Medical Workers' Multidisciplinary Collaborative Approaches to Identifying, Assessing, and Intervening on Social Determinants of Health in Integrated Healthcare Settings

Yassmeen Ibrahim Alnajjar[1], Nisreen Ghazi Albouq[2], Noorah Mohammad Alshareef[3], Turki Mulfi Khelaiwi Alharbi[4], Bushra Salem Alotuibi[5], Adel Aqeel Alanezi[6], Safiah Solaiman Alzhrani[7], Alaa abdulqader Alahmadi[8], Enas Mohammed Sokail[9], Nahid mohamad sokail[10], Khadijah Mohammed Thani Othman Sokail[11], Ammar Saud Hodiban Alahmadi[12], Majed Mustafa Hussein Mimarji[13], Dalal Saud Alahmadi[14], Nahla Homud Almowld[15]

[1] Consultant family medicine, Ministry Headquarters
[2] ENT Senior Registrar, Ohud Hospital, ENT Department, Madinah
[3] Associate Consultant, King Abdullah Medical Complex Jeddah
[4] Nursing Technician, Ohad Hospital, Surgery, Medina Health Cluster
[5] Nursing technician, King Salman Medical City, Medina Health Cluster
[6] Nursing Technician, Uhud Hospital Madinah, Medina Health Cluster
[7] Nursing technician register, Ohud Hospital, patient experience department, Madinah
[8] Nursing specialist, Ministry of Health Headquarters
[9] Nursing Technician, Maternity and Children's Hospital, Madinah Health Cluster
[10] Staff Nurse, Jubail Health Network, Eastern Health Cluster
[11] Medical Secretary, Madinah Health Cluster, Patient Experience, Madinah Health Cluster
[12] Nursing Specialist, Al-Amal Psychiatric Hospital, King Salman Medical City
[13] Nursing Specialist, Al-Amal Psychiatric Hospital, King Salman Medical City
[14] Medical Secretary, Ohud Hospital, Madinah Health Clustr
[15] Nurse, Almadinah Health Cluster, Ope Cinicl

Accepted: 15-07-2024 **Published: 15-09-2024**

Abstract

Social determinants of health (SDOH) significantly influence health outcomes, yet healthcare systems have historically struggled to effectively address these factors within traditional medical models. This article examines how multidisciplinary collaborative approaches among medical workers can enhance identification, assessment, and intervention on SDOH in integrated healthcare settings. Drawing on recent literature and practice examples, the article explores interprofessional collaborative frameworks, role-specific contributions, implementation challenges, and promising intervention models. Findings indicate that effective SDOH-focused collaboration requires intentional team structures, clear role delineation, shared decision-making protocols, and organizational support. Particular attention is given to the integration of social workers within healthcare teams, the development of structured screening and referral processes, and the cultivation of collaborative competencies. The article concludes with recommendations for strengthening multidisciplinary SDOH approaches, including organizational policy changes, educational innovations, and systems-level integration strategies. This comprehensive analysis contributes to understanding how healthcare workers can collaborate more effectively to address the complex social factors influencing patient health and wellbeing.

Expanded Implementation Models for Collaborative SDOH Approaches

Structured Screening and Referral Processes: Detailed Implementation Strategies

The implementation of structured screening for social determinants of health requires careful consideration of numerous operational factors. Healthcare organizations have developed various approaches to effectively integrate SDOH screening into clinical workflows:

Screening Tool Selection and Administration

Successful SDOH screening begins with selecting appropriate assessment tools. The most widely implemented tools include:

- **PRAPARE (Protocol for Responding to and Assessing Patient Assets, Risks, and Experiences)**: This comprehensive 21-item assessment covers multiple domains including housing, food security, transportation, social support, and stress.
- **AHC-HRSN (Accountable Health Communities Health-Related Social Needs Screening Tool)**: Developed by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, this tool focuses on five core domains: housing instability, food insecurity, transportation difficulties, utility needs, and interpersonal safety.
- **WE CARE (Well Child Care, Evaluation, Community Resources, Advocacy, Referral, Education)**: This pediatric-focused tool screens for family social needs that impact child health and development.

