

Stages in the Development of Health Pathway Systems- Jeff Oxendine and Kevin Barnett, October 2014

Key Factors	Low Readiness for Pathway Development Stage 1	Pathway Interest and Potential 2	Strong Programs/Leaders to Anchor Pathway Development 3	Maturing Multi-level Pathways, Increasing Coordination 4	Comprehensive, Sustainable Pathway System producing results 5
Perceptions, Priorities and Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership and key stakeholders do not perceive a case for pathway development • Not linked/ integral to true area priorities • Major competing priorities/conditions • Political or attitudinal barriers to developing pathways • Major leadership changes or organizational transitions among key stakeholders that limit readiness or commitment. • Limited capacity of organizations to do pathway work • Major community issues will overshadow pathway development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing support for pathways from some key leaders • Conceptual linkage of pathway development to area priorities • Emerging case and urgency • Competing priorities but not insurmountable • Potential to overcome political or capacity barriers • Sufficient stability in key leadership roles to support pathways • Potential to align and leverage other related local initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership perceives case for pathways and provides some support • Awareness of one or more strong area pathway programs • Pathway development is part of/linked to major area and partner priorities • Increasing case and urgency for pathway development. • Higher competing priorities but conditions becoming more favorable • Potential to overcome political or capacity barriers • Sufficient stability in key leadership roles to support pathways • Growing potential to align with and leverage BMOC, education reform , economic and other related initiatives • Growing perception that pathway programs are important to success of priority initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership is persuaded of the case for pathway development • Pathway development is among or integral to top area priorities. • Pathway development among and across <u>multiple</u> educational levels is a priority and feasible. • Sufficient capacity among key organizations to engage in and advance pathway development • Progress to institutionalize pathway programs • Stability of multiple key leaders and organizations • Potential for alignment with BMOC, education and other related initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compelling case for comprehensive pathway development is demonstrated. • Leadership has acted on the case and support pathways. • Pathway development is central to highest area and partner priorities • Current pathway efforts have solid support. • Pathway programs becoming institutionalized • Community conditions and capacity for pathway development strengthening • Increasing alignment and leverage with BMOC, Education reform or other related community initiatives

Key Factors	Low Readiness for Pathway Development Stage 1	Pathway Interest and Potential 2	Strong Programs/Leaders to Anchor Pathway Development 3	Maturing Multi-level Pathways, Increasing Coordination 4	Comprehensive, Sustainable Pathway System producing results 5
Champions and Drivers of Pathway Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No or few champions for pathway development Success of area priority initiatives not linked to pathway programs Health workforce needs not compelling and/or leading to collective pathway action Employment and educational needs not compelling or linked to pathway development. Education reform not linked to career pathways or work-based learning No interest in pursuing collaborative efforts to secure funding for pathway development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing perception that pathways and workforce are important Several key champions express interest in pathways system and coordination Pathways linked to economic, education or health initiatives Compelling health workforce needs Interest in seeking funds for programs and collaborative efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple key and capable champions are motivated to expand pathways and coordinate One or more proven programs in the region can serve as anchor or foundation for pathway expansion to other partners and levels Compelling area health workforce and education needs Need to secure funding to sustain programs Awarded funding to expand pathways or need to secure to sustain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinated multilevel pathway development with momentum and support. Pathway system supported by key champions at multiple levels. Documented, compelling workforce needs with agreed upon priorities for action Funding in place for components of pathway program expansion and pathway system development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pathway development driven by documented need and success that fuels drive for expansion Pathway champions among senior leaders in key organizations Strong pathway leaders in place at multiple levels and coordinating for greater good. Strong, data driven case for expansion. Advancing vision to develop and sustain comprehensive pathways across levels Sustainable funding model and substantial resources
Pathway Programs and Track Record	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No experience or bad experience with pathway program development Limited or no current or past support for pathway programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some experience with current or prior pathway program success Capable individual pathway program leaders interested in expansion Some promising programs in place or planned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or more strong pathway programs in place with track record and relationships to build on Leadership of programs and key stakeholders share vision for expansion Linkages being made to other important stakeholders and pathway levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proven programs in place at 2 or more educational levels. Track record of collaboration among multiple programs/potential for increasing support and impact. Shared vision for linked sequential pathways across levels and region Some articulation already in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proven programs in place at 3 or more levels interconnected to support students Track record of collaboration among multiple programs with commitment to create comprehensive pathways system Shared measures demonstrate collective success

