

Evaluation of an interdisciplinary education program to foster learning health systems

Sathana Dushyanthen, Nadia Zamri, Wendy Chapman, Daniel Capurro, Kayley Lyons

Submitted to: JMIR Medical Education
on: October 31, 2023

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript.....	5
---------------------------------	----------

Preprint
JMIR Publications

Evaluation of an interdisciplinary education program to foster learning health systems

Sathana Dushyanthen¹; Nadia Zamri²; Wendy Chapman¹; Daniel Capurro^{1,3}; Kayley Lyons¹

¹Centre for Digital Transformation of Health University of Melbourne Carlton AU

²Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences Monash University Parkville AU

³School of Computing and Information Systems University of Melbourne Melbourne AU

Corresponding Author:

Kayley Lyons

Centre for Digital Transformation of Health

University of Melbourne

700 Swanston St.

Carlton

AU

Abstract

Background: Learning Health Systems (LHS) have the potential to utilise health data in real-time through rapid and continuous cycles of data interrogation, implementing insights to practice, feedback, and practice change. However, there is a lack of an appropriately skilled interprofessional informatics workforce that can leverage knowledge to design innovative solutions. Therefore, there is a need to develop tailored professional development training in digital health, to foster skilled interprofessional learning communities in the healthcare workforce in Australia.

Objective: This study aimed to explore participants' experiences and perspectives from participating in an interprofessional education program over 13 weeks online. The evaluation also aimed to assess the benefits, barriers, and opportunities for improvements, and identify future applications of the course materials.

Methods: We developed a wholly online short course open to interdisciplinary professionals working in digital health in the healthcare sector. In a flipped classroom model, participants (N=400) undertook 2 hours of pre-class learning online and then attended 2.5 hours of live synchronous learning in interactive weekly Zoom workshops for 13 weeks. Throughout the course, they worked in small, simulated learning communities (N=5-8) working through various activities and problems, contributing their unique perspectives and diverse expertise.

To evaluate the utility of the program, we undertook a mixed methods evaluation consisting of pre- and post-surveys rating scales for usefulness, engagement, value and applicability for various aspects of the course. Participants also completed identical measures of self-efficacy pre- and post (N=200), with scales mapped to specific skills and tasks that should have been achievable following each of the topics covered. Further, they undertook voluntary weekly surveys to provide feedback on which aspects to continue and recommendations for improvements, via free text responses.

Results: From the evaluation, it was evident that participants found the teaching model engaging, useful, valuable and applicable to their work. In the self-efficacy component, we observed a significant increase ($P < .0001$) in perceived confidence for all topics, when comparing pre- and post-course ratings. Overall, it was evident that the program gave participants a framework to organise their knowledge and a common understanding and shared language to converse with other disciplines; changed the way they perceived their role and the possibilities of data and technologies; and provided a toolkit through the LHS framework, that they could apply in their workplaces.

Conclusions: We present one program and means of educating the health workforce to adopt the LHS model into standard practice. Interprofessional collaborative learning was a major component of the value of the program. This evaluation shed light on the multifaceted challenges and expectations of individuals embarking on a digital health program. Understanding the barriers and facilitators of the audience is crucial for creating an inclusive and supportive learning environment. Addressing these challenges will not only enhance participant engagement but also contribute to the overall success of the program and, by extension, the broader integration of digital health solutions in healthcare practice and, ultimately patient outcomes.

(JMIR Preprints 31/10/2023:54152)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.54152>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in [http://www.jmir.org/](#)

Original Manuscript

Title: Evaluation of an interdisciplinary education program to foster learning health systems

Sathana Dushyanthen¹, Nadia Zamri², Wendy Chapman¹, Daniel Capurro^{1,3}, Kayley Lyons¹

¹Centre for Digital Transformation of Health, University of Melbourne

²Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Monash University

³School of Computing and Information Systems, University of Melbourne

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Kayley Lyons

Digital Health Education and Workforce Development Lead

Centre for Digital Transformation of Health

University of Melbourne

700 Swanston St, Carlton VIC 3053

Kayley.lyons@unimelb.edu.au

+61 499093088

Abstract

Background: Learning Health Systems (LHS) have the potential to utilise health data in real-time through rapid and continuous cycles of data interrogation, implementing insights to practice, feedback, and practice change. However, there is a lack of an appropriately skilled interprofessional informatics workforce that can leverage knowledge to design innovative solutions. Therefore, there is a need to develop tailored professional development training in digital health, to foster skilled interprofessional learning communities in the healthcare workforce in Australia.

Objectives: This study aimed to explore participants' experiences and perspectives of participating in an interprofessional education program over 13 weeks online. The evaluation also aimed to assess the benefits, barriers, and opportunities for improvements, and identify future applications of the course materials.

Methods: We developed a wholly online short course open to interdisciplinary professionals working in digital health in the healthcare sector. In a flipped classroom model, participants (N=400) undertook 2 hours of pre-class learning online and then attended 2.5 hours of live synchronous learning in interactive weekly Zoom workshops for 13 weeks. Throughout the course, they worked in small, simulated learning communities (N=5-8) working through various activities and problems, contributing their unique perspectives and diverse expertise. The course covered a number of topics including: background on LHS, establishing learning communities, the design thinking process, data preparation and machine learning analysis, process modelling, clinical decision support, remote patient monitoring, evaluation, implementation and digital transformation.

To evaluate the utility of the program, we undertook a mixed methods evaluation consisting of pre- and post-surveys rating scales for usefulness, engagement, value and applicability for various aspects of the course. Participants also completed identical measures of self-efficacy pre- and post (N=200), with scales mapped to specific skills and tasks that should have been achievable following each of the topics covered. Further, they undertook voluntary weekly surveys to provide feedback on which aspects to continue and recommendations for improvements, via free text responses.

Results: From the evaluation, it was evident that participants found the teaching model engaging, useful, valuable and applicable to their work. In the self-efficacy component, we observed a significant increase ($P<.0001$) in perceived confidence for all topics, when comparing pre-and post-course ratings. Overall, it was evident that the program gave participants a framework to organise their knowledge and a common understanding and shared language to converse with other disciplines; changed the way they perceived their role and the possibilities of data and technologies; and provided a toolkit through the LHS framework, that they could apply in their workplaces.

