**Open Access Library Journal**
2026, Volume 13, e15501
ISSN Online: 2333-9721
ISSN Print: 2333-9705

# Reconceptualizing Compassion as a Renewable Resource: Implementing the G.R.A.C.E. Model to Address Compassion Fatigue in Acute Care Settings

**Tim Mussche**

Department of Spiritual Care, Ochsner Health, New Orleans, USA
Email: tim.mussche@ochsner.org, musschet@hotmail.com

**How to cite this paper:** Mussche, T. (2026) Reconceptualizing Compassion as a Renewable Resource: Implementing the G.R.A.C.E. Model to Address Compassion Fatigue in Acute Care Settings. *Open Access Library Journal*, **13**: e15501.
https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1115501

**Received:** May 19, 2026
**Accepted:** June 5, 2026
**Published:** June 8, 2026

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Open Access Library Inc.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Open Access

## Abstract

Compassion fatigue and burnout among acute care professionals have reached crisis levels, threatening both clinician well-being and patient care quality. This narrative conceptual review, drawing on a practice-based doctoral inquiry, examines Joan Halifax's G.R.A.C.E. model as a structured intervention that reframes compassion as a renewable resource rather than a finite capacity. The paper proposes a conceptual model linking unregulated empathy and chronic exposure to suffering to empathic distress and subsequent withdrawal or burnout risk, and locates G.R.A.C.E. as a mechanism for cultivating self-regulation and ethical clarity that reduces distress while sustaining engaged care. Evidence supporting general compassion and mindfulness training is distinguished from the limited empirical evidence on G.R.A.C.E. specifically, identifying both the conceptual strength of the protocol and the need for direct outcome studies. Implementation faces significant barriers including time constraints, cultural resistance, and organizational pressures, requiring leadership buy-in, workflow integration, and protected practice time. The discussion specifies concrete outcome measures (ProQOL, Maslach Burnout Inventory, Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale, WHO-5, absenteeism and turnover) and maps them to a 90-day implementation roadmap. While the model shows theoretical promise and practical applicability, rigorous empirical validation through randomized controlled trials remains necessary.

## Subject Areas

Public Health, Nursing, Health Policy, Mental Health

**Keywords**

Compassion Fatigue, Burnout, Empathic Distress, G.R.A.C.E. Model, Mindfulness, Resilience, Acute Care, Chaplaincy

## 1. Introduction

Compassion fatigue and burnout are increasingly pervasive challenges in acute care, particularly in high-acuity environments such as emergency departments and intensive care units. These conditions are intensified by repeated exposure to trauma, rapid patient turnover, and ongoing systemic pressures including staffing shortages and rising workloads that collectively diminish clinicians' resilience, empathy, and overall well-being. The resulting emotional exhaustion and detachment compromise not only clinicians' mental and physical health but also patient safety, care quality, and organizational stability [1].

Recent research highlights the alarming prevalence of compassion fatigue and burnout among acute care professionals, with rates reaching critical levels, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic [2]. Compassion fatigue, often described as the cost of caring, encompasses both burnout—a gradual process marked by hopelessness and inefficacy—and secondary traumatic stress arising from repeated exposure to others' suffering [3]. The cumulative effects can lead to loss of empathy, increased clinical errors, higher turnover, and a diminished sense of purpose [4]. Hooper *et al.* define compassion fatigue as a gradual lessening of compassion over time affecting up to 85% of healthcare workers, particularly those exposed to trauma victims; the condition manifests through cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and spiritual symptoms, ultimately impacting both individual well-being and organizational effectiveness [5].

Addressing these challenges requires more than fostering individual resilience; it calls for systemic, evidence-based interventions [6] that enhance clinicians' capacity for compassion and ethical engagement [7] [8]. Among compassion-based approaches, the G.R.A.C.E. model developed by Joan Halifax offers a structured, evidence-informed framework for cultivating compassion, resilience, and ethical presence in clinical care [9].

This paper addresses the crisis of compassion fatigue and burnout among acute care professionals by examining Halifax's reconceptualization of compassion as a renewable resource rather than a finite capacity. The analysis centers on the G.R.A.C.E. model, a five-step intervention comprising 1) Gathering attention, 2) Recalling intention, 3) Attuning to self and other, 4) Considering what will serve, and 5) Engaging and ending, enabling clinicians to maintain compassionate presence while protecting against empathic distress [9].