Administration approaches vary significantly across settings, with considerations including:

- **Timing**: Some organizations conduct screening at every encounter, while others implement annual screening with triggered reassessments when circumstances change.
- **Modality**: Options include paper forms, tablet-based entry, patient portal completion prior to visits, or verbal administration by team members.
- **Administrator**: Screening may be conducted by medical assistants, nurses, reception staff, social workers, or community health workers, with role assignment often reflecting team composition and workflow considerations.

Kreuter et al. (2021) note that screening implementation is most successful when organizations pilot processes with small patient populations before scaling, allowing for workflow refinement and staff adaptation. Their research indicates that embedding screening questions within existing clinical processes (e.g., adding social needs questions to intake forms) generally achieves higher completion rates than introducing separate screening processes.

Referral Pathway Development

Effective referral systems for addressing identified social needs typically include several key components:

1. **Resource mapping**: Comprehensive identification of available community resources for each social need domain, including eligibility criteria, service capacity, and access procedures.
2. **Prioritization protocols**: Guidelines for determining which needs should be addressed first when patients present with multiple social challenges, typically incorporating both acuity assessment and patient preferences.
3. **Clear responsibility assignment**: Designation of which team members handle referrals for specific types of needs, often with tiered approaches where complex situations escalate to team members with specialized expertise.
4. **Documentation standards**: Consistent methods for recording referrals made, patient engagement with referrals, and outcomes achieved.
5. **Follow-up processes**: Structured approaches for checking whether patients successfully connected with referred resources and assessing whether needs were adequately addressed.

Rowe et al. (2017) describe a particularly effective referral model in primary care where initial referrals for low-complexity needs are managed by medical assistants and nurses using a standardized resource directory, while more complex situations trigger "warm handoffs" to embedded social workers who conduct comprehensive assessments and develop multifaceted intervention plans. This model maximizes efficiency while ensuring appropriate expertise for challenging situations.

Embedded Social Care Models: Operational Considerations

The successful integration of social care professionals within healthcare teams requires attention to several operational dimensions:

Staffing Models and Ratios

Organizations have implemented various staffing approaches for embedded social care, including:

- **Dedicated assignment**: Social workers or community health workers permanently assigned to specific clinical teams or departments
- **Consultation model**: Social care professionals available for referral from multiple teams
- **Hybrid approaches**: Core embedded staff supplemented by specialists who consult across teams for specific issues (e.g., housing specialists, legal aid navigators)

Staffing ratios vary widely based on patient population needs and service model, but Heenan and Birrell (2019) report that most hospital-based models maintain ratios between 1:15 and 1:30 (social worker to inpatient beds), while outpatient models typically range from 1:1000 to 1:3000 (social worker to patient panel size). These ratios should be adjusted based on social risk factors in the population served, with higher-need communities requiring more intensive staffing.

Physical Space and Infrastructure

The physical integration of social care has important implications for collaboration effectiveness. Key considerations include:

- **Co-location**: Providing office space for social care professionals within clinical areas rather than in separate departments
- **Consultation rooms**: Designating private spaces for social need discussions that may involve sensitive topics
- **Team workspaces**: Creating shared areas where interprofessional teams can collaborate on care planning
- **Technology access**: Ensuring social care professionals have appropriate access to electronic health records and other clinical information systems

Browne (2019) emphasizes that physical proximity significantly influences informal consultation patterns, with co-located team members engaging in approximately three times more spontaneous case discussions than those located in separate areas. This informal collaboration often addresses emerging social needs before they escalate to crisis situations.

Integration Levels

Embedded social care models exist along a continuum of integration, from basic coordination to full integration:

1. **Basic coordination**: Social care professionals receive referrals from clinical teams but maintain separate workflows, documentation systems, and supervision structures.
2. **Co-location**: Social and clinical providers work in the same physical space but maintain distinct roles, responsibilities, and reporting relationships.
3. **Collaboration**: Team members develop shared care plans with regular communication, but retain profession-specific workflows for much of their work.

4. **Full integration**: Comprehensive team-based care with unified workflows, documentation, supervision, and accountability structures.