Conclusions: We present one program and means of educating the health workforce to adopt the LHS model into standard practice. Interprofessional collaborative learning was a major component of the value of the program. This evaluation shed light on the multifaceted challenges and expectations of individuals embarking on a digital health program. Understanding the barriers and facilitators of the audience is crucial for creating an inclusive and supportive learning environment. Addressing these challenges will not only enhance participant engagement but also contribute to the overall success of the program and, by extension, the broader integration of digital health solutions in healthcare practice and, ultimately patient outcomes.

Keywords: continuing professional development, learning health systems, flipped classroom, digital health, informatics, data science, health professions education

Introduction

As healthcare delivery evolves in complexity and scope, the need for systems that promote continuous learning and adaptation is paramount. The Learning Health Systems (LHS) concept has emerged as a transformative framework that bridges clinical practice with ongoing research, ensuring that healthcare institutions remain at the forefront of scientific and patient-centered care advancements [1, 2]. Central to the LHS paradigm is the notion that data contributes to a broader system of knowledge and is utilised to refine care practices in real time [1, 3]. Achieving this ideal requires an interdisciplinary workforce adept in information systems, informatics, data interrogation, quality improvement and implementation methods, and systems-based practice, to be able to use existing data to inform future care [3]. Moreover, healthcare transformation such as this requires the skills of various professions working together towards solving these complex problems [4, 5].

While there are previous studies that have described their LHS-focused programs, few have robustly evaluated the utility of their implementations. Furthermore, other programs have focused on specific cohorts of participants such as: PhD students [6], post-doctoral students [7, 8], and clinical fellows [9-11] in the United States [6, 9-11] and Canada [7]. Our study adds new insights to the literature given the interprofessional nature of the program, as well as its design (flipped classroom, working groups) and delivery (wholly online). To our knowledge, few programs have involved teaching a structured curriculum [8, 12], while other programs have involved mainly project based work and on the job learning [7, 10, 13, 14].

For such a dynamic and integrated approach to take root, educating the next generation of healthcare professionals about LHS principles is crucial. While the theoretical foundation of LHS has been well-established, there has been a paucity of research evaluating the efficacy and impact of educational interventions centered on LHS. We developed a 13-week short course called Applied Learning Health Systems, which commenced in September 2021 and has now been running for two years [15]. The program is open to all professionals working in the healthcare setting—clinical and non-clinical—and focuses on inter-disciplinary work; the LHS concept can be taught to both digital health and informatics generalists and specialists, clinicians and non-clinicians, front-line workers, and upper management [15].

As institutions increasingly incorporate LHS into their curricula, understanding the nuances of its educational translation becomes vital. This research aims to evaluate the motivations, experiences and perceptions of participants learning in a collaborative learning environment, as well as the effectiveness, confidence, applicability, challenges, and outcomes of LHS education, providing insights that will shape pedagogical strategies and potentially influence the future of healthcare education.

The purpose of this paper is to explore participants' experiences and perspectives of participating in a wholly online interprofessional education program. This evaluation also aimed to assess the benefits, barriers, and opportunities for improvements, and identify future applications of the course materials to the participants' workplace endeavours. We will also discuss the implementation, feasibility, and outcomes of the program which aimed to foster Learning Health System skills in the Australian healthcare workforce through didactic coursework, interactive workshops and collaborative learning. By describing our program and its two-year evaluation, we believe current and future educators can learn from our experience when building their own programs. Additionally, our paper will contribute to the emerging education literature on how to foster Learning Health Systems through workforce development and education. Compared to previous publications on LHS education programs, we are contributing novel insights to this literature through new perspectives based on our location (i.e., Australia), the health system data infrastructure (i.e., recent electronic medical record implementations, digital immaturity), and our participants (i.e., diverse interprofessionals). While we have had early successes, we also wish to highlight the obstacles we encountered and how we refined our approach in response. Our results will be valuable to other educators as they consider similar endeavours.

Methods

Study Design & Recruitment

We undertook a mixed methods study consisting of both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Surveys were conducted pre-course, throughout teaching and post-course. The surveys consisted of metric scales, qualitative

scales and open free text boxes. Participation in the research project was via opt out. Therefore, all enrolled participants were eligible to participate in the project voluntarily, unless they chose not to. There were several modes of recruitment for the course itself. These included reaching out to existing precinct partners who undertook internal EOI recruitment processes to sponsor a number of places; social media advertising on X and Linked In; Google search SEO and University students undertaking electives or the formal university accredited certificates.

Ethical considerations

This study was approved by the University of Melbourne Ethics Committee (Project ID 22641). For parts of the study, the participants could either opt-out (e.g., surveys) or consented to participate (e.g., interviews). In terms of informed consent, participants were provided with a plain language statement describing the purpose and design of the study. Participants were notified that participation was voluntary and were given the ability to opt out. For privacy and confidentiality, data was completely de-identified and only aggregate data was analysed and presented. Data was housed on secure University of Melbourne single sign on Qualtrics servers and restricted access OneDrive servers. As participation was completely voluntary, no compensation was provided to participants, however, participants in the pilot version of the course were given free scholarship admission in return for their feedback.

The program

The LHS short course was created by the University of Melbourne Centre for Digital Transformation of Health, a high-research academic institution with existing partnerships with local and regional hospitals and primary care networks. The course has been delivered five times to 400 participants. Each iteration of the short course involved a 13-week online course revolving around Learning Health Systems (LHS) and was delivered wholly online, by diverse instructors, in a flipped classroom learning format. Participants were from a range of backgrounds, including working professionals in healthcare, PhD research students, Masters level university students and consumers. The course structure involves 3 hours of weekly individual asynchronous pre-readings, followed by 2.5 hours of weekly workshops. Each week participants work through activities associated with a threaded diabetes case scenario, in their assigned interprofessional working group [15].

We mapped the stages of the LHS system onto a swim lane diagram and created specific learning objectives for skills and knowledge at each stage, that were then operationalised into the diabetes scenario. Filling in this swim lane and competency map required knowledge from many disciplines, including data science and biostatistics, standards, user-centred design, change management, workflow mapping, app development, implementation science, and evaluation as well as expertise in the clinical domain and in how the Australian health system works. No single person could effectively design the course we developed, which posed challenges and opportunities for curriculum development. Using the LHS cycle enabled curriculum designers to join the varied subject matter expertise, by mapping it to an agreed framework. Details of the full course design, development and curriculum outline are published (Figure 1) [16].




