Older Americans comprise approximately half the patients on inpatient medical wards. There are too few geriatricians to care for these patients, and few geriatricians practice hospital medicine. Hospitalists often provide the majority of inpatient geriatric care, and at teaching hospitals, hospitalists also play a pivotal role in educating residents and students to provide high-quality care for hospitalized geriatric patients. Thus, hospitalists will be the primary clinicians educating many trainees to care for older patients, and the hospitalists must be skilled in addressing the clinical syndromes that are common in these patients, including delirium, dementia, falls, and infection. Generalists and geriatricians have anticipated a shortfall in clinicians prepared to educate trainees about geriatrics and called for faculty development for generalists in geriatrics.

In this issue of the *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, Podrazik and colleagues present initial results from a major initiative to enhance the quality and quantity of geriatric inpatient education for residents and students. The Curriculum for the Hospitalized Aging Medical Patient (CHAMP) at the University of Chicago represents a multifaceted faculty development effort funded in part by the Donald W. Reynolds and John A. Hartford Foundations. In 12 half-day sessions offered weekly, hospitalist and general internist faculty members learned about four thematic areas—the frail older person, hazards of hospitalization, end-of-life issues, and transitions of care—while also receiving training in engaging and effective teaching strategies. At each session, participants drew on their own experiences attending on the wards to generate clinical examples and test new teaching strategies. CHAMP incorporates the attributes of “best practices” for integrating geriatrics education into internal medicine residency training: it promotes model care for older hospital patients, uses a train-the-trainer model, addresses care transitions, and promotes interdisciplinary teamwork.

CHAMP achieved its initial goals. Faculty participants were satisfied and CHAMP substantially increased participants’ confidence in practicing and teaching geriatric care. Faculty participants also gained confidence in their teaching abilities and presumably learned teaching strategies that could be applied to other topics in inpatient medicine. Faculty participants demonstrated modest improvements in their knowledge of geriatric issues and more positive attitudes about geriatrics at the end of the course than at the beginning. It is worth noting that the hos-
hospitalist and general internist ward attending physicians who participated in CHAMP were volunteers and may have started the process with greater interest in learning geriatric care than other attendings. Thus, it is unknown whether CHAMP might have greater or lesser effect on other faculty.

The CHAMP train-the-trainer model offers the potential to impact future practitioners. Findings of the CHAMP investigators are consistent with the literature on faculty development programs for educators, which shows that faculty development on teaching yields high participant satisfaction, knowledge gains, and improved self-assessment of the ability to implement changes in teaching practice. The use in CHAMP of a diverse menu of teaching strategies and active learning techniques such as case-based discussions and the Objective Structured Teaching Exercise in a small group of colleagues should promote learning and retention.

Is the CHAMP curriculum worth the cost? The program requires resources to pay for 48 hours for each faculty participant and for instructors with expertise in geriatrics and teaching skills. We estimate that the cost for 12 faculty participants would be roughly $72,000. We believe this investment will likely pay off in terms of enhancing faculty skills, improving faculty job satisfaction, promoting faculty retention in academic or other teaching positions, and improving care provided by trainees. For example, if CHAMP were to lead to the retention and promotion of even 2 faculty for just 1 year, it would save recruitment costs that would exceed the direct program costs, and other benefits of CHAMP would only further add value. However, analysis of the benefits of CHAMP will require more in-depth evaluation data of its impact. The program leaders currently contact former participants around the time of ward attending to reinforce teaching concepts and encourage implementation of CHAMP materials, through a Commitment to Change contract. The ultimate downstream educational goal would be that these faculty learners retain and apply this newly acquired knowledge and skills in their clinical practice and teaching activities. Ideally, evidence would confirm that these benefits improve patient care. The long-term evaluation plan for CHAMP incorporates important additional outcome measures including resident and student geriatric knowledge as well as patient satisfaction and clinical outcomes. We commend the authors for aiming to expand their evaluation plan over time and aspiring for sustained changes in teaching practice. The literature on the impact of hospitalists has similarly evolved from early descriptions of hospitalists and the logistics of developing a hospitalist program to sophisticated analyses of the impact of hospitalists on clinical outcomes such as length of stay and mortality.