Steketee et al. (2017) found that more highly integrated models generally produced better outcomes, particularly for patients with complex social needs, though they also required more substantial organizational changes and resource investments. Their systematic review indicated that full integration models demonstrated the strongest evidence for cost savings through reduced healthcare utilization, with average returns on investment between $2.00 and $3.59 for every dollar spent on integrated social care.

Care Transition Teams: Comprehensive Approaches

Care transition models focusing on SDOH have developed increasingly sophisticated approaches to addressing the social factors that affect post-discharge outcomes:

Comprehensive Assessment Frameworks

Effective care transition teams utilize structured assessment processes that evaluate multiple dimensions of social risk, including:

- **Home environment safety and accessibility**
- **Caregiver availability and capacity**
- **Transportation access for follow-up appointments**
- **Medication affordability and management ability**
- **Nutritional resources and food preparation capacity**
- **Communication abilities and health literacy**
- **Financial resources for post-discharge needs**

Rammohan et al. (2023) describe a particularly effective assessment protocol that combines standardized screening tools with home visits conducted prior to discharge for high-risk patients. These pre-discharge home assessments, typically conducted by occupational therapists or community health workers, identify environmental barriers and resource gaps that might otherwise remain undetected until problems arise post-discharge.

Transitional Support Intensity Models

Care transition teams increasingly utilize tiered approaches that match intervention intensity to patient risk levels:

1. **Universal interventions**: Basic discharge planning and resource information provided to all patients
2. **Targeted support**: Enhanced services for patients with moderate social risk, including follow-up calls and assistance with specific resource connections
3. **Intensive management**: Comprehensive support for high-risk patients, including home visits, accompaniment to initial follow-up appointments, and direct advocacy with social service agencies

This tiered approach allows for efficient resource allocation while ensuring that patients with the most significant social barriers receive appropriately intensive support. Implementation typically involves risk stratification algorithms that incorporate both clinical and social factors to determine appropriate intervention levels.

Technology-Enhanced Communication

Advanced care transition models increasingly utilize technology to enhance coordination across settings:

- **Shared care platforms** accessible to hospital teams, outpatient providers, and community organizations
- **Patient-accessible portals** that allow real-time communication about emerging social needs
- **Automated alert systems** that notify team members when patients miss appointments or experience other warning signs
- **Remote monitoring tools** that track social indicators alongside clinical metrics

Rammohan et al. (2023) describe how one healthcare system implemented a mobile application connecting discharged patients directly with care transition team members, finding that patients who utilized this technology experienced 32% fewer readmissions compared to similar patients receiving standard transition support.

Community-Clinical Partnerships: Partnership Development and Governance

Developing effective community-clinical partnerships for SDOH intervention requires intentional relationship-building and governance structures:

Partnership Formation Approaches

Successful community-clinical partnerships typically evolve through several developmental stages:

1. **Exploration**: Initial identification of potential partners and informal discussions about shared interests
2. **Formation**: Development of partnership goals, roles, and preliminary agreements
3. **Implementation**: Execution of joint activities with regular adaptation based on feedback
4. **Maintenance**: Ongoing operations with established processes and relationship management
5. **Evaluation and evolution**: Regular assessment of partnership effectiveness with strategic adjustments

Vanderbilt et al. (2015) emphasize that successful partnerships allocate sufficient time for relationship development before implementing programmatic activities. Their analysis of partnerships in underserved communities found that those spending at least six months in exploration and formation phases demonstrated significantly stronger long-term collaboration than those rushing to implementation.

Governance and Decision-Making Structures

Effective partnerships establish clear governance mechanisms that balance efficiency with inclusive representation:

- **Steering committees** with balanced membership from healthcare and community organizations
- **Working groups** focused on specific SDOH domains or operational functions
- **Community advisory boards** ensuring authentic community voice in decision-making
- **Formalized agreements** clarifying roles, responsibilities, and resource contributions
- **Conflict resolution protocols** for addressing inevitable tensions and disagreements

Noel et al. (2022) highlight the importance of explicitly addressing power dynamics in these governance structures, noting that healthcare organizations typically enter partnerships with significantly greater resources and institutional power than community-based organizations. Their systematic review found that partnerships explicitly incorporating power-balancing mechanisms (e.g., rotating leadership, consensus decision-making, equitable resource control) demonstrated stronger collaboration sustainability and more positive outcomes.