Figure 1. Applied Learning Health Systems short course curriculum [16].

Evaluation framework

We utilised the Kirkpatrick Model of Evaluation [17] to map out our measurements (Table 1). This model is a widely used evaluation framework in education and is employed to shift researchers away from simply measuring perceptions and satisfaction. We explored evidence of whether participants changed their attitudes, knowledge, behaviour, and professional practice. Additionally, we applied a mixed methods approach that included pre-, post-survey, weekly surveys, and post-interviews.

Table 1. Application of the Kirkpatrick Model of Evaluation (amended by Barr et al.) to this project [18]

Level	Details	Evaluation Measures and Data Sources in this Project
1	Perception of training by subjects	Pre-, weekly, and post-surveys, post-course participant interviews
2a	Change of attitudes of subjects	Pre-, post- change in digital health interest and identity
2b	Change of knowledge and/or skills of subjects	Pre-, post-self-efficacy changes in specific LHS concepts (skills) Pre-, post-concept maps (knowledge) (out of scope for this paper)
3	Changes of behaviour of subjects	Post-course participant interviews (will follow up in one year with participant interviews)
4a	Change in professional practice	Post-course participant interviews (Will follow up in one year with participant interviews)
4b	Changes in patients' condition	Not applicable

Pre-course and post-course surveys

The pre- and post-surveys were developed by using a combination of psychological scales and open-ended questions. The pre- and post-survey included the same self-efficacy scale (100 points; cannot do at all to highly certain can do) [19] which has significant evidence of reliability and validity. We choose to evaluate self-efficacy as it is one of the strongest proxy measures in education to predict actual and future performance, which are more difficult and take longer to measure [20]. The ten items on the self-efficacy scale were adapted from the material taught in the LHS course and language from the LHS literature (e.g., use machine learning algorithms to create a model for predicting a health outcome) [21, 22]. The open-ended questions included demographic questions (e.g., job title) and questions related to digital

health identity development, course benefits, course barriers, what to keep, what to improve and other suggestions or comments.

Surveys were designed and distributed via Qualtrics®. Participants were invited to complete the surveys through emails and the Learning Management System. Responses to open-ended survey questions were also analysed through qualitative content analysis. Two coders independently coded the text responses using NVivo® software. Coders met to resolve discrepancies and solidify themes and categories under each research question. The self-efficacy scales were analysed using two tailed, un-paired t-test using Graph Pad Prism, to determine whether there was an improvement in self-efficacy for the 13 LHS concepts.

Weekly surveys

Over the 12 weeks, participants had the opportunity to provide feedback on the level of engagement, usefulness, value, satisfaction and areas for improvement in the course content, through participation in weekly surveys. These surveys contained scales (strongly disagree to strongly agree) and ask questions like “how useful did you find this topic”; “how engaged did you feel”; and open boxes for free text responses. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, mean and standard deviation will be used to summarise the data from these questions. Completion of these weekly surveys ranged from 25-30 participants each week.

Qualitative coding of free text responses

To analyse the text response according to our research questions, we first de-identify the transcripts for participant and institution names. The transcripts will be uploaded to NVivo® software for qualitative content analysis [23]. A codebook was developed deductively from the literature and inductively from the research data. Two coders independently analysed the transcripts according to the codebook. The two coders met to calculate an inter-rater agreement rate and resolve any discrepancies. The final codes were synthesised through creating summaries, narratives, and matrices. The final results included coding frequencies, themes, and categories according to the research questions.

Quantitative statistical analysis

For descriptive statistics, number of participants (N) and proportion of participants (%) are shown. For rating scales, frequency (N) and proportion (%) are shown. Pre course and post course self-efficacy comparisons were undertaken using a two-tailed, unpaired, t-test. Where data was incomplete or missing, it was excluded from the analysis. P values represent $P < .05^*$, $P < .01^{**}$, $P < .001^{***}$, $P < .0001^{****}$.

Results

Demographics

Thus far the Applied Learning Health Systems program has had approximately 400 participants from various organisations (healthcare, government, research/university, industry) and job roles (clinician, researcher, data/IT, health services management, allied health, IT, EMR implementation, health administration, consumer advocacy) (Table 2). N=343 of 400 participants completed the pre-survey (Week 0) (86% response rate) and N=200 of 400 participants completed the post-survey (Week 12) (50% response rate). A few participants were lost to follow-up during the final week because they were ill, dropped out due to over commitment, or did not respond to requests.

Table 2. Demographics shared by participants in the Applied Learning Health Systems program.

Professional background	Number of participants	Proportion (%)	Role type	Number of participants	Proportion (%)
Primary Healthcare	44	11%	Clinician – Medical	67	17%
Tertiary Healthcare	141	35.3%	Clinician – Nursing	25	6.4%
Health Services Management	29	7.3%	Clinical Informatician	22	5.6%
Allied Health	48	12%	Researcher (Health Services Research/Public Health)	68	17.3%

Government	10	2.5%	Data Analyst	28	7.1%
Academia/Research	73	18.3%	Allied Health Professional	58	14.8%
Business/IT/Tech/Data analytics	47	11.8%	Health Services Manager	36	9.2%
Other	7	1.8%	Quality Improvement Lead	24	6.1%
			Consultant/IT Professional	19	4.8%
			EMR Implementation Team	18	4.6%
			Health Administration	8	2%
			Consumer Advocate	20	5.1%
TOTAL	N=399	100%	TOTAL	N=343	100%

What were participants previous encounters with the LHS framework?

At the beginning of the course, participants were asked if they had any previous exposure to the LHS framework. Almost one-third of the participants had no previous experience with the LHS concept or any digital health concepts (N=121 of 343, 35.3%). Some participants stated that they had previous exposure to digital health and informatics concepts (N=50 of 343, 14.6%) through other courses and certifications (N=27 of 343, 7.8%), as well as through work-based activities, for example EMR implementation and optimisation (N=47 of 343, 13.1%), quality improvement, data interrogation (N=56 of 343, 16.3%), and various other health services projects (N=45, 13.1%). Others stated that they had no previous exposure to digital health or LHS concepts (N=49 of 343, 14.2%).

