful “proof of concept” for the value of developing alliances between the legal and health professions. Through continued collaboration and trust-building, the law school’s Dean has recently created a three-year funded Visiting Assistant Professor position to help formally launch a new medical-legal partnership clinic at the law school, to be called Memphis CHiLD (Children’s Health Law Directive). This clinic will enhance our ability for interdisciplinary education, and more broadly, it will be a strong addition to the longitudinal public health law curriculum, especially as we combine individual client advocacy in the clinic with the systems-change orientation of the Practicum.

In sum, this fellowship year has proven how much can be accomplished within the walls of the legal academy when it opens its doors and not simply welcomes others in, but purposefully walks through those doors to engage with communities with the aligned goals of fostering learning and enhancing community health by serving with and alongside a broad range of disciplinary experts and the community itself. In breaking the divide between doctrine and practice, and marrying “hard” and “soft” skills, initiatives such as these represent the critical tools to open doors and effectively, meaningfully engage to truly use law to advance health.
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Educating the New Public Health Law Professional

Sarah Davis

Introduction
This article offers my experience designing and implementing an asynchronous online course, “Public Health Law Online Practice Workshop,” as a companion to externships in public health law. It describes how my approach to teaching has been influenced by concerns for the well-being of students (future healing/service professionals) and the need for professionalism touchstones. It also shares how the faculty fellowship program described in this Journal issue enhanced my teaching and offers guidance for others wishing to dip their toe into online teaching.

Teaching Philosophy
In a touchstone essay for educators of new professionals, Parker Palmer challenges teachers to help learners preserve the values that lead them to become service professionals and confront institutions that constrain ethical behavior. In his view, four conditions impede 21st-century professionalism: (1) thinking of institutions as unchangeable, (2) devaluing emotional intelligence, (3) individualism and isolation, and (4) separation between work and personal spheres. I use his essay in my teaching, and I reread it frequently, to stay true to my teaching values.

Research repeatedly reminds us that in both law and medical schools, a negative transformation occurs during the training of students in the ways of a new profession. In law school it is the staggering increased depression rate, and in medical school it is the loss of empathy. Both are concerning for anyone, much less individuals who will be leaders and healing/service professionals.

Within this context, it is vital for law faculty to talk about institutional power, and to teach that institutions are changeable, and that lawyers should be leaders and change agents. We must teach that emotional intelligence is as important as cognitive intelligence in the practice of law and that, with effort, all intelligence can be enhanced. As we help our students develop their professional identities, we have an ethical obligation to teach that values always influence work, and that to pretend otherwise is detrimental to clients and self, and likewise, that what we do under the guise of our professional cloak impacts us personally and profoundly. Law faculty need to talk about depression within the legal profession, and should teach cultivatable skills such as resilience and healthy ways to address the stresses of law practice. We should expose our students to an ethics-based problem-solving approach and to the expertise and skills of professionals in other disciplines who can enhance problem solving for clients.

I do all of these things in the new workshop course. I also created it in the context of the current legal education crisis and the values conflicts it highlights. A core tension illuminated in the 2014 American Bar Association (ABA) Task Force on the Future of Legal
Education is whether law schools are educating lawyers who will be “deliverers of technical services requiring a certain skill or expertise,” or “broad-based problem solvers and societal leaders.” Similar values conflicts are ever present in public health policymaking. Tensions and disagreements exist over the role of government, autonomy, power and inequity, ethical considerations, models of representation, and the role of citizen engagement. The course invites students to confront such challenges with creativity, collaborative problem-solving, humility, and a sense of humor.

Creating a Course for New Professionals
This two-credit online course is designed to be taken in tandem with an externship at government or non-profit agencies involved with public health law and policy. These field placements ensure that students are actively engaged in public health law projects for real clients and exposed to the daily workings of public health agencies and practitioners. The online format allows students to extern anywhere (in local, regional, national, or international field placements), to maintain a connection to the law school community, and to deepen their learning through both thoughtful reflective exercises and comparison across externship sites.

In its first iteration, this course was designed for law students only, including dual-degree students pursuing both a J.D. degree and a master’s degree in public health, public affairs, or other related degree. The course meets the ABA requirements for contemporaneous reflection during externships. A doctrinal health law or public health law course is a prerequisite.

Course Content
The course focuses on the actors, strategies, and broad practice considerations for lawyers and other stakeholders interested in practicing public health law. It is vital for future public health lawyers to learn how public health policies are crafted and operationalized, and how they can guide institutional and individual behavior to promote health and wellness. Exploration of effective and ineffective policymaking processes, and the resulting good and bad policies, can inform lawyers’ independent professional judgment.

The course has six modules. The first module introduces students to the strategic use of law as a tool to advance the public’s health and explores the advantages of, and barriers to, interdisciplinary and cross-sector collaboration in public health. It frames how public health law is practiced today and reminds students of the field’s focus on population health. It also identifies how public health law field offers many opportunities for non-law-practice (“J.D. preferred, but not required”) problem-solving jobs, like elected officials, policymakers, lobbyists, public health department directors, compliance officers, and community organizers.

The second module develops the concept of the “whole lawyer” and emphasizes leadership and resilience. We discuss how to cultivate resilience and self-awareness, develop emotional intelligence, and avoid professional burn-out. This module also encourages students to develop their professional identity as change agents in society.

Students explore the factors that influence organizational culture and workplace satisfaction in the third module. They also learn how to match their own professional strengths with an organization’s needs, and how to seek feedback in the workplace and engage successfully in their own life-long learning.

The fourth module introduces the process of evidence-based policymaking in public health. Students learn about the role of evidence (anecdotal and otherwise) in policymaking and the resources for finding such evidence. They also explore how conflicts over different values in our society can impact policymaking. Students learn how to evaluate policies and programs for their impact on populations, particularly their disparate impact on vulnerable populations.

Strategic lawyering and ethical stewardship are the topics of the fifth module. Students discuss the practicalities of lawyering in or for public health agencies. They are introduced to tools for practicing public health law strategically, and provided ethical frameworks to apply in uncertain situations. They examine the role of law in encouraging voluntary action to promote health and wellness and the role of lawyers in proposing practical solutions to public health problems.

The course concludes with a module on community engagement and media advocacy to advance public health. It introduces students to community-based participatory research and other tools for public involvement in policymaking. Students also learn how the media can influence the public’s perceptions of health, and they discuss strategies to harness that influence and foster the media as a trusted source of health information.

Hands-on Learning Activities
Highly successful online course activities capitalize on electronic resources (in all their mixed media forms). The course requires students to co-create a public health law evidence-based resource guide. The three-fold goals of this teaching tool are to: (1) introduce students to web-based resources to find the best evidence to support public health policies; (2) reinforce
the value of collaboration; and (3) support the generation of a portfolio of resources to support future public health law practice. This tool is best imbedded in a unit on the evidence base in public health law (my fourth module), which explores the role of data, values conflicts, and anecdote (narratives and stories about citizens’ experiences). It is designed to engage students in the exploration of multiple resources and create a practice-ready tool. Included along with the website link for each resource is a link to each site’s video tutorial on search functionality or one created by a UW-Madison law librarian.

Students are required to review in-depth at least one resource and complete the spreadsheet for that resource. After completing a short assignment, which has them review more than one resource, they are required to add additional information to any of the resources listed on the spreadsheet. Lastly, they are encouraged to add additional resources they discover and download the living document to take with them into their future practice. The activity and tool could be incorporated into any public health law course and is valuable primer for a policy brief assignment.

A course activity that benefits from private self-reflection is embedded in the second module on the “whole lawyer.” The goals of this teaching tool are to: (1) acculturate students to the role of leader expected of lawyers; (2) introduce them to various styles of leadership; and (3) provide space for reflection and integration regarding how this will be actualized for them personally. After reading seminal pieces on leadership, students turn to their own contemplation of what they will bring to leadership in the public health law sphere. Students are prompted to ensure they have sufficient time and space to engage in three self-assessments regarding personality traits, leadership styles, and character strengths.

Next they integrate the readings, strength assessment results, and their own reflections to create a leadership vision statement. Whether or not law students see themselves as leaders, by virtue of being lawyers, others will see them as leaders. We are desperately in need of thoughtful leaders to address the challenges of our public’s health with competency, creativity, a commitment to equity, and a desire to fundamentally change institutions so they are in the service of people.

Why Online?

Trends and Personal Interest

The online format is responsive to the needs of today’s law students. Students’ increased focus on job acquisition makes the ability to extern anywhere while still enrolling in additional courses appealing. At UW-Madison Law School, we also have a statistically significant number of students graduating in two and in two and a half years, making enrolling in more credits, and utilizing summer semesters, in flexible ways, appealing. Students who are juggling jobs, families, and school can benefit from the flexibility of asynchronous distance courses. Lastly, the upcoming ABA experiential learning requirement, coupled with financial constraints on law schools may provide an opportunity for schools to offer experiential learning and companion courses to students across institutions.

I am a new convert to teaching online; I have come to love it. This was not my disposition when colleagues and I at our interdisciplinary Center for Patient Partnerships (CPP) decided, with trepidation, to convert our entire set of consumer health advocacy certification courses, including a clinical component, to an “eLearning” format. I was downright skeptical. I am not very tech savvy and have no inherent interest in cultivating technology skills. Now I fully embrace the benefits of online teaching.

Benefits of Online Teaching

Whether a course is taught fully or partially online, distance technology can enhance learning, encourage reflection, foster integration of material, and model collaborative co-creation of knowledge that enhances critical thinking. It also facilitates resource exploration and acquisition, introducing students to tools they will utilize in practice. It is an equal playing field for introverts and extroverts — all are required to participate, and all do. In the online “virtual” classroom, written discussions are elevated over the oral ones experienced in a physical classroom. Another benefit of the online written discussion forum format is that it provides students repeated opportunity to work on the clear, concise writing that is necessary for client communication, but often difficult to find in other law school courses.

Online learning is especially helpful in the public health law context, where practice is so incredibly local/geographically bound. Students can extern in the community that is using innovative legal approaches, is addressing a specific issue (e.g., vaccination rates, heroin overdoses, obesity) they are passionate about, or where they intend to put down roots upon graduation.

Online learning has its limitations, and like teaching in all settings, it can be done poorly. A quality online course is less about the medium, but rather the intentional pedagogy, learning time dedicated to the course, and opportunities for collaboration.
All good teaching requires transactional closeness (faculty presence), a social dimension, and active learning.19

**Online Format**
Consistent with other online courses I have developed, I followed a format that CPP faculty created based upon adult learning and instructional design theory.20 All CPP courses meet ABA requirements and are created in module form. Every module contains consistent sections: (1) introduction, (2) key concepts, (3) guided practice, (4) resources, and (5) application (see Table 1). A consistent organizational style makes it easier for students who enroll in multiple CPP courses and faculty who create courses. All courses include an introductory module, “Intro to eLearning at CPP.” In addition, mod-

---

The fellowship program emboldened me to proudly embrace teaching professional development, lawyering skills, and the importance of collaboration and community. A lawyer who knows only substantive law better not have any clients. A lawyer who believes his or her work has social value and has nurtured relationships with colleagues and community can have a transformative impact on issues that plague our collective health and well-being. This experience has also confirmed the importance of having communities of practice — colleagues with whom I engage in a process of collective learning. This fellowship group is one such community, and we can continue to foster it using online tools.

---

Challenges and Lessons Learned from the Pilot
The fellowship timeline necessitated teaching this course in the spring semester of 2015, which resulted in anticipated low enrollment. Only two students were enrolled, and they were both externing at a non-traditional public health law site that was a start-up non-profit without a physical office and corresponding organizational culture and infrastructure. The substance of their externship experience, however, appeared to be topnotch. They worked collaboratively on a 50-state survey of wellness-program legislation.

Since the course was designed for students to evaluate their externship sites and compare and contrast across placements in various local, state, and federal agencies, this aspect of the course needed to be reinterpreted. The students and I therefore approached the course as a hybrid independent “directed research.” Since one student was also simultaneously employed at a health-related state agency, and the second student had a master’s of public health and would be externing at the local city/county public health department in the summer, they were easily able to apply different relevant experiences to the exercises. Despite the need to re-interpret some activities, students found the content on strategic lawyering, policymaking, and engaging stakeholders relevant to their future practice, as described in their final course reflection:22

I really enjoyed the strategic lawyering section.... I can see how a lawyer can really focus on communicating with non-lawyers to facilitate changes....

---

Lawyers are so vital for the future of public health initiatives, yet we will probably never hear about the exploits of the most successful ones... who use different methods of communication to subtly guide the legal framework on these issues.

I came into this course with very little background on public health issues. What I enjoyed most about this course was learning the frameworks and challenges that policymakers face.

The topic of involving the community in the research was very intriguing.... I hope to one day be involved in a project where external stakeholders [are] not only surveyed for feedback but actively participate....
What’s Next? Welcoming Others and Constant Improvement

In response to reduced class sizes and ABA experiential learning requirements, the next step for this course is a multi-school pilot. The plan is to co-teach it in 2016 with several other former public health law faculty fellows or mentors. Students will enroll and receive credit in their own institution. Faculty, matched with subject matter expertise, will each take the lead for one or more modules. In this role, they will be responsible to respond to group activities, contributing to discussion forums and responding to collaborative documents. Each faculty member will be solely responsible for the assessment of their own students, grading all assignments and assigning participation points for activities.

Prior to teaching the collective course, all participating faculty will review content and offer improvements. The course will also be updated based upon feedback from students in the first pilot, such as changing the order of two modules and requiring more exercises in the resilience activity. In addition, some activities will be modified to more clearly emphasize recommended professional development skills such as questioning, presenting, and clearly conveying complex information.

Living Up to the Reflective Practice I Expect of My Students

The fellowship program required deep reflection and a focus on professional development for faculty. I was the student. It was unpleasant at times. I teach at the institution I attended and am deeply invested in it. This current crisis in legal education will require significant changes in how we teach.

The fellowship program emboldened me to proudly embrace teaching professional development, lawyering skills, and the importance of collaboration and community. A lawyer who knows only substantive law better not have any clients. A lawyer who believes his or her work has social value and has nurtured relationships with colleagues and community can have a transformative impact on issues that plague our collective health and well-being. This experience has also confirmed the importance of having communities of practice — colleagues with whom I engage in a process of collective learning. This fellowship group is one such community, and we can continue to foster it using online tools.

A Continuing Call

Palmer asks: “How do I stay close to the passions and commitments that took me into this work — challenging myself, my colleagues, and my institution to keep

Table 1

Course Organization and Content for Each Online Course Module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Section</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Introduction   | • Provides the broad overview and context for the material  
|                 | • Offers logistical information: reminders about the time estimate for completion of the module and the types of learning activities  
|                 | • Includes Learning Objectives and Aspirations (for learning beyond the course) |
| Key Concepts   | • Often includes an invitation for students to identify and share preexisting foundational knowledge  
|                 | • Outlines foundational ideas, knowledge, themes, concepts and essential information  
|                 | • Generally introduced through required readings, presentations, videos, podcasts, and diagrams |
| Guided Practice| • Designed for deep engagement with material  
|                 | • Applying foundational knowledge from Key Concepts in learning activities and assignments  
|                 | • Activities include: discussion forums, case studies, inventories, interviews and collaborative documents (where students share research and co-create knowledge)  
|                 | • Includes short assignments that are submitted privately for feedback: reflections, reaction papers, collaborative projects, interviews, and self-assessments |
| Resources      | • Provides resources with hyperlinks on topics covered in module for use in course and beyond  
|                 | • Multi-formatted resources provided: supplemental texts, books, journal articles, videos, podcasts, websites, and databases |
| Application    | • Reflect upon integration of material from the course into externship and/or use in future public health law practice |
faith with this profession’s deepest values?"27 During this crisis in legal education, I welcome being a part of a community of practice that is striving to do right by our students and our world. I deeply appreciate all hope for innovation efforts and broader engagement in improving the health of our legal community.
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Teaching Population Health Outcomes Research, Advocacy, and the Population Health Perspective in Public Health Law

Robert Gatter

The Project
As a fellow in The Future of Health Law Education faculty fellowship program,¹ I designed a project to expand an existing public health law curriculum to incorporate lessons on population health outcomes research, extra-legal advocacy, and the population health perspective. With respect to each of these lessons, I created opportunities for students not only to read about and discuss concepts, but also to employ the lessons more practically through exercises and by writing white papers on public health law reform topics relevant to population health in Missouri. To do this, I expanded an existing didactic course and created a new credit-bearing, experiential “Lab.” Each is described below.

The Course
Prior to the fellowship, I had taught a two-credit didactic course in public health law. It focused on key constitutional and administrative law doctrines as applied in public health. As part of the fellowship, I added another credit to the course and revised the syllabus to introduce new lessons.²

The revised course begins by introducing students to the practice of public health, the population health perspective, and extra-legal advocacy skills that are important to public health law practice. From there, the course presents the legal doctrine that comprised most of the pre-existing course. Finally, the revised course introduces students to outcomes research methodologies and their use in public health law.

The purpose of teaching outcomes research concepts to law students is twofold. First, it exposes them to concepts fundamental to the empiricism underlying public health practice. Second, and related, it helps students become conversant in the language of those they will work with and clients they will serve in public health law. There are similar purposes behind the lessons in the population health perspective and extra-legal advocacy as well. In the end, a core skill in public health law is translating between public health practice that speaks in terms of communities and data and laws that talk in terms of individual rights and the bounds of governmental power.

Lessons designed to have students see policy from a different professional perspective and that move students well beyond legal doctrine can be challenging. So I used several mock exercises throughout the course to help students deploy these lessons in a hands-on manner. For example, one exercise placed each student on an interdisciplinary team of professionals in a state agency working on a backlog of Medicaid applications.³ As legal counsel, students were required to do more than provide legal advice. They had to discern the agency’s practical and political goals and devise a legal strategy that both served those goals and fit within an over-arching media and political advocacy plan.

Another exercise teamed law students with graduate students in public health. These interdisciplinary groups of students evaluated a then-current policy of quarantining all healthcare workers exposed to Ebola...
while working overseas in any of three West African nations. In each group, public health students were required to explain to law students their evaluation of the policy from the standpoint of preserving population health. Likewise, law students were required to explain to public health students their legal analysis of the policy from the standpoint of protecting individual rights and respecting the boundaries of governmental authority.

I evaluated students in the course using yet another mock exercise. Each student was required to draft a memorandum to the director of a fictitious state public health agency, with the student acting in the role of legal counsel. I created a hypothetical about rising levels of E. coli in a lake frequented by vacationers.

I provided a file to students containing a scientific report, a task force report proposing a solution, and a few newspaper clippings related to the economic impact of both the problem and proposed solutions. In addition to providing legal analysis of the agency’s proposed course of action, students were required to propose alternative strategies that were consistent with the scientific facts and accounted for the political and economic context.

I taught this course during the 2014–2015 academic year. The syllabus and exercises are available through the Network for Public Health Law.

The Lab
In addition to the restructured course, I also created an offering called the “Public Health Law Research Lab,” which I will teach for the first time in spring of the 2015–2016 academic year. The Lab will give students a hands-on opportunity to use health outcomes research to advocate for legal reforms designed to better serve population health.

Students will be introduced to empirical research on the effectiveness of different legal strategies to improve a particular aspect of population health. So, for example, they might look for data about which regulatory strategy is associated with the highest rates of immunizations — an absolute legal mandate, a mandate with exceptions, or official recommendations without any mandate? Students learn to use the Community Guide, the Law Atlas, and reports published by the Network for Public Health Law to find and evaluate such legal effectiveness data.

Armed with this information, students will research and evaluate Missouri law related to key aspects of population health in the state. They will look for data-driven ways to make state law more effective at achieving particular population health goals.

The Lab will further provide students with an opportunity to advocate for specific public health law reforms by drafting white papers for public consumption. The Lab will also instruct students on the use of white papers as advocacy pieces, and it will teach them how best to construct a white paper to reach a broad public audience.

The number of students in the Lab will be limited to no more than 12. Each student will be teamed with other students to develop and complete a project. Ideally, law students will be teamed with public health or other graduate students in a relevant field. The Lab has been approved and added to the law school curriculum, and I am pursuing ways to offer the Lab to graduate students at the University’s College for Public Health and Social Justice.

Students in the Lab will be assessed both individually and as part of their project teams. Early in the process students will work individually as they learn to use legal effectiveness data and to identify opportunities for public health law reform. As each team begins to create a white paper, however, students will be assessed based on their group project. To assure individual accountability in this group assessment, students will be required to write both an assessment of their own contributions to the team project and an assessment of the contributions of each of the other team members. They will share these reports with me as the instructor and with each of their team members.

Benefits and Challenges
Public health agencies and organizations need lawyers who can speak their language, who can incorporate a population health perspective into effective advocacy, and who can work as part of interdisciplinary, problem-solving teams. The primary benefit of the revamped public health law course and the Lab is that they develop these skills in students.
By training students in outcomes research and its application to public health law, the course and the Lab provide an empirical foundation for legal analysis and law reform advocacy. Because public health practice is data-driven, this training will help students find common ground for communicating with public health practitioners.

Moreover, these offerings require students to engage in problem-solving beyond doctrinal analysis, and often they do so in an interdisciplinary context. The lessons in advocacy will expand each student’s understanding of how to persuade decision-makers beyond legal advocacy skills commonly taught in law schools. Meanwhile, students are challenged to put these skills to work when they become part of interdisciplinary teams tasked with a law reform problem.

The course and the Lab offer other benefits as well. Most notably, the white papers generated in the Lab and posted for public consumption have the potential to provide community benefit.

The greatest challenge in developing this project was determining how best to teach to law students lessons in health outcomes research and public health advocacy. Fortunately, I had access to experts in both of these areas.

With respect to outcomes research training in the course, the problem was choosing the concepts to introduce and determining how best to teach them in a limited period of time. I received considerable help from Dr. Leslie Hinyard, a faculty member and Associate Director of the Saint Louis University Center for Outcomes Research. Additionally, I consulted with my fellowship mentor, Professor Leslie Wolf.

In the end, the outcomes research lesson plans in the course were framed by a few examples of published legal effectiveness outcomes research. We also used the E. Coli hypothetical, described above, as the basis for a lesson on causal mapping in public health law effectiveness research.

The design of the Lab involved a different challenge. I had originally intended that students in the Lab would conduct primary research in public health law effectiveness, and I had been concerned about choosing a project that would not be too challenging for students new to such work. Early on in the fellowship, and with the help of Professor Scott Burris, I opted instead to train Lab students in the use of existing legal effectiveness data to propose changes in the law.