Compassion fatigue and burnout are highly pertinent topics in applied sociology, public health, and psychology, given their substantial risks to professionals in caregiving fields who routinely face the emotional demands of working with

trauma and suffering. Compassion fatigue, which drains emotional resources, often progresses to burnout—a syndrome marked by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment [10]. The consequences are far-reaching, encompassing decreased job satisfaction, impaired empathy, increased staff turnover, and compromised quality of care [4]. Despite advances in mindfulness practices, resilience training, and reflective supervision [7] [8] [11], a notable gap remains in practitioner training regarding compassion fatigue and the use of compassion-based interventions, highlighting the necessity for comprehensive educational programs [12].

The paper proceeds in five steps. Section 2 describes the approach and methodology of this conceptual review. Section 3 defines key constructs used throughout the paper. Section 4 develops the theoretical background and proposes a working conceptual model. Section 5 describes the G.R.A.C.E. intervention and distinguishes general from G.R.A.C.E.-specific evidence. Section 6 presents the discussion, including implementation recommendations, concrete outcome measures, and a 90-day evaluation plan.

## 2. Approach and Method

### 2.1. Type of Inquiry

This paper is a narrative conceptual review situated within a practice-based doctoral inquiry in pastoral theology and clinical chaplaincy. It is not a systematic review and does not employ meta-analytic methods; rather, it integrates theoretical literature, empirical research on compassion fatigue and mindfulness interventions, and the author's clinical experience as a board-certified chaplain working in acute care and palliative settings. The aim is conceptual integration and translation—connecting Halifax's reconceptualization of compassion to the implementation realities of acute care—rather than statistical synthesis. Where empirical claims are made, sources are cited; where claims are theoretical or interpretive, they are framed accordingly.

### 2.2. Source Identification and Selection

Sources were identified through structured searches of PubMed, PsycINFO, CINAHL, and Google Scholar using combinations of the terms "compassion fatigue", "burnout", "empathic distress", "compassion satisfaction", "moral distress", "secondary traumatic stress", "mindfulness", "compassion training", "G.R.A.C.E.", and "acute care". Searches were not restricted by date because foundational conceptual texts (e.g., the Maslach Burnout Inventory manual) remain authoritative. Priority was given to peer-reviewed journal articles, foundational books and book chapters by Halifax, and recent (post-2018) reviews and meta-analyses. Grey-literature sources (e.g., the Halifax/Upaya Zen Center G.R.A.C.E. instructional document and the National Academy of Medicine perspective on healthcare worker burnout) were included where they constitute primary statements of the construct or framework under discussion. Selection prioritized conceptual relevance to the

G.R.A.C.E. mechanism and to acute care implementation; it did not aim for exhaustive coverage of all compassion-fatigue literature.

## 3. Key Constructs

Because the literature on caregiver distress uses overlapping terms inconsistently, this section defines the constructs used throughout the paper. These definitions are then applied consistently in subsequent sections.

### 3.1. Compassion and Empathy

**Compassion.** The emotional response that arises upon witnessing another's suffering, accompanied by a motivation to alleviate that suffering [13]. Compassion is distinguished from related affective states by its action-oriented motivation and is, in Halifax's account, an emergent, regulated capacity rather than a fixed trait [14].

**Empathy.** The capacity to share or resonate with another's feelings. Empathy is not equivalent to compassion: when sustained without regulation or capacity to act, empathy can deplete the observer rather than benefit the sufferer [14].

**Compassion satisfaction.** The positive fulfillment derived from helping others, captured as one of three subscales (alongside burnout and secondary traumatic stress) in the Professional Quality of Life Scale [15]. High compassion satisfaction is protective against the other two domains.

### 3.2. Compassion Fatigue, Empathic Distress, and Related Conditions

**Compassion fatigue.** A gradual erosion of compassion over time among caregivers exposed to others' suffering, manifesting across cognitive, emotional, behavioral, spiritual, interpersonal, and institutional domains [16]. The American Psychological Association defines it as exhaustion and stress-related symptoms emerging from prolonged engagement with traumatized individuals [17]. Figley frames compassion fatigue as a form of vicarious traumatization, marked by emotional detachment, anxiety, and a sense of being overwhelmed [18].