Key Factors	Low Readiness for Pathway Development Stage 1	Pathway Interest and Potential 2	Strong Programs/Leaders to Anchor Pathway Development 3	Maturing Multi-level Pathways, Increasing Coordination 4	Comprehensive, Sustainable Pathway System producing results 5
Tangible opportunities for pathway program expansion and system development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No immediate proposed programs • Some suggested ideas to pursue but levels or interest and paths to develop unclear • Insufficient capacity to develop pathway programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promising ideas or proposals for pathway development • Expressed interest and sufficient stakeholder capacity • Potential path for pathway development and implementation • Potential for successful outcomes and system in place for some programs in 3 years • Opportunity to expand programs through external partners at key educational levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid opportunities to address key needs in existing programs • Promising proposals for expansion or replication of proven programs at same level • Opportunity to add programming at another educational • Potential to achieve measurable targeted outcomes in 3 years • Potential for increasing scale of program to sufficient level within and beyond 3 years • Potential to institutionalize and programs in 3 years • Willingness to strengthen linkages with other pathway programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans to increase the scale and impact of proven programs • Solid proposals to fill gaps in multilevel pathways • Potential for expansion or replication of proven programs at 2 or more levels • Coordination to support students across 2 or more levels • Potential to increase measurable targeted outcomes in 3 years • Potential to institutionalize and sustain pathway system in 3 years • Shared vision for linking pathway programs for collective impact • Strong programs for employment of graduates in region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to expand collective and program impact and scale in 3 years • Proposals to fill needed gaps/enablers for further pathway expansion and impact • Potential for expansion or replication of proven programs at 3 levels • Coordination to support students across 3 levels • Achieving measurable outcomes • Potential to increase the scale of programs in 3 years • Potential to institutionalize and sustain pathway system within 3 years • Shared vision for linking pathway programs for collective impact • Strong programs for employment of graduates in region

Key Factors	Low Readiness for Pathway Development Stage 1	Pathway Interest and Potential 2	Strong Programs/Leaders to Anchor Pathway Development 3	Maturing Multi-level Pathways, Increasing Coordination 4	Comprehensive, Sustainable Pathway System producing results 5
Key Stakeholder Engagement and Commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited or no engagement of key stakeholders • Trust concerns among key stakeholders • Questionable willingness and ability to work together • Key players with no history of engaging in pathways • Competition among players undermines potential for pathway development • Limited capacity for stakeholders to participate in pathway development • Key employers not engaged or interested in pathways • Limited K-12 health pathway programs • Key pathway stakeholders don't play well with others • Workforce investment boards not prioritizing health • Limited community college health programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders have interest in some level of pathway development • Potential for trust and collaboration among key stakeholders but not yet demonstrated • Potential for sufficient expertise, capacity, clout and resources among key stakeholders • Stakeholders from education, employers and higher ed at the table. • Interest in and potential capacity for pathway development from at least one key school. • Organizational barriers can be addressed. • Schools interested work based learning • Workforce investment boards prioritize health and want to partner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders have interest in some level of pathway development • Potential for trust and collaboration among key stakeholders. • Leaders of proven programs trusted and willing to work together. • Potential for sufficient expertise, capacity, clout and resources among key stakeholders • Stakeholders from education, employers and higher ed at the table. • Workforce Board or other potential stakeholders engaged or interested • Solid relationship with one or more employers. • Linkages to area higher education and health professions training programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders have commitment to multi-level pathway development and expanding and sustaining coordinated pathways. • Growing trust and collaboration among key stakeholders. Leaders of proven programs trusted and willing to work together. • Trusted capable convenor and coordinator • Engaged stakeholders providing sufficient expertise, capacity, clout and resources among key stakeholders • Support from senior leader from almost all key stakeholders at the table • Programs underway and capacity for pathway expansion at 2 or more levels • Two or more proven programs at local schools. • Potential for expansion or replication. • Solid champions in place at two or more schools • Organizational barriers can be addressed. • Schools involved in work based learning. • Solid engagement of multiple employers • Workforce Boards at the table and engaged. • Health professions schools engaged in the pathway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders have demonstrated commitment to multi-level pathway and perceive valued results • Agreed upon plan to expand and sustain coordinated pathways over 3 years and beyond. • Sufficient trust and collaboration among key stakeholders. • Leaders of proven programs trusted and functioning well • Trusted capable convenor and coordinator • Engaged stakeholders providing sufficient expertise, capacity, clout and resources among key stakeholders • Senior leaders from all key stakeholders from all key stake at the table and committed to pathway expansion. • Programs underway and capacity for pathway expansion at multiple levels • Three or more proven programs at local schools. • Potential for expansion or replication. • Solid champions in place at two or more schools • Organizational barriers have been overcome • Work based learning part of core. • Schools contributing funding • Workforce Boards providing resources and expertise. • Multiple employers engaged. • Higher ed and HPEI part of the pathway.