Finally, teaching extra-legal advocacy in the course was challenging because of limited time. Saint Louis University School of Law is very fortunate to have a program in grassroots health advocacy, and I solicited help from the health policy fellow in that program, Professor Cora Drew Walker. Together we identified readings and devised a lesson plan around an exercise that would take place over two class meetings. That exercise is the “Medicaid backlog” hypothetical, described above.

**Lessons Learned**

My experience in this fellowship program was tremendous, and I learned many lessons. I will share two of them here.

*Lesson one: my law students became most highly engaged when they were in same classroom as graduate students in public health.*

I originally designed both the course and the Lab for law students only. An opportunity arose during the course, however, to involve graduate public health students in a class devoted to Ebola quarantine policy in the United States. As described above, I invited public health students into the classroom and teamed them with law students. Each small group evaluated a quarantine policy using techniques and principles from their particular professions. Most notably, each student was required to explain his or her analysis to the others in their group.

It was in this process of cross-professional communication where students in the course seemed to have learned the most. In evaluations of the course, nearly every student identified that class as his or her favorite moment. At least half of the visiting students also asked me as they left if we could arrange for another similar opportunity in the future. I heard the same thing from the public health faculty members who had participated in the class as well.

As a result of this experience, I plan to open both the course and the Lab to graduate students outside of the law school and in other relevant fields of study.

*Lesson two: engaging in a sustained project to improve my public health law course has reinvigorated all of my teaching.*

I am the old guy among the fellows, having completed 18 years of full-time law teaching. I am relatively new, however, to public health law teaching. That is why I was eager to participate in the program.

Over the years I have participated in many workshops focused on scholarship. I had not, however, work-shopped my teaching beyond the long-ago visits by experienced faculty colleagues to my classroom as part of the promotion and tenure process.

In the end, I experienced this fellowship as a rigorous, year-long teaching workshop. We vetted the content of each other’s projects. We met with outside experts who critiqued our lesson plans to help us better achieve our pedagogical goals. Along the way, we
read and talked about connecting to students, challenging students, and taking risks ourselves.

It was not long before I found that my teaching in other courses was deeply affected by techniques I was trying in my new public health law course as part of the fellowship. In the end, I have valued this opportunity to become a better teacher as much as any other aspect of the fellowship.

The Future
Unlike most of the other fellows, I have not yet implemented all aspects of my project in the classroom. As described at the outset, the project consists of two distinct offerings. The first is the revamped course, which I taught in its new form in fall of 2014. The second is the Lab, which I have created but not yet taught. I will teach it in the spring of 2016. So for me, the immediate future involves launching the Lab for the first time.

As indicated above, I also hope to offer the course in the future to graduate students in public health and other related fields. So I will also be working to list the course at other schools at my university.

Lastly, maintaining both the course and the Lab in the law school curriculum may be a challenge over the next many years as all law schools slowly recover from low enrollments. When most law schools are paring down their curricula, it is a difficult time to argue for new public health law offerings.

I suspect, then, that all of the fellows will need strategies to make sustainable courses out of our projects over the next several years. Among these strategies should be articulating the important practice skills that students can develop through public health law, including, most notably, interdisciplinary communication and problem-solving skills. Additionally, opening public health law coursework to graduate students in other related fields can help bolster enrollment and justify scheduling these offerings in future years.

Acknowledgements
I am forever grateful to Charity Scott for creating the fellowship, to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for generously funding the program, to the entire staff and faculty of the fellowship with special thanks to Leslie Wolf for her wise mentoring and to Scott Burris for his guidance, and, finally, to the fellows for their boundless creativity and energy.

References
2. Network for Public Health Law, “Public Health Law Faculty Teaching Resources,” available at <https://www.networkforphl.org/faculty_teaching_resources/> (last visited January 12, 2016) (this site is password protected; faculty may request a password from the Network on the site) (see “Public Health Law” syllabus by Gatter in the Syllabi section of the website).
3. See id., at “Medicaid Backlog” advocacy exercise in the Case Studies section of the website. Thanks to Cora Drew Walker for developing and teaching this exercise with me.
4. See id., at “Ebola Hypothetical” in the Case Studies section of the website.
5. Id., at “E-Coli Hypothetical Memorandum” in the Case Studies section of the website.
6. See supra notes 2, 4, and 5.
Public Health Law as a Way to Explore and Develop Professional Identity

Jennifer L. Herbst

Introduction
I used the fellowship year to design a hybrid three-credit public health law course (one credit asynchronous online, two credits in-person) for cross-enrollment by law, medicine, nursing, and social work students. The primary objectives of this course are the following: (1) to better understand the role of law in fostering the health of populations; (2) to recognize how each discipline/profession informs and contributes to the law governing community and public health; (3) to understand the roles of government, private sector entities, and individuals in creating and maintaining the conditions for people to be healthy; and (4) to assess multifarious legal and ethical conflicts between governmental interests in protecting the public's health and respecting individual rights.

Hybrid Course
I chose the hybrid structure for two reasons: one pedagogical and one logistical. Pedagogically, I have struggled in the past in cross-enrolled courses to provide law students with the depth of analysis that the law requires while still keeping the non-law students engaged. Similarly, I also struggled to provide non-law students a foundational explanation of legal concepts without frustrating the law students (although law students occasionally welcomed the review). The hybrid structure for the public health law course allows me to design the online content in a way that provides both a basic foundational presentation for the non-law students and a more detailed, nuanced analysis for the law students. Additionally, relying on what is known as the “jigsaw” method of team-based teaching (where students are individually responsible for teaching others concepts and then using the concepts together to solve problems as a team), each student is able to use her own discipline’s distinct research and analytical framework as she prepares for the in-person discussion. The weekly in-class time is then spent primarily in interdisciplinary small groups working through public health law problems.

Logistically, I struggled to find a common in-person class time across four graduate programs. Our nursing, social work, and medical curricula and schedules needed a three-credit law and policy elective that met only once a week in order to fit with their off-campus clinical days. Our law school schedule tends to have three-credit courses that meet twice a week. A single three-credit block of time significantly conflicts with core law school courses, which would have precluded most law students’ enrollment. The hybrid course provides the necessary three credits and meets for two hours on Thursday afternoons, after the medical, nursing, and social work students’ morning block of classes and before the law students’ evening classes.

Team-Based Practice and Professional Identity
As part of the fellowship program and my attempts to “advertise” the course before registration, I invited my faculty colleagues (from the law, health sciences, medical, nursing, and business schools) to a lunchtime mock public health law class. I sent them representative readings and a video in advance with the request that they consider whether lawyers should be incorpo-
rated as members of case management teams for complex patients. This team-based practice model would be a departure from the typical structure of medical-legal partnerships where lawyers remain employed within legal services firms or law school clinics to one where lawyers are integrated members of a case management team employed by the health care system.

To my colleagues’ credit, lunch was well attended and sparked a conversation about the current financing of legal services and the potential effect of management of legal services by non-lawyers. A number of my more senior colleagues actively tracked me down afterwards to thank me for providing them a chance to revisit what the profession’s relationship to the community might be, the potential value of the work we do as lawyers, and the number of community stakeholders (and other professions) who have an interest in the legal system working well for all members of the community. With a bit more context and background on the social determinants of health, my colleagues are starting to see more ways that zealous interdisciplinary advocacy may improve health (and when it may not), hopefully narrowing the gap between the dominant vision for the legal profession as independent advocacy (with litigation as the dominant paradigm) and an alternative vision of law as a healing profession with a holistic approach to client representation and attorney health (where litigation shares the stage with mediation and other problem-solving processes).

Within the context of the lunchtime conversation and several personal conversations afterwards, it became increasingly clear that many of my law school colleagues are concerned that certain forms of collaboration with other professions and disciplines may start to chip away at a foundational quality of the legal profession — that of lawyers’ exercise of independent judgment as zealous advocates, beholden to nothing and no one but the law and their clients’ interests. This strong sense of professional legal identity as a champion willing and able to fight against a biased, fearful, or otherwise corrupted institution or community runs deep in our popular and historic narrative. Less familiar and celebrated are the efforts by myriad lawyers as counselors, mediators, policymakers, and problem solvers. Even less discussed in law school, lawyers are not the only professionals who pride themselves as powerful advocates. As one who also teaches professional responsibility at both our law and medical schools, I am truly enjoying the conversations about what it means, and what it should mean, to practice a profession.

What Does It Mean to Be a “Professional”?
While a professional has historically been one who made a “profession of faith” in the midst of a disheartening world,” Parker Palmer suggests that every professional should be “a moral agent with the power to challenge and help change the institution[s]” in which he or she practices. In her essay in this supplement issue of JLME, Sarah Davis provides one powerful way of how she, consistent with Parker Palmer’s vision, educates public health professionals to have the will to deal with the institutional pathologies that threaten the professions’ highest standards. As a part of this larger effort to effectively prepare our professional students to navigate and move institutions, I use my public health law class to provide our future professionals opportunities to grapple with and internalize these “highest standards” in the context of institutions, systems, and communities charged with improving health.

What Does It Mean to “Practice” Law/Medicine/Nursing/Social Work?
The semester opens with this question as part of the first online module. I ask students to reflect on what drove them to graduate school to study social work, medicine, nursing, and law. I also ask them to post online how they would explain to someone unfamiliar with their field what it means to practice their profession. What do they expect to learn in their graduate program?

The lack of a simple or clear definition for what it means to practice a specific profession (whether due to state-by-state variation in definitions, ongoing debate about scope of practice, or a wide array of practice settings) provides ample space for discussion. An interdisciplinary public health law class allows students multiple opportunities to reflect upon and try to name just what it is they are devoting years to study. For example, a law student and medical student had the following exchange on the course discussion board in response to the question, “How would you explain to someone unfamiliar with your field what it means to practice your profession?”:

Second-year law student: “I plan to practice health law but I am not 100% sure what setting, be it law firm, medical group or hospital or for a company. Regardless, my focus should be on advocating for my client, whether that is the clients of a firm, doctors, or the employees of the company, my main goal is to advocate for them and to be the buffer between their actions, potential business decisions, etc. and liability. To me this means to first listen: What are my clients looking for? What are their needs? While I may have an idea of what they want or need, that may not always be the case so I want to have a rap-
port with them that allows for communication back and forth to be honest and continuous. The moment that connection is lost I think problems could arise. I need to be credible. I want them to trust in me and the information that I bring back to them. This means I must stay up to date on what is happening in the industry and also be able to provide them with only the pieces of that information they may need based on our discussions. Lastly, I want to strive for positive change through my actions and the actions of my employer.

Second-year medical student: “Wow, when I was reading this this could have sounded exactly like what it means to be a physician. We’re taught to advocate for our patients, to find out what their needs are instead of superimposing our own ideas about what they should have, and to form a therapeutic alliance with the patient so we can work on their health together. We also have to keep up to date on the latest research, stay on our employers’ good side, and think about student loan debt. I think that means that there’s lots of similarity when it comes to professions that in some way want to save the world: Even though we sometimes struggle with the mundane aspects, our professions attract those with big ideas and big hearts.”

In most professions, a “practice” implies counseling and caring for individuals or organizational clients using extensive specialized knowledge, training, values, and independent judgment. How, though, to briefly explain what law schools aspire to teach students? How might one explain the similarities and distinctions between social work and law? Is the difference in the guiding values of the professions? Is it a difference in the problems addressed by each? Or is it the difference in the kinds of research and experience are considered authoritative or relevant for decision-making, counseling, or treatment? Over the course of the semester, I ask students to revisit their reflections and start identifying situations when they might approach the limits of their profession and reach out to other differently trained colleagues for help caring for an individual.

One of the advantages of a public health law course is that it readily lends itself to shifting students out of the traditional professional-client/patient dyad relationship into a position where the larger public or community is the intended beneficiary of their professional research and analysis. For many of my students, this is one of the first opportunities they have in the course of their studies to consider what happens to their professional identity when working outside of the context of treating and advising individuals. If they do not treat individual patients or clients, are they still physicians, nurses, social workers, and lawyers?

Social workers recognize that a community can be a client deserving of all the same respect and diligence as an individual client. Similarly, the nurse’s primary commitment is to “the patient, whether an individual, family, group, community, or population.” These two professions recognize fluid movement between individuals and communities, and deliberately situate their individual clients and patients within larger family and community systems. By contrast, physicians are expected “to participate in activities contributing to the improvement of the community and the betterment of public health” but “must recognize responsibility to patients first and foremost.” The practice of medicine, like law, recognizes that physicians are likely to be seen as community leaders by dint of their advanced education, but generally separates and raises the needs of the individual patient above those of the larger community.

What Does It Mean to Be a Lawyer? According to Black’s Law Dictionary, a lawyer is “[s]omeone who, having been licensed to practice law, is qualified to advise people about legal matters, prepare contracts and other legal instruments, and represent people in court.” This definition may be descriptive, but scarcely hints at a meaningful sense of professional identity. Like the other professional associations (i.e., the American Nursing Association, American Medical Association, and National Association of Social Workers), the American Bar Association (ABA) has spent much time and energy working on a set of rules meant to describe what it means, or should mean, to practice the profession.

Unlike the other professions, though, the ABA’s rules have been largely adopted as the law governing state legal licenses, enforceable through disciplinary actions. While the other professions have the luxury of articulating aspirational standards without considering how they might be enforced, the ABA’s Model Rules of Professional Conduct were created with enforceability in mind. The Preamble attempts to provide a framework for the highest standards of the profession, recognizing roles for lawyers as representatives of clients (whether as advisor, advocate, negotiator, or evaluator), officers of the legal system, third-party neutrals, and public citizens.
Rules themselves provide more concrete, more easily enforced standards for the practice of law.

In the first in-person class, I am able to use this distinction between the various codes of ethics and the ABA’s Model Rules to illustrate the difference between normative and descriptive standards. I also raise for the first time (often revisited over the course of the semester) the concept that “law” is not solely a matter of standards, but also requires consideration of enforcement mechanisms and just consequences.

Regardless of role, lawyers have a unique responsibility for the quality of justice. There is an underlying assumption in the ABA Model Rules, however, that the lawyer’s responsibility to a larger community is met through work to improve the law, access to the legal system, the administration of justice, and the quality of service rendered by the legal profession. Strikingly, these expectations are attributed to lawyers as “public citizens,” not as “representatives of clients.”

Reconsidering the Role of “Zealous Advocate”
When framing the concept of attorney as “Advocate,” the Model Rules primarily envision a litigation or adversarial context. Much of law school, especially those courses which focus primarily on reading, analyzing, and applying judicial opinions, provides law students with the opportunity to try on the litigator hat, thinking through and trying possible oral arguments. By contrast, public and community health advocacy happens more often outside the courtroom and is not limited to attorneys. Indeed, many non-lawyers advocate in the public health sphere. Part of “being a nurse” is being an effective patient advocate, which requires understanding “patients’ context, their world, and their experience.” Social workers, too, are expected to “advocate for living conditions conducive to the fulfillment of basic human needs and should promote social, economic, political, and cultural values and institutions that are compatible with the realization of social justice.” While the concept of advocacy is newer to the practice of medicine, it is quickly gaining ground.

Given the shared professional value of advocacy, it is not enough for lawyers’ professional identity to be merely “zealous advocates,” as powerful and necessary as that may be. An interdisciplinary public health law course provides students an opportunity to revisit their assumptions about what it means to be a zealous advocate and think about the law’s role in creating systems, relationships, standards, and policies in a community. Much of the work in this sphere is collaborative and creative, requiring maintenance of relationship where objective third-party decision-makers are non-existent. What, if any, unique value do lawyers bring to this sphere? What skills should lawyers have to do this work effectively?
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Considering Lawyers’ Role in the Community
Using the law to implement changes in a community has the potential to drive systemic change (whether through legislation, regulation, or impact litigation), affecting more people than possible through representing individual clients. Of course, the “law” is never just a single statute, regulation, or court opinion, and lawyers are uniquely trained on how constitutional, common, and statutory law interacts on federal, state, and local levels, across the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government, and into the private sector. No other profession can bring this skill set to the table.

As an “Advisor,” lawyers are required to exercise independent professional judgment and render can-
did advice. While attorneys may consider moral, economic, social, and political factors in addition to the law when rendering this advice, they are not required to do so. This is in stark contrast to social work’s defining feature: “the profession’s focus on individual well-being in a social context and the well-being of society. Fundamental to social work is attention to the environmental forces that create, contribute to, and address problems in living.” Perhaps there is an assumption that the law, as part of an ostensibly representative democratic government, inherently reflects the social context and ideals for the well-being of society. Given the recognized need for perpetual legal reform, though, it seems unlikely that this assumption is valid.

While law schools should continue to provide students foundational knowledge of extra-legal factors necessary to evaluate the quality of justice, law students and lawyers also need to appreciate that other professions are well qualified and well situated to evaluate the practical impact of laws. For laws meant to improve public and community health, it is critical that lawyers, health care providers, public health workers, and social service providers learn to work together effectively despite the different, and often conflicting, vocabularies, cultural norms, values, and assumptions.

The Challenges of Interdisciplinary Education

When I first envisioned this course, I had hoped to include graduate business students in it. For many, the link between public health law and business may seem attenuated, at best. From my perspective, however, community health and well-being depends as much on the decisions made in the for-profit private sector as those made by governmental agencies and courts, if not more so. Even so, the relationship between the public health and business communities is hardly warm or collegial. Both are suspicious and skeptical of the other, and the tension often results in unhelpful “either/or” framing of issues — i.e., either we regulate products/practices/policies or we have a healthy economy. I was hoping to have a chance to see whether professionals and business-minded folks might move towards a “both/and” default — e.g., we can both regulate and improve productivity (because our workforce is healthier). I was also looking forward to hearing how business students perceived social work, law, medicine, and nursing professions (more likely a client and patient perspective) and whether the law, nursing, social work, and medical students perceived business students equally as “professionals.”

Lastly, I tend to believe that public health efforts could benefit tremendously from the organizational leadership, financial savvy, and management know-how in which the for-profit sector excels.

Unfortunately for cross-enrollment purposes, our business school is moving towards a fully online graduate curriculum. Rather than designing a fully-online course for all five schools, I decided that the hybrid design for four schools was better suited to provide the students a meaningful opportunity to work on their interprofessional collaboration and problem-solving skills, especially law students’ ability to present, discuss, and negotiate the law with non-legally trained colleagues. Going forward, I will continue to look for opportunities to bring the business community into the conversation to provide yet another perspective on what it means to be a professional.

That said, the sustainability of this class depends heavily on the willingness of my non-law faculty colleagues allowing and actively advising their graduate students to cross-enroll in the course. Without their continued support, the richness of the online and in-class discussions will be diminished. As much as I try to read, write, and collaborate with my colleagues across campus, my attempts to provide their voices pales in comparison to their students’ contribution.

Similarly, the course depends heavily on the support of my law school colleagues and administration. Only as long as they see the value in thinking about advocacy far beyond individual representation in courtrooms and transactions will this course continue to be offered. This is no sure thing. Like most law schools, mine is being asked to do more with less revenue and fewer students. Each year, faculty and administration review our course offerings and decide whether or not the overall goals of the school are being met. Only as long as this type of interdisciplinary opportunity is seen as critical for new professional education will this class be possible.
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Expanding Interdisciplinary Learning Opportunities on a Shoestring through a Medical-Legal Partnership

Laura D. Hermer

Introduction

My project for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation fellowship program was to establish a medical-legal partnership (MLP) between my institution of Hamline University School of Law (Hamline) and United Family Medicine (United Family), a well-established and well-reputed federally-qualified health center in St. Paul. MLPs are community collaborations among legal and health care professionals that address not merely the medical but also the legal and social issues adversely affecting lower-income patients’/clients’ health. I also planned to establish curricula for two courses related to the MLP — one clinical, to be taught in the MLP itself, and one classroom-based, to be taught as a prerequisite to the clinical course.

Hamline’s health law clinic was in transition at the time the fellowship program was starting in 2014. The prior instructor was moving on to other opportunities. We saw this as a chance to reshape the clinic into a different form. I had been interested in developing an MLP for some time, and was in discussion at the time with United Family about starting one together. Especially given Hamline’s lack of opportunities for law students to interact professionally with health care providers, social workers, and others, given that Hamline offers no health care training programs, I saw the MLP as an excellent chance to provide Hamline students with that exposure to interprofessional interactions in the context of a clinical course with clients, while at the same time helping members of our community and furthering United Family’s objectives.

The problems that MLP clients experience require not merely legal assistance to individuals, but also institutional and societal redress. To use a recent example from another local MLP, it may be that the substantial cut to a clinic patient’s food stamp aid is not simply an isolated miscalculation, but rather reflects a systemic problem that has impacted many other local food stamp recipients as well. Because of the often systemic nature of the problems affecting lower-income MLP clients, clinic students can be more effective advocates for both their clients and for the communities in which their clients live if they come to the clinic having already studied the effects that individuals’ living, work, and social environments have on their health, and how those in turn are shaped and permeated by law and policy. Thus, I also planned to establish — and did establish during the fellowship year — a course to address those issues.

This classroom course provides a brief introduction to how the law shapes both health and the socioeconomic determinants of health, and then focuses on several major and relevant topics in social welfare law and policy: housing, nutrition, domestic and community violence, the health care safety net, and cash welfare, as well as the navigation of social, economic, and governmental systems relevant to each. The topics are covered neither abstractly nor with a primary emphasis on learning the relevant law, but rather are intended to equip students to accomplish two goals: first, to gain a broader and deeper understanding of the relationship among the law, health, and socioeconomic determinants of health, particularly as situated in St. Paul; and second, to gain locally-relevant tools
and an introduction to local organizations and the people who work in them that will help them become effective advocates for their clients and for social change necessary to improve the public’s health.

**Experiential Learning in a Classroom Course**

I had originally intended to establish the MLP clinic first, but funding and staffing resources were not in place in time to launch these during the fellowship year. Instead, I flipped the order of development, and designed and offered the new classroom course, “Community Health and Vulnerable Populations,” during the 2015 spring semester. Especially after the summer institute held in connection with the fellowship program, at which we learned and experienced a variety of different teaching modalities, I knew I wanted not merely to cover readings that would both be informative and help spark a lively debate among the students, but also to provide in-class activities that would ask the students to draw on a variety of tools with which to find necessary information and solve problems.