What type of teaching approaches did participants perceive as effective?

Participants were asked to rate the usefulness and engagement of the topic's pre-class learning and in-class sessions. In terms of usefulness, the majority found the pre-class materials useful (N=880 of 956; 92% - *"the pre-class material was excellent and really helped to clarify many of the terms that I had heard people say but not truly understood."*) and in-class sessions useful (N=902 of 955; 94.5% - *"analysing the data during the class was useful and to see it connect with pre-learning materials was good."*). When asked to rate engagement, the majority found the pre-class (N=881 of 954; 92.4%) and in-class activities engaging (N=881 of 955; 92.3%) (Table 3).

Responses to the question of satisfaction also yielded highly positive results. For overall quality of the short course, most agreed that that it was of a high standard (178 of 182; 97.8%), including the instructor quality (175 of 182; 96.2%). When asked if they would recommend the short course to a colleague, 89.5% (163 of 182) said they would. In terms of revisiting the decision to complete it again, 85.1% (N= 154 of 182) still said they would choose to take the course. When rating the value of the course to their personal career development, a majority found the course valuable (N= 173 of 200; 86.5%). Participants were also asked to rate the applicability of the course to their day-to-day work, where 73.4% (N=134 of 182) found it applicable.

Given the number of facets implemented in the course, we asked participants to rate the value of these various elements. The most highly rated was the instructors: *"the speakers were great, and the structure of having a short lecture and then doing an activity then coming back and having another lecture was good"*, with 92.8% (169 of 182) finding them moderately or extremely valuable. Next, in-class learning (N=155 of 182; 85.2%), pre-class learning (N= 154 of 182; 84.6%), collaborative learning (N=138 of 182; 75.8%), the diabetes case scenario (N=134 of 182; 73.7%), and the Canvas learning management system platform (N=136 of 182; 74.7%) rated similarly. The use of Jupyter Notebooks (N= 87 of 182; 47.8%), and the discussion boards (N=52; 28.5%) rated lower (Table 3).

Table 3. Ratings of usefulness and engagement with pre-class learning materials and in-class zoom sessions. Participants were asked to rate agreement for usefulness (extremely useless to extremely useful) and engagement (extremely unengaged to engaged), weekly for each topic (1-13). Participants' ratings of value pertaining to various domains: overall value to personal career development for all topics, applicability to current workplace role for all topics, overall satisfaction with quality of course, recommendation, instructors, and choice to revisit; and value of educational activities: instructors, Zoom workshops, Canvas pre-class activities, collaborative learning, the diabetes case scenario, Jupyter notebooks and discussion boards.

Rating	Ex-tremel y use- less		Moder- ately useless		Slightly useless		Neither useful nor useless		Slightly useful		Moder- ately useful		Ex- tremely useful		TOT AL
Ques- tions	%	Fre q	%	Fre q	%	Fr eq	%	Fr eq	%	Fr eq	%	Fr eq	%	Fr eq	Tota l Freq
I found this topic's pre-class learning useful (13 topics)	0.5	5	4.1	39	1.4	13	2.1	20	22.0	210	27.7	265	42.3	404	956
I found this topic's in-class session useful (13 topics)	0.2	2	1.4	13	0.9	9	2.9	28	10.8	103	37.7	360	46.0	440	955
I felt engaged when completing the pre-class learning for this topic (13 topics)	0.5	5	0.9	9	3.0	29	3.1	30	13.3	127	44.9	428	34.2	326	954
I felt engaged when participating in the topic's in-class session (13 topics)	1.0	10	1.4	13	1.8	17	3.5	33	10.9	104	36.5	349	44.9	429	955
Rating	Highly un- valu- able		Unvalu- able		Neutral		Valu- able		Highly valu- able						
Ques- tion	%	Fre q	%	Fre q	%	Fr eq	%	Fr eq	%	Fr eq					Tota l Freq
Valuable to your personal career	0.6	12	0.6	13	12.3	251	48.5	989	38	776					2041

development (13 topics, N=189)															
Rating	Highly not applicable		Not applicable		Neutral		Applicable		Highly applicable						
Question	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq					Total Freq
Applicability to your current workplace role (13 topics, N=189)	3.1	64	7.5	154	15.9	325	41	837	32.4	661					2041
Rating	Extremely valueless		Moderately valueless		Slightly valueless		Neither valuable nor valueless		Slightly valuable		Moderately valuable		Extremely valuable		
Questions	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	Total Freq
Collaborative learning in the working groups (n=182)	0.5	1	3.3	6	1.6	3	2.7	5	15.9	29	34.6	63	41.2	75	182
Pre-class learning activities on Canvas (n=182)	0.0	0	1.6	3	1.1	2	1.1	2	11.5	21	42.3	77	42.3	77	182
In-class learning (Zoom) Sessions (n=182)	0.5	1	1.1	2	0.5	1	3.3	6	9.3	17	40.7	74	44.5	81	182
The Diabetes Case Scenario (n=182)	0.5	1	2.2	4	1.6	3	5.5	10	16.5	30	38.5	70	35.2	64	182
Jupyter Notebooks (n=182)	0.0	0	6.0	11	6.0	11	11.0	20	29.1	53	30.2	55	17.6	32	182
Canvas - learning management sys-	0.0	0	0.5	1	1.6	3	6.6	12	16.5	30	45.6	83	29.1	53	182

tem (n=182)															
Discus- sion boards (n=182)	2. 7	5	5. 5	10	5.5	10	23. 6	43	34. 1	62	21. 4	39	7.1	13	182
The in- structors (n=182)	0. 0	0	0. 5	1	0.0	0	2.2	4	4.4	8	26. 9	49	65. 9	12 0	182

Preprint
JMIR Publications

How did participants' self-efficacy for digital health topics change after the course?

