



BACKGROUND

- 1. Campus environments influence academic success and the well-being of campus communities, such as the improved rate of retention among staff and the decreased rate of student dropout.
- 2. There is a significant difference in population needs and demographics based for every college and university.
- 3. There is also a significant difference in the adoption and implementation of health-promoting initiatives in higher education institutions.
- 4. Traditional evaluation frameworks, often because of the lack of support for comprehensive program evaluation studies, focus on isolated behaviors or outcomes of the population of interest.
- 5. Those evaluation studies are often limited to internal reports or discussion, leaving gaps for program improvement.
- 6. Hence, there is a need for an evaluation framework that could be customized for every institution, while maintaining its core structure.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- 1. Describe the key components of the Social Determinants of a Healthy Campus (SDHC) framework.
- 2. Assess how campus environments and social networks shape health behaviors and outcomes.
- 3. Apply the SDHC framework to evaluate and improve health-promoting initiatives within higher education institutions.
- 4. Design comprehensive evaluation strategies that incorporate social determinants to measure the effectiveness of campus health programs.

FRAMEWORK AND APPLICATION

Social determinants of health impact a range of health indicators, such as mental health, access to healthcare, and financial stability. The proposed framework, **Social Determinants of a Healthy Campus**, provides a comprehensive list of determinants to consider while evaluating health-promoting initiatives in higher education settings.

A systematic, multifaceted approach is needed to adopt this framework as intended. Institutions must set specific equity-embedded goals, ensure leadership buy-in, facilitate participatory decision-making, and close the feedback loop by involving recipients of well-being services. Health promotion accountability further depends on the governance of the institutions. For example, public universities may be held accountable by state laws, whereas private universities may require buy-in from boards of trustees.



SOCIAL DETERMINANT	TRADITIONAL APPROACH	SDOH-FOCUSED EVALUATION
Access to Resources	Considers resource availability without deep analysis of access or quality	Evaluates access, quality, and usage and their long-term effects on health, academic success, and retention.
Cultural and Institutional Inclusivity	Evaluates diversity initiatives through participation metrics, with a limited assessment of cultural and institutional impacts on well-being.	In-depth analysis of cultural inclusivity and institutional policies' effects on campus climate and well-being
Economic Stability	Often overlooked, it focuses on immediate outcomes like service usage	Integrates analysis of financial stressors and their impact on health outcomes and academic performance
Education Access and Quality	Focuses on educational outputs like grades and graduation rates	Examines the intersection of education access, academic support, and health outcomes, considering stress and inequality
Health and Healthcare Services	Service utilization and satisfaction	Holistically assesses access, quality, utilization, and outcomes
Mental Health and Well-being	Service utilization and short-term outcomes	Integrates mental health into broader evaluations
Neighborhood and Built Environment	Narrow focus on environmental factors	Includes factors like transportation and safety, and their impact on health
Social and Community Context	Limited engagement with social networks	Deep analysis of social networks

Evaluation Components	Student, Health and Wellness Goals	Higher Education-Specific Theoretical Frameworks	Campus Resources Utilization	Analysis Tools and Techniques	Academic and Social Support Systems	Adaptability and Flexibility	Student Feedback and Participation
Planning Phase							
Implementation Phase							
Analysis Phase							
Campus-Wide Dissemination and Policy Adjustment							
Continuous Improvement Phase							

IMPLEMENTATION

- 1. Build capacity for comprehensive evaluation by investing in program evaluation faculty and staff.
- 2. Foster interdisciplinary collaboration among various institutional groups with the same end goal.
- 3. Secure firm commitment from campus leaders and add evaluation priorities into departmental and institutional strategic plans.

NEXT STEPS

- 1. Develop evaluation capacity in various offices working towards improving the holistic health and well-being of the UCR campus community.
- 2. Evaluate well-being programs and services at UCR using the proposed framework.

LIMITATIONS

- 1. Data collection and privacy related challenges might appear due to the nature of the data that needs to be collected to adopt this framework.
- 2. While this framework will provide a comprehensive picture of the progress towards building healthy campuses, the effect of isolated factors that influence health and well-being should not be disregarded.
- 3. Resource constraints might prohibit higher education institutions from extensively embedding comprehensive evaluation into their studies.

REFERENCES

Healthy People 2030: <https://health.gov/healthypeople>  
Newton, J., Dooris, M., & Wills, J. (2016). Healthy universities: An example of a whole-system health-promoting setting. *Global Health Promotion*.