The feasibility of disseminating CHAMP is an open question. The University of Chicago model employs a time-intensive curriculum that engages participants in part by releasing them from clinical duties for a half day per week. Release time was funded through combined support from external funding sources and the Department of Medicine. This model addresses the major barrier to faculty development in geriatrics for general internists: lack of time. The investment in intensive, longitudinal faculty development may generate higher returns than periodic short faculty workshop sessions that do not build in the time for role-playing, practice, and reinforcement of key concepts. This type of intervention may also be more feasible when done in conjunction with one of the approximately 50 Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)-supported Geriatrics Education Centers, which can fund teachers and infrastructure for faculty development.

How is this article useful for hospitalist educators? Many hospitalists at academic centers serve important teaching functions, and some will aspire to advance their educational efforts through more scholarly activities such as curriculum design. The CHAMP curriculum represents a successful model for hospitalists aiming to follow a rigorous approach to curriculum design relevant to inpatient medicine, and the extensive CHAMP materials are available online. It serves as a practical model that could be applied to other clinical topics related to hospital medicine. Hospitalists are effective and respected teachers for residents and students, and they develop unique expertise in the content and process of inpatient medicine. The authors followed the 6 steps of effective curriculum design: problem identification, targeted needs assessment, goals and objectives, education methods, implementation, and evaluation.

The CHAMP curriculum typifies a set of materials that aligns well with the Society of Hospital
Medicine (SHM) Core Competencies. As part of their needs assessment, the authors also surveyed hospitalists at a regional SHM meeting to determine the geriatrics topics for which they perceived greatest educational need. The Core Competencies chapters on the care of the elderly patient, delirium and dementia, hospital-acquired infections, and palliative care highlight the common learning goals shared by hospital medicine and geriatrics. Both disciplines also emphasize the team-based, multidisciplinary approach to care, particularly during care transitions, that is highlighted in the CHAMP curriculum.

More generally, the CHAMP curriculum can be used to teach and assess the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) competencies, which must be assessed in all ACGME-accredited residency programs. In an initial session on “Teaching on Today’s Wards”, CHAMP participants brainstorm about how to incorporate both geriatrics content and the ACGME competencies into their post-call rounds. The emphasis in CHAMP on the health care system and interdisciplinary care is evident in topics such as end-of-life care and transitions in care, and provides opportunity for assessment of residents’ performance in the ACGME competency of systems-based practice. The organization of the curriculum by ACGME competency makes it more applicable today than some prior geriatric curricula that emphasized similar themes but without the emphasis on demonstrating competency as an outcome.

Hospitalists partnering with the Donald W. Reynolds and John A. Hartford Foundations and other external organizations may find funding opportunities for educational projects. For example, the Hartford Foundation has partnered with SHM since 2002 to support hospitalists’ efforts to improve care for older adults. Products of this collaboration include a Geriatric Toolbox that contains assessment tools designed for use with geriatric patients. The tools assess a range of parameters including nutritional, functional, and mental status, and the website supplies guidelines on the advantages and disadvantages and appropriate use of each assessment tool. With support from the Hartford Foundation, hospitalists have also conducted several workshops at SHM meetings on improving assessment and care of geriatric patients and developed a discharge-planning checklist for older adults.

As hospitalist programs gain traction in academic centers, hospitalists will increasingly serve as key geriatric content educators for trainees. The CHAMP curriculum offers a model of intensive faculty development for hospitalists and general internists that clinician educators find engaging and empowering. The partnerships of geriatricians and hospitalists, and of the SHM with national geriatrics organizations, have the potential for widespread benefits for both learners and elderly patients.
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