To explore the change in self-confidence levels pre and post course, participants were surveyed on the key competencies for the 13 topics. Participants completed the same set of ratings at the beginning and at the end of the course, following completion of all the material. For all 13 learning outcomes, there was a statistically significant increase in self-efficacy ($N=200$, $P<.0001$) (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Pre course and post course self-efficacy in LHS concepts. Participants rated confidence on a scale of 0-100 (0= cannot do at all - 100= highly certain can do). Two-tailed, unpaired t-test was undertaken ($N=296$ pre-course, $N=200$ post-course). Changes from baseline to post course confidence are shown for each LHS concept ($P<.05^*$, $P<.01^{**}$, $P<.001^{***}$, $P<.0001^{****}$).

How did participants' self-perceived role in digital health change?

In the pre- and post-survey, participants were asked to respond to the open-ended question of "What do you see as your role in digital health?" There were several types of roles that participants perceived themselves embodying post course. These included: User of digital health, Learners; Champions, Advocates and Change Agents; Researchers, Innovators, Entrepreneurs; Leaders, Managers, Strategic Planners, Decision Makers; Educators and Mentors; Specialists, Implementers; Community Builders, Connectors, Facilitators, Collaborators and Translators (Table 4).

After the course, there was an increase in participants who viewed their role as an end user/learner and a community builder/facilitator, whereas there was a decrease in those who viewed their role as a champion/advocate and leader in digital health.

Table 4. Participants' perceived roles in digital health pre and post course (qualitative themes)

Pre course	No of re-sponses	Proportion (%)	Post course	No of re-sponses	Proportion (%)
End user of digital health/ Learner	41	15.0	End user of digital health/ Learner	54	23.7
Champion/ Advocate/	62	22.6	Champion/ Advocate/	37	16.2

Change Agent			Change Agent		
Researcher/ Innovator/ Entrepreneur	32	11.7	Researcher/ Innovator/ Entrepreneur	30	13.2
Leader/ Manager/ Strategic planner/ Decision Maker	38	13.9	Leader/ Manager/ Strategic planner/ Decision Maker	22	9.6
Educators/ Mentors	13	4.7	Educators/ Mentors	6	2.6
Specialist/ Implementer	57	20.8	Specialist/ Implementer	41	18.0
Community Builder/ Connector/ Facilitator/ Collaborator/ Translator	31	11.3	Community Builder/ Connector/ Facilitator/ Collaborator/ Translator	38	16.7
TOTAL	274	100.0	TOTAL	228	100.0

What did participants perceive as the applications of the learning in their workplace?

There were five main themes that arose for the types of applications that participants foresaw themselves using the course learnings for. These included learning and professional development: *"upskilling in the current role, more understanding of the roles of my team members"*, using data and undertaking data analysis more effectively: *"data mining and improving processes at work"*, implementing the LHS framework for digital health interventions: *"we are embarking on establishing a data and analytics 3 year plan and we intend to incorporate LHS principals into this strategy"*, for undertaking research and quality improvement activities and collaborating and sharing knowledge and learnings with colleagues: *"I intend to instil the LHS framework into my role, the work that I do and share it with my team"* (Table 5).

Table 5. Participants' anticipated applications of learning in the workplace (qualitative themes).

Pre course	No of responses	Proportion (%)	Post course	No of responses	Proportion (%)
Learning and professional development	74	21.9	Learning and professional development	47	20.3
Using data and undertaking data analysis	54	16.0	Using data and undertaking data analysis	43	18.6
Implementing digital health solutions with the LHS framework	63	18.6	Implementing digital health solutions with the LHS framework	52	22.5
Researching and quality improvement	82	24.3	Researching and quality improvement	62	26.8
Collaborating and knowledge sharing	65	19.2	Collaborating and knowledge sharing	27	11.7
TOTAL	338	100.0	TOTAL	231	100.0

What were the perceived benefits of the program?

Participants were asked to state the benefits of the program. The major themes that arose were: learning and knowledge acquisition: *"the course material was presented well on Canvas and had a good mix of different learning resources to use"*, value of collaboration: *"the course has been extremely eye-opening and has led me to begin collaborations on digital health projects through contacts made through the course"*, participant diversity and group work: *"being in a group of people with all different work backgrounds and skills coming together with a common interest was really good for tackling the problems to solve in the class"*, beneficial course structure and content delivery (pre-class: *"the course material was presented well on Canvas and had a good mix of different learning resources to use"*, in class: *"beneficial to be in a diverse group of other healthcare professionals - I learnt a lot from the robust and engaging discussions on Zoom"* and learning tools, importance of real world applications: case study and personal work: *"applying course concepts to this real-world scenario was instrumental in reinforcing their understanding"*, appreciation for instructors' diversity, expertise, engagement and quality: *"the instructors were very engaged and passionate about their topics"*, consumer focus, and focus on data analytics (Table 6).

Table 6. Beneficial elements of the course

Theme	No of responses	Proportion (%)
Collaborative group work/ diversity/ multidisciplinary approach	63	21.4
Course structure and content delivery/ pre and in class material	54	18.3
Learning and Knowledge Acquisition	53	18.0
Real world scenarios/ real world applicability	44	14.9
Exposure to tools and techniques	28	9.5
Appreciation for instructors	25	8.5
Exposure to complexity and challenges	14	4.7
Focus on consumers	14	4.7
TOTAL	295	100.0

What were participants' barriers to engaging with the program?

When asked regarding barriers to participating in the course, participants' responses formed the following major categories: time constraints due to work, family, and other social commitments: *"time constraints, balancing clinical work, other non-clinical work and home life"*, a lack of knowledge, terminology and experience: *"limited coal-face/frontline exposure and visibility of emerging frontline issues. I work at a more systems-based level and am not involved in interacting with patients day-to-day"*, technical challenges *"I found using so many new platforms e.g. Jupyter notebooks, BPMN so quickly challenging..."*, content complexity, and limited interactions online (Table 7).

Table 7. Barriers to effective participation

Theme	No of responses	Proportion (%)
Time constraints/keeping up with materials	109	42.1
Lack of knowledge and experience	56	21.6
Family and personal commitments	37	14.3
Technical challenges	23	8.9
Healthcare terminology and clinical knowledge	14	5.4
Work commitments	14	5.4
Course structure and content	6	2.3
TOTAL	259	100.0

What changes or improvements would participants suggest to the short LHS coursework?