**Empathic distress.** Halifax's reframing of what is conventionally called "compassion fatigue". Empathic distress is the stress that arises when one resonates with another's suffering yet feels powerless or insufficiently regulated to act effectively. In this account, compassion itself is not fatiguing; rather, unregulated empathy in the absence of skillful response is [14]. This distinction is foundational to the conceptual model below.

**Burnout.** A syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization (cynicism toward those served), and reduced personal accomplishment arising from chronic workplace stress, operationalized through the Maslach Burnout Inventory [10].

**Secondary traumatic stress (STS).** A trauma-response constellation arising from indirect exposure to others' trauma, with symptoms paralleling post-traumatic stress disorder (intrusion, avoidance, hyperarousal), measured by the Sec-

ondary Traumatic Stress Scale [19].

**Moral distress.** The psychological distress that arises when one knows the ethically right action but is constrained by institutional, hierarchical, or resource limitations from taking it [20]. Moral distress is distinct from burnout in that its source is structural-ethical rather than affective-exhaustive, though the two interact in acute care.

Throughout the remainder of the paper, the term empathic distress is used when referring to Halifax's reconceptualization, while compassion fatigue is retained when summarizing literature that uses the term explicitly. Burnout, STS, compassion satisfaction, and moral distress are used with the operational meanings above.

## 4. Theoretical Background and Conceptual Model

### 4.1. Enactive Compassion and the ABIDE Model

Goetz *et al.* [13] argue that compassion evolved as a specialized emotional response serving cooperation and protection of the vulnerable, distinct from empathy (sharing feelings) and sympathy (concern without necessarily prompting action). Compassion is triggered by perception of another's undeserved suffering, communicated through caregiving signals such as gentle touch and soothing vocal tone, and associated with distinct neural and physiological patterns.

Halifax critiques static and neurocentric framings as overly simplistic, arguing instead for an enactive view in which compassion emerges through interactions among internal states, lived experience, social context, and ethical engagement [21]. Drawing on Buddhist philosophy, she distinguishes referential compassion (directed toward familiar others), insight-based compassion (rooted in ethical understanding of impermanence and interdependence), and non-referential compassion (a spontaneous, universal response without specific object) [14].

In her heuristic model, compassion integrates six non-compassionate elements: attention, affective resonance, intention, insight, embodied engagement, and equanimity [22]. Alone, no element constitutes compassion; affective resonance without equanimity, for example, produces empathic distress rather than compassion. Halifax's ABIDE model organizes these elements along three axes: attentional and affective balance (A/A), intention and insight (I/I), and embodiment and engagement (E/E) [23]. The model conceptualizes compassion as an emergent, context-dependent capacity that can be intentionally cultivated through integration of these faculties.

### 4.2. A Working Conceptual Model

The constructs and frameworks reviewed above can be summarized as a working conceptual model that organizes the causal claims of the paper. The model has three linked propositions.

**Proposition 1.** Chronic exposure to suffering, combined with unregulated empathy and limited capacity for effective response, produces empathic distress ra-

ther than sustained compassion [14]. Empathic distress is therefore the mechanism through which acute care conditions generate what the literature commonly labels "compassion fatigue".

**Proposition 2.** Empathic distress, when sustained, increases the risk of behavioral withdrawal, depersonalization, and the affective-exhaustive components of burnout, with downstream consequences for STS, absenteeism, turnover, and patient care quality [4] [10].

**Proposition 3.** Structured cultivation of attention, intention, affective regulation, and embodied engagement—the elements operationalized by G.R.A.C.E.—supports the transition from unregulated empathy to regulated, compassion-based response. This transition predicts reduced empathic distress, sustained compassion satisfaction, and protection against burnout and STS [9] [22].

In schematic form: chronic suffering exposure + unregulated empathy → empathic distress → withdrawal/burnout/STS risk; whereas chronic suffering exposure + G.R.A.C.E.-supported regulation → self-regulation and ethical clarity → reduced distress and sustained compassion satisfaction. This model is offered as a heuristic for organizing existing evidence and for specifying testable outcomes in future trials; it is not a validated structural model.