Professional Competencies for Effective SDOH Collaboration

Core Competencies Across Professions

Effective interprofessional collaboration on SDOH requires certain foundational competencies that transcend specific professional roles:

Systems Thinking

All team members need capacity to understand how multiple systems interact to create and sustain social determinants of health. This includes:

- Understanding the organization and financing of healthcare, social services, housing, transportation, and other relevant systems
- Recognizing the policy frameworks that govern these systems at local, state, and federal levels
- Identifying leverage points for intervention within and across systems
- Anticipating how changes in one system may affect others

Spencer et al. (2022) note that systems thinking enables healthcare workers to move beyond individual-level interventions to address structural factors that affect population health. They emphasize that developing this competency often requires explicit training, as many healthcare educational programs focus primarily on individual patient interactions rather than systemic analysis.

Cultural Humility and Structural Competence

Addressing SDOH effectively requires understanding how cultural factors and structural inequities shape health experiences:

- Cultural humility involves ongoing self-reflection about one's own cultural assumptions and biases
- Structural competence requires recognizing how systems and institutions create and perpetuate health inequities
- Both perspectives emphasize the importance of learning from patients and communities rather than imposing professional assumptions
- These approaches help team members avoid blaming individuals for structural problems while recognizing agency and resilience

Vanderbilt et al. (2015) emphasize that cultural humility and structural competence are essential for developing interventions that resonate with community needs rather than reflecting professional or institutional priorities. Their analysis found that interprofessional teams that explicitly incorporated these perspectives were more successful in engaging marginalized populations in SDOH interventions.

Collaborative Leadership

Effective SDOH collaboration requires leadership approaches that differ from traditional hierarchical models:

- Distributed leadership that recognizes different team members as leaders in different contexts
- Facilitative approaches that create space for all voices to contribute
- Adaptive leadership capable of responding to emerging challenges
- Boundary-spanning leadership that connects across professional and organizational divides

Warren and Warren (2023) argue that collaborative leadership for SDOH requires specific skills development, as many healthcare professionals are trained in directive leadership models that may be counterproductive in interprofessional contexts. They recommend explicit leadership development programs that help team members navigate the complexity of collaborative decision-making across professional boundaries.

Profession-Specific Competencies and Development Needs

While shared competencies provide a foundation for collaboration, each profession also requires specific competencies to contribute effectively to SDOH work:

Physicians and Advanced Practice Providers

Physicians and advanced practice providers need specific competencies beyond their traditional clinical expertise:

- **Structural vulnerability assessment**: Ability to identify how structural factors create vulnerability for specific patients

- **Resource awareness**: Knowledge of available social services and how to access them
- **Interprofessional humility**: Willingness to defer to other team members with greater expertise in social domains
- **Advocacy skills**: Capacity to advocate for systems changes that address structural barriers to health
- **Collaborative documentation**: Ability to document social needs in ways that support team-based intervention

Esperat et al. (2023) note that these competencies receive limited attention in most medical education programs, creating a significant development need for practicing physicians. Their analysis of interprofessional collaborative practice for chronic disease management found that physicians who received specific training in these domains collaborated more effectively with other team members addressing social determinants.

Nursing Professionals

Nurses require specific competencies to maximize their contributions to SDOH-focused teams:

- **Comprehensive assessment**: Ability to integrate social, environmental, and clinical factors in patient assessments
- **Care coordination**: Skills in navigating complex systems to connect patients with needed resources
- **Patient education**: Capacity to provide education that acknowledges and addresses social barriers to health
- **Team facilitation**: Ability to facilitate communication among diverse team members and with patients
- **Community engagement**: Skills in connecting clinical work with community-based approaches

Rogers and Warwick (2022) emphasize that rural nurses, in particular, often serve as primary coordinators for SDOH interventions due to limited availability of social workers and other specialized staff. Their study of sustainable maternity services in rural settings found that nurses who developed strong competencies in these domains were able to maintain effective SDOH-focused care despite resource limitations.