While majority of participants found beneficial elements to the course, there are always improvements that can be made. Areas in which changes were suggested were: course structure, duration and timing, suggesting concerns around the pace of the course and amount of information and breadth covered: *"it feels like a lot of materials are being cramped into 1 session and it was hard to appreciate the differences between the models"* and the timing of delivery after a long work day; the usability of some learning tools, such as Jupyter notebooks, difficulties with learning management platform navigation, more revision activities to reinforce learning and a desire for more printable or downloadable resources; questionable benefit of group work and collaborative work where students wanted more support and time to hear instructor expertise: *"I feel there was too much reliance on group work and not enough input and guidance from the experts"*; course delivery – online format, questioning whether networking opportunities were lost online; prerequisite skills required, given the difficulty of some content (Table 8).

Table 8. Participants suggested improvements to the course

Theme	No of responses	Proportion (%)
Course content and structure – curriculum, quality, volume of material, level of complexity, clarity, usefulness, effectiveness, engagement, applicability	64	40.5
Course logistics and administration – course duration, pace, delivery modality, pre-requisites, learning platforms	37	23.4
Learning tools and materials – usability, accessibility	15	9.5
Group work and collaboration activities – diversity, effectiveness, interaction	30	19.0
Instructor interactions in-class – interaction, engagement, support	12	7.6
TOTAL	158	100.0

Discussion

Despite the concept originating in 2007 [24], there are a lack of reports evaluating Learning Health System education programs. In this evaluation, we discuss the findings of two years of implementation and iteration of an interdisciplinary Applied LHS professional development course (400 participants total, N=343 pre-survey respondents, 85% response rate, N=200 post-survey respondents, 50% response rate), to a diverse range of professionals working and studying in healthcare, with an interest in digital health. Most of our participants were from Australia, where LHS was a novel but emerging concept [15, 25-27][28]. The participants found the course engaging and relevant to their work. Participants highlighted specific benefits, barriers, and applications to this course and the LHS framework on their work.

Most health systems are actively seeking to increase the use of data and digital technology to drive improved healthcare delivery and health outcomes. A major ingredient needed to achieve that lofty goal is a workforce that knows how to not only thrive within the rapidly digitising world but also how to innovate to improve value-driven care. Training a diverse workforce in the digital transformation of health poses an overwhelming number of choices about the most important learning objectives, competencies, and skills. The LHS framework [16] placed boundaries around the grand vision and enabled us to concretely tell a story that resonated with the goals of potential learners while lending itself to hands-on activities that invite learners to be part of that story.

In addition to the advantages to multidisciplinary curriculum development, the LHS framework was also a key part of the value of the course to interdisciplinary learners. We launched this course as a pilot and hand selected 50 participants from a much larger pool of applicants with the aim of multidisciplinary involvement and of creating buzz around the course to encourage enrolment for a fee-paying version of the course. Medical directors, research leads, clinicians and managers brought learnings from the course to hallway discussions and team meetings in their workplaces about how they could apply the LHS framework in specific projects. In addition to better understanding of how a project could go from idea to implementation and evaluation using the LHS principles, the framework provided a shared lexicon, a set of approaches like creation of a learning community, and a toolkit of methods that learners could envision being used in their work. Their excitement was contagious, and a large proportion of our enrollees have come from organisations who continue to sponsor entire interdisciplinary teams of people to take the course together, because they see the value of the framework as a connector across disparate teams, such as clinicians, IT/EMR analysts, and health intelligence units, seeking to work towards a shared goal.

Overall, the course attracted a wide range of professionals at different levels (e.g., medical students to Directors of Emergency Departments), professions (e.g., nursing, social work), consumers, researchers, and disciplines (e.g., IT professionals). In this study, participants highly valued the interdisciplinary nature and collaborative learning activities in the course. Based on previous education research, we purposefully sorted the groups for diversity of professions and kept the participants within the same groups for the majority of the course to encourage relationship building. The interdisciplinary aspect of this course was a strength of our education model as it mimics the type of interdisciplinary practice required for complex LHS and digital health initiatives [28].

From several written comments and weekly surveys, we found that different disciplines struggled at different points within the course. For example, people without a research background found the data analysis topic and using Jupyter Notebooks the most challenging aspect of the course. Whereas those with a non-clinical background struggled the most with mapping clinical workflows and implementation. Although we used these struggles as teaching moments to demonstrate the need for an interdisciplinary team in LHS, our experience indicates the need to improve our interdisciplinary education model. Previous education researchers and motivational theorists have established that optimal challenge is key ingredient for engagement and learning [29]. If material is too easy or too difficult, then learners disengage and, thus, do not learn the material. Many educators have described the challenge of designing a course for optimal challenge among a large cohort uni-professional courses [30]. However, our experience is that this challenge is even more dramatic in a one-size-fits-all model in an interdisciplinary course. The content we taught is still appropriate for all audiences, but each person may require more or less self-directed preparatory work as part of the flipped classroom model. Future researchers and educators should investigate how to continue serving an interdisciplinary audience while creating optimal challenge for all participants. For example, in future iterations, we will explore the use generative artificial intelligence tools to personalise the self-directed online modules for participants' previous knowledge and professional context.

The participants' self-described digital health roles before and after the course only went through minor changes.

There was a small conversion in participants who started out seeing themselves as leaders and then later described their roles as connectors. This phenomenon may have been due to instructors telling participants about the importance of connector roles within the LHS framework. Another reason for this effect may be the Dunning-Kruger effect [31]. The Dunning-Kruger effect is when individuals with low exposure to a topic often overestimate their abilities due to a lack of metacognitive awareness. As they gain more knowledge, they become more aware of the limitations. Despite the potential for Dunning-Kruger effect, the lack of significant changes in participant digital health identity was in contrast to a similar evaluation of our parallel LHS education offering – a one-year LHS fellowship program for clinicians [15]. In the fellowship program, half of the participants began that program by describing their role as champions and leaders and then, by the middle of the program, all of the participants described their role as champions and leaders. This potential effect may be due to the benefits of the fellowship program; the fellowship is more experiential, project-based, and explicit focused on leadership development. Since self-identities are an important mediator of future performance [32], future educators and researchers should continue to investigate how LHS education programs influence participants' self-described roles in the LHS framework and digital health.