**Goals**

Toward those ends, I decided that, in addition to discussing readings and doing in-class hypotheticals, we would also take a number of field trips to learn from the people who work on some of these issues every day in the community. During the summer institute, Charity Scott had organized, among other excellent activities, a field trip to the Summit County Department of Public Health. There, we not only heard from public health officials about their work, but got to travel with them to either a restaurant inspection or a tour of the water treatment facility. I have to admit: I had never done either before.

The opportunity to talk with the local health officials about their work and, in my case, see how the water treatment facility worked and what the officials did in the process was eye-opening. I am sure I could have found equivalent information to read, but nothing beats having the individuals who do the job present, talking with them, and actually seeing how something works. I wanted to replicate that type of experience in my course.

**Field Trips**

Accordingly, I built three field trips into this course: one to United Family Medicine to discuss the health care, social, and legal needs of United Family patients with a social worker and a family physician; one to the Minnesota Department of Human Services, to discuss health programs for immigrants with the department’s attorneys; and one to a vacant building temporarily owned by the City of St. Paul, to discuss homelessness prevention and housing-related environmental public health issues with relevant county public health workers.

As far as I know, while of course other Hamline Law classes make use of guest speakers, no other courses have law students travel offsite to where the speakers work, to show students what they actually do in the settings in which they do it. The field trips, predictably, were one of the best-liked features of the class, and are something I plan to build in to more of my classes. The students appreciated the opportunity to learn from people working directly on the situations we were studying, and to see some of what that practice was like in the environment in which it happens.

During our housing unit, for example, we met at a vacant, city-owned building with lead paint and mold issues, and heard from a senior member of St. Paul’s “House Calls” unit about efforts to help people with hoarding issues and from workers at the city’s environmental health unit about what happens when a building has untenable environmental issues and the legal tools available to help them. Apart from being bone-chillingly cold, it was very successful on all accounts. The presenters were detailed and vivid in their discussion of the problems that residents encountered or, in the case of hoarders, created in their homes, and the impact of those problems on the residents’ health. The students learned about the problems that the environmental health workers typically encounter in St. Paul, as illustrated through the residence in which we met. They worked through sections of the city code of ordinances relevant to the house’s lead paint and mold problems. We discussed the pernicious effects of lead poisoning on children, and the potential impacts of that poisoning on the children’s lives and society more generally. The students also learned about some of the consequences — both intended and otherwise — that some of the city’s litigation of substandard housing conditions against major landlords has had on both the law and on tenants.

**Interdisciplinary Benefits**

The UFM site visit was substantively important, and perhaps the most eye-opening to both the students and the presenters in terms of what it taught regarding interdisciplinary interactions. The presenters — a nurse/social worker and a family physician — addressed the students as they might medical students, with an assumption that they possessed a certain level of background medical knowledge that only one of the students actually had. I waited for the students to interrupt to ask questions about some of the medical terminology that the speakers were using, but in vain. Ultimately, I needed to step in at
several points to ask the students if they understood some of the terms and concepts in question (and they did not), at which point the presenters would back up and explain. The students learned they needed to ask questions if they did not share a common level of understanding assumed by the presenters, and the presenters learned they could not assume any specialized medical knowledge on the part of the students.

**MLP and Clinic Course**
Over the course of the fellowship year, I was able to take the time needed to resolve a number of resource issues for the MLP and clinic course. A hoped-for partnership with a local legal services organization had fallen through at the beginning of the fellowship year. Another early setback was the unavailability of funds to be able to hire someone to oversee the clinic in time to offer it during spring semester 2015. Fortunately, these issues have been resolved with the recent hiring of a managing attorney for the MLP who will oversee the clinic. The attorney has dived right in with the MLP and is making excellent progress in learning the community and creating networks for the MLP and herself. The MLP and the clinic are officially opening their doors to students as of spring semester 2016.

**Benefits and Impact**
As mentioned above, a major reason I created the MLP was to offer Hamline law students the opportunity to work as part of a team with health care providers and social workers in solving legal problems experienced by lower-income clients in the community. Students from different professional disciplines can learn a lot by sharing a classroom with students and instructors from disciplines that are different from their own, yet relevant to the material under study. The experience opens new ways of approaching and analyzing issues for the participants, and draws on the variety of experience that each student brings.

The need of lower-income people for free or low-cost legal services is acute, yet is often compartmentalized from their other medical or socioeconomic needs by the legal and health professions. Often, these needs are intertwined. For example, a 43-year-old woman with advanced ovarian cancer may need a will, as well as a guardianship for her two minor children. She can try to focus on her health care, but her other life needs intrude, urgently. A parent continually may bring her young son to an emergency room for acute symptoms due to asthma, but the source of the health problem is not so much the parent's inconsistency in following prior medical treatment orders but rather the mold and cockroaches that infest the family’s building. A recent immigrant is acutely injured at work, and has little money and no health insurance to pay for care. All these individuals have medical problems complicated by legal problems, or legal problems complicated by medical problems. Both the former and the latter need to be sorted out. Addressing either, separately, will not yield ideal results. These people require a holistic plan of care that addresses their medical, legal, social, and economic needs.

Law students — like other professional students, including medical and other health care students — often do not understand this. They have been so immersed in the study of their new discipline that it often eclipses all other modes of analysis. They have a hammer, and all they see are nails. The problem is that clients’ lives often are not that simple. A purpose of the new section 303(a)(3) of the American Bar Association’s Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law School, requiring students to complete at least six credit hours of experiential courses, is to ensure...
that all students will have had at least some exposure to complexity of working with clients and the complexity of client problems prior to graduation. Working with clients through MLPs, in conjunction with other and different professionals, exposes law students to new dimensions of holistic client assistance.

Understanding the Real World of Poverty
The classroom course yielded eye-opening experiences for students. In the first iteration of the course, several of the students shared their experiences growing up in poverty with the rest of the class. The students learned from each other what it was like to try to survive on cash welfare, with insufficient funds to buy wholesome food, without the means to afford safe, nurturing, enriching day care for one’s children, in environments where one might not be safe from violence at home or in the streets. They learned that poverty is all around us, impacting people we interact with on a daily basis, and affecting us in ways we might not ever have realized. Sharing these experiences brought an immediacy to the reading assignments and their potential policy implications that otherwise might not have materialized to the same degree.

Fellowship Relationships
Finally, one of the best things about the fellowship year was the relationships forged as a result of it. It was not just the talent, experience, and wealth of ideas that everyone contributed, but also the support. I am truly grateful to have been able to be a part of the fellowship program, and to be able to look forward to further collaborations and projects among the fellows.

Challenges
The fellowship year was not all smooth sailing, however. The timely launch of the MLP and its associated clinic was complicated by the impending merger of Hamline Law with William Mitchell College of Law in the winter of 2014. The combination had been a subject of periodic discussion for many years, and no one quite expected the talks to conclude successfully when they did. Fundraising and hiring for the MLP with an ongoing possible-but-not-certain merger was challenging, as both had to take a back seat to the merger activities. The combination seriously threatened to derail the development of the MLP, delayed the search for a managing attorney by three months, and has hampered ongoing efforts to raise additional funds for salary support. I am confident the combination will ultimately prove to be a success for both law schools and their students and for the Twin Cities legal community, but it has certainly complicated the MLP’s launch and further delayed the launch of the clinic.

Cobbling together additional and future funding for the MLP was also hindered until quite recently by the lack of a stable, nonprofit entity to use for seeking funds. The Mitchell Hamline combination took place at the end of 2015. While United Family has been making great progress in soliciting funds for other MLP needs such as translation services, other needs that have been inadequately funded to date that more directly concern the legal side of the MLP have had to wait for funding.

Finally, courses take time to develop well. I offered the classroom course on community health and vulnerable populations in the St. Paul area in the spring as a last-minute fallback, given that the clinic was not yet up and running. Because of its eleventh-hour nature, it was not as well conceived as I would ideally have wanted. Most notably, I offered the students a choice of writing or presenting a research paper, or doing a project in the community and either writing it up or presenting orally on it. I did not, however, do anything in the way of setting up possible community projects that would be both useful to the community and community organizations as well as feasible for the students in terms of the timeline. That will take a fair bit of time and effort on my part, and it is something I plan to do for future class iterations.

Lessons Learned
I learned, or relearned, a number of lessons over the course of the fellowship year. First, no matter what happens, always soldier on, and figure out the best way to make the best out of a situation that has unexpectedly changed in one or more ways. When I first started this project for the fellowship year, I thought, “What could possibly go wrong?” — a thought, I have since realized, that I tend to have when, for instance, I decide to use power tools, undertake repairs on a slippery roof, or enter long-distance races at the last minute with inadequate training. When I do these things, I usually find out rather quickly how they can indeed go wrong. This fellowship year was no exception. Yet the project was worth both effort and perseverance.

Second, courses take a lot of time to thoroughly and deliberately develop. I thought I would be able to do a thorough and thoughtful job with the course on community health and vulnerable populations, given that I had three and a half months during the fall semester to research and create it. While I worked diligently during that time, the time was not quite sufficient; I really needed to take a more active role in crafting meaningful possibilities for the students’ final papers and projects, rather than largely leaving them solely up to the students’ own creation. I was pleased with the work most of the students did, but wish I had been
able to do more initial legwork so they would have had better opportunities to choose and develop projects in the community.

Third, choose your partners wisely and make sure that your missions and goals align with theirs. The legal services organization that we first considered working with was initially a very promising partner. However, challenges due to lack of attorney time and resources—understandably, given budget issues facing such organizations everywhere—diminished those possibilities, at least for now. United Family Medicine, on the other hand, has been absolutely wonderful throughout the entire process. They have been enthusiastic and supportive at every step and generous with their time, and did not let setbacks, such as the failure to start earlier intake for clients, sway their interest in the partnership or diminish their support. They are supportive of the educational aspect of the MLP and related curricula and participated in the classroom course. I am looking forward to working towards involving the residents in both the classroom and clinical courses. They are also currently doing some fundraising for the MLP, which should be greatly helpful, particularly while Hamline, as an institution, is in transition.

For the Future
I am looking forward to further refining the curriculum for the community health and vulnerable populations course. I am also looking forward to working with the MLP managing attorney on developing the curriculum for the MLP-associated student law clinic, and to continuing my work to fund and support the MLP.

Using these courses as a springboard, I am also looking forward to developing a third course on legislative advocacy around public health issues arising in the context of the MLP. Many of the issues the MLP clients face are ones that are not unique to them, but affect many others in their communities and similar communities in the metropolitan area and in the state. Hamline’s location in St. Paul, both as a major urban center and as Minnesota’s capitol, as well as some of the synergies that will be made possible through the upcoming Mitchell Hamline combination, provide an excellent opportunity to teach students how they can address problems not only on the level of individual client needs, but on a broader societal level through work with municipal and state governing bodies. When the curricula are completed, our students will be able to study issues affecting the health of lower-income community members by learning about the nature and scope of the problems in question, helping to provide redress to their ill-effects on individual community members’ lives, and trying to craft and propose possible solutions in the legislative arena.

References
5. The syllabus for this course is available through the fellowship program’s teaching resources library on-line. See Network for Public Health Law, “Public Health Law Faculty Teaching Resources,” available at <https://www.networkforphl.org/faculty_teaching_resources/> (last visited January 13, 2016) (this site is password protected; faculty may request a password from the Network on the site) (see “Community Health and Vulnerable Populations” in the Syllabi section of this website).
Seminar in Public Health Law and Policy in an Interprofessional Setting: Preparing Practitioners for Collaborative Practice at the Macro Level

Heather A. McCabe

Course Design
In 2014, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and Georgia State University launched The Future of Public Health Law Education faculty fellowship program with the goal of creating innovative opportunities for interprofessional training in the field of public health law. As a fellow in this program, I developed a new course, called “Seminar in Public Health Law and Policy in an Interprofessional Setting.” The course included students from the professions of law, social work, and public health at the graduate level. I offered it as a pilot course for the first time in the spring semester 2015.

The course was created to address the need for interprofessional education (IPE) to equip graduate and professional students for collaborative practice at the systemic and policy (i.e., “macro”) levels in the health care and public health fields. To train students for doing effective policy work in these fields, IPE will need broad involvement across multiple professions, including those outside the usual IPE clinical practice settings (e.g., medicine, nursing, allied health sciences). Despite important IPE work being done at the clinical practice level, limited existing IPE models examine larger systemic issues. The course is designed specifically to enable students in social work, law, and public health to recognize the reciprocal relationships between policy and interprofessional collaborative practice, including the need for understanding of the impact of team-practice work at the system and policy levels. This course is the first step in a longitudinal process to clarify the specific competencies needed to equip students as practice leaders who are able, upon graduation, to identify and address policies and organizational structures to support interprofessional practice in health care and public health settings.

Student Learning Objectives
As outlined in the syllabus, this interdisciplinary course was designed to help develop professionals who can: (1) understand and analyze public health law and regulations as appropriate to the discipline; (2) work as a part of a collaborative team of public health, social work, and legal professionals to analyze different options for action; and (3) learn from a team of public health, social work, and legal professionals to better understand social determinants of health in order to advocate for clients and for more effective public health policies. Developing the teamwork skills for effective interprofessional collaboration was a primary focus of this course.

Students were assessed for baseline public health and law knowledge, but coverage of subject matter content was generally driven by the particular substantive information the students would need to perform the work that they would be doing for two community organizations in the public health law field during the semester. The course was designed to provide the skills needed to work in interprofessional teams to ensure that the work for these two experiential-learning sites benefited from all the different
disciplinary backgrounds and perspectives of the professional students involved in the work, rather than be dominated by a uniprofessional framework with the different professional students’ work cobbled together at the end of the project in the final paper.

**Group Projects**
The two community agencies for the pilot course were the Indiana Health Advocacy Coalition (IHAC)\(^4\) and the Riley Child Development Center (RCDC).\(^5\) IHAC is a non-profit organization which seeks to reduce the negative effects of the social and economic determinants of health by supporting organizations, such as interprofessional medical-legal partnerships (MLPs), which work to address unmet legal and social needs that can adversely impact people’s health. RCDC is a federally funded Leadership Education in Neurodevelopmental Disabilities (LEND) program. RCDC trains 17 different disciplines in an interprofessional manner and works to create leaders in the field of neurodevelopmental disabilities.

The students in this course worked on specific policy-based questions for these organizations. For IHAC, the two teams of students worked on two specific questions. The first group examined current legislation regarding MLP in Georgia and New York. They provided a comparative analysis of enabling legislation in those two states and discussed the process each state used to get the legislation passed. That team then analyzed the political landscape in Indiana and provided recommendations for IHAC to consider as its leaders discussed potential legislation regarding MLP implementation in Indiana. The second team researched possible reimbursement avenues for the work of MLPs in Indiana. They examined what other states have successfully achieved to ensure financial stability for MLPs and made recommendations for consideration by IHAC.

For RCDC, a team of students examined possible funding mechanisms for coverage of Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA) for children with autism in Indiana. Students reviewed current coverage options available in Indiana, then did a national search for other state programs providing coverage for these services. The students ultimately provided the organization with an issue brief entitled “Rethinking Indiana’s financial reimbursement for Autism Spectrum Disorder under Medicaid as mandated by Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.” The issue brief was designed to be used with those who may be in the policy field, but not necessarily well versed in the needs of those with autism. It provided information on the current services for children with autism covered by public and private insurance in Indiana, the mandate from the federal government, a description of model programming in two other states, and brief information on advocacy methods effective for influencing policy.

All three teams of students worked in interprofessional groups at the experiential-learning sites to apply the skills from the classroom setting. In addition to the final product delivered to the agencies, the students had the opportunity to create posters representing their work for presentation at a statewide conference. They also presented the findings of their projects to the board of directors for IHAC and to the leadership team at RCDC. The different audiences and methods of presenting their work provided students with multiple experiences to negotiate how their teams would perform in different settings.

**Student Assessment**
Because the focus of the course was on developing interprofessional teamwork skills, assessment was different than it would have been if learning the substantive content were the primary goal. Students were assessed using reflection papers, concept mapping assignments,\(^6\) in-class discussion, and a final product deliverable for their agency. There are few tools specifically designed to measure the interprofessional competencies that were targeted in this course. It is the goal of the research described below to create an assessment tool specifically for this purpose to use in future iterations of this course.

**Benefits**
For Students
The students reported benefits primarily relating to working with students from other professions. Following the final project and grades, one student said that it had been a favorite course she had taken because it allowed her to put her skills to work on real-world issues. The same student reported that she enjoyed working on the team in this course because they concentrated on communication and consensus building, rather than each person on the team doing their own work then putting it together at the last minute.

There were three dual-degree students in the course: two students were earning a master’s degree in public health (M.P.H.) and master’s degree in social work (M.S.W.), and one was pursuing a law degree (J.D.) and M.P.H. One of the M.P.H./M.S.W. students reported that before this course she had seen the two degrees as separate. She said that the course helped her blend the two degrees. The same student reported that this was her best group project experience, due largely to the course’s focus on developing effective interprofessional teamwork skills.
One of the law students observed that she believed law students often saw themselves as the hardest working professionals and at the top of the social hierarchy among the professions. She said that she had no idea prior to this class what social workers did, particularly in the policy arena. She also said that not only had she learned a lot about the expertise and perspectives that social workers can bring to the policy table and that she would be incorporating their insights in her work, but also she had brought these perspectives back to other students in her law classes.

For the Home Institution
Indiana University has been moving towards integrating interprofessional education into the health curriculum. It has shown a strong support to this movement by funding a Center on Interprofessional Health Education and Practice. Originally including the professions of medicine, nursing, dentistry, social work, and allied health, this movement has been expanded to include public health professionals. The law school has also begun working with these efforts. A group of lawyers who work both in the law school and throughout campus met and discussed ways for law to participate in these IPE efforts. These legal academics will become more involved in initiatives as appropriate. The new course has been a positive way to show the institution that law and public health professionals are key collaborators in this work in addition to other efforts across campus.

For the Public Health Law Community
The agencies with which the students worked reported positive results from the students. For example, IHAC representatives asked one of the student groups to serve as resources for the organization based on the high quality of their work. The board recognized the importance of the diverse backgrounds of the interprofessional group. The students in the course all reported feeling that they learned skills in collaborative teamwork which would allow them to create better policies once they leave the academy.

Opportunities and Challenges
Getting the schools of law, social work, and public health all to allow the course for their students was a new process, as the course was the first on our campus that would be offered to students in all three schools on an interprofessional basis. The school of social work course-approval process was made more difficult with the curriculum tracks that the school offers. The school offers five tracks, which are areas of concentration for students. Each track has its own course requirements. For three of the five tracks, students must take a very specific set of classes, with no room for elective classes of their own choosing. Due to the absence of electives for these students, though the faculty approved the new course, it was available only to the health and leadership track students, who have electives available.

It was more difficult to get the course approved at the law school. We ultimately got it approved as a two-credit-hour course. The number of minutes required for a credit hour at the law school was different than at the social work and public health schools. The course ended up being a three-credit-hour course for social work and public health students and a two-credit-hour course for the law students. The course itself was very work intensive, particularly because of the group projects for the community agencies. Law students typically have only a final exam at the end of the semester, with some classes having a midterm, unless it is specifically a writing class. This course, with ongoing writing assignments and weekly field work, is a different type of course for the law students. The law students particularly discussed the amount of work feeling quite heavy compared to other two-hour law courses. In the future it will be important to figure out a way to ensure that the workload is commensurate with the credit hours for each of the professional schools, particularly law.

The public health school allowed its students to register in the social work course and count it towards the M.P.H. degree, thanks to the guidance of one of the mentors in the faculty fellowship program who works in that school. Pre-existing relationships with faculty and administration at each of the schools was helpful with expediting the process.

Community Opportunities and Challenges
It was important to find community agencies that had genuine organizational system or policy issues they wanted to have addressed. The two organizations chosen were a good fit for a couple of reasons. First, they were agencies with whom I had previously worked, and I had good working relationships with the student contacts there. For a pilot program and all the work involved, it was important to have good communication with the sites, and currently existing relationships with the sites facilitated our communication. Second, both sites already had an interprofessional focus.

Though we worked hard to ensure the topics and deliverables were well defined before the start of the semester, in the next iteration, we will ensure additional clarity. A question arose for some student groups about who the audience would be for their deliverables. For some it was to be the agency itself. For others, the agency hoped to use the students’ work
product with outside parties. I had not thoroughly vetted this question prior to assignment to the students groups and was left wishing that I had done so. It is particularly important that the projects be well defined so that the students are able to do this work in the time provided.

Other Opportunities and Challenges
Despite its strong conceptual support for interprofessional education, the university system can create administrative or logistical barriers or disincentives to actually implementing interprofessional courses. For example, the flow of tuition dollars from student enrollment may be an impediment for some schools. At our university, the tuition from the students goes to the school in which the student registers. However, the school where the professor has the appointment pays the salary of the faculty member who teaches the course. It was clear that to resolve this potential problem and to get the new course approved, the support of the faculty dean in the school of social work (where I have my primary appointment) was crucial. If he had been less supportive, it would have been difficult to gain cross-school acceptance. In the future, it may be necessary to work with the schools either to provide for co-teaching with faculty members from each of the schools so that one faculty member does not have the whole course responsibility, or to provide for each school with registering students to assist in the cost of offering the course.

Meeting promotion and tenure standards can pose challenges for faculty members who want to teach or write on an interprofessional basis. Though the academy generally supports the idea of interprofessional work, and in fact Indiana University has IPE as a key part of its strategic plan, many schools’ or departments’ promotion and tenure guidelines within the university may reflect a preference for single-authored scholarship in the schools’ particular disciplinary fields. If the schools do not “count” interprofessional work for promotion and tenure purposes, many junior faculty on the tenure track will be left to decide between single-discipline work and interprofessional work.

Lessons Learned
Each student has different needs, styles, and strengths. In future offerings of this course, I plan to give a questionnaire or request a writing sample that is less about content knowledge and more about working styles and skill level prior to the assignments of teams. It is important to ensure that the groups have a mix of stronger students and those who need more assistance in each group. When working with community agencies, it is important that the final product (here white papers and issues briefs) be something of benefit to them. We want to ensure continued positive relationships with the community. When there is not a balance of strengths and backgrounds within each team, it is possible to end up with some excellent projects and some which are not as strong. Additionally, along with discussion of interprofessional collaboration skills, I would like to spend more time on developing conflict resolution skills. Though we discussed managing conflict during our class, I received feedback that for some teams, more time spent on this topic would have been beneficial.