Social Workers

Social workers, while already trained in person-in-environment perspectives, need specific competencies for healthcare integration:

- **Medical knowledge**: Understanding of how health conditions interact with social factors
- **Healthcare system navigation**: Ability to help patients move through complex healthcare systems
- **Interprofessional communication**: Skills in translating social work concepts for other healthcare professionals
- **Brief intervention models**: Capacity to adapt traditional social work approaches to faster-paced healthcare contexts
- **Outcome measurement**: Ability to document social interventions in ways that demonstrate healthcare impact

Zerden et al. (2021) found that social work students in integrated healthcare settings often felt unprepared for the pace and communication style of healthcare environments, highlighting the need for specialized education focused on these competencies. Their evaluation of social work students' experiences in integrated care settings recommended curriculum adaptations to better prepare social workers for effective collaboration in healthcare contexts.

Technological Innovations Supporting Collaborative SDOH Approaches

Integrated Electronic Health Records with SDOH Functionality

Advanced electronic health record (EHR) systems increasingly incorporate specific functionality to support collaborative SDOH work:

Standardized Documentation Tools

Modern EHR systems now often include:

- Structured templates for SDOH screening results
- Standardized problem lists that incorporate social needs alongside medical diagnoses
- ICD-10 Z-codes for social factors affecting health status
- Risk scoring algorithms that incorporate social determinants
- Documentation fields specific to different professional roles

These structured approaches enable systematic data collection and analysis while facilitating efficient communication across team members. Kreuter et al. (2021) note that standardized documentation is essential for tracking outcomes and demonstrating the value of SDOH interventions, but caution that poorly designed documentation requirements can create significant administrative burden that detracts from direct patient care.

Resource Directory Integration

EHR systems increasingly incorporate or interface with resource directories that:

- Maintain up-to-date information about community resources
- Filter resources based on patient characteristics and eligibility criteria
- Generate personalized resource lists for patients
- Track referrals and referral outcomes
- Provide feedback to community organizations about service gaps

These integrated directories significantly improve the efficiency of referral processes compared to traditional approaches relying on paper resource lists or team members' personal knowledge. However, maintaining accurate information requires dedicated staffing and ongoing community engagement, as resource availability can change rapidly.

Telehealth Approaches for SDOH Intervention

Telehealth technologies are creating new possibilities for collaborative SDOH intervention:

Virtual Home Visits and Environmental Assessment

Telehealth enables team members to:

- Conduct virtual home visits to assess environmental conditions
- Include multiple team members in assessments without overwhelming patients
- Incorporate family members or caregivers who might not attend in-person visits
- Reduce transportation barriers for both patients and providers

Moore et al. (2016) describe how emergency department-based social workers began conducting virtual follow-up assessments during the COVID-19 pandemic, finding that this approach allowed them to identify housing safety issues and social support limitations that were difficult to assess in the emergency department environment. This virtual approach has continued as a standard practice due to its effectiveness in identifying SDOH concerns.

Remote Interprofessional Consultation

Telehealth facilitates interprofessional consultation on social needs through:

- Synchronous video consultations bringing multiple professions together with patients
- Asynchronous consultation through secure messaging systems
- Virtual "huddles" for team coordination without requiring physical co-location
- Shared viewing of documentation and care plans during remote collaboration

These approaches are particularly valuable for organizations serving rural or geographically dispersed populations where in-person collaboration may be impractical. Rogers and Warwick (2022) describe how telehealth-enabled consultation between rural nurses and urban-based social workers and specialists helped maintain comprehensive social needs services in remote communities during staffing shortages.

Data Analytics for Population-Level SDOH Approaches

Advanced analytics are enabling more sophisticated population-level approaches to SDOH:

Predictive Modeling

Healthcare organizations increasingly use predictive analytics to:

- Identify patients at highest risk for SDOH-related complications
- Predict which social interventions are most likely to benefit specific patients
- Anticipate community-level social needs based on demographic and economic trends
- Guide resource allocation and workforce planning for social care

Steketee et al. (2017) describe how predictive models incorporating both clinical and social data demonstrated significantly better accuracy in identifying patients at risk for preventable hospitalizations compared to models using clinical data alone. These integrated models enabled more precise targeting of intensive care management resources to patients most likely to benefit.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

GIS technologies enable spatial analysis of SDOH through:

- Mapping the geographic distribution of social needs within communities
- Identifying "hot spots" requiring targeted intervention
- Analyzing accessibility of resources relative to population needs
- Visualizing disparities in resource distribution across communities

Spencer et al. (2022) describe how one healthcare system used GIS analysis to identify neighborhoods with high rates of emergency department utilization for asthma exacerbations alongside poor housing conditions. This analysis guided the development of a targeted housing intervention program involving community health workers, legal aid attorneys, and clinicians, which reduced asthma-related hospitalizations by 45% among participants.