### 4.3. Causes and Consequences in Acute Care

Jeanmonod *et al.* provide a multidimensional analysis of compassion fatigue in emergency medicine, distinguishing primary traumatic stress (direct trauma to clinicians) from secondary traumatic stress (witnessing others' suffering) [4]. Emergency departments are high-risk environments, with healthcare workers facing rates of workplace violence far exceeding those in other professions. Cumulative exposure produces post-traumatic symptoms including intrusive thoughts, anxiety, avoidance, and hypervigilance. High emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, combined with low personal accomplishment, correlate strongly with burnout. Key drivers include high job demands, low autonomy, lack of control, insufficient resources, social isolation, and inadequate leadership support. Unchecked compassion fatigue produces reduced patient care quality, diminished patient satisfaction, increased depression and substance use among clinicians, and higher attrition from the specialty.

### 4.4. Obstacles to Compassionate Care

Obstacles to compassionate care are organizational, sociocultural, and individual. Babaei and Taleghani found that nurses encounter organizational barriers such as heavy workloads, insufficient staffing, and lack of managerial support, which shift focus from patient-centered care to routine tasks; sociocultural challenges including gender dynamics, language differences, and restrictive norms further limit compassionate interactions [24]. Pehlivan emphasizes that excessive workloads, inadequate staffing, lack of time, rigid institutional protocols, and individual emotional fatigue all impede compassionate care, advocating relational and team-

based care cultures, supportive institutional policies, and multidisciplinary collaboration [25].

Dev *et al.* demonstrate that barriers are not uniformly experienced: medical students face heightened challenges and require enhanced mentorship, while nurses remain especially vulnerable to environmental constraints [26]. Naseri *et al.* found that compassionate care among ICU nurses is significantly influenced by the work environment, with higher patient-to-nurse ratios and weaker managerial support correlating with reduced compassion [27]. van den Berg *et al.* synthesize evidence identifying four main themes of enablers and barriers: personal and professional characteristics, patient-related factors, and workplace-related factors, concluding that compassionate care is both a personal and organizational responsibility requiring holistic strategies [28].

## 5. The G.R.A.C.E. Intervention

### 5.1. Rationale and Goals

If left unaddressed, compassion fatigue manifests as exhaustion, irritability, apathy, and reduced empathy, ultimately producing decreased job satisfaction, impaired professional performance, and compromised patient care. The impact extends beyond the individual to higher turnover, increased absenteeism, and declining quality of care [11]. The primary goal of compassion-based interventions is to restore and maintain clinicians' capacity for empathy and compassionate engagement while safeguarding their mental health and resilience [7]. The G.R.A.C.E. model is designed to meet these goals by systematically fostering mindful awareness, ethical clarity, and emotional attunement, enabling clinicians to remain present and compassionate even in emotionally charged situations [9] [22].

### 5.2. The Five Steps

The G.R.A.C.E. model, developed by Roshi Joan Halifax, is a structured, mindfulness-based approach designed to help clinicians and caregivers respond to suffering with compassion, clarity, and ethical grounding. It functions as both mnemonic and practical guide, enabling clinicians to slow down, become mindful, and foster compassion in real time. It has been widely adopted by nurses, physicians, therapists, chaplains, and social workers [9].

**Gathering attention.** The first step involves pausing to focus, ground, and balance oneself through mindful awareness of breath or bodily sensations, interrupting automatic reactions and creating a stable foundation for compassionate engagement.

**Recalling intention.** The practitioner consciously reconnects with core motivation—to serve, alleviate suffering, or uphold patient well-being—reinforcing meaning and ethical clarity in the encounter.

**Attuning to self and other.** The clinician attunes to their own internal state (bodily sensations, emotions, biases) and to the cues and needs of the patient, fostering empathy, affective resonance, and perspective-taking without becoming

overwhelmed.

**Considering what will serve.** The practitioner reflects on what action will truly benefit the patient, integrating clinical knowledge, intuition, and contextual awareness, with discernment grounded in attentional and affective balance.

**Engaging and ending.** The final step involves enacting a compassionate response and then mindfully concluding the interaction, allowing the clinician to acknowledge what occurred, release the encounter, and prepare for the next.

## 5.3. Evidence from General Compassion and Mindfulness Training

A robust body of research supports the broader claim that compassion and mindfulness training produce measurable changes in stress physiology, attention, and emotion regulation. Mindfulness meditation modulates brain networks involved in attentional control, self-awareness, and affective regulation [29]. Compassion training enhances neuroplasticity—the brain's capacity to adapt structurally and functionally in response to experience [30] [31]. Compassionate behavior is associated with improved physical health outcomes, including reduced inflammation and enhanced immune function, and with social and longevity benefits [32] [33]. Compassion training has been shown to alter altruism and neural responses to suffering [34] and to reduce symptoms of depression and anxiety by shifting attention from self-focus to other-focus [35].