Lastly, I believe it will be important to give attention to the balance between lecture time in the classroom and time for students to work on their group projects for their community agencies. I had packed the syllabus with content I believed would be useful to the students, and I had planned to do at least half of each class period on the topics I had chosen. I heard early on from students that, while they needed some of this content, they also wanted to be able to drive the content by asking for lectures on issues as they arose at the experiential-learning sites. In the future, I will continue to include important content on interprofessional collaborative teamwork, but I will leave more room for both group work and open topic time where content can be driven by student questions.

Impact
On Students
Student reflections provided a good source of information regarding the impact of this course on their learning. An MSW student spoke specifically to the interprofessional aspects of the course, saying:

Although I believe that a uniprofessional team of social workers could have completed this project and created a quality product, working as an interprofessional team has been invaluable. [The law student’s] legal skills have been invaluable as we have analyzed the legislation from other states, and [the public health student’s] public health education has provided a unique perspective to the team. I think our product is better because it was completed by an interprofessional team.

A good illustration of the impact of the course on students happened at one team’s final presentation to the board of directors of their agency. The students were able to present a professional and thought-provoking set of facts and recommendations. The students answered the board's questions in a thorough and positive way. At the end of the presentation, I asked...
the students to talk about what it was like to learn in an interprofessional manner. The students each spoke about how important the learning had been. The law student discussed specifically how she had spoken with other law students about what she had learned, not in terms of content, but in terms of interprofessional process. The social work students talked about how empowering it had been to be able to share expertise within their purview, and also what they had learned about law and public health. The professionals in the room expressed strong interest in the interprofessional process. I was amazed. I wanted to take that group of students around our campus to demonstrate how IPE should be the way of the future! This course has affirmed my hypothesis that interprofessional work could truly benefit the policy process.

At the end of the presentation, I asked the students to talk about what it was like to learn in an interprofessional manner. The students each spoke about how important the learning had been. The law student discussed specifically how she had spoken with other law students about what she had learned, not in terms of content, but in terms of interprofessional process. The social work students talked about how empowering it had been to be able to share expertise within their purview, and also what they had learned about law and public health. The professionals in the room expressed strong interest in the interprofessional process. I was amazed. I wanted to take that group of students around our campus to demonstrate how IPE should be the way of the future! This course has affirmed my hypothesis that interprofessional work could truly benefit the policy process.

spoken with other law students about what she had learned, not in terms of content, but in terms of interprofessional process. The social work students talked about how empowering it had been to be able to share expertise within their purview, and also what they had learned about law and public health. The professionals in the room expressed strong interest in the interprofessional process. I was amazed. I wanted to take that group of students around our campus to demonstrate how IPE should be the way of the future! This course has affirmed my hypothesis that interprofessional work could truly benefit the policy process.

Institutional Impact
In addition to the classroom impact, this course will have an impact on interprofessional learning and scholarship at the macro level. I applied for and received a curriculum enhancement grant from the university for 2015-2016. This grant provides me with release time and technical support to use the information received from students during the course to provide in-depth analysis of their learning in the course. The grant includes the provision that I write an article regarding this research. The university’s process for approval for human-subjects research from its Institutional Review Board has been completed, and a qualitative analysis of concept maps and reflection papers is underway. The information will be used both to add to the scholarship of teaching and learning and to inform the creation of a framework for working in interprofessional teams to create public health policy.

Reflections on Personal Impact
This year was challenging and thought-provoking. One of the most important things for me was that I was able to truly integrate my social work frameworks, methods, and skills to the benefit of a public health law course. It has been fantastic to be accepted to this fellowship program as a social work faculty member. Though I have a law background and have been teaching in the law school longer than at the school of social work, it was daunting to be the only fellow in the fellowship program without a primary faculty appointment in a school of law or public health.

It was interesting to see that the other disciplines in the course and in the community agencies, particularly the legal professionals, articulated the usefulness of the social work professional background. Social workers are trained in systems theory with a person-in-environment perspective. This means that social workers highlight “the importance of understanding an individual and individual behavior in light of the environmental contexts in which that person lives and acts.” Additionally, social workers are trained in executive leadership, including leading groups. One legal professional, after the student presentation, said that he was amazed that the social work students mentioned having specific coursework in collaboration and group dynamics. He said that having worked in the MLP field, he could see how beneficial that could be.
Course Follow Up and Future Planning

The pilot course is in the process of a funded in-depth evaluation. The course will be offered again in the spring of 2016, using any lessons learned from the pilot course to inform the teaching and content from the initial evaluation.

I will be using my work from this course in two distinct ways. One will be the scholarship of teaching and learning. I will be working on the course evaluation with the goal of publishing at least one article to guide others wanting to do similar work. The other goal will be to use what was learned while teaching this course to help develop a framework for thinking about interprofessional work with public health systems and policies. We have competencies developed for interprofessional work at the clinical level,\(^9\) and I would like to examine the similarities and differences when working at the macro (policy or systemic) level.

Anyone wanting to design a similar course in the future should work to ensure that the community experiential-learning sites are prepared to work with the students. In the future, I will work to provide more frequent interaction with the agencies. It is important both from the perspective of providing more guidance and of providing students the opportunity to interact more with the community.

I will also explore co-teaching this class in the future. If we expect students and future professionals to work as collaborative teams, we, as faculty, should model these behaviors. Team teaching is time consuming when done well, but it is anticipated that the results will be worth the effort.

I would encourage anyone who is interested in interprofessional engagement in public health law to design a course in this field, using mine or others fellows’ projects described in this supplement issue of *JLME* as guides. Our collective experiences mean that others teaching in the field do not have to reinvent the wheel. Public health is inherently a multifaceted profession. Public health law should be no exception. This faculty fellowship program provided the mechanism for a strong set of model programs to help those wanting to begin this work. The experience for me has been well worth it both personally and as a faculty member who enjoys seeing students excel.
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Teaching Prevention: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Improving Population Health through Law and Policy

Elizabeth Tobin Tyler

Introduction
Recent reports by the Institute of Medicine promote two principles important to the future of public health law education: the need for better integration of clinical medicine and public health1 and the need to “revitalize” law and policy to meet new challenges in public health.2 The two reports, taken together, demonstrate the need for better integration of all three disciplines — law, medicine, and public health — to improve population health. Medical, legal, and public health professionals, therefore, need to understand where these disciplines intersect as well as how to work effectively with interdisciplinary partners.

With a greater focus on teaching population health,3 many medical schools are undertaking curricular innovations that expose medical students to public health principles as well as community-based prevention strategies. Most notably, many medical schools are developing opportunities for interprofessional education — providing students with opportunities early in their education to collaborate and problem-solve with students from other professions to improve patient and population health.4 At the same time, schools of public health are increasingly including curricula focused on the health care delivery system, including health care reform, as well as clinical care models that promote public health goals.

While public health law is still not routinely taught in schools of public health or law schools, it is growing in popularity.5 In recent years, discussion of the role of law in public health has expanded beyond more traditional topics, such as the State’s authority to require immunizations or quarantine to prevent the spread of infectious disease, to the role of law in preventing chronic disease through intersectoral “health in all policies” approaches.6

With this expansion and integration of public health curricula into medical education and of legal and policy curricula into public health education, I was interested in effective ways to expose medical, public health, law, and public policy students to the important intersections among the different disciplines and to help them to develop interdisciplinary problem-solving skills that are required for intersectoral prevention strategies and policies. For my project in The Future of Public Health Law Education faculty fellowship program,7 I proposed an interdisciplinary course for medical, public health, public policy, and law students focused on the role of law in either promoting or obstructing prevention in clinical medicine and public health.

Overview of the Course
Framing the course around the concept of prevention, I explored how different disciplines define prevention; what types of strategies each discipline can use to promote prevention and better health outcomes; what each discipline can learn from one another about promotion of population health; and what joint prevention strategies they can employ to improve health.

Learning Objectives for Students
The primary objectives for the course were to challenge students from these different disciplines8 to: (1)
define “prevention” through an interdisciplinary lens that includes perspectives from clinical medicine, public health, law, and policy; (2) explore the role of law, not just as a foundation of the health care and public health systems, but also as a critical social determinant of health; (3) expand understanding of the skills, methods, and values of the other professions, particularly as they relate to promoting prevention; and (4) practice interprofessional problem-solving that incorporates law and policy as tools for population health goals.9

I proposed to achieve these objectives by: (1) designing interdisciplinary curriculum to include readings, speakers, and other resources (media) that would expose students to the four disciplines as well as illustrate the importance of interdisciplinary and interprofessional collaboration to achieve public health goals; (2) providing a foundation for students to understand the importance of law in public health, including the constitutional framework for governmental public health authority as well as the inherent tensions between individual rights and protection of public health, while also challenging them to think about the role that law plays in preventing disease and injury; (3) giving students different types of “hands-on” opportunities to explore interdisciplinary problem solving through in-class projects, case studies, and interdisciplin ary group projects with community agencies; and (4) incorporating multiple opportunities for reflection about individual learning, team process, and skill-building.

Content of Course
The course, which I titled “Prevention: Medicine, Public Health, Law and Policy,” (hereinafter, “Prevention”) was divided into four sections. First, the introductory section described the definitions of “prevention” in the four disciplines of medicine, public health, law, and public policy; offered an overview of the values, goals, and methods of each of the professions/disciplines; and explored interdisciplinary and interprofessional collaboration in public health. The second section on public health law and prevention provided a foundational understanding of the role of law in public health authority and regulation, health care delivery, and the social determinants of health. The third section, which was on evidence-based policymaking, explored the role of different types of evidence for informing law and policy, including clinical, epidemiological, and legal evidence. The final section explored transdisciplinary models of public health law and policy and included discussions of the public health policymaking process and a forum for students to present their interdisciplinary team projects.

With this expansion and integration of public health curricula into medical education and of legal and policy curricula into public health education, I was interested in effective ways to expose medical, public health, law, and public policy students to the important intersections among the different disciplines and to help them to develop interdisciplinary problem-solving skills that are required for intersectoral prevention strategies and policies. For my project in The Future of Public Health Law Education faculty fellowship program, I proposed an interdisciplinary course for medical, public health, public policy, and law students focused on the role of law in either promoting or obstructing prevention in clinical medicine and public health.
with some comfort that if an unfamiliar term was used in class discussion or a reading, they could draw on these resources, or their classmates, for help.

While the beginning of the course content focused heavily on legal concepts and doctrine, the third section of the course on evidence-based policymaking allowed the medical, public health, and policy students to bring important discussion to the table. It helped the law students to think differently about “evidence,” as it relates to public health law and policy, and provided a forum for the medical and public health students to explore how to effectively articulate and translate complex or scientific evidence to policymakers.

The case studies were also designed to incorporate the different disciplinary perspectives in problem-solving. For example, a healthy housing case study required students to understand issues related to enforcement of housing codes, as well as how to bring medical and epidemiological evidence to bear in changing policy and practice.

Community Partnerships: Interdisciplinary Team Projects
Students were divided into interdisciplinary teams and partnered with four community-based organizations and agencies to work on previously designed public health law and policy projects. My primary goals for the community-based team projects were for the students to: (1) explore and analyze, through a real public health problem or issue, the intersection of public health, law, and policy; (2) practice interdisciplinary and interprofessional problem solving, working with students from different disciplines; (3) build skills in working on a team; and (4) contribute a valuable product, in the form of a final report and presentation to the organization or agency in fulfillment of its needs and goals.

In designing the projects, I wanted to ensure that each project contained a clear public health focus while at the same time requiring legal or policy analysis. Once I had initial conversations with the agency representatives in person, I asked them to fill out a project template to spell out in more detail their expectations for the project. This proved to be very helpful in identifying early in the process any mismatched expectations about the role the students would play.

Team Process
To facilitate individual and team reflection, students completed an initial self-assessment at the beginning of the semester, which included reflection questions about their own strengths and weaknesses as team members and what they would contribute to their team. The teams drafted a team charter, laying out their joint expectations for how they would function as a group. Students then completed a mid-semester team review, which they discussed in class.

Assessment
Writing Assignments
In addition to the final report for the team project, there were two short writing assignments in which students: (1) analyzed a particular public health law or policy problem; (2) identified and articulated clinical, public health, or legal evidence to support a particular position; and (3) explored the administrative, legal, and political context in which public health law and policies are made. The first assignment was to draft and orally deliver legislative testimony on whether a state should require the HPV vaccine. The second was to write a policy issue brief analyzing clinical and public health evidence and different state laws on vaccination exemptions and offering policy recommendations to the state legislature.

These assignments met my objective of introducing students to practical analytical and writing skills in policy advocacy. One student commented in her final course evaluation:

I had never written either legislative testimony or a policy brief before this course, so those assignments were extremely beneficial for my learning experience. I have written longer papers with a policy or legal perspective, but there is a skill to being able to write concisely and directly in order to appeal to the audience (whether as a testifying witness or to a politician).

Team Projects
For their final projects, the teams presented their findings to the class and invited community guests, including their supervising agency representatives, and submitted a final report to their supervisor and to me. I used several methods to assess student learning through the team projects. These included both individual and group assessments. Individual students were assessed for their contribution to the final report and presentation through team member and self-assessments. The final reports and presentations were assessed as final products for the full group.

Learning Assessments
In addition to the formal assessments, students completed an initial self-assessment at the beginning of the semester. They then completed a final learning assessment at the end of the semester. These were designed to both encourage reflection by the students...
about their learning in the course and to inform me about the students’ perceptions of their learning over the course of the semester. Both the initial self-assessment and the final learning assessment included questions aimed at interprofessional education in the context of law, policy, and systems-thinking.20

Assessment of the Course by Students
I asked students to complete a final course evaluation (in addition to the ones required by their respective programs), which was intended to assess how well I met my course objectives, as well as individual components of the course. Overall, these evaluations of the course were very positive. However, some of the critiques included: (1) too much reading, (2) not enough time for discussion of the case studies, and (3) lack of clarity from some project supervisors. This feedback will help me with future planning and revisions of the course.

Benefits of the Project

To Students
The interdisciplinary content and team projects were beneficial to student learning in several ways. First, the projects gave the students a real-world opportunity to apply their classroom learning (both in terms of content and interprofessional team skills). As a public policy student noted in her final learning assessment:

[W]hile it was helpful to learn from peers in other disciplines, the course really improved my comfort level in working with “other professionals” more generally. Group projects have always been a struggle for me, and the course’s semester-long project with two peers and an external “client” was extremely helpful in improving my ability (and willingness) to collaborate, divide up work, be held accountable, trust others and their work, communicate effectively, and to challenge (+be challenged by) teammates.

Second, students were able to experience the complexities of public health law and policymaking by struggling with the realities of how difficult policy change is to achieve. The students working on a project related to enforcement of the Rhode Island Lead Hazard Mitigation Act repeatedly expressed how their project brought home the challenges of improving enforcement and protection of families due to entrenched bureaucracies.

Third, students discovered that interdisciplinary teams can achieve more than single-discipline teams. A student expressed this value in her final learning assessment:

It was helpful to see how students from other disciplines approached problem solving and critical thinking about the topics we discussed throughout the course. For the group project, it was really helpful to have input from people with expertise in different areas that I had no idea how to approach.

To the Academic Institutions
Since becoming established as a school in 2013, the Brown University School of Public Health has undergone rapid growth. While I was teaching this new course, the school was undergoing accreditation. The course not only helped to expand the school’s course offerings in public health law and policy, it served as a “selective course” for the health services, policy and practice program demonstrating that it met many of the program’s health services research learning objectives and course competencies. The course also met core competencies for accreditation for the MPH program, which was also undergoing accreditation review.

Additionally, the experiential learning component of the course fit squarely within the school’s goals and mission. The school created a community advisory board in 2014 with the explicit goal of connecting students and faculty to community organizations and agencies working to improve public health in Rhode Island. The students’ team project provided an excellent example of this type of academic-community partnership.

Lessons Learned

• Logistical challenges can be overcome and can be important learning experiences.

As I predicted, some students expressed in their course evaluations that attempting to work on team projects with students from different programs and institutions proved very challenging. For example, the medical student had very little time to meet with her group because of her clinical rotation schedule. The law students spend most of their time on the campus in Bristol, Rhode Island, which is 20 miles from Brown University in Providence. Finally, all of the students have extremely busy schedules; the added burden of coordinating with students who have very different schedules was challenging. Nonetheless, with troubleshooting and creativity, the students were able to complete their projects quite successfully, often using technology, rather than face-to-face meetings, to facilitate regular communication. This is, in fact, a valuable lesson in itself: teamwork in the workplace is becoming more common. Developing skills in coordi-
nation and communication among team members is critical to effective and efficient productivity.

- *Teaching and providing practice in teamwork is important to student learning and they value it.*

Team projects are challenging and time consuming for the professor, at times frustrating for students, and not always successful, but they are extremely valuable to student learning. In designing the interdisciplinary team projects, I had some trepidation, particularly whether the students would view them as overly burdensome. While there were certainly challenges and frustrations along the way — including unevenness in student contribution, communication difficulties with supervisors, and challenges in completion within a semester timeframe — the final reports and presentations evidenced sophisticated analysis and learning by the students.

An additional lesson learned was that teamwork must be taught and discussed proactively; it cannot be assumed that students will figure it out. Teamwork exercises were woven throughout the semester through case studies, exercises, and reflection (individual and about group process). I told students at the beginning of the semester that working in a team is like being married; it takes open and active communication to make it work. Time for content needs to be balanced with time for team process and problem-solving.

**Advice to Faculty Considering This Type of Course**

First, allow time for course approvals and registration/credit issues. When creating an interdisciplinary course that spans several programs (or even more than one institution), it is critical to leave time for the course approval process. Each program and institution likely has its own process and structure.

Second, take a risk and branch out in curriculum development. While the initial work of designing a new course out of “whole cloth” can be daunting and time consuming, breaking out of the box in the approach to teaching a topic like public health law is very gratifying for you and for your students. Students appreciate it when faculty design courses that break away from courses designed around established textbooks or topics. This type of course design also allows the professor to populate the course with timely examples and issues, which students appreciate.

Third, spend time upfront determining your learning objectives and continue to revisit them during the course. With a course that has so many different parts — interdisciplinary content and students, team projects, and community partners — I spent a great deal of time revising and revisiting my learning objectives to ensure I was meeting them. The following comment from a student in her course evaluation made all the initial work worth it:

Part of the reason that I was so intrigued by the course was the organization of the syllabus, which is one of the most comprehensive I have ever been given in a class. We covered a lot of ground throughout the semester, from different professions, to data, to balancing individual interests and behavior against the public good/health. But throughout the entire time I always understood how these different themes connected back to our major objectives.

Finally, build in ample time and opportunities for reflection and problem solving around team projects. As noted above, for courses that include community-based project work, incorporate multiple opportunities for individual and team reflection and “check-ins” during class. This may mean reducing and refining substantive content to allow in-class time for team project discussion.

**Impact**

The experiential learning component with community partners and interdisciplinary team projects were beneficial to both student learning and community impact. One project in particular had an especially compelling impact both on students and on the community agency. In late 2014, the City of Providence Healthy Communities Office (HCO) signed on to participate in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Healthy Communities Transformation Initiative.\(^{22}\) The HCO Director and I worked together to assess the components of the project to determine if this would be an appropriate project for my students starting the class in January 2015. We agreed that it was.

Three students were selected to work on the project: an undergraduate public health student, a fourth-year medical student, and a master’s in public policy student. Because the project required a range of skills and expertise, the team divided the work according to their disciplinary skills and knowledge.

The public policy student had experience in GIS mapping so she contributed this skill to the project; the medical student and public health student worked to gather and analyze the data. The team worked together and in collaboration with the Healthy Communities Advisory Council to assess the value and usefulness of the Healthy Communities Assessment Tool\(^{23}\) indicators for the city in designing policies and programs aimed at addressing the social determinants.
of health and reducing health disparities across neighborhoods. The students’ final report and presentation included a very sophisticated assessment of the usefulness and limitations of the web-based data tool developed by HUD. They also presented very thoughtful legal and policy recommendations to the city based on the goals of the initiative.

This team project met the objectives I had for student learning and for community partnerships. The students helped to collect, organize, and analyze data on the social determinants of health that drive many of the health disparities seen across neighborhoods. They utilized the skills and knowledge base of their interdisciplinary team to collaborate around shared project goals, while developing important skills in working as a team. Finally, they provided a service and product to the City of Providence that will be instrumental in helping the city to assess policies and programs that are required to improve health and reduce health disparities.

Conclusion
This fellowship program provided a critical professional development opportunity to expand my understanding and knowledge, not just of public health law, but also of effective teaching strategies, particularly for interdisciplinary content and students. In addition to designing this new “Prevention” course, my work for the fellowship has inspired me to assess (and reassess) my objectives for all of the courses I teach, as well as to integrate new teaching techniques and materials, such as interdisciplinary case studies and online modules.

The fellowship program reinforced the importance of assessment of student learning against stated objectives. One key area of interest for me is effective ways to assess student learning in interdisciplinary or interprofessional learning environments. Much of the literature on this topic has focused on interprofessional education of health professions students, but not law, policy, or public health students. This is a common interest among some of the fellows; we hope to continue to work together to explore effective assessment tools for interprofessional learning.

The “Prevention” course will continue to serve as a biannual offering at the School of Public Health. Given the developing national conversation about the need to break down silos between the disciplines and professions to improve population health, this course will continue to offer students a unique opportunity to expand their understanding of the intersection of medicine, public health, law, and policy and to practice new approaches to complex problems.
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Tearing Down the Silos: An Interdisciplinary, Practice-Based Approach to Graduate School Education

Elizabeth (Bjerke) Van Nostrand

Introduction
The most meaningful measure of effective teaching is how well students learn. According to Michael Hunter Schwartz, an expert on teaching, learning, and curriculum design in law schools, students learn best when they think, do, reflect, write, speak, and collaborate.1 With the exception of the dreaded “group project,” the traditional graduate or professional school educational experience does little to encourage meaningful collaborative interactions between students in any given field, let alone across disciplines.

The normative culture of student “silos” was reflected in my own legal education. I began law school at Tulane University in 1981. All of my classes were held in one building. Each class consisted only of law students. Professors ruled as autocrats, and both course content and outputs were singularly controlled by them. Teaching approaches focused on the Socratic method of questioning, with an occasional merciful offering of traditional lecture-oriented pedagogy.