Measuring and Evaluating Collaborative SDOH Approaches

Outcome Measurement Frameworks

Comprehensive evaluation of collaborative SDOH approaches requires multidimensional measurement frameworks:

Quadruple Aim Plus Equity

An expanded version of the Institute for Healthcare Improvement's Quadruple Aim provides a useful framework for SDOH evaluation:

1. **Patient experience**: Satisfaction with care, perceived relevance to needs, cultural responsiveness
2. **Population health**: Clinical outcomes, functional status, well-being measures
3. **Cost reduction**: Healthcare utilization, total cost of care, return on investment
4. **Provider experience**: Team satisfaction, burnout rates, retention
5. **Equity**: Distribution of outcomes across population groups, reduction in disparities

Kreuter et al. (2021) emphasize that equity must be an explicit dimension of evaluation rather than assumed to follow from overall improvements. Their review found that some SDOH interventions improved average outcomes while actually widening disparities between groups, highlighting the importance of stratified analysis by race, ethnicity, language, income, and other relevant factors.

Process and Implementation Measures

In addition to outcome measures, evaluation should assess implementation quality through metrics such as:

- **Screening rates**: Percentage of eligible patients receiving SDOH screening
- **Need identification**: Prevalence of identified social needs across domains
- **Referral completion**: Rate at which referrals result in successful connections
- **Need resolution**: Percentage of identified needs successfully addressed
- **Collaboration quality**: Team functioning, communication effectiveness, role clarity

Tadic et al. (2020) found that process measures were particularly important during early implementation phases when outcome changes might not yet be detectable. Their evaluation of social workers in interprofessional primary care teams demonstrated that teams with strong process metrics in the first year subsequently showed stronger outcome improvements in years two and three.

Innovative Evaluation Approaches

Traditional evaluation methods may not fully capture the complexity of collaborative SDOH work, leading to several innovative approaches:

Ripple Effect Mapping

This participatory evaluation technique documents the intended and unintended consequences of collaborative interventions by:

- Engaging diverse stakeholders in group reflection about observed changes
- Visually mapping direct, indirect, and emergent outcomes
- Identifying connections between different types of outcomes
- Capturing community-level changes that might be missed in individual-focused evaluation

Noel et al. (2022) describe how ripple effect mapping revealed unexpected community capacity development resulting from collaborative interventions between social workers and community health workers. These community-level outcomes, including enhanced social networks and increased collective efficacy, represented important value that would have been missed by traditional evaluation methods focused solely on individual patient outcomes.

Social Return on Investment (SROI)

SROI analysis extends traditional cost-effectiveness evaluation by:

- Assigning monetary values to social, environmental, and health outcomes
- Incorporating multiple stakeholder perspectives in defining value
- Accounting for outcomes across sectors and systems
- Calculating comprehensive return ratios that include both financial and social returns

Steketee et al. (2017) found that SROI analyses of social work interventions in healthcare settings typically demonstrated returns between $3 and $7 for every dollar invested when incorporating cross-sector benefits. These analyses helped justify continued investment in collaborative SDOH approaches even when direct healthcare cost savings alone might not have supported the business case.

Future Directions for Collaborative SDOH Approaches

Integration with Value-Based Care Models

The continued expansion of value-based payment models creates both opportunities and challenges for collaborative SDOH approaches:

Accountable Health Organizations

Emerging accountable health organizations extend the accountable care organization concept by:

- Assuming responsibility for both health and social outcomes
- Incorporating social care providers as core team members
- Developing payment mechanisms that support social interventions
- Creating shared savings arrangements that incentivize social investment

Spencer et al. (2022) describe several demonstration projects testing these models, finding that they show promise for sustainable SDOH financing but require significant infrastructure development and regulatory flexibility. Their analysis suggests that these models may eventually become the dominant approach to integrating health and social care, though full implementation will likely require at least another decade of development and testing.