Key Factors	Low Readiness for Pathway Development Stage 1	Pathway Interest and Potential 2	Strong Programs/Leaders to Anchor Pathway Development 3	Maturing Multi-level Pathways, Increasing Coordination 4	Comprehensive, Sustainable Pathway System producing results 5
Resources and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No or insufficient resources committed to pathways No model for sustainability Not leveraging funders and other resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited current investment Increasing commitment /potential for sufficient resources Interest in developing sustainable model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some but insufficient investment in proven local programs. Programs constantly struggling for funds and sustainability. Programs have insufficient sustainability models Could leverage resources more effectively Potential for additional funds from local, state or Fed sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient funding for some but not all programs. Increasing funds for individual programs and collective efforts Funding for coordinating infrastructure but may not be sufficient Sustainability model for some programs Plan and roadmap for increasing scale, sustainability Increasing leverage local funds and resources Some programs institutionalized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient funding for multiple pathway components. Increasing funds for individual and collective efforts Sufficient funding for coordinating infrastructure Sustainability model for key programs and infrastructure Plan and roadmap for increasing scale, sustainability Increasing leverage local funds and resources Many programs institutionalized
Coordinating Coalitions and Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No coordinating infrastructure in place nor plans to develop. Key stakeholders for pathway development not organized. Limited or no potential organizational candidates to serve as coordinating intermediary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No coordinating infrastructure in place Moderate potential interest among stakeholders of exploring collaboration and coordination Potential candidate organization (s) to serve as intermediary Potential broader regional coalitions and infrastructure to align with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No coordinating infrastructure across programs Some expertise and infrastructure for individual programs Legitimate interest among stakeholders of exploring collaboration and coordination Potential candidate organizations (s) with capabilities and trust Potential broader regional coalitions and infrastructure to align with that have interest in BHC pathway development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinating Coalition in place among key stakeholders Coordinating infrastructure in place at some level of maturity and success Infrastructure may not be of sufficient scale, capability or sustainability Capabilities include workforce and pathway program development expertise Potential for strengthening and expansion of intermediary with funding Strong potential regional coalition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-functioning coordinating coalition in place with trust and vision for expansion Sufficient coordinating infrastructure in place with necessary capabilities Commitment of resources to sustain and scale infrastructure

Key Factors	Low Readiness for Pathway Development Stage 1	Pathway Interest and Potential 2	Strong Programs/Leaders to Anchor Pathway Development 3	Maturing Multi-level Pathways, Increasing Coordination 4	Comprehensive, Sustainable Pathway System producing results 5
Shared Vision and Road Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few if any programs • No shared vision or plan for pathway development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some programs with interest in further development. • No shared vision or plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parallel programs with limited or no shared vision or plan. • Individual programs may have plans • Interest in developing vision and plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated programs with some agreed upon vision and success measures • Formal shared priorities and road map that includes employer and education goals and roles. • Forum, staff and accountability for managing plan implementation and achieving results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared vision, road map and measures • Multi-year plan with milestones and reporting. • Forum, staff and accountability for managing plan implementation and achieving results • Communication and celebration of results • Adjustment of plan as conditions and priorities change. Annual plan updates.
Measures of Success and Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No measures of success in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures of success may be in place for individual programs • Definition of success not defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures of success may be in place for individual programs • No shared definition of success or measures • Collective impact not tracked or reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared definition and measures of success • Systems in place to measure and report. • Participant tracking planned or in place • Mechanisms for sharing data and stories of impact to key stakeholders and funders • Initial data used to make the business case for investment and sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared definition and measures of success • Systems in place to measure and report. • Participant tracking in place and used to demonstrate impact and provide ongoing support • Mechanisms for sharing data and stories of impact to key stakeholders and funders • Robust data used to make the business case for investment and sustainability
Expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No expertise in pathway development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some local expertise in pathway development • Use of technical assistance, partners or hiring of expert staff to advance efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid expertise in anchor program (s) • Expertise in other key stakeholders • Willing to share expertise for program expansion • Secure expertise not in place or partner with expert organizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expertise in pathway system development • Use of outside expertise and assistance as needed • Intermediary develops capacity in priority areas • Partner with others in key gap areas • Shared expertise for common good. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expertise in pathway system development • Use of outside expertise and assistance as needed • Intermediary has capacity in priority areas • Partner with others in key gap areas • Shared expertise for common good.

Key Factors	Low Readiness for Pathway Development Stage 1	Pathway Interest and Potential 2	Strong Programs/Leaders to Anchor Pathway Development 3	Maturing Multi-level Pathways, Increasing Coordination 4	Comprehensive, Sustainable Pathway System producing results 5
Producing Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No results from pathway development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anecdotal results from some programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurable results from anchor programs. Targeted results in other areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valuable results in multiple programs and collectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large scale collective and individual program results aligned with target measures
Policy and Systems Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No or low interest in policy and systems change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness of and interest in the potential for policy and systems change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for policy and systems change to help sustain, institutionalize or expand programs. Minimal emphasis on or capacity to influence policy and systems change. Competing priorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy and systems change are intentions and measures of success. Infrastructure and plans can sufficiently support. Key stakeholders with policy change expertise, capacity and influence are engaged. Policy and systems change priorities are established and being worked toward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy and systems change are intentions and measures of success. Infrastructure and plans can sufficiently support and key stakeholders are engaged. Positive policy or systems changes have been made and fueled momentum. Policy and system changes are institutionalized and additional targeted changes are underway for lasting, large scale impact.