There was one exception to Tulane’s uniformity: a course on law and psychiatry. This course was offered to both law and medical students, and the classes were held off-campus in a New Orleans hospital auditorium. The approach was multidisciplinary (i.e., the legal and medical issues were taught in parallel and the different schools assessed their students separately) rather than interdisciplinary (i.e., a course that draws from more than one discipline to effectuate a common goal). Educational scholars associate interdisciplinary education with a number of distinct benefits, including advanced critical thinking and cognitive development.2

After a 35-year absence, I returned to academia at the University of Pittsburgh. There were a few noted changes in the way law school classes were taught. Some of my law school colleagues retreat from the one-grade assessment based on student performance on a single final exam. Instructors tend to be a lot less combative and more intent on keeping students, rather than eliminating those who are less than high performers. But one aspect has remained consistent: overwhelmingly, law students remain educated in a disciplinary silo.

Formal and informal surveys of my public health law students reveal that this approach is contradictory to how they would like to be educated. Universally, students want to work with others in different disciplines in which real-world public health issues are identified, effective strategies implemented, and community health improved.

I work closely with the Allegheny County Health Department (ACHD), an autonomous local health department of approximately 350 public health professionals serving 1.2 million individuals in southwestern, Pennsylvania. Local health departments play increasingly pivotal roles in the provision of community services; however, many are also experiencing diminished funding and reduced workforces. In light of these constraints, it is evident that public health
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practitioners could benefit greatly from the insight and research capacity of graduate students.

In November 2013 a law school colleague suggested that I apply for The Future of Public Health Law Education faculty fellowship program, which was being funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF).4 At first, I was skeptical — why would I ever be considered for such a prestigious honor? However, the more I thought about it, the clearer it became that it was a wonderful opportunity to construct a class that would address the concerns of my students, assist the ACHD, improve the health of the community, and serve as a template for others’ courses. The prospect presented a creative and logistical opportunity for me: how could I develop a meaningful, interdisciplinary practice-based course that students would actually want to take and that would provide a practice partner with beneficial information? This essay explores the challenges I faced, how I addressed them, and the lessons I learned from this fellowship experience.

**Challenge #1: Creating the Course**

**Choosing a Community Partner and Course Topic**

After being given this tremendous opportunity by the RWJF fellowship program, I became petrified that: (1) no one would enroll in my course; (2) a couple of students would enroll, but the number would be too few to make the experience a meaningful one; or (3) a respectable number of students would enroll, but they would all be from one school so the premise of an interdisciplinary class would be undermined.

My fears were not completely baseless. At the University of Pittsburgh’s School of Public Health (“Pitt Public Health”), students are required to take many core courses, leaving few electives such as my new one. At the law school, law students tend to gravitate toward courses that will help them pass the bar or improve their grade-point averages. Also, I am a relatively new professor and not particularly well known across the university.

Inspiration came from the ACHD, and we worked together to identify the first topic to be addressed in the course: the regulation of tattoo parlors. I hoped that the legal, economic, and health implications associated with inking would appeal to 20-somethings. Moreover, the possible regulation of tattoo parlors is a topic that the ACHD has been interested in since they initially explored it in 2008. Because of a sparse workforce, the health department’s analysis was incomplete and inconclusive. The scope of the research topic appeared to be narrow enough to allow a thorough analysis to be completed in one semester.

Pennsylvania does not regulate tattoo parlors at the state level, but a few local jurisdictions have promul-
**Lessons Learned:** When offering a new course, particularly one with novel practice-based and interdisciplinary features, use every avenue possible to promote your class. Start early enough so that students can plan well ahead of the drop/add deadline. Also, do not be ashamed of promoting your course. Engage the assistance of fellow colleagues to make students aware of the new offering.

For the next class, I also gave an overview of public health, the legal process, and public health law. I also asked LuAnn Brink, Chief Epidemiologist at the ACHD, to lecture about Pennsylvania’s public health infrastructure (which is unique and fractured) and the health department’s previous research into the regulation of tattoo parlors. Dr. Brink was invited back mid-semester so that the students could ask her questions about formatting their projects as well as to share their initial findings.

It is critical to create a class that is student-centered with respect to content as well as process. Despite a well-thought syllabus in advance, remain as flexible as possible with it, to meet your students’ needs as they arise during the semester. Listen to your students. Incorporate not only what you feel is necessary for your students to know, but also what they want to learn.

Through this course, I learned how to play the role of an effective advisor, mentor, and guide, and to give up trying to control the students’ learning. It can be hard for type-A faculty like myself, accustomed to the role of benign classroom dictator, to step back and let the students take responsibility for their own learning, but doing so results in better student outcomes.

**Challenge #2: Structuring an Unstructured Course in Uncharted Territory**

No one ever taught a class like this before at the university, so I was unable to discuss a choice of textbook nor could I review someone else’s syllabus to glean ideas as to how to proceed. On one hand, the lack of precedent gave me the freedom to move in any direction I wanted. There was no clear, accepted method of teaching an interdisciplinary, practice-based course. On the other hand, it was difficult to gauge exactly how long it would take in any one class session to cover the course material or what subject matter would be most beneficial for the students. I had to walk a fine line between approaching this as an “anything goes” course and imposing a structure that would be too rigid to allow for change.

**Practice-Based Learning**

The first class was entitled “Learning to Speak Another Language.” I encouraged the students to reveal self-identified stereotypes of each other’s professions. My approach, however, was rather cursory. In the future, I will spend more time exploring similarities and differences between disciplines. I will also give the students an issue with public health law implications and have each cohort explain to the others the methodology they use to address problems.

**Lessons Learned:** To maximize the benefit and constructive learning opportunity offered by having a practice-based partner, be sure to keep your partner engaged throughout the semester. Elicit feedback to make sure your project is sound, informative, and delivered in a way that is useful to your partner.

**Student Engagement**

For the rest of the initial classes, we talked about evidence-based judicial decision-making, population health, and the administrative process. In retrospect, I spent too much time on theory. My lectures should be less pedantic and more didactic.

I also did not realize until later in the term that the students were unfamiliar with some rudimentary professional competencies. For example, the students did not fully understand how to create an agenda or run an efficient meeting. Few of them could produce a logic model or work plan, which are essential tools for many grant proposals and useful organizational instruments for any career path. The students needed a refresher in how to create an effective survey. I was able to create mini-lectures (i.e., 30-minute presentations) for each of these areas, and each class was run thereafter like a meeting with committee reports, new business, and status updates.
**Lessons Learned:** It is critical to create a class that is student-centered with respect to content as well as process. Despite a well-thought syllabus in advance, remain as flexible as possible with it, to meet your students’ needs as they arise during the semester. Listen to your students. Incorporate not only what you feel is necessary for your students to know, but also what they want to learn. Through this course, I learned how to play the role of an effective advisor, mentor, and guide, and to give up trying to control the students’ learning. It can be hard for type-A faculty like myself, accustomed to the role of benign classroom dictator, to step back and let the students take responsibility for their own learning, but doing so results in better student outcomes.

**Field Experiences**

In order to better familiarize the students with the tattoo process, I arranged a trip to a local body art establishment. This was definitely a highlight of the semester, and the information gathered during our hour-long excursion proved invaluable. We watched the owner tattooing a customer and learned about the art of inking. We also interviewed the customer and other employees about the industry (including best practices, changes they would like to see implemented, and problems within their profession).

**Lessons Learned:** Students learn much more effectively by doing than by reading or hearing. Try to incorporate relevant trips, meetings, and other interactions into the curriculum to synthesize theory and practice.

**Group Project**

After the initial six weeks of class, the students then started to delve into the practice-based project. A scribe was elected to take notes during our work sessions. An account with Google Docs was created to share information and drafts of work product.

The students determined that research was necessary in three areas: law, health outcomes, and economic implications. With respect to legal differences, I grouped students into pairs to look into the tattoo regulations in seven diverse jurisdictions: Oregon, Virginia, New York, the District of Columbia, New Jersey, Monongahela, and Philadelphia. The students had teleconferences with local health departments in these jurisdictions to ascertain how practitioners implemented the legal mandates. Questions were raised concerning the number of health department employees assigned to monitor the artists and owners, the amount of revenue generated from licensure fees, and the type of support or push back health departments encountered from the industry. The students reported their findings to the group, and similarities/differences between the laws were noted.

After sharing their legal research findings, the students self-divided into three new work groups: the research team, the deliverables team, and the presentation team. My sole prohibition was that a team could not be a student silo (i.e., each team had to involve students from at least two different disciplines).

The research team took the lead in creating a survey of tattoo parlor owners and artists. The students on this team designed the survey using Survey Monkey and sent it electronically to over 100 establishments in Allegheny County. They made follow-up telephone calls to discuss some of the responses. The survey data were analyzed, graphically represented, and presented to the rest of the class.

The research team also assigned projects to students in the other groups, including analyses of the health and economic impacts of tattoo parlors. The results were surprising. Very few poor significant health outcomes were directly attributable to tattoo parlors. Anecdotal evidence revealed that the majority of minor problems associated with tattooing (such as mild infections or rashes) were primarily caused by amateurs who were not associated with a brick-and-mortar business. Regulation of tattoo parlors is also costly, as was confirmed through the follow-up teleconferences with local health departments.

After comparing the laws and analyzing survey results and health outcomes, the students determined that regulation in Allegheny County was not warranted at this time; therefore, model regulations were premature (which was a surprising departure from my original proposal). The class came to a consensus that a consumer-education campaign and the convention of a stakeholder advisory board would better serve the community.

**Lessons Learned:** By letting the students take responsibility for determining the necessary research to be undertaken, the other data to be gathered, and the conclusions to be drawn, I learned how important it is to not micromanage your students. Give them guidance and set parameters, but also be respectful of your students’ conclusions. After all, it is their work product, not yours.

**Presenting the Students’ Recommendations**

The students decided that the best way to convey their recommendations to the ACHD was through a white paper. The deliverables team was responsible for the paper’s layout and design, working within a modest printing budget, and assigning additional student projects. The deliverables team determined that outreach needed to be made to the other universities in Allegh-
Students perform better when...
how to prioritize tasks, how to work within a budget, and how to respectfully educate others.

The University of Pittsburgh benefitted from this project as well. There is a certain caché associated with the RWJF fellowships. There is a closer tie now between Pitt Public Health, the School of Law, and the ACHD. The university’s support of an RWJF fellow has been promoted throughout the country and, in turn, reflects upon the university as a leader in public health law.

From a personal standpoint, the best thing about the class was the feedback from my students. Our students assess their instructors and courses using an online evaluation tool. The results were humbling. The student responders were unanimous in giving the highest score of 5 (“One of the most outstanding”) in most areas, including that the instructor explained the subject matter in a way that made it understandable, made good use of examples to clarify concepts, conveyed knowledge of the subject, maintained an environment where students felt comfortable asking questions, included worthwhile information in class that was not duplicated in course materials, provided useful feedback, and encouraged independent thinking. Perhaps most importantly, unanimous scores of 5 were given for overall teaching effectiveness of instructor and that the instructor generated interest in the subject as well as stimulated a desire to learn more about it. I credit much of the success of this course to the support, education, and inspiration I received through the RWJF fellowship program.

The students would linger after every single class and seemed really interested in discussing the class’s take-aways. After one particularly intense work session, I decided to reward them by dismissing the class ten minutes early. Following what I assumed would be an welcomed pronouncement, one of my students said, “But Professor, we still have ten minutes to go. Can we keep working?” The other students’ heads nodded around the table, and then one remarked, “That’s the first time that I have ever heard students asking to stay after being dismissed by their teacher.” It truly warmed my heart that the students were so dedicated to the project and their enthusiasm was infectious.

Because of the course’s success, Pitt Public Health is exploring whether it should be a mandatory course for all students in its health policy and management program. In the second iteration of Law in Public Health Practice, the class is even more diverse than the original cohort and is populated with students from the schools of medicine, law, public health, and public policy. We are exploring legal and public health interventions to address the opiate epidemic. Additionally, the School of Law already has a health law certificate program, but no similar concentration is available in Pitt Public Health. I am honored that my Pitt Public Health students have asked that I develop a law and ethics certificate program here because of the newfound interest in public health law that was generated from my course.

Lessons Learned: Do not hesitate to apply to be a fellow in one of the RWJF fellowship programs. The experience was invaluable for me, particularly because it encouraged me to think beyond my own siloes of comfort. The student feedback reflected that they loved the course and gained invaluable professional and networking experiences. My university now has a more cogent relationship with governmental public health and is seen as a pioneer in fostering public health law education. The ACHD benefited by having an issue thoroughly vetted by multi-disciplinary experts. Much to my delight, the ACHD was recently contacted by members of the Pennsylvania legislature concerning tattoo regulation. The Director forwarded a copy of the class’s white paper as part of the department’s response. I want to thank RWJF for introducing me to my fellow fellows who are remarkable not only in their scholarship, but also in their commitment to educating the next generation of public health law practitioners. I look forward to continued collaboration with the fellows, mentors, and others in our community of practice in the field of public health law.
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Reflections on Mentoring

Mary Crossley and Ross D. Silverman

Introduction
Merriam Webster defines “mentor” as “someone who teaches or gives help and advice to a less experienced and often younger person.” This definition implicitly suggests that the primary benefits in a mentoring relationship flow in one direction, from the mentor to the person being mentored. That may be the case in most mentoring relationships. In this instance, though, serving as mentors as part of the faculty fellowship program offered tremendous opportunities for professional and personal growth for both of us, even as we sought to provide help and advice to the fellows whom we mentored. In these reflections, we describe our experience and offer thoughts on lessons learned about mentoring, individuals’ roles in institutional changes, our own professional growth, and some implications for legal and interprofessional education.

The Mentors’ Roles: What We Did
When Charity Scott first called with an invitation to serve as a mentor in the faculty fellowship program, one of us was reminded of a quotation often attributed to Theodore Roosevelt: “Whenever you are asked if you can do a job, tell ‘em, ‘Certainly I can!’ Then get busy and find out how to do it.” Being familiar with Charity’s experience and success in program development, combined with the conviction that building successful models for teaching public health law is a worthy goal, persuaded us that this project was worthy of an investment of our time and energy over the next eighteen months. Little did we know, though, the range of things we would be called on to do.

Five mentors were chosen for this program: ourselves, James G. Hodge, Jr., of the Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law; Kathleen Hoke of the University of Maryland School of Law; and Leslie E. Wolf of Georgia State University College of Law. Our formal “job description” included: reviewing applications for the fellowship program; participating in the planning of the program and its pedagogical centerpiece, the ten-day summer institute in Park City, Utah; attending and participating in the summer institute; and providing guidance to and accountability for the two faculty fellows who would be assigned to each of us during the following academic year as they refined and implemented their projects.

The ten-day retreat in Park City marked the formal kickoff of the fellowship program. However, the planning undertaken in the months leading up to the retreat by the program leadership team and the mentors foreshadowed the program’s character. Creativity and deliberateness are not typically portrayed as going...
hand in hand. But the planning process led by Charity married intentionality and creativity, and it modeled for everyone involved the power of that combination. The group consistently focused not only on ensuring the quality and variety of information, interactions, experiences, and resources the fellows would receive during the institute, but also on how experiences during the ten days could foster fellows' skills as teachers, program creators, leaders, and change agents. Even in the planning stage, the importance of reflection emerged as a dominant theme, so that the fellows, who would be blazing new curricular trails with their projects, would be equipped with questions to reflect on as they developed and implemented their projects.

The result of these planning efforts — the ten-day retreat in Park City — was a uniquely powerful and valuable professional development experience for each of us. Given the program’s title, the absence of much formal discussion of public health law content was notable. There was little debate over core concepts, cases, or the latest (or most seminal) events affecting the field. To our minds, this absence worked, as it left space for discussions and experiences that the fellows would not likely have access to at more traditional, topic-centered conferences.

We formally and informally interacted with our assigned fellows and the leadership from their institutions, allowing us to gain insight into the institutional expectations being shouldered by the fellows, as well as the terrain across which they would be attempting to navigate in the coming year. We engaged in service and were pushed beyond our comfort zones in various ways. By the end of the ten days together, these shared experiences helped close bonds of trust and respect to form among all participants. A high level of enthusiasm for the fellows’ projects prevailed. We examined ourselves as teachers, learners, and professional colleagues, gaining greater understanding of our personality styles, our personal strengths, and our preferred approaches to addressing conflicts. We heard perspectives from leaders in public health law practice and academia.
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stresses of law school mergers (on the more unusual end). And we continued to check in with the program leaders and the other mentors as well, which provided us mentors the support and accountability that we were providing our fellows.

What We Learned as Mentors (and Why It Might Matter)
For each of us, participating in the fellowship program contributed to significant professional growth and enhanced insight into the challenges and opportunities facing higher education, and particularly legal education. Although these lessons overlap, we divide them into four primary categories.

...About Being Mentors
The five mentors entered the program with diverse mentoring experiences. All of us had some kind of leadership or advising experience where we had been called on to help “bring along” students or more junior colleagues, and most of us had some experience that equipped us to advise our fellows about important concepts like how to navigate institutional policies and politics to get approval for new school initiatives and courses. The diversity of our experiences in more sustained or formal mentoring, though, was notable. One mentor could not point to anyone who had mentored her on a sustained basis, while others recounted how influential their mentors were in their professional development. None of us, though, professed to having been trained in being a mentor prior to this experience.

Formal training in how to serve effectively as a mentor generally is not offered to law, medical, or public health faculty; mentorship opportunities arise more as a result of achieving longevity in the field. In many ways, senior faculty service as a mentor can be a lot like being a parent: you know how you were raised by your parents (or senior colleagues or personal mentors) and the types of things you would and would not emulate in what you learned from them along the way. Perhaps you have friends who preceded you in such parenting/mentoring experiences from whose successes and foibles you could learn. But professional growth in law school and then in law academia is not structured the same way as, say, development in a Ph.D. program, in which a Dissertation Chair is formally assigned to aid in and guide a candidate's professional development.

The mentoring training we received prior to the summer institute, and the ongoing discussions among the mentors and program leaders of how to be effective mentors, were helpful. Also enlightening was the group debriefing of the mentors at the conclusion of the fellowship program. As from the beginning, we were able to share openly and learn from one another’s experiences. It was one of those situations, though, that led us to wish there were some way to capture and share the benefit of the collective experience so that we could have used it while we were still serving. Of course, this is the nature of learning from experience.

That said, it has led us both to conclude that it would be highly valuable for law schools and other academic environments to develop formal mentor training programs for their senior faculty, as a way to aid the growth of junior colleagues as well as the programs we serve. Formally recognizing and nurturing effective mentoring might also help serve as a corrective to prevalent models of law faculty members as “free agents” whose professional fortunes rise or fall based solely on their own talent and initiative who thus may feel little sense of institutional investment.

....About Individuals’ Roles in Institutional Growth and Change
Tolstoy wrote: “Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.” The same might be said of law schools, with the caveat that the current challenges facing legal education mean that few law schools today would be deemed “happy.” Collectively as mentors, we had ringside seats for viewing how ten faculty members’ initiatives to pursue an innovative public health law offering played out at a range of law and other professional schools. It was fascinating to witness the ways that schools embraced, facilitated, and sometimes undermined these initiatives. But because each school was distinctive in its particular configuration of ambitions, politics, and challenges, it is difficult to draw general lessons about how to manage growth and change in professional schools, beyond the cliché truism that “change is hard.” Nonetheless, we learned a good deal from our experience as mentors about the value of mentoring relationships and membership in a community of practice for individuals who seek to drive change at an institution. No matter how hard we tried as mentors, participation in the fellowship program did not give fellows a magic wand capable of fixing the problems they faced as a result of bureaucratic labyrinths, demanding deans, faculty politics, or declining enrollment. But it helped equip them to offer the strongest, best-designed course possible, and the community of practice that resulted provided fellows with moral support and generous intellectual partners who helped them face their own distinctive challenges.

...About Ourselves as Professionals
A common refrain among the mentors in our final reports and end-of-program debriefing was how much
each of us learned and grew from participating in the fellowship program. Part of the learning, certainly, flowed from functioning as a mentor, as described above. But for each of us, the greatest growth came from participating in all the activities and experiences at the summer institute. Like the fellows, we learned about ourselves, about best practices in course design and teaching, about how public health law plays out in the real world, and about the importance of reflection. One of us (Ross) learned that, because his greatest strengths lay in the analytical, ideation, and deliberative realms, he could best advance his goals by finding collaborators with complementary strengths, like achieving and activating. Acting on that insight helped bring about one of the most productive years he has had as an academic. The other of us (Mary) relied heavily on the ideas generated in the summer institute’s teaching workshop and the teaching techniques shared by mentors and fellows in designing a new course she taught the semester following the summer institute. And pushing past a fear of heights to take part in the high-ropes-course with another mentor as a partner (thank you, Leslie!) reminded her how empowering it can be to push past fear to take on a challenge. As a result, she will be teaching her first online course in early 2016...knowing that her colleagues in this community of practice will provide a “safety harness” of sorts!

At the May 2015 celebration closing the fellowship program, one of the mentors shared a New York Times op-ed piece written by David Brooks about the importance of adult friendships and how experiences like the one we shared at the summer institute provide fertile soil for the growth of enduring bonds. We heartily endorse that sentiment, but also offer our own slightly different reflection. For the mentors, participating in the fellowship program gave us the chance to share whatever wisdom we might have gained from years of experience. That we expected. But we did not expect how much it also gave us, along with the fellows, a chance to know ourselves better, a push to stretch in new directions, and the enthusiasm and confidence to take on new challenges. To return to a point made at the beginning of this essay, the benefits for more senior faculty from serving as a mentor in a fellowship program like this can be just as great as those received by the fellows, although they are somewhat different.

...About Legal and Interprofessional Education

We are at an inflection point in legal education. Law schools are being asked by students, alums, as well as the employment markets into which our students will enter, to reexamine what is taught within schools, as well as how it is taught. Expectations about the knowledge and skills that graduates of law schools (and other professional schools) should develop are shifting and rising. Some are questioning how long the law school experience itself should be. This period of flux presents a valuable opportunity for great innovation both in teaching within law schools, and in teaching law students alongside professionals from other disciplines like public health, medicine, nursing, business, and social work.

At the same time, little infrastructure currently exists for formally assessing how well we are educating and training the next generation of lawyers, or their development of both the technical and critical thinking skills and the knowledge base needed to succeed in the future marketplace. At best, we may receive some indirect and informal feedback from the employers who hire our graduates, or through metrics like bar passage rates.

