

# Leadership for health equity: What contributes?

CLAIRE BEIKER, RN, MN, PhD(C), CCHN(C)  
JUNE 24, 2015, COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSES OF CANADA  
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

## Objectives

- ▶ Explore the evidence base and gain an understanding of the factors that contribute to public health leadership
- ▶ Describe the attributes of (effective) leadership for health equity
- ▶ Discuss innovative and emerging strategies for leadership development and support

## Starting point

- ▶ A traditional systematic review was considered by the National Collaborating Centre for Determinants of Health (2012)
- ▶ The purpose was to answer the following research questions:
  - ▶ What is the impact of public health leadership on action to address the social determinants of health and advancing health equity?
  - ▶ What are effective interventions to enhance public health leadership specifically as applied to the determinants of health and health equity?
- ▶ The body of studies found did not lend themselves to a full systematic review



## Scoping review of the literature

- ▶ A scoping review is used when the topic area is broad and where many different study designs have been used
- ▶ It is a "useful way of mapping fields of study where it is difficult to visualize the range of material that might be available" (Arskey & O'Malley, 2005, p. 21)

Scoping  
101

## Scoping review of the literature

- ▶ Map the "key concepts underpinning a research area and the main sources and types of evidence available, and can be undertaken as stand-alone projects in their own right, especially where an area is complex or has not been reviewed comprehensively before" (Mays, Roberts, & Popay, 2001, p. 194)

Scoping  
101

## Scoping review of the literature

- ▶ "An iterative, conceptual and interpretative approach that emphasizes the importance of developing a critique based on the relevance, credibility and contribution of evidence rather than by rigidly determined methodological considerations of analysis and synthesis" (Davis et al, 2009, p. 1388).

Scoping  
101

## Scoping review of the literature

- ▶ Scoping review of scoping reviews (Pham et al, 2014)
- ▶ Findings:
  - ▶ 344 – 1999 and 2012
  - ▶ 75% addressed a health topic
  - ▶ Gaining momentum as a research activity
  - ▶ Varied in terms of purpose, methodological rigour, reporting and the use of the term
- ▶ Recommendations – use term *scoping review*; not a quick alternative to a systematic review; different type of review with a different set of purposes and objectives; answers a different type of research questions

## Scoping review of the literature

Framework by Arskey & O'Malley (2005)

1. Identify initial research questions
2. Identify (search for) relevant studies
3. Select studies
  - ▶ adopt systematic review methods for screening
  - ▶ establish inclusion and exclusion criteria

## Scoping review of the literature

4. Chart the data
  - ▶ Broader approach than a systematic review
  - ▶ Does not assess the methodological quality of the studies
5. Collate, summarize and report the findings
6. Consultation process (optional)
  - ▶ validate findings, additional references
  - ▶ valuable insights and perspectives

## Purpose

To summarize published research studies on public health leadership to address the determinants of health and advance health equity in order to identify gaps in the literature and research evidence base.



## Research Question

What aspects of public health leadership to address the determinants of health and advance health equity have been considered by research?



## Objectives

1. Identify the extent, range and nature of research studies examining public health leadership to address the determinants of health and advance health equity; and thereby identify gaps.
2. Explore the research methods used to investigate public health leadership to address the determinants of health.
3. Gain an understanding of the factors that contribute to public health leadership at the individual, organizational and systems level.
4. Describe strategies used to develop leadership in public health to address the determinants of health and advance health equity.

## Search

- ▶ Electronic databases: Medline, EMBASE, PsycINFO, Cochrane Central, CINAHL, Social Science Abstracts, Applied Social Science Index and Abstracts, Campbell Collaboration and Business Source Complete
- ▶ Limited search of the non-database grey literature
- ▶ 2000 and forward
- ▶ English and French
- ▶ Initial search in 2012 – found 5,546 potentially relevant articles (grey and peer reviewed)
- ▶ Updated in 2013 and 2014 - total 6,916



## Inclusion/exclusion

- ▶ Research study
- ▶ Focus - leadership in public health
- ▶ Describes outcomes
  - ▶ of public health leadership
  - ▶ direct or indirect
  - ▶ on action or health related to addressing the social determinants of health and/or to advancing health equity



## Inclusion/exclusion

- ▶ 2 rounds of screening at title and abstract – 853 (6063 excluded)
- ▶ 3 rounds of screening at full text - 40 (813 excluded)
- ▶ Data extraction
  - ▶ 3 reviews
  - ▶ 26 studies with outcomes
  - ▶ 5 describe perceptions
  - ▶ 6 exclude on 4<sup>th</sup> review



## Inclusion/exclusion

- ▶ 2 rounds of screening at title and abstract – 853 (6063 excluded)
- ▶ 3 rounds of screening at full text - 40 (813 excluded)
- ▶ Data extraction
  - ▶ 3 reviews
  - ▶ **26 studies with outcomes**
  - ▶ 5 describe perceptions
  - ▶ 6 exclude on 4<sup>th</sup> review

