**Appendix A.**

Guiding coalition members were exposed to three intervention components: (1) three annual forums to bring together members from all 10 LSL sites; four semiannual, one-day workshops at their own hospitals; and (3) access to a web-based platform that included a repository of project resources and spaces for discussion. This most intensive of these three components were the semiannual in-hospital workshops, detailed below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Leadership Saves Lives Workshop Curriculum** | |
| **Structure** | Four semiannual, one-day workshops (6-8 hours each), facilitated by two LSL study team members. The format included lecture-based introduction of the content, followed by learning experiences to encourage engagement and application of the content to each coalition’s context (discussions, cases, simulations, and work sessions). For each hospital, the lead facilitator remained constant and the support facilitator changed with each round of workshops. |
| **Content** | **Focus 1: Building a culture that supports creative problem solving**   * We prepared coalitions to **bring the right perspectives to the table** by providing instruction and learning experiences related to role clarity,[1] working across boundaries,[2 ,3] and working with hierarchy.[4 ,5] * We **pursued full engagement** as guiding coalition members contributed their unique skills and perspectives to a common objective by providing instruction and learning experiences related to leadership and followership,[6] representational groups,[7-9] psychological safety,[10] group decision making,[11] levels of analysis[12 ,13] * We **promoted progress** by providing instruction and learning experiences related to managing conflict[14] and building accountability[15]within the group   **Focus 2: Implementing evidence-based strategies to reduce mortality in patients with AMI**   * We introduced **evidence-based strategies** and aspects of organizational culture associated with lower 30-day RSMR for patients with AMI[16 ,17] * We facilitated the coalition through the **strategic problem solving approach** (defining the problem of AMI mortality, setting and measuring progress toward shared objectives for AMI mortality reduction, identifying and prioritizing of root causes of mortality, and generating and pursuing strategic solutions).[18] * We supported the coalition to apply the **AIDED model** for stick and spread of LSL-related innovations[19] |
| **Application between workshops** | Between workshops, coalitions were expected to take steps to identify, prioritize and address root causes of AMI mortality at their hospitals. At subsequent workshops, they reported on their progress, with the goals of (1) identifying and addressing implementation challenges, and (2) further developing their individual and group leadership capacity. |
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