Participating in this fellowship program prompted us to question whether we — either as a discipline (public health law) or as a broader field (legal education) — should do more to assess both teaching effectiveness as a core competency of being a law professor and how and what our students learn. We have concluded that we should do more to infuse law teaching and interprofessional educational programs (like those developed by our program fellows) with formal opportunities to assess the effectiveness of these curricula using the principles of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

Development of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) infrastructures within our law schools and interprofessional education programs will help us develop best practices for our education programs. Such infrastructure development would demonstrate that our field values innovations and effectiveness in teaching highly. SoTL initiatives in law schools also would give faculty members who develop novel public health law courses and programs more opportunities to produce research valuable both to their professional development and for promotion and tenure decisions. At institutions like Indiana University, while peer assessments and student evaluations are valued in determining the quality of one’s teaching, the only way a faculty member can demonstrate excellence in their teaching is through the scholarly dissemination of knowledge about teaching, preferably in peer-reviewed publications.

Law schools may not wish to formally educate every one of their faculty in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, but it would be worthwhile for them to consider developing the resources within their schools (or within the offices of their associate deans of faculty
research and development and/or education) so that they can assess their educational programs, and so that more formal, replicable, and comparable assessment of student knowledge and skill development can take place across institutions. Such assessments might also allow us to better gauge whether and how teaching innovations add value to the careers of our programs’ alumni one, five, or ten years after graduation.

**Conclusion**

Before signing on as mentors, neither of us could have predicted how profound the fellowship program’s impact on us would be. Being able to contribute in some way to the development of the program and to the success of our fellows’ projects was tremendously satisfying, and our own individual growth was meaningful. As the fellowship program drew to a close, we both agreed that it was among the most rewarding experiences we have had as educators and academics in the field of public health law.
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The Importance of Including the Deans

Diane E. Hoffmann

Introduction
When Professor Charity Scott called me (over two years ago) to ask if I would work with her to develop and implement a new Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF)-funded project to increase public health law curricula and learning opportunities at schools of law and public health through a fellowship program, I jumped at the chance. Not only would it give me the opportunity to work with Charity and the team that she had put together, but it was a chance to do something new and different and potentially make an impact on this area of law. I was engaged to serve as the “deans’ consultant” for the project, acting as a liaison between the project and deans (or associate deans) at the schools from which the fellows were selected. Charity shared with me during our initial conversation that because RWJF wanted to see the curricular changes and innovations developed by the fellows embedded at their home institutions and sustained over time, the Foundation insisted the deans be incorporated into the fellowship program. This requirement, in hindsight, as one of the deans said, was “a stroke of genius.”

I was comfortable serving in the role of deans’ consultant as I had been an associate dean for 12.5 years and had served as director of the Law & Health Care Program for 14 years at my home institution. It would later become clear that my experience having taught an interdisciplinary course including students from schools of law, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, dentistry, social work, and public health would also be valuable background.

The deans were included in the project from the start. Any faculty member applying for the fellowship program had to include his or her dean’s “Letter of Support.” That letter ensured that the deans knew that the faculty member was applying to the program and what the faculty member was proposing to do in terms of curricular innovations. The letter also indicated that the dean or his/her associate dean would attend the first two-and-a-half days of the summer institute in Park City, Utah.

Once the fellows were selected, it became clear who the deans were that would be attending the summer institute in Park City. They included three deans of schools of public health (one of whom was an associate dean), six deans of law schools (two of whom were associate deans), and one dean of a school of social work.

The Summer Institute
While I participated in the planning of the ten-day summer institute, my focus was on the content of the first two-and-a-half days when the deans would be attending. Our goals for these initial days were to educate the deans about the value of public health law and how their fellow’s curricular innovation might bring benefits to their school and/or university and to their students. We also hoped that by being exposed to the ambitious goals of their fellows, the deans would support them by ensuring they would have the time they needed to devote to the project and/or by assisting them with negotiations they might need to have with faculty or administrators at other schools within their
institution, e.g., if at a law school, that might include negotiations with the university’s schools of public health, medicine, nursing, social work, or business. Like any other new course or clinic, the curricular proposals would likely benefit students by exposing them to a new area of substantive law, but because many of the proposals had an interdisciplinary or experiential component, there were other potential opportunities for the home institution.

With this background in mind, we included the following components in the first two days of the summer institute:

- **Leadership forum:** During this session a university president engaged in a dialogue with a dean of a law school and dean of a school of public health about the future of higher education in the 21st century. The conversation focused on the challenges and opportunities for interprofessional education and collaboration and how public health law is a strong vehicle for meeting them.

- **Panel of practicing public health professionals and attorneys:** This session included a series of presentations by public health professionals and attorneys practicing public health law at places like the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. They discussed what they do and why they do it and why schools of law and public health should teach public health law to ensure a well-educated public health workforce in the 21st century.

- **Conversation with RWJF:** In this session the senior vice president and director of the health group at RWJF provided an overview of the Foundation’s commitment to creating a culture of health and building the field of public health law. While deans of schools of public health would be familiar with RWJF, we wanted to expose deans of law schools to the Foundation and its mission and goals.

- **Roundtables on careers in public health law:** With job opportunities for law school graduates diminishing, we felt it would be beneficial to include information for the deans about opportunities for employment in the public health law field. During this session, representatives from federal, state, and local governments and not-for-profit organizations talked about their needs for public health lawyers and practitioners who are well educated in public health law.

- **Program academy – innovations:** In this session, which we arranged as “poster presentations,” we had program mentors and members of the program core staff present innovations in public health law education that they had implemented at their home institutions. These included examples of experiential and inter-professional opportunities.

In addition to these sessions, we included time for each fellow to briefly present his/her proposed curricular innovation so that all the deans would have a sense of the variety of curricular changes that were being proposed. After these presentations we created space in these initial days for small group meetings where the program mentors would meet with their two fellows and their deans to further discuss the fellows’ projects, their plans and concerns, their home institution’s support, and what they hoped to focus on and get out of the summer institute. Finally, we allowed time for a “Dean’s Forum” and asked each dean to come prepared to discuss three issues: (1) the opportunities offered by their fellow’s projects at their home institutions, (2) the challenges the fellows may face and how the deans could help in overcoming them, and (3) other perspectives the deans had gained from the institute for enhancing public health law education at their home institutions.

Initial feedback from the deans revealed that to a large extent our goals for their participation in the institute were met. They were able to articulate why public health law was an important area for their school to include in its curriculum as well as some of the opportunities the project presented for their institution. In terms of what was most beneficial about the institute, several of the deans mentioned learning about the field of health law more generally; others said they came away with a realization of the importance of interdisciplinary teams in addressing complex public health problems we face as a society and “how public health, science and law can have synergies.”

One dean (from a school of law) talked about how the project and her time in Park City expanded her baseline knowledge of “a need for folks with expertise in [public health law]” and this area as a new career path for law students. “Our school,” she said, “has always had a mission to do public service and many of our students go into public interest jobs and this fits right in. We had not explored this career path for our students before this opportunity.” Another dean (from a school of public health) said that “[f]or me, Park City was very useful as it reinforced the purpose for this whole program and made clear the iterative process that RWJF has used to put resources into public health law. My time in Park City was very practical and useful. In the context of what [my fellow] was doing,
it was a wake-up call for me to be more involved and aware of his role in our school and his position on campus and role with the school of law.”

The Role of the Deans

We hoped the deans would take back what they learned from the summer institute to their home institution and continue to be involved with their fellow’s project. The deans were told that I would be reaching out to them during the course of the academic year to find out their perspective on how their fellow was progressing with the implementation of his/her project. In follow up, I interviewed each of the deans at the end of the fall 2014 and spring 2015 semesters.

During the fall 2014 semester, most of the fellows were busy planning for implementation of their new course. In addition to finalizing the course design, this often included obtaining curriculum committee approval from one or more schools, establishing connections and working relationships with local public health departments, establishing a time to offer the course that would be conducive to students from different schools, figuring out how students from different schools could register for the course and how tuition issues would be resolved, advertising the course at multiple schools, and securing sufficient enrollment to offer the course. At the end of this semester I asked deans what progress their fellow had made, whether their fellow was facing any significant challenges, and whether the fellow’s work was fitting in with goals that the dean and the faculty of the school had for their institution.

During the spring semester virtually all of the fellows implemented their projects or some portion of their projects. At the conclusion of this semester I asked each dean how well the dean thought the fellow was able to implement the project the fellow had envisioned, what impact the project had on the dean and or their school or university, and whether their fellow’s project would be able to be sustained at their institution.

From these interviews it was clear that overall the deans were a vital part of the program for at least three reasons:

1. In a number of cases they became an ally and advocate (and sometimes defender) for their fellow in dealings with their own school’s faculty, with the administration at other schools, and with the larger university when issues of scheduling, tuition, or course registration became an obstacle.
2. They were able to see the opportunities and benefits the fellowship presented to their institution and take advantage of those opportunities when dealing with internal and external constituents.
3. They were often in a better position than the fellow to ensure that the initiative would be sustained at their institution.

Ally, Advocate, and Defender

Overall the deans were a consistent source of support for their fellows. In some cases, deans generously gave their fellow a reduced teaching load, release time, or reduced administrative responsibilities; in others, although the fellows had no release from teaching or other commitments, their deans provided assistance when it came to helping their fellow obtain approvals from the university and/or other schools. One dean, for example, helped her fellow negotiate with university officials to offer the course at a time that was conducive to enrolling students from several schools. Another dean (from a school of public health) stepped in to assist allowing law students from a different university to take courses at her institution without applying for admission to her university. Two deans agreed to let students from other schools take the fellow’s course at their institution without receiving the tuition dollars from those students. This was very helpful to the fellows getting an interdisciplinary enrollment for their courses.

In some cases deans (particularly deans of law schools) became defenders of their fellow implementing their project at their school. They reported that some of their faculty expressed concerns about implementing this new addition to the curriculum when the school’s resources were being stretched very thin. They spoke of a reduced student body, of downsizing their faculty, and of faculty having to teach more courses and take on more responsibilities rather than less. They shared that some of their faculty viewed a new interdisciplinary public health law course as a luxury in a time of austerity and that they (the deans) were having to assure faculty that the course and moving in this direction made sense for multiple reasons, including the need for law students and lawyers to learn to work in multidisciplinary teams and that the new initiative offered ways to enhance the reputation of the law school in the eyes of both the university and the broader community. A number mentioned that the course and doing more in public health law was consistent with their school’s strategic plan that called for more emphasis on experiential learning and identified health law as a growth area that the law school should expand.

Seeing the Bigger Picture and Other Opportunities

One dean I spoke with summed up the added value of having the deans involved in the program by saying,
“I think the advantage of having college leadership involved is that [they] tend to think about sustainability and the bigger picture not just this one project.” This was evident from conversations I had with many of the deans. Virtually all were able to see how this project could be leveraged or be the jumping off point for other initiatives. Many saw its value as an example of the kinds of interdisciplinary initiatives their schools or institutions could take or of the types of connections that their school was making with the community. As one dean said, “This project allowed us to get out into the community and develop relationships we otherwise would not have. For example, we got our Chancellor to attend a meeting with local hospital officials to talk about how we could collaborate better to keep them updated on what they are required to do in the public health area, e.g., privacy, emergencies.” Her fellow’s focus on Ebola raised interest on the part of university leadership and hospital personnel. Those deans with significant institutional memory were able to see the possibility of building on prior relationships or for connecting anew with institutions where there historically had not been an ongoing collaboration.

Several deans also shared how the fellowship project was a catalyst for other public health law initiatives and collaborations between different schools and community organizations. For example, one dean realized the benefit to her institution of opening the course that was being offered by her fellow to county or city public health officials: it would both enhance the reputation of the law school as well as provide a valuable educational opportunity for public health officials. Two deans spoke about how the project led to them either establishing a new medical-legal partnership (MLP) at their school or participating in an existing medical-legal partnership. For example, one dean at a school of public health and her fellow realized their school could potentially add an evaluation component to an existing MLP that included their affiliated academic medical center and the local legal services association. The MLP collaboration was not part of her fellow’s proposal, but the idea for it came out of the institute in Park City. The fellow is now exploring funding to engage in some novel evaluation of services provided by the MLP, looking not only at patient outcomes but also at economic benefits to the health care system such as reducing repeat admissions for the same diagnosis. A second dean also shared that his fellow’s project laid the foundation for a new MLP with the local hospital. In establishing the MLP, his law school and the hospital shared the costs of hiring a visiting professor for three years. This person will devote two-thirds of her time to the MLP and one-third of her time to teaching at the law school. The dean was very pleased with this arrangement as it expanded the school’s teaching resources.

A number of deans spoke about the value of the fellowship project as an example of a new way of teaching or providing legal services when talking to potential donors or state legislators, to university leadership, or even to their faculty. For example, one law school dean said:

My mantra as dean has been that we are educating the whole lawyer to deal with the whole client, that legal services must be contextualized, that lawyers have to be able to work in an interdisciplinary way. Now, here comes my fellow with this interdisciplinary course she is creating. I now have one more concrete example I can point to for my philosophy of a contextualized, interdisciplinary, team approach to legal work. Also, the project is sensitizing our faculty to law as a social determinant of health. It’s allowed us to revisit the role of lawyers and their contributions to the public’s health. The project has worked pretty smoothly into our conversations about MLPs and strengthened our conversations about health law related initiatives.

That same dean saw the advantages to communicating about her fellow’s course to her alumni, to students applying to her school, to a potential donor, and to her faculty as part of faculty development. “I could see that this project would be of interest to a donor, but even if it’s not for this specific project, it will likely be helpful as an example for us to show our commitment to this area and to show a donor the innovative kinds of courses we are offering.”

One dean talked about how she used the example of her fellow’s project when speaking with her president and university leadership. She mentioned that her university was going through a strategic planning process and that as part of that process the university leadership talked a great deal about the university’s mission. “Our fellow’s project,” she said, “really fit into this well. In fact there was a lot of focus on his project as what we (the university and law school) should be doing more of. We were able to showcase our fellow’s work.” This dean also said she used her fellow’s project as an example many times when speaking to external constituencies. She also saw the project as a way to combat some of the criticisms of law schools and that it was good for communicating with alumni and employers about how the law school is preparing students for practice.
Two deans (from law schools) talked about how they thought the fellowship was enhancing the reputation of their school within the legal community and their broader community. One mentioned that his school had spent the year doing strategic planning and that part of the school’s focus was on things that will be helpful to their city. They want to make the city a better place to live and work. “The kinds of things [our fellow] is doing,” he said, “are extremely helpful in that effort.” He also mentioned that the public health focus and defining health more broadly than medical and hospital care has been a help to the school in making more connections with the community. He and his faculty are thinking more about other things they are doing as related to public health and talking about them more this way to the community, e.g., they have a clinic that is focused on cleaning up blighted property and are beginning another clinic on improving the juvenile justice system. They are thinking about both of these clinics as relevant to public health. He related that his fellow’s work had raised the school’s profile locally as well as within the university; that the university wants to do things to help the city and has identified health as an area where it could make a difference. The dean felt that the fellowship had been helpful in making the law school a major player in that effort.

*Sustaining the Initiative*

Several deans were instrumental in thinking about how the fellow’s initiative would be sustained. One dean mentioned that the initiative would likely be integrated into their J.D.-M.P.H. joint degree. Several deans (from law schools) saw that the project could be counted as fulfilling a requirement for receipt of their institution’s health law certificate or other certificate program. A dean from a school of public health said that her school was interested in establishing a track in law and ethics and that the course on public health law could fit well within that track.

Another dean, from a law school, mentioned that her school had been “pretty deeply engaged this year in articulating [the school’s] learning objectives and mapping [its] curriculum to see where those objectives are achieved. As that kind of culture takes root more students will be looking for classes that satisfy those learning objectives. That kind of curricular guidance,” she said, “will push more students into this kind of learning environment, i.e., the kind that [her fellow] is creating with her interdisciplinary course.” Some deans spoke about how the fellowship motivated them to establish something bigger than the fellow’s project that would be sustained at the university level. One dean (from a school of public health), after coming back from Park City, reached out to the dean of the law school at his home institution to discuss how the two schools could work together. He said they both see public health law as a viable focus for the future and have met several times to discuss possible models for collaboration including bringing in other partners. He would like to involve others at the university who are doing public health law or policy work, e.g., those in the College of Food & Agriculture or in the Engineering School. This dean elaborated saying that the “whole idea of public health law didn’t click for him until he was in Park City,” but that now he sees it as a way to improve access to care.

At least for law school deans, participation in the summer institute and project changed the lens through which they saw some of their school’s other initiatives — they were not only vehicles for improved access to legal services or to justice but for addressing social determinants of health. The fellowship program provided them with a new language with which to talk to leaders interested in public health and health care. Similarly, some of the deans of schools of public health and social work saw law in a new light as being an important tool to bring about positive public health outcomes. And I think all the deans saw the benefits of collaboration between law and public health to bring about new interdisciplinary educational programs and initiatives that lead to real reforms and improvements in our public health infrastructure.
Conclusion
RWJF, which funded the public health law fellowship program, had great foresight in insisting that the program implementers include the deans of the fellows’ institutions in the fellowship program. Their participation was key in getting “buy in” of the fellow’s home institution. In addition to this general buy in, the deans were able to serve as allies, advocates, and, in some cases, defenders of their fellows. They were also able to see the potential connections of the project to other things going on at their university and in their communities and were helpful, and hopefully will continue to be helpful, in seeing that the project continues at their school.

In addition, at least for law school deans, participation in the summer institute and project changed the lens through which they view some of their school’s other initiatives — now, they are not only vehicles for improved access to legal services or to justice but for addressing social determinants of health. The fellowship program provided them with a new language with which to talk to leaders interested in public health and health care. Similarly, some of the deans of schools of public health and social work now see law in a new light as being an important tool to bring about positive public health outcomes. Finally I think all the deans see the benefits of collaboration between law and public health to bring about new interdisciplinary educational programs and initiatives that lead to real reforms and improvements in our public health infrastructure.
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Polishing the Apple: A Holistic Approach to Developing Public Health Law Educators as Leaders of Change

Debra Gerardi

“Public health problems pose special challenges. They are generally enormous in scale, stem from numerous and highly complex causes, play out in the public eye, impact a vast array of stakeholders and require unusually longterm solutions.1... In short, public health requires its leaders to stretch their minds and souls in almost unimaginable ways.”2

Introduction
The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) public health law faculty fellowship program3 provided an opportunity for legal and public health scholars to come together to develop innovative approaches for teaching public health law in schools of law, public health, medicine, and social work nationally. The primary goals of the fellowship program were to provide the ten fellows with dedicated resources to help them design and implement exemplary educational initiatives that would increase the availability of professionals with expertise in public health law and create sustainable organizational change in their academic institutions, all as a means of furthering a “culture of health” across the United States.

The fellowship program emphasized the importance of integrating individual change (personal and professional development) with organizational change as twin pillars of the core competencies necessary for advancing public health law education. To further support the sustainability of the projects and ongoing scholarship, a community of practice model4 was utilized to create a network of like-minded colleagues who co-created resources and shared expertise in teaching, leadership, and academic change management.

By design, the program provided the fellows with the opportunity to develop the skills and competencies needed by public health leaders who seek to manage the complexities and interdependencies inherent in the field. This article describes the curriculum and learning formats used throughout the fellowship to guide the fellows’ development in the areas of leading change, managing conflict, building collaborative partnerships, and maintaining personal resilience.

Learning Designed to Build Adaptive Capacity
The challenges faced by public health professionals are exemplified by complex, interdependent problems that have the potential to affect large numbers of people and that require expertise and input from a variety of diverse stakeholders. These problems are rarely solved by technical solutions alone, such as legislation or use of authority. Instead, complex public health problems require solutions that involve learning and unlearning over time and are better framed as adaptive challenges. Adaptive challenges are described by Heifetz and colleagues as problems that “can only be addressed through changes in people’s priorities, beliefs, habits and loyalties.”5 They require that people
develop the capacity to learn together in the presence of uncertainty, and often discomfort and loss, in order to adapt to changing circumstances.

Public health leaders require adaptive capacity in order to “function in an ambiguous arena without clear boundaries or hierarchies, using a chaotic context as a starting point for change.”

As such, leaders working in public health require competencies that go beyond substantive knowledge of the law and legal procedures. They require the capacity to shift and adapt as a way of life in order to respond to unpredictable and sometimes volatile circumstances.

Leadership development for public health professionals is in its infancy. In addition, the availability of funding for leadership training for nonprofit leaders is scarce. The RWJF public health law fellowship program provided a unique opportunity for the fellows to develop essential skills using an applied leadership model. Paralleling the competencies required of public health law practitioners, the faculty fellowship program was designed to enhance the fellows’ technical, behavioral, and professional proficiencies as a way of developing their capacity to address adaptive challenges faced in the design and implementation of their individual innovation projects.

Using a variety of learning formats, program faculty and mentors provided the fellows with the opportunity to further develop proficiency in leadership and conflict management, inter-professional collaboration, building community partnerships, and organizational change management. The program emphasized an “inside-out” approach by integrating self-knowledge and reflective practice (intra-personal skills) with team and community building (interpersonal skills) as the foundation for influencing change in organizations and their broader communities. The various learning formats were distributed throughout the fellowship year, beginning with the ten-day summer institute.

A Relational Approach to Learning and Leading

The fellows initiated their yearlong program with a ten-day summer institute intensive. As part of the institute, the fellows participated in a seven-day immersive learning program that was designed to exemplify a relational model for enhancing teaching and leading change. This relational framework incorporated a holistic approach that integrated intra- and interpersonal approaches to professional development along with expansion of technical expertise.

The seven-day immersive curriculum began with a focus on developing “knowledge of self” and expanded to include knowing oneself in the context of professional roles as educators, change agents, and community members. Described below are the learning formats and content used during the summer institute to facilitate the personal and professional development of the fellows and to set the stage for the initiation of their innovation projects.

Summer Intensive: Learning to Lead

Knowing “Self”

“Teaching and learning leadership development skills and aptitudes requires self-examination, introspection, getting to know oneself better, and becoming clearer regarding one’s own goals and values.”

Borrowing from the field of organization development, the curriculum was designed to incorporate the concept of “self-as-instrument” of change. Generally, this concept adopts the construct that leading others involves a relationship between the leader (teacher) and those who are part of the change process. In addition, to be effective, the leader (teacher) must do the intra-personal work needed for effectively engaging with others including obtaining self-knowledge regarding strengths, habits, patterns, triggers, conflict

The fellowship program emphasized the importance of integrating individual change (personal and professional development) with organizational change as twin pillars of the core competencies necessary for advancing public health law education. To further support the sustainability of the projects and ongoing scholarship, a community of practice model was utilized to create a network of like-minded colleagues who co-created resources and shared expertise in teaching, leadership, and academic change management.
styles, and other aspects of human interaction that are requisite for working interdependently.