Strengths, limitations and future directions

Overall, we achieved commendable survey response rates, suggesting a high level of engagement from participants. This study uniquely contributes to the existing literature by evaluating an interdisciplinary Learning Health System (LHS) education program—a domain previously underexplored. Our comprehensive approach encompassed both pre- and post-course survey data, leveraging learning theories such as self-efficacy theory and the Kirkpatrick evaluation framework to inform our evaluation. Moreover, our qualitative analysis offers valuable insights into participants' perceptions, enriching our understanding of their experiences. However, a limitation is our current inability to capture the upper levels of the Kirkpatrick model, specifically how the LHS course may have influenced participants' workplace behaviours and the subsequent outcomes of those behaviours. In the long term, we aim to evaluate the impact this course and other LHS education offerings have had on individuals and their health organisations' journeys towards a learning health system and individual's career progression. We aim to do this by conducting follow up in depth interviews with participants and organisational sponsors and thematically analysing the changes that have occurred over time.

Achieving a learning health system requires a symbiotic partnership between researchers and health services—by bridging theory and real-world application, future innovations emerging from an LHS will be evidence-based and clinically relevant. To increase academic-practice collaboration, our LHS educational offerings aim to grow understanding of LHS principles and skills in our health services partners and to provide insight into the enablers and barriers for their digital transformation. The shared LHS framework and increased mutual understanding from these programs is increasing trust and collaborative opportunities, leading towards joint translational LHS innovation programs within the health services. We hope future educators and academic leaders see promise in our emerging LHS education evaluation work [15], other descriptions of LHS education initiatives [6-11], and the success of LHS initiatives in healthcare practice [33-35].

By providing a professional development short course, we were able to serve a large market of health professionals who would not otherwise have participated in an expensive university degree. While some professionals like medical specialists receive a continuing medical education fund, most other disciplines are not provided with funding for professional development. Additionally, a major source of participants was partner organisations supporting and sending groups of staff through the program, to learn together as cohorts to develop communities of practice. In this scenario, enrolment was funded by their employers. This is crucial, as at the national and international level, we require a critical mass of appropriately skilled workforce to leverage LHS principles in improving quality and value of healthcare delivery.

An interdisciplinary LHS short course has also provided a testbed for applying new technologies to learning. For instance, in the last iteration of the course we experimented with generative AI feedback on the participants' learning. In their working groups, participants developed an evaluation plan. They fed their plans into Chat GPT, which we provided with structured, custom prompts to provide feedback and rate the quality of the plans. Although some students found the feedback to be generic, the depth of the feedback was dependent upon the richness of the data initially fed to the machine. In large group settings, where there are limited instructors and limited time to provide in-depth feedback to each interdisciplinary group or participant, Chat GPT may be a useful tool to assist with providing formative feedback. The utility of this will be further explored in future iterations of the course.

Conclusion

Overall, the Applied LHS course received significantly positive feedback from interdisciplinary learners. They found the course to be well-structured, engaging, and a valuable learning experience. The qualitative comments emphasised the importance of delivering courses that not only provide knowledge but also inspire and motivate learners, and provide concrete tools to apply in their workplaces. A significant number of participants expressed interest in future courses and opportunities for further learning, underscoring the potential for expanding and diversifying course offerings in the future. There is still a great deal of education that needs to be provided to upskill the workforce adequately enough to undertake digital health transformation, but it begins with a shared vision, common language and a mutual framework to follow.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the dedication of several instructors and contributors to the Applied Learning Health Systems program: Dr Mahima Kalla, Dr Kara Burns, Dr Chris McMaster, Associate Professor Brian Chapman, Dr Douglas Capurro, Reuben Daniels, Jennifer Morris, Dr Vlada Rozova, Anna Fedyukova, Dr Kit Huckvale, Professor Kathleen Gray, Associate Professor Graeme Hart and Dr Debbie Passey.

Funding

No funding was involved in this project.

Data availability

All relevant data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article. The raw data sets generated during and/or analysed during this study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Conflicts of interest

The authors have no financial or non-financial competing interests to declare.

Author contributions

SD – data curation, formal analysis, investigation, project administration, visualisation, writing original draft, review and editing

NZ – formal analysis

DC – review and editing

WC – conceptualisation, review and editing

KL – investigation, methodology, supervision, writing original draft, review and editing