Alternative Payment Models

Specific payment innovations supporting collaborative SDOH work include:

- **Per-member-per-month payments** for care coordination that addresses social needs
- **Risk-adjusted capitation** incorporating social risk factors
- **Bundled payments** that include social support services alongside clinical care
- **Shared savings models** that incentivize reducing utilization through social intervention

Kreuter et al. (2021) note that these payment innovations remain limited in scale but are expanding as evidence accumulates regarding their effectiveness in improving outcomes and controlling costs. They emphasize that payment model development must explicitly address equity concerns to ensure that organizations are not penalized for serving populations with greater social needs.

Workforce Development Innovations

Meeting the growing demand for collaborative SDOH approaches requires significant workforce innovations:

Transdisciplinary Professional Development

New approaches to professional development include:

- **Interprofessional learning collaboratives** bringing teams together for ongoing skill development
- **Cross-training** that develops shared competencies across professional boundaries
- **Joint credentialing** recognizing expertise in collaborative practice
- **Team-based continuing education** that reinforces collaborative approaches

Chithiramohan et al. (2023) describe "experience days" that immerse postgraduate medical trainees in the work of other professions, finding that these structured experiences significantly enhanced collaborative capabilities. Their evaluation showed that participants demonstrated greater understanding of other professions' contributions to SDOH intervention and more frequently initiated collaborative approaches in their subsequent practice.

Emerging Roles and Career Pathways

The evolving landscape of collaborative SDOH practice is generating new professional roles:

- **Social determinants navigators** specializing in connecting patients with resources
- **Community integration specialists** who bridge clinical and community settings
- **Interprofessional team leaders** with expertise in facilitating collaborative practice
- **SDOH data analysts** who integrate and interpret social and clinical data

These emerging roles create new career development pathways for professionals interested in collaborative approaches to social determinants. Noel et al. (2022) note that creating clear career advancement opportunities for these specialized roles is essential for workforce

retention and development, particularly for community health workers and other professionals who may have traditionally had limited advancement possibilities.

Conclusion: A Comprehensive Vision for Collaborative SDOH Approaches

The evolution of multidisciplinary collaborative approaches to social determinants of health represents a fundamental shift in healthcare delivery—moving from a narrow focus on medical intervention toward comprehensive approaches that address the full spectrum of factors influencing health and wellbeing. As this evolution continues, several guiding principles emerge for developing effective and sustainable collaborative models:

1. **Patient-centeredness must remain paramount**. Collaborative approaches should be guided by patients' own definitions of their needs and priorities rather than professional or institutional assumptions. This requires authentic engagement with patients in designing and evaluating collaborative models.
2. **Equity must be an explicit focus**. Collaborative SDOH approaches must intentionally address disparities in both health outcomes and social conditions, with particular attention to communities that have experienced historical marginalization and disinvestment.
3. **Professional integration requires mutual respect**. Effective collaboration depends on recognizing the unique value that each profession brings while creating space for overlapping responsibilities and shared decision-making.
4. **Community partnership is essential**. Healthcare organizations cannot effectively address social determinants alone; authentic partnerships with community organizations and residents are necessary for developing contextually appropriate interventions.
5. **Sustainable financing mechanisms must be developed**. Despite growing evidence of their value, collaborative SDOH approaches remain vulnerable to budget constraints without robust financing models that recognize their contribution to improved outcomes and reduced costs.

The journey toward fully realized collaborative approaches to social determinants will likely continue for decades, requiring ongoing innovation, evaluation, and adaptation. However, the foundation has been laid through pioneering work in interprofessional education, integrated care models, and community-clinical partnerships. As healthcare continues to evolve toward value-based approaches that emphasize outcomes rather than services, collaborative SDOH models will likely become increasingly central to healthcare delivery rather than remaining at the margins.