To facilitate self-knowledge and reflective practice, prior to the institute the fellows were asked to complete the StrengthsFinder assessment and bring their results to the institute. In addition, the fellows were asked to begin an individual professional development journal identifying: their learning goals (personal and professional) for the program; their method for meeting those goals; their greatest challenges in implementing their project; how they would integrate the other fellows as support; other supports available; and updated learning goals following the institute. The journals were shared with the program team and mentors prior to the start of the institute to help guide the focus for mentoring and coaching.

The first day of the immersive learning program focused on learning about one's self in the context of working together within a team. The fellows participated in team-building exercises (ropes course, team games, and equine-facilitated learning) and a service-learning project (building trails). A group dialogue that integrated their observations from the team-building exercises with their StrengthsFinder results followed these activities. The facilitated discussion focused on each fellow's signature strengths and how the under- and over-use of strengths can impact team-effectiveness. The group discussed how to identify strengths in others, and the session set the stage for the ongoing application of self-insight and reflective practice as a part of professional growth and leadership effectiveness.

Building on the concept of self-as-instrument, the institute continued with application of self-knowledge in the context of the professional roles of teacher, organizational change agent, and community member.

**Self-Knowledge and the Role of Teacher**

“Good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher.”

To further the professional growth of the fellows, focus was placed on developing an understanding of how to bring their “whole self” into their work, particularly into their role as educators. Incorporating the interplay of self-awareness in the context of the dynamic system of teacher/student, the fellows had the opportunity to deepen their effectiveness as educators and reflect on their strengths and areas for growth as applied to use of pedagogical best practices.

The fellows spent two days learning innovative approaches to legal education that incorporated adult learning principles, particularly experiential learning. Working with master teachers, the fellows identified areas where they could enhance their effectiveness and creativity in their approach to educating adult learners, including incorporation of learners as co-designers of their courses. The fellows had the opportunity to apply the techniques to new courses they were creating as well as existing courses and clinics.

They also had the opportunity to reflect on which techniques felt “risky” or took them outside of their comfort zone and identify what they would need in order to use more innovative methods in their courses.

A number of the fellows participated in a session using applied improvisation techniques as a learning methodology to help learners expand beyond analytic thinking and develop adaptive capacity. In keeping with the premise that the “medium is the message,” the program faculty continued to use various learning modalities with the fellows throughout the institute to model a range of approaches for actively engaging learners.

**Self-Knowledge and Leading Organizational Change**

“Research has documented an overemphasis on a narrow conception of technical mastery, and an underemphasis on the imperative to connect education with professional leadership for challenging times.”

Leadership development has been underrepresented in legal training. As stated by Rhode, “Several decades of research have found that attorneys’ distinctive personality traits can pose a challenge for them as leaders, particularly when they are leading other lawyers. For example, lawyers tend to be above average in skepticism, competitiveness, ‘urgency,’ autonomy, and achievement orientation.” Rhode lists the following qualities of effective leaders that are rated as important across various leadership situations:

- “values (such as integrity, honesty, trust and an ethic of service);
- personal skills (such as self-awareness, self-control, self-direction)
- interpersonal skills (such as social awareness, empathy, persuasion and conflict management);
- vision (such as forward looking and inspirational); and
- technical competence (such as knowledge, preparation, and judgment).”

Given the complexity of implementing change within academic institutions, the immersive curriculum
included a day exploring aspects of organizational dynamics that are essential to effective change management. Content provided to the fellows covered the areas of conflict management and negotiation styles; emotional intelligence as a component of leading others; resistance to change; and inter-professional partnering.

The fellows completed the Thomas Kilmann conflict modes assessment to identify their dominant conflict styles, and they discussed the ramifications of these styles in addressing conflict within their work environments. In addition, they learned strategies for addressing resistance to change among colleagues and others and how conflict styles can impact personal response to resistance when it arises. The fellows were introduced to the concepts of emotional and social intelligence as essential for effective leadership, including how self-awareness and reflective practice are foundational to these qualities.

An additional method for supporting organizational change management skills was the use of a project plan to guide the progress of developing and implementing the fellows’ innovation projects. Prior to the institute, the fellows were asked to initiate a project plan using a template provided by the program team. The project plan prompted the fellows to think about the practical steps in implementing change within their organizations including the identification of stakeholders and their interests, and what might be needed to support the changes they proposed. The project plans also helped the fellows to identify resources and set time frames for achieving milestones throughout the fellowship year in order to track their progress. The plans were updated and submitted to the lead faculty mentors at various points throughout the program to monitor progress and provide the team with any indicators that help was needed by any of the fellows in moving their plans forward.

Self-Knowledge and Role as Community Member

“Attention to issues of teaching and learning often results in improvements and even experiments in teaching. And when innovation is the focus of a group of colleagues in and across institutions, the practice of teaching can become the basis of community, where the substantive knowledge about teaching and learning can be built upon and shared publicly over time, in the fashion of traditional academic scholarship, rather than being gained and lost anew with each individual teacher.”

The final days of the institute included presentations by the fellows of their initial project plans and an opportunity to receive feedback from their peers using peer coaching. The presentation format included the opportunity to ask questions of peers to gain clarity and identify areas to consider in moving forward with the plans. At the end of the institute, the fellows participated in a facilitated dialogue to integrate their insights and lessons learned from the previous ten days and to surface concerns and fears about re-entry and returning to their work environments. The dialogue and peer-coaching formats were used to deepen connections within the emerging community of practice and solidify their roles as members of this community. The fellows practiced supporting one another and created strategies for staying in touch, including conference calls and site visits throughout the fellowship year.

Coaching Support

To further support personal and professional development, the fellowship program provided the fellows and mentors with the opportunity to meet one on one with a professional coach both during the summer institute and throughout the fellowship year. Participation in coaching was voluntary and provided the participants with a confidential space for addressing challenges and deepening their capacity to lead change, manage competing priorities, and maintain their personal resilience.

During the summer institute, fellows and mentors sought out in-person, one-on-one spot coaching sessions. The sessions were typically an hour and provided the participants with an opportunity to think through their projects, identify potential barriers and concerns, and reflect on how their own personal habits and patterns could support or derail their efforts going forward. The sessions were confidential and provided the fellows with exposure to coaching as a learning modality as well as an opportunity to work through their own coachable issues.

Following the institute, the fellows were given the option of scheduling one-on-one coaching calls with the program coach to further support their professional growth and to trouble shoot issues that arose within the context of their projects. Seven of the ten fellows requested and received follow-up coaching by phone. A total of 25 coaching hours were provided throughout the fellowship year.

Areas of Coaching

The coaching sessions were rich and varied, and the topics addressed during the coaching sessions tended to fall into four categories:
1. **Managing Organizational Change**: resistance by faculty/others; structural challenges within the organization; negotiating resources; political landscape within the workplace; strategic thinking; aligning interests; working within hierarchical structures; dealing with power dynamics.

2. **Leadership Skills**: engaging in conflicts with co-workers; negotiating workload; prioritizing competing obligations; negotiating support from administration; creating a support network; building relationships and partnerships; addressing tenure obligations; developing effective teaching skills.

3. **Transition Planning**: rethinking career paths; optimizing current positions and future career/life goals; boundary setting; proactive management of career objectives and activities; connecting to personal purpose and goals for life contribution.

4. **Personal Growth and Resilience**: dealing with overwhelm and exhaustion; emotional intelligence; embedded habits and patterns in response to conflict and stress; health issues; dealing with the inner critic and self-doubt; impostor syndrome; blind spots; restoring energy and creativity; coping with the stress of service-oriented work and developing resilience techniques.

**Impact of Coaching**

In addition to the overall program evaluations, the fellows were provided an opportunity to evaluate the coaching component of the fellowship program. Feedback from the fellows regarding the use of coaching was very positive, and the fellows recommended including coaching and leadership development in future programs. In their coaching evaluations in response to the question, “How did the coaching component of the program help you with your overall change initiative/project?”, the fellows’ responses included the following:

- “It was key. I think that law schools know how to teach substantive law in a specific (old fashioned) way. I think most schools do not offer the affective and holistic professional skills essential to a fulfilling and productive career. The orientation of the fellowship, coupled with your [coach’s] influence, made me see the value in teaching/introducing students to these essential skills.”
- “It allowed me to identify and take a step back from negative (and unhelpful) relationships with two of my colleagues, both in terms of my research and the fellowship. As a result, I spent much less time and energy trying to process their comments and justify my work and, instead, was able to redirect that energy to getting more important stuff done.”
- “While I’ve had a bunch of training in different types of conflict management/engagement/resolution skills, I very much appreciated the opportunity to have help working through the immediate conflicts facing me. I would expect many future fellows to feel similarly.”
- “Generally speaking, you helped me to be more flexible, open, and creative when confronting change or resistance.”
- “I also used the year to soul search and can now articulate with clarity what feeds me professionally, and what does not. The freedom of being a... professor is that I have tremendous choice over what I do, and don’t do. I am much better positioned now to harness that incredible power.”
- “Learning how to take time for self-reflection (and walking) before/after potentially conflict-laden activities (and specifically scheduling in ‘me’ time).”

**Considerations for Future Programs**

Several lessons were culled from the experiences of the fellows, mentors, and program team during the course of the fellowship year. Several of these pertain to the inclusion of leadership development and organizational change as essential components of the program design. The fellows consistently acknowledged the challenges they faced in design and implementation of their projects due to unanticipated changes in resources or support; naturally occurring resistance to change; and the competing priorities that make taking on additional projects a challenge for busy academic professionals, particularly those who are working to break down barriers and/or seek tenure. Providing road maps and models to help them navigate change, manage conflict, and cope with organizational dynamics gave the fellows an opportunity to further develop their leadership skills in real time with the support of mentoring and coaching.

Support for the personal and professional growth of the fellows also stood out as a beneficial aspect of the program. The opportunity to self-reflect, understand strengths, work on effective coping patterns, better manage work/life tensions, negotiate competing commitments, and expand personal resilience were all added benefits valued by the fellows. Additionally, inclusion of a holistic methodology modeled for the fellows the importance of including more humanistic
approaches and content in their individual courses and their work with students and colleagues. Working with a professional coach gave the fellows the opportunity to experience how to come from a coaching stance as an effective strategy for developing adult learners, and several fellows indicated they would use a coaching approach more often with their students.

Conclusion
The leadership development and change management aspects of the fellowship program were integral to the personal and professional growth of the fellows and the successful implementation of their projects. The fellows frequently cited the need for remaining adaptive and flexible throughout their change initiatives as they stepped up to address unanticipated circumstances and navigate resistance to change and conflict. They also highlighted as essential the development of positive relationships within their community of practice as key to their ability to remain resilient and inspired throughout the fellowship year. Incorporating a holistic approach to learning for future fellowship programs would further enhance the development of academic leaders and support the sustainability of innovations designed to advance education in public health law.
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Introduction
Georgia State University College of Law, through the Center for Law, Health & Society, developed a pair of online libraries for faculty teaching public health law in schools of law or public health. Development of these libraries was funded by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation as part of The Future of Public Health Law Education: Faculty Fellowship Program.¹

One of the several goals of the fellowship program was to share and build resources that foster model approaches and best practices for teaching public health law. In support of this goal, the two online libraries were developed to provide access to existing public health law resources to the fellows during the fellowship program as they designed courses, externships, and clinics for their fellowship projects, as well as to provide access to existing resources and new resources developed by the fellows and others as part of the fellowship to faculty teaching public health law beyond the fellowship program’s conclusion. Both online libraries can be accessed at law.gsu.edu/PHLFellowship.

Public Health Law Research Guide
The first online library is the Public Health Law Research Guide (see Figure 1).² This research guide is publicly accessible and includes a database of substantive public health law materials for use in courses and research by faculty, students, and others. This guide was compiled by graduate research assistants under direction of fellowship program lead Charity Scott and Stacie Kershner. Fellows and mentors with the fellowship program reviewed the site, provided feedback, and suggested edits which were incorporated. The research guide is regularly curated to add new materials and to remove outdated ones. Materials selected for the research guide are considered introductory for a target academic audience new to public health law or to specific topics within public health law. The site is hosted and maintained through the Georgia State Law Library using the Springshare LibGuides platform.³

The research guide is broken down into categories. These include an introduction to public health law, an overview of public health practice, and broad topics such as communicable disease prevention and control, chronic disease prevention, injury prevention, and environmental health. These topic areas were selected because the coverage reflects that of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and state public health agencies and because these categories generally align with the textbooks most commonly used for introductory public health law courses. Within each category is a series of materials, including links to relevant government agencies and organizations, textbooks and study aids, journal articles, seminal court cases, videos, and other research materials. Faculty may use materials on this site during class, assign readings or videos from the site, or suggest that students access the materials for a starting point when conducting research or as review for exams.

Stacie P. Kershner, J.D., is the Associate Director of the Center for Law Health & Society, and Adjunct Professor of Law, teaching Public Health Law at Georgia State University College of Law. Previously, she was a fellow in the Public Health Law Program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. She was the Co-Project Director for The Future of Public Health Law Education: Faculty Fellowship Program, which was supported by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to Georgia State University College of Law and its Center for Law, Health & Society.
Public Health Law Faculty Teaching Resources

The second online library, Public Health Law Faculty Teaching Resources, features a database of teaching tools and other materials (see Figure 2). This site offers a collection of materials that can be used by faculty teaching public health law and related courses such as food and drug law, HIV/AIDS and the law, legal preparedness for public health emergencies, or tobacco control. Upon demonstrating proof of teaching a course in this area, faculty may request a login and password to access these materials. The site is password protected to encourage faculty to contribute their own resources and to use materials on the site without fear that students have accessed these materials outside of class.

One of the several goals of the fellowship program was to share and build resources that foster model approaches and best practices for teaching public health law. In support of this goal, the two online libraries were developed to provide access to existing public health law resources to the fellows during the fellowship program as they designed courses, externships, and clinics for their fellowship projects, as well as to provide access to existing resources and new resources developed by the fellows and others as part of the fellowship to faculty teaching public health law beyond the fellowship program’s conclusion. Both online libraries can be accessed at law.gsu.edu/PHLFellowship.

While the format for the site was developed by fellowship program leads, the web design was provided by the Network for Public Health Law, a sister program funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The Network will continue to host and maintain the site. A primary reason for this is in recognition of the Network’s function as a hub for various professionals in public health law to connect and collaborate in a centralized location, including legal counsel for public health departments, practitioners, and now faculty. The Network has a variety of public health law tools that may be beneficial to faculty, aside from these teaching resources, and faculty can easily identify experts in the field through the Network’s website that may provide updated information, offer a greater understanding of how legal issues play out in the field, and serve as guest speakers. A separate but related project, the Student Network for Public Health Law, is also housed on the Network’s site and is a resource for law students interested in practicing public health law after graduation, providing information on careers and opportunities for networking. A secondary reason for housing the site with the Network is practical. The Network’s grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation is for multiple years which will help to ensure sustainability of the teaching resources.

Once logged in, faculty are able to access a compilation of teaching tools and materials such as syllabi, case studies, bibliographies, and slides. These materials cover a variety of topic areas in public health law and were created by the fellows, mentors, and other public health law faculty. Faculty may download materials for their courses and use them as written or adapt them to their course. After using these tools and materials, faculty can provide feedback on how they used the materials, what worked well, and any modifications they may have made to adjust for class size, format, or recent changes to statutes or regulations.

Faculty are encouraged to upload their own teaching tools to the site as well. New contributions to the site will help make it a robust and valued teaching resource. As public health law is a broad and constantly changing field, the teaching site allows for faculty to obtain materials developed by individuals with expertise in certain topics and to contribute materials in areas of their own expertise. The site is also a way for faculty to develop relationships with each other as new faculty reach out to veteran faculty for additional information and advice with the materials on the site serving as a conversation starter.

Anecdotally, syllabi and case studies or class exercises appear to be the most popular materials for faculty on this site. Faculty compare and contrast syllabi of their colleagues when designing their own courses to organize the order of topics, determine the amount of attention to give a particular topic, select readings, and plan individual assignments and class exercises. Case studies and class exercises offer faculty an opportunity to teach core competencies of skills and values, in addition to knowledge, through hands-on learning.

Network for Public Health Law, “Public Health Law Faculty Teaching Resources,” available at <https://www.networkforphl.org/faculty_teaching_resources/> (last visited January 21, 2016) (this site is password protected; faculty may request a password from the Network on the site).
Through case studies and class exercises, students are able to practice identifying legal issues, applying relevant law, analyzing the impact of possible legal interventions, and assessing additional considerations such as ethics, policy, and health equity, in the safe environment of a hypothetical but real-world scenario.

The teaching resources library provides faculty with limited time the opportunity to focus on developing a few key exercises of their own and to borrow or tailor exercises developed by other faculty, expanding the repertoire that can be used with their students. Currently, there are over 30 case studies and exercises on the site addressing topics such as quarantine of disease carriers, vaccination and religious objections, tobacco advertising and cartoons, the movie *Contagion*, abatement of nuisances, and gun control, among others.

**Future**

Both online libraries have a variety of materials that are useful to public health law faculty teaching in schools of law and public health and related graduate programs where public health law is taught. Initial materials on each site provide a solid foundation on which to build robust databases. To ensure the future of the online libraries developed through the fellowship program, faculty who find the materials beneficial will need to continue to access the materials, provide feedback, and contribute materials for others to access. Funding for development of additional resources is also critical. For example, several fellows have suggested that short videos or podcasts on specific hot topics in public health law would be valuable for enhancing their courses. Creating these videos would require funding to identify the appropriate experts in the field, arrange for and conduct the recording, and post the video or podcast to the online library.

While these libraries are specific to public health law, the concepts could be replicated in other teaching fields. Although virtual, libraries like these serve to connect faculty teaching in similar areas, helping to foster a sense of community and connection.

**Contact**

For more information about the online libraries or to provide feedback, suggest additions, or contribute materials, contact Stacie Kershner, J.D., Associate Director for the Center for Law, Health & Society at Georgia State University College of Law.

**References**

4. Network for Public Health Law, “Public Health Law Faculty Teaching Resources,” available at <https://www.networkforphl.org/faculty_teaching-resources/> (last visited January 21, 2016). (This site is password protected; faculty may request a password from the Network on the site).
Innovation in Higher Education: Lessons Learned from Creating a Faculty Fellowship Program

Nancy J. Kaufman and Charity Scott

Program Conception at RWJF
When the Strategic Vision Group conducted a needs assessment in 2009 to look at gaps for advancing the field of public health law for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF), leaders in public health practice, legal counsel to public health organizations, and academics with expertise in law and public health identified three areas of need: attracting new lawyers to public health careers, strengthening faculty and public health law curricula, and building working relationships among lawyers and practitioners in public health within states. Specific public health law experiences and needs gathered through a national sample of state and local public health officers and their counsel provided additional fellowship recommendations. Responding to these needs, one of the authors (Kaufman) worked with staff at RWJF to design and pilot five fellowship programs, of which two focused on faculty.

Kaufman and RWJF staff originally conceived a faculty fellowship program, which ultimately emerged as “The Future of Public Health Law Education” program that is the subject of this supplement issue of JLME, as a one-year experience for ten professors of law within law and public health schools that would include: an intensive two-week on-site professional development experience focused on effective teaching, public health practice, and self-discovery; connecting fellows to schools of public health and strong state/local/tribal health departments; providing them tools and examples of curricula through a resource library; and periodic contact with institute faculty and mentors for 11 months following the institute. We expected fellows to create a course or courses, clinical experiences, or externships in public health law practice to be offered at their schools and to share these among the cohort and with others through an online resource library. To improve the potential for curricular change and sustainability, RWJF also required engagement of the fellows’ deans.

Armed with these ideas, we then searched for leadership to bring the ideas to life. During interviews with leaders in public health law academics, interviewees consistently recommended two leaders: Charity Scott and Diane Hoffmann. They agreed to work together, with Scott directing the program and Hoffmann focusing on engaging the deans.

Program Development
Like creating a quilt from bits and pieces of fabric, we formed a program team of Georgia State University (GSU) law faculty and staff, RWJF staff, and consultants to create a fellowship program from the sketchy initial ideas and recommendations, a process that took 18 months before the kickoff in July 2014.
to the year-long fellowship program with an intensive 10-day summer institute in Park City, Utah. The program team undertook planning for the summer institute and fellowship program against a backdrop of principles of adult learning to maximize the fellows’ learning and to model methods and tools for teaching public health law. Hopefully, the institute’s agenda, which implicitly incorporated these principles, would encourage the fellows to model them for students at their home schools. Many of these principles have been articulated in the classic text on adult learning by Malcolm Knowles and others:

**Learners’ need to know:** Before adult learners will learn something, they often need to know why they need to know it. Learners need to see how the educational activities are relevant to their lives or careers. The program team knew at the outset of the summer institute what the fellows’ initial project plans were, and so we could incorporate activities and workshops that would have direct applicability and relevance to their curriculum projects.

**Learners’ self-concept:** Adults are autonomous and self-directed, which creates a self-concept of being responsible for their own lives and decisions; they can resent or resist situations which feel like impositions of others’ wills. The program team incorporated opportunities for the fellows to establish their own learning goals at the outset of the summer institute and to revise them over the course of the fellowship year. We also encouraged the fellows, perhaps more than they had done previously in their teaching, to let their students take more responsibility for determining their own learning objectives and outcomes and for designing some parts of the new courses as they evolved over the semester.

**Role of learners’ experiences:** Adults bring a wealth of prior experiences to any educational activity, so emphasis should be on experiential techniques that tap into these experiences, such as group discussions, simulations, and problem-solving and peer-helping activities. The summer institute would be designed to model these and other experiential-learning methods in nearly all of its teaching formats, and fellows would be encouraged to adopt them as appropriate for their own curricular projects.

**Readiness to learn:** If they understand why they are learning something, adults come ready to learn it. The program team hoped that the summer institute would leverage the fellows’ readiness to learn (evidenced by their wanting to be in the fellowship program) into genuine enthusiasm for new ways of thinking about and engaging in teaching.