References

1. Friedman CP. What is unique about learning health systems? *Learn Health Syst.* 2022 Jul;6(3):e10328. PMID: 35860320. doi: 10.1002/lrh2.10328.
2. Friedman CP, Wong AK, Blumenthal D. Achieving a Nationwide Learning Health System. *Science Translational Medicine.* 2010;2(57):57cm29-57cm29. doi: doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3001456.
3. Friedman CP, Allee NJ, Delaney BC, Flynn AJ, Silverstein JC, Sullivan K, et al. The science of Learning Health Systems: Foundations for a new journal. *Learning Health Systems.* 2017;1(1):e10020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/lrh2.10020>.
4. Detmer DE. Interprofessional clinical informatics education and practice: Essentials for learning healthcare systems worldwide. *Journal of Interprofessional Care.* 2017 2017/03/04;31(2):187-9. doi: 10.1080/13561820.2016.1250554.
5. Gray K, Gilbert C, Butler-Henderson K, Day K, Pritchard S. *Ghosts in the Machine: Identifying the Digital Health Information Workforce.* 2019.
6. McMahon M, Bornstein S, Brown A, Tamblyn R. Training for Impact: PhD Modernization as a Key Resource for Learning Health Systems. *Healthc Policy.* 2019 Oct;15(Sp):10-5. PMID: 31755856. doi: 10.12927/hcpol.2019.25983.
7. Sim SM, Lai J, Aubrecht K, Cheng I, Embrett M, Ghandour EK, et al. CIHR Health System Impact Fellows: Reflections on "Driving Change" Within the Health System. *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2019 Jun 1;8(6):325-8. PMID: 31256564. doi: 10.15171/ijhpm.2018.124.
8. Grant RW, Schmittiel JA, Liu VX, Estacio KR, Chen Y-FI, Lieu TA. Training the next generation of delivery science researchers: 10-year experience of a post-doctoral research fellowship program within an integrated care system. *Learning Health Systems.* n/a(n/a):e10361. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/lrh2.10361>.
9. Kalra A, Adusumalli S, Sinha SS. Cultivating Skills for Success in Learning Health Systems: Learning to Lead. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2017 Nov 7;70(19):2450-4. PMID: 29096813. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2017.09.1086.
10. Wysham NG, Howie L, Patel K, Cameron CB, Samsa GP, Roe L, et al. Development and Refinement of a Learning Health Systems Training Program. *EGEMS (Wash DC).* 2016;4(1):1236. PMID: 28154832. doi: 10.13063/2327-9214.1236.
11. Kohn MS, Topaloglu U, Kirkendall ES, Dharod A, Wells BJ, Gurcan M. Creating learning health systems and the emerging role of biomedical informatics. *Learn Health Syst.* 2022 Jan;6(1):e10259. PMID: 35036547. doi: 10.1002/lrh2.10259.
12. Robinson CH, Thompto AJ, Lima EN, Damschroder LJ. Continuous quality improvement at the frontline: One interdisciplinary clinical team's four-year journey after completing a virtual learning program. *Learning Health Systems.* 2022;6(4):e10345. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/lrh2.10345>.
13. Kasai B, Thompson E, Glazier RH, McMahon M. Early Career Outcomes of Embedded Research Fellows: An Analysis of the Health System Impact Fellowship Program. *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2023;12:7333. PMID: 37579439. doi: 10.34172/ijhpm.2023.7333.
14. Lozano PM, Lane-Fall M, Franklin PD, Rothman RL, Gonzales R, Ong MK, et al. Training the next generation of learning health system scientists. *Learn Health Syst.* 2022 Oct;6(4):e10342. PMID: 36263260. doi: 10.1002/lrh2.10342.
15. Dushyanthen S, Perrier M, Chapman W, Layton M, Lyons K. Fostering the use of Learning Health Systems through a fellowship program for interprofessional clinicians. *Learn Health Syst.* 2022 Oct;6(4):e10340. PMID: 36263261. doi: 10.1002/lrh2.10340.
16. Dushyanthen S, Choo D, Perrier M, Gray K, Capurro D, Pires D, et al. Designing an Interprofessional Online Course to Foster Learning Health Systems. *Stud Health Technol Inform.* 2024 Jan 25;310:1241-5. PMID: 38270013. doi: 10.3233/SHTI231163.
17. Jones-Bonofiglio KD, Willett T, Ng S. An evaluation of flipped e-learning experiences. *Med*

- Teach. 2018 Sep;40(9):953-61. PMID: 29271281. doi: 10.1080/0142159x.2017.1417577.
18. Barr H KI, Reeves S, Hammick M, Freeth D. *Approaching Learning and Teaching*: Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2005 2022/03/31. 95-104 p. ISBN: 9780470776445.
 19. Sherer M, Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. The Self-efficacy Scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*. 1982;51(2):663-71. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1982.51.2.663.
 20. Pajares F. Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*. 1996;66(4):543-78. doi: 10.2307/1170653.
 21. Greenberg-Worisek AJ, Shippee ND, Schaffhausen C, Johnson K, Shah ND, Linzer M, et al. The Learning Health System Competency Appraisal Inventory (LHS-CAI): A novel tool for assessing LHS-focused education needs. *Learning health systems*. 2020;5(2):10.1002/lrh2.10218. PMID: 33889729. doi: 10.1002/lrh2.10218.
 22. Forrest CB, Chesley FD, Jr., Tregear ML, Mistry KB. Development of the Learning Health System Researcher Core Competencies. *Health Serv Res*. 2018;53(4):2615-32. PMID: 28777456. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.12751.
 23. Hsieh H-F, Shannon SE. Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*. 2005 2005/11/01;15(9):1277-88. doi: 10.1177/1049732305276687.
 24. Institute of Medicine (US) Roundtable on Evidence-Based Medicine; Olsen LA AD, McGinnis JM, editors. *Washington (DC): . The Learning Healthcare System: Workshop Summary. . National Academies Press (US) 2007*. doi: 10.17226/11903.
 25. Enticott JC, Melder A, Johnson A, Jones A, Shaw T, Keech W, et al. A Learning Health System Framework to Operationalize Health Data to Improve Quality Care: An Australian Perspective. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2021;8:730021. PMID: 34778291. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2021.730021.
 26. Ellis LA, Sarkies M, Churruca K, Dammery G, Meulenbroeks I, Smith CL, et al. The Science of Learning Health Systems: Scoping Review of Empirical Research. *JMIR Med Inform*. 2022 2022/2/23;10(2):e34907. doi: 10.2196/34907.
 27. Dammery G, Ellis LA, Churruca K, Mahadeva J, Lopez F, Carrigan A, et al. The journey to a learning health system in primary care: a qualitative case study utilising an embedded research approach. *BMC Primary Care*. 2023 2023/01/19;24(1):22. doi: 10.1186/s12875-022-01955-w.
 28. Friedman C, Rubin J, Brown J, Buntin M, Corn M, Etheredge L, et al. Toward a science of learning systems: a research agenda for the high-functioning Learning Health System. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2015;22(1):43-50.
 29. Nakamura J, Csikszentmihalyi M. The concept of flow. *Handbook of positive psychology*. 2002;89:105.
 30. Cooper JL, Robinson P. The argument for making large classes seem small. *New directions for teaching and learning*. 2000;2000(81):5-16.
 31. Kruger J, Dunning D. Unskilled and unaware of it: how difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 1999;77(6):1121.
 32. Nolen SB, Horn IS, Ward CJ. Situating motivation. *Educational Psychologist*. 2015;50(3):234-47.
 33. Enticott J, Johnson A, Teede H. Learning health systems using data to drive healthcare improvement and impact: a systematic review. *BMC health services research*. 2021;21:1-16.
 34. Casey JD, Courtright KR, Rice TW, Semler MW. What can a learning healthcare system teach us about improving outcomes? *Current Opinion in Critical Care*. 2021;27(5):527-36.
 35. Budrionis A, Bellika JG. The learning healthcare system: where are we now? A systematic review. *Journal of biomedical informatics*. 2016;64:87-92.