References:

[1] Browne, T. (2019). Social work roles and healthcare settings. In S. Gehlert & T. Browne (Eds.), Handbook of health social work (3rd ed., pp. 21–37). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119420743.ch2

[2]Chithiramohan, A., Prakash, R., Dawood, S., & Nurhussien, A. (2023). 'Experience days': Promoting interprofessional collaboration and understanding for postgraduate doctors in training. British Journal of Hospital Medicine, 84, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.12968/hmed.0223.0199

[3]Esperat, M. C., Hust, C., Song, H., Garcia, M., & McMurry, L. J. (2023). Interprofessional collaborative practice: Management of chronic disease and mental health issues in primary care. Public Health Reports, 138, 29S–35S. https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549231155469

[4]Heenan, D., & Birrell, D. (2019). Hospital-based social work: Challenges at the interface between health and social care. British Journal of Social Work, 49, 1741–1758. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcy114

[5]Kreuter, M. W., Thompson, T., McQueen, A., & Garg, R. (2021). Addressing social needs

in health care settings: Evidence, challenges, and opportunities for public health. Annual Review of Public Health, 42, 329–344. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-090419-102204

[6]Moore, M., Whiteside, L. K., Dotolo, D., Wang, J., Ho, L., Conley, B., Forrester, M., Fouts, S. O., Vavilala, M. S., & Zatzick, D. F. (2016). The role of social work in providing mental health services and care coordination in an urban trauma center emergency department. Psychiatric Services, 67, 1348–1354. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201500469

[7]Noel, L., Chen, Q., Petruzzi, L. J., Phillips, F., Garay, R., Valdez, C., Aranda, M. P., & Jones, B. (2022). Interprofessional collaboration between social workers and community health workers to address health and mental health in the United States: A systematised review. Health & Social Care in the Community, 30. https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.14061

[8] Rammohan, R., Joy, M. V., Magam, S. G., Natt, D., Patel, A., Akande, O., Yost, R. M., Bunting, S., Anand, P., & Mustacchia, P. (2023). The path to sustainable healthcare: Implementing care transition teams to mitigate hospital readmissions and improve patient outcomes. Cureus, 15, Article e39022. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.39022

[9] Rogers, J. M., & Warwick, K. A. (2022). Stronger together: Interprofessional collaboration and sustainability of maternity services in a small northern Ontario hospital. Canadian Journal of Rural Medicine, 27, 99–103. https://doi.org/10.4103/cjrm.cjrm_30_21

[10] Rowe, J. M., Rizzo, V. M., Vail, M., Kang, S.-Y., & Golden, R. (2017). The role of social workers in addressing nonmedical needs in primary health care. Social Work in Health Care, 56, 435–449. https://doi.org/10.1080/00981389.2017.1318799

[11] Spencer, M. S., Walters, K. L., Allen, H. L., Andrews, C. M., Begun, A., Browne, T., Clapp, J. D., DiNitto, D., Maramaldi, P., Wheeler, D. P., Zebrack, B. J., & Uehara, E. (2022). Close the health gap. In R. P. Barth, J. T. Messing, T. R. Shanks, & J. H. Williams (Eds.), Grand Challenges for Social Work and society (pp. 36–55). Oxford University Press.https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190858988.003.0003

[12] Steketee, G., Ross, A. M., & Wachman, M. K. (2017). Health outcomes and costs of social work services: A systematic review. American Journal of Public Health, 107, S256–S266.https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.304004

[13] Tadic, V., Ashcroft, R., Brown, J., & Dahrouge, S. (2020). The role of social workers in interprofessional primary healthcare teams. Healthcare Policy | Politiques de Santé, 16, 27–42.https://doi.org/10.12927/hcpol.2020.26292

[14] Vanderbilt, A., Dail, M., & Jaberi, P. (2015). Reducing health disparities in underserved communities via interprofessional collaboration across health care professions. Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare, 2015, 205–208. https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S74129

[15]Warren, J. L., & Warren, J. S. (2023). The case for understanding interdisciplinary relationships in health care. Ochsner Journal, 23, 94–97.
https://doi.org/10.31486/toj.22.0111

[16]Zerden, L. D. S., Jones, A., Day, S., & Lombardi, B. M. (2021). Interprofessional collaboration: An evaluation of social work students' skills and experiences in integrated health care. Journal of Social Work Education, 57, 758–770.
https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2020.1743219