**Orientation to learning:** Adults are life-centered in their learning, meaning that they learn new knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes most effectively in the context of real-life situations. The summer institute took advantage of the local Park City community for many of its learning activities, and the program encouraged the fellows’ development and use of field trips, community partnerships, real-life case studies, and simulated problem-solving exercises for their own students.

**Learners’ motivation:** While adults can be responsive to extrinsic factors (e.g., rewards in the form for grades or raises), intrinsic factors (e.g., increased personal happiness or satisfaction) can be more powerful motivators to learn new things. The program team was fortunate to be dealing with a highly intrinsically motivated group of fellows at the summer institute, who were breaking new ground in legal and public health education simply because they wanted to and thought it was important to do so.

Overall, the program team designed a summer institute and fellowship program that could reflect these principles for a student-centered model of teaching and would encourage a shift by faculty from the traditional role of teacher to the more effective role of facilitator of students’ learning. We also sought to create a community of practice among the faculty fellows, their faculty mentors and deans, the program team, and other institute participants, academic experts, and public health practitioners, to provide support for the fellows and encourage interchange of ideas and experiences beyond the cohort as a means for enhancing sustainability. Our goal was to create an experiential-learning, professional-development program that would enrich the teaching and learning of public health law by students and faculty, and hopefully would have a lasting national impact on the teaching of practice-based public health law.

Despite some challenges, this pilot fellowship program achieved its goals and has yielded rich lessons. What worked well? What were the challenges? How might things be done differently? What were critical components if this program or a variant were undertaken again? What do we see as the future for this form of higher-education professional development? What follows is a reflection on these questions based on conversations with the participants, their reports, our experiences over the course of the year-long fellowship program, and Kaufman’s discussions and meeting observations undertaken as the program evaluator for RWJF and the program’s quality-improvement efforts.

### What Worked Well

**Summer Institute**

Virtually all of the participants said that the summer institute at Park City was a highlight and primary
driver of success for the fellowship program. This intense, focused experience at the beginning of the fellowship year created rapid bonding and trust, allowing for self-reflection and sharing of concerns and ideas. As a result, fellows made significant adjustments in their project plans and left the institute energized, using the momentum coming out of the experience to push them ahead through barriers and challenges that occurred back home. Having the program model different forms of teaching stimulated fellows to incorporate new methods into their projects (e.g., externships, clinics, site visits, and hands-on projects with public health practitioners). The variation in participants’ professional disciplines, practice experiences, and public health law teaching topics and methods created new insights and tools for fellows to use in carrying out their projects. The thoughtful planning of the agenda, along with the specially chosen location and demeanor of the program team, mentors, and other speakers and faculty, signaled to the fellows that they were valued as people beyond their teaching roles.

The fellows attributed the rapid formation of a community of practice and lasting professional relationships to these factors. Another important bonding factor noted by fellows and mentors was the experiential learning day spent at the National Ability Center, where all participants labored side by side in a service project (building a trail), challenge courses, and sensory experiences (working non-verbally with horses and dining blind-folded). Along with time for socializing in group meals off-site and recreational pursuits, the summer institute created a work hard/learn a lot/have fun atmosphere. As one fellow noted, “I have attended countless conferences, workshops, symposia, retreats, and professional development programs.... This fellowship was, and I suspect, will remain the most impactful of my career because of the sustained time learning together with so many guests and mentors during the summer institute that carried me through my project and the year.”

Deans’ Engagement

The requirement that the fellows’ deans attend the summer institute had a number of underlying rationales. First, their presence signaled that they were personally invested in the success of their fellows. Second, the summer institute provided them with a “mental map” and understanding of the public health law field, both in academia and in society, which was not necessarily part of their own disciplinary backgrounds. For the public health and social work deans, they gained more awareness of the important role that law plays in promoting the public’s health and its relevance for their graduate students. For many law deans, the institute represented their first in-depth exposure to the public health world, its role in social justice, and its opportunities for employment of law graduates; they particularly appreciated hearing from the practitioner roundtables about the jobs open to law graduates and the factors the public and private-sector agencies look for when hiring. Third, all deans could appreciate how much they had in common across disciplinary fields, particularly the value of and need for increased interdisciplinary and community-engaged learning opportunities for all of their students. As one dean said, “I now have one more concrete example I can point to for my philosophy of a contextualized, interdisciplinary, team approach to legal work. Also the project is sensitizing our faculty to law as a social determinant of health.”

Afterwards, fellows, mentors, and the deans themselves reflected on the importance of requiring their engagement. Bringing in the deans brought sage higher-education political expertise, credibility, and support to the fellows and program.

Professional Development Approach

Fellows reported developing professionally as teachers, both for their new public health law courses and for their other courses. Many described their fellowship experience as “transformational”: they gained confidence, learned to take risks, developed a richer knowledge base about public health and the real world of practice, enhanced relationship-building skills, learned to problem-solve through barriers (including reaching out to other colleagues for advice and support), and developed leadership skills. The confidential coaching sessions with the development coach were seen as particularly useful. One fellow reflected on the value of having the time and a close network of colleagues with whom to explore and brainstorm how to teach more effectively: “Most of the time our interactions with other faculty are related to discussing administrative matters, not how or even what we teach....Teaching can be a relatively solitary process. Talking through the challenges as well as those moments when students ‘get it’ with this group has been one of the most important professional opportunities I have had.”

Community of Practice

All fellows reported using the community of practice extensively during the fellowship year and after. Begun at the summer institute, it was strengthened during the fellowship year by frequent calls and email exchanges, working on case studies and student assessment methods together, and exchanging course and clinic materials. It was also reinforced by in-per-
son get-togethers and collaborative presentations at professional conferences during the year, by giving presentations at each other’s schools, and by inviting onto their campuses other experts in public health law with whom they had connected through the program during the year.

Impact
Students
The students enrolled in the fellows’ classes, externships, and collaborations with health departments clearly benefited from the new methods of teaching. Some expressed amazement that public health law had not been taught in their school before. Many learned to approach problem-solving in interdisciplinary teams of law and public health students or through interacting with public health and community agencies as part of their course assignments, and some experienced learning across other disciplines (e.g., with social work, nursing, and medical students, and with professionals in urban planning and community development). The law students found inclusion of other professional students very helpful to their learning. Projects required students to practice interdisciplinary communication skills. Students also participated actively in generating course content and outcomes as faculty stepped back and let them lead.

Students saw how different areas of law (e.g., constitutional, civil rights, insurance, and even international laws) connect through the public health case studies and projects they worked on. They learned about policy processes and how coalitions are built and sustained. Most importantly, students realized that lawyers cannot create policy change alone and that more can be accomplished through interdisciplinary teams than solo-profession approaches. And several students expressed interest in pursuing careers in public health law.

Students’ experiential learning was much different than learning approaches in other courses, and profoundly affected their thinking and skills. As one student reflected:

Prior to my enrollment in law school I was a police officer for 12 years…. I assumed that the best way to address a problem was head on; kick the door in and neutralize the threat…. As I was initially introduced to the [project — helping youth suffering from severe asthma], I attempted to apply my prior problem-solving technique…. I quickly found out that…every door I intended to knock down only led to another door, or worse yet a wall!… [I soon realized] that the problem of childhood asthma…is a multi-layered issue requiring an organized effort from many people in the community…. I began to see that rather than being the hammer that smashes the door, I needed to step back and instead join the many cogs working together to solve this serious problem. I was excited to see ‘cogs’ like doctors, lawyers, social workers, and the…Mayor all working in unison. Participating [in this project] has been a highlight of my law school career and given me a new perspective on problem-solving and renewed hope in the ability of our community and its leaders to work together for the betterment of our future.

University
Deans noted the increasing interest from university leadership for creating practice-ready professionals who have experienced collaborating with community agencies, and they used their fellows’ projects as examples of how their schools collaborate and engage with the community. Several deans reported improved relationships with their communities as a result of the fellowship, and a number are being highlighted by university administration in their communications to alumni, the community, and their boards of trustees.

Overall, deans demonstrated support for the fellowship and helped their fellows work through barriers. Several engaged other deans at their universities to sustain or broaden interdisciplinary learning and collaborations with communities. Communities are now approaching several of the law schools for help with other policy issues. Two deans and one fellow reported their participation in the fellowship raised their reputation in the field of health/public health law. One dean reflected on her faculty fellow’s innovative use of new technology to make online materials readily available to the students throughout their externship experience with a public health organization, whenever the information becomes relevant and valuable: “This is a real innovation in teaching, which if we can manage to translate into legal pedagogy more broadly, would represent a real improvement to law teaching—which hasn’t changed appreciably in a few centuries.”

Fellows
All fellows experimented with and incorporated experiential, practice-based learning into their teaching. The program, credibility of the RWJF fellow designation, attendance of deans during a portion of the summer institute, and the reputations of program leadership increased fellows’ standing with their deans and among faculty peers. In some cases this visibility brought new assignments and requests from their schools or community partners, stretching limited
time they had to commit to their fellowship projects even further. Fellows learned how to reach out and work with people new to them in the community, experienced in implementing new and cross-disciplinary courses and the burden imposed by the program in submitting progress reports and updates to their project plans and professional development journals, and participating in calls with mentors, the program lead, and the cohort. A timing crunch occurred when the fellows’ final reports and the program’s closing conference occurred at their busiest time of year — in May at the end of the semester and graduation — and before the final student evaluations were submitted. For some fellows, the 12-month fellowship period proved too short for designing and implementing all of the components of their project plans and getting them through university approval processes.

- **Recommendations:** In retrospect, the fellowship program might have been improved by the following:
  1. Providing a stipend to the fellows (or their schools) to buy out some teaching time for them during the fellowship year (e.g., a course release), perhaps matched in some portion by a time release commitment from their school for faculty service/committee work;
  2. Extending the fellowship year by three to six months, to allow final reports and the closing conference to occur during the summer after the school year;
  3. Limiting the fellows’ written submissions to the program during the year and allowing more time to develop their projects’ tangible products and teaching tools (like case studies and interdisciplinary assessment instruments); and
  4. Allowing more flexibility in the timing and format of periodic conference calls and check-ins among the fellows, perhaps teaming up pairs of fellows rather than the entire cohort on these calls, and using pairs to do progress checks with each other as one way to reduce the number of written update progress reports.

**Challenges and Recommendations**

As with any pilot effort, the participants and program team faced significant challenges. We learned from these challenges and made adjustments along the way, where possible. The following section describes some of these challenges and our recommendations for addressing them.

**Time Constraints**

Fellows, deans, and mentors all mentioned the workload burden for the fellows on top of their other teaching and faculty duties. Few fellows received release time. The workload turned out to be much more than originally anticipated, often due to the difficulties they would face in enacting changes that would both complement their educational experience and be academically significant. All fellows stepped “out of the box” of typical teaching and took risks, learning that thoughtful risk-taking brings rewards. All intend to incorporate new teaching methods and student experiences into their teaching more broadly.

Fellows also benefitted from the program’s nurturing of their capacities for self-reflection and professional growth. As one fellow reflected:

“I’ve spent a significant amount of my education and career feeling “less than” I should be or barely “good enough.” Working with the folks in the fellowship program over the course of this year, I have had more than a handful of moments where I felt like I have actively moved projects and conversations forward because I was actually the right person, with the right skills and perspective, for the job or the question. It has been a tremendous joy working with a group of hard-working, smart folks who consciously look for and celebrate each others’ strengths. I’d like to think I’m becoming one of those people.”

**Designing New Interdisciplinary Courses**

Fellows with interdisciplinary projects sometimes faced significant administrative challenges beyond those experienced within just one school when creating a new course. Working with other professional schools having their own processes exacerbated complexities and lengthened time for approval — in one
case, it took the entire fellowship year to accomplish the necessary interdisciplinary approvals and thus the course could be offered only at the fellow’s own school during the fellowship year. Class calendaring also presented major barriers. Professional schools operate with different calendars and class schedules, complicating finding an overlap time when jointly-listed courses could be taught. Securing course approvals through different multiple schools revealed different requirements and credit-hour calculations for different professional schools.

Lack of student opportunities to take elective courses, due to the number of courses that may be required in a professional degree program, may limit enrollment in new public health law offerings. Law students may focus on courses felt to be related to passing the bar exam. Public health education accreditation requirements can leave room for few electives, creating challenges in establishing a multi-disciplinary learning environment.

University system reimbursement for teaching time also can create potential barriers to teaching on an interdisciplinary basis. Some fellows discovered that tuition dollars per credit enrolled went to the school the student was registered in, even if faculty from another school taught the course. Deans facing budget cuts and schools where faculty positions require income generation noted the issue would need resolution for course sustainability.

Several fellows based in law schools also faced faculty resistance. One fellow dealt with concerns that collaborating with other professions might interfere with lawyers exercising independent judgement. In a number of schools, faculty expressed concerns that the new courses might interfere with students’ taking the courses required to pass bar exams.

The deans proved essential in negotiating solutions where barriers occurred.

• **Recommendations:** As strong advocates of the benefits of interdisciplinary education, we would recommend the following measures to address the administrative burdens of implementing interdisciplinary courses and enrolling students from different disciplines:
  1. Encouraging deans to acknowledge the benefits of interdisciplinary learning and to lead university efforts to accommodate interdisciplinary enrollments across their campuses;
  2. Encouraging faculty who engage in interdisciplinary or community-engaged courses to share their experiences at informal gatherings of their faculty and administrators (as the fellows were required to do during the fellowship year);
  3. Sharing best practices for how other schools address scheduling, credit hours, creating more elective slots, and tuition flow and reimbursement for interdisciplinary courses; and
  4. Encouraging public health schools and their accreditation body to decrease required courses or otherwise allow more flexibility in program requirements in order to free up time for electives, such as public health law.

**Demands on Students**

Fellows discovered that teaching through group projects and working with community agencies on legal projects required more time commitment from students than traditional courses. A number of fellows cut back the assignments or restructured the complexity of them to fit student schedules and expectations. For group work and discussion, especially multi-disciplinary ones, more class time was needed, and coverage of assigned course materials had to be pared back. In the future some credit-hour increases may be needed to allow sufficient time for both coverage of subject-matter content and work on team-based projects.

• **Recommendations:** Each of the fellows’ projects was unique and new, so all were undertaken in the spirit of experimentation and some trial and error. We recommend that they, like all faculty teaching a new course for the first time:
  1. Use their first pilot experience to refine their syllabi and adjust their coverage, expectations, and pacing;
  2. Share with their community of practice a set of best-practice time estimates for various types of activities, both inside and outside of the classroom; and
  3. Consider whether aspects of their course justify a request for an overall credit-hour increase or a different staging of components of their course, perhaps over two semesters.

**Community Partnerships**

While the projects with health departments and related community organizations produced many benefits for the students and their partner agencies, several challenges emerged. Engaging health departments in work with students often proved tricky, in that the departments were often short-staffed and the fellows did not want to create undue burden on
department staff. Likewise, managing expectations of health department staff about the skill sets and time available from students became important so that the fellows did not disappoint new community partners.

- **Recommendations:** For faculty who engage in practice-based learning with community partners, we recommend that they:
  1. Discuss up-front their mutual interests and separate challenges, their own and their community partner’s expectations of their respective roles and responsibilities, and the realities of student participation, and ensure that there is alignment of these understandings;
  2. Manage expectations and track progress through periodic check-ins with partners and students; and
  3. Intervene after students have encountered challenges or conflicts within their teams, insufficient guidance or unreasonable expectations from their community partner, or other problem that the students have tried but cannot solve on their own.

**Relationship Building**

Establishing an interdisciplinary course and practice-based experiences within community agencies requires navigating and cultivating a complex network of relationships. For some fellows, the time to create working relationships took longer than anticipated and, along with the numerous steps required for coordination, created frustrations. Within law schools, some fellows faced feelings from other faculty that their novel courses were not sufficiently related to helping students pass the bar exam. The deans facilitated connections for the fellows but allowed the fellows to take the lead in developing relationships and negotiating what they needed.

- **Recommendations:** Looking back over the summer institute and fellowship program, we would recommend retaining some features and incorporating others to foster good skills and opportunities for building the constructive relationships needed for successful change in higher education, such as:
  1. Retaining fellowship training on negotiation skills and organizational change theory, while increasing conflict-resolution training;
  2. Retaining engagement of a professional coach with conflict-resolution and medi-
ing calls with the professional development coach, who provided advice, modeled language suggestions for negotiating, and supplied relevant literature about relationship building.18

• Recommendations: Good mentoring, feedback, and coaching skills have typically not been explicitly and systematically fostered as part of faculty members’ professional development in law and other professional schools. In light of the fellows’ experiences being mentored, it would be beneficial to use this cohort of fellows as mentors in any similar future fellowship program. In hindsight, the fellowship program might have been improved by:
1. More in-depth training for the mentors in good mentoring skills during or before the summer institute and increased stipend for mentors’ participation in the fellowship program;
2. Training for the fellows on methods for using mentors constructively;
3. Having fellows and mentors develop mutual guidance for structuring their calls and making agreements on how much (and what kind of) substantive feedback on course materials and other project components or concerns was desired; and
4. Encouraging calls via Skype to enhance face time with each other, as there was consensus that in-person conversations were generally more effective than audio-only phone calls.

Program Administration
Just as the fellows had underestimated how much time and work would be involved in implementing their new projects, RWJF and the program team underestimated the amount of time and level of effort that were needed to simultaneously conduct a competitive application and selection process for the fellows while also planning the summer institute and program year. As one author (Scott) observed, “Planning a ten-day conference is like planning ten weddings.” All of the participants, including the program team, have personal and professional lives and responsibilities outside of the fellowship program, and being graciously accommodating of the inevitable curve balls (e.g., unexpected health, family, or job-related concerns) that everyone is going to be thrown at some point over the course of a year is as necessary to good program administration as having a solid structure within which to organize it.

• Recommendations: To ensure careful advance planning, a clear structure and management system for the program, and good humor when the unexpected happens, we recommend retaining several measures that were adopted during this program’s development:
1. Beginning with the end in mind — selecting the right program team (faculty, staff, consultants, and mentors) and setting out agreed-upon goals and desired outcomes at the outset, and then developing the activities to achieve them;
2. Designing the program evaluation instruments to measure success in achieving those specific goals and desired outcomes;
3. Clarifying what is expected of all program participants, either through conference calls or written memos outlining deliverables and timelines, and gently overseeing compliance; and
4. Remaining flexible in the face of challenges and being open to new opportunities, as both will inevitably arise during the course of any year-long program.

Critical Components for Success
We offer the following as the key components of the fellowship program that were unique to it and that were critical to its success:

1. Its focus on teaching rather than substantive content: By modeling different methods for teaching at the beginning of the program, it encouraged creativity and expanded skill sets that earned positive feedback from students, faculty colleagues, and the community.
2. Intensive, experiential-learning institute at the beginning of the program set the stage for new skills acquisition with appropriate pacing to both enhance reflection and allow for rapid bonding through group activities and fun social events.
3. Freedom to innovate, with support for taking risks: Innovation and community engagement was encouraged at the summer institute by, for example, including service learning, field visits to observe real-world public health practice, and healthy food service. Risk-taking was practiced and encouraged, with personal coaching and support from peers, mentors, the project team, and consultants throughout the fellowship year.
4. Establishing a community of practice: It was important both to foster this collegial com-
munity from the outset of the program in order to create trust and a support network for fellows that would encourage cooperation and creativity, and to nurture and expand it throughout the fellowship year and afterwards through the sharing of resources and jointly developed products, the creation of the online, publicly accessible libraries, and connections with other public health law experts and leaders nationally.

5. Emphasis on professional and leadership development through the provision of professional coaching services and mentor support and guidance. The fellowship program was purposefully designed with these components in mind, from its initial training at the summer institute, followed by opportunities for self-reflection, professional coaching, and mentoring feedback throughout the year.

Other factors that were important contributors to the success of the program included:

1. Leadership: The organizational capacity and experience of the whole program team, coupled with credibility, extraordinary passion for public health law, and commitment of the lead faculty/project director and deans’ consultant, were noted by many participants as critical to the successes achieved. These leaders received strong support and participation from GSU’s president and law school dean. As with many ventures, especially innovative ones, choosing leaders with “the right stuff” can be the difference between success and failure.

2. Engaging deans at the summer institute: The requirement that deans attend broadened their understanding of the importance of law in creating healthy communities and fostered bonding with their fellows, resulting in their support for innovation and guidance for organizational change and sustainability.

3. RWJF brand: The stature of RWJF as a national leader in public health added credibility and recognition for the fellows, deans, their schools, and the university — in many cases increasing their visibility and standing within the academy and the communities in which they are located. This standing helped pave the way for improving relationships and interactions internally and perhaps more importantly with communities, by replacing “ivy tower” stereotypes with real assistance and mutual ways to enhance professional education and community health.

4. Mix of fellows: The professional backgrounds, disciplines, and schools of the fellows brought interdisciplinary views to the program, enriching the content of training sessions and the community of practice. The broad range of project curricular innovations — from helping a health department meet accreditation, to researching a topic and making recommendations to a health department about a service it was considering regulating (tattoo parlors), to participating in a community-wide effort to reduce severe asthma in children, to establishing medical-legal partnership clinics — demonstrated ideas for future course activities among the fellows and engaged the fellows in helping each other based upon their own expertise.

Envisioning the Future

As fellows described it, the “gift” of the fellowship program was integrating substantive public health law with best teaching practices, experiential learning skills, relationship building, and personal development. It has had profound impact on the fellows and changed their visions and tool boxes as teachers and spilled over beyond the boundaries of a one-year program.

Sustainability of these efforts remains a question; yet, we remain optimistic. Certainly all of the fellows’ projects illustrate advances in the kinds of curriculum reforms advocated by the Carnegie Foundation Report and reflected in new ABA accreditation standards for law schools. Many of the deans already have moved ahead with ideas to sustain or expand multidisciplinary and practice-based teaching. Building strong internal and external relationships and a network of colleagues to call on provides additional support for continuing these higher-education innovations, or creating even better ones.

Sustainability and spread of innovations requires telling the stories of the experiences and results in a compelling way. We encourage the fellows and their schools and universities to partner with their community collaborators to continue to create a record of what happened in their projects and thereafter, and to use numerous media for communicating these results.

If our nation is to build a “culture of health,” as RWJF encourages us to do, we must prepare professionals to understand and work alongside each other and their communities, as part of the community solution to complex issues. Higher education currently is
not yet fully prepared to take on this challenge and bring down its siloed walls. We hope this fellowship program and others pave the way towards achieving this goal.
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