## Preliminary findings

### Date published

- ▶ Very recent publications
- ▶ 1- 2005
- ▶ 1 - 2007
- ▶ 4 - 2009
- ▶ 2 - 2010
- ▶ 2 - 2011
- ▶ 6 - 2012
- ▶ 7 - 2013
- ▶ 2 - 2014

### Country

- ▶ United States 13
- ▶ Canada 2
- ▶ United Kingdom 2
- ▶ New Zealand 2
- ▶ South Africa 2
- ▶ Australia 1
- ▶ Jamaica 1
- ▶ Netherlands 1
- ▶ Sweden 1
- ▶ Uganda 1

## Preliminary findings

### Scope or setting

- ▶ National 5
- ▶ Regional (province, state, health authority) 11
- ▶ Urban 6
- ▶ Rural 3
- ▶ Urban/rural (11 sites) 1
- ▶ Organization 0

## Preliminary findings

- ▶ Questions
  - ▶ Descriptive and exploratory - "Explore", "examine", "describe", "Identify"
  - ▶ Equity a consideration in 21/26
- ▶ Method
  - ▶ 3 quantitative, 3 mixed methods, 6 program evaluation
  - ▶ 14 qualitative (8 case studies)
    - ▶ Interviews, document and website reviews/analysis, focus groups
- ▶ Theory or frameworks
  - ▶ Noted in 20/26 studies – guiding study or as an output
  - ▶ All different – 2 used empowerment theory

## Preliminary findings

### Intervention

- ▶ Program and service – 12/26 ex. Immunization, surveillance, "Altogether Better"
- ▶ Policy – 4/26 ex. National public health policy, institutional racism in policy making
- ▶ Action on the determinants of health – 4/26 ex. political priority, CHW advocacy, PHU officials worldview and action
- ▶ Partnership – 3/26 ex. enhanced engagement in research
- ▶ Community engagement – 1/26
- ▶ Intersectoral collaboration – 1/26
- ▶ Training event – 1/26
- ▶ Other – leadership hubs

## Preliminary findings

### Intervention Group

- ▶ Specific community – 15/26 + (Society – 2)
- ▶ Identified population – 12/26 (Children and youth – 3)
- ▶ Government – 1
- ▶ Organization – 2



## Leaders were described as ...

- ▶ Relational - 21/26
- ▶ Knowledgeable – 13/26
- ▶ Trusted – 10/26
- ▶ Respected - 10/26
- ▶ Credible – 10/26
- ▶ Motivated to be involved – 9/26
- ▶ Effective communicator – 9/26
- ▶ Passionate
- ▶ Charismatic
- ▶ Visionary
- ▶ Humility
- ▶ Patience
- ▶ Transformational

## Relational

- ▶ talks to people informally
- ▶ engaged with community members
- ▶ knowing who to talk to
- ▶ team oriented
- ▶ community "champions", can take action
- ▶ partnership and coalition building – interagency and cross sector
- ▶ collaborative, participatory, reflective
- ▶ participatory decision making
- ▶ at multiple levels
- ▶ able to negotiate, solution oriented
- ▶ situated, relational personhood, relational autonomy, and relational solidarity
- ▶ engaged in community activities, "build bridges" - leader to leader, collaborative, participatory
- ▶ brought relationships with them
- ▶ reach out
- ▶ common vision and goals
- ▶ "engaging the community in decision making, collaboration, coalitions, community engagement and partnerships"
- ▶ builds social capital
- ▶ epistemological consistent

## Knowledgeable

- ▶ clinical background, advanced education
- ▶ clinical background mattered
- ▶ about the community through a community health assessment
- ▶ 'sense of the community', "knowing about the community was especially important", "its issues and members"
- ▶ highly aware and highly supportive
- ▶ raised awareness of issues
- ▶ use multiple forms of evidence
- ▶ engaged with the community

## Tools, strategies & mechanisms to facilitate leadership

- ▶ accreditation
- ▶ quality improvement methods
- ▶ CBPR as a strategy for capacity building
- ▶ conceptual framework to guide work and action, ex. empowerment model
- ▶ discussing values and politics that inform decisions
- ▶ using research and evidence
- ▶ innovative nursing services
- ▶ leadership hubs

## Tools, strategies & mechanisms to facilitate leadership

- ▶ logic models
- ▶ provision of information to community in relevant ways
- ▶ leadership development programs
- ▶ training for senior leaders
- ▶ diversity in workforce
- ▶ knowledge of the population characteristics
- ▶ YouTube videos (production and dissemination)

## Next steps

Finish charting the data

Collate, summarize and report the findings

Consider a consultation process (optional)

- ▶ validate findings, additional references
- ▶ further insights and perspectives



## References

- ▶ Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International journal of social research methodology: Theory & practice*, 8(1), 19–32.
- ▶ Davis, K., Drey, N., & Gould, D. (2009). What are scoping studies? A review of the nursing literature. *International journal of nursing studies*, 46(10), 1386–1400.
- ▶ Pham, M. T., Rajić, A., Greig, J. D., Sargeant, J. M., Papadopoulos, A., & McEwen, S. A. (2014). A scoping review of scoping reviews: Advancing the approach and enhancing the consistency. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 5(4), 371–385.