Within healthcare specifically, brief mindfulness-based interventions have been shown to reduce compassion fatigue in nursing settings [36], and mindful self-compassion training reduces stress and burnout symptoms among practicing psychologists in a randomized controlled trial [37]. These findings, while not specific to G.R.A.C.E., establish the plausibility of brief, structured contemplative interventions producing measurable effects on the outcome domains of interest.

## 5.4. Evidence for G.R.A.C.E. Specifically

Evidence specific to G.R.A.C.E. as a discrete protocol is far more limited than evidence for compassion and mindfulness training in general. Halifax's description of G.R.A.C.E. for nurses [38] is the foundational practitioner-facing publication and outlines the protocol's rationale, structure, and intended clinical use in nurse-patient interactions; it is, however, a descriptive and theoretical account rather than an outcome study. To date, the protocol has been disseminated primarily through the Upaya Zen Center and through clinical training programs at academic medical centers and palliative care institutions [9], but published randomized controlled trials or pre-post studies with validated outcome measures and adequate sample sizes specifically evaluating G.R.A.C.E. remain notably absent from the peer-reviewed literature [39].

The practical implication is that confidence in G.R.A.C.E.'s effectiveness currently rests on two convergent but distinct sources: a) the strength of the theoretical model and its alignment with the enactive-compassion framework, and b) ex-

trapolation from the broader compassion-training and mindfulness-intervention evidence base summarized in Section 5.3. This evidential structure justifies cautious clinical implementation accompanied by systematic outcome measurement, but it does not justify claims of established effectiveness. Section 6.4 specifies the outcome measures appropriate for closing this evidence gap.

## 6. Discussion

### 6.1. Strengths of the Model

The G.R.A.C.E. model's strengths lie in its structured, accessible design and adaptability to the realities of contemporary healthcare [40]. The acronym provides a clear, stepwise process that practitioners can recall and apply even in high-stress, time-sensitive situations [22]. Each component is designed for real-time implementation, making the model feasible for integration into daily clinical routines without extensive training or additional resources [23]—a feature particularly valuable in acute care, where time for reflection is limited. By encouraging practitioners to attune to their own experience as well as the patient's, the model fosters a grounded, patient-centered approach to care, supporting clinicians' well-being while reducing the risk of burnout and secondary trauma. The ethical and patient-centered focus is explicit: each step is rooted in the intention to serve and act with integrity. Finally, the model facilitates team-based reflective practice, supporting clear communication, mutual support, and continuous learning within healthcare teams.

### 6.2. Limitations and Barriers

A critical examination of the G.R.A.C.E. model's application in acute care reveals several significant weaknesses. Chief among these is the mismatch between the model's contemplative requirements and the fast-paced, high-pressure reality of acute care environments. Healthcare professionals must respond rapidly to emergencies and manage multiple critical cases simultaneously, leaving little room for the reflective pauses the model prescribes. As Knudsen *et al.* emphasize, allocating time and space is a persistent barrier to mindfulness-based interventions in hospitals [41]. The environment is further characterized by high stress and cognitive overload, with constant alarms, urgent calls, and life-threatening situations activating the sympathetic nervous system and undermining the calm, grounded state mindfulness requires.

Workload and staffing pressures compound these challenges. Chronic understaffing and heavy workloads lead many professionals to view contemplative practices as an unaffordable luxury. Cultural resistance is also significant: traditional medical culture often values action, efficiency, and scientific objectivity over introspection or "soft" skills, producing skepticism that undermines adoption [41]. The episodic nature of patient relationships in acute care further limits applicability, since the protocol was originally adapted for settings where clinicians develop longitudinal patient relationships. Organizational and structural barriers

also impede implementation: successful adoption requires dedicated training, protected practice time, and a supportive culture—resources many acute care institutions lack [42]. Measurement challenges complicate efforts to justify resource allocation, as the subjective nature of compassion cultivation makes outcomes difficult to quantify within standard quality improvement frameworks [43]—a limitation Section 6.4 addresses directly by specifying validated measures.

### 6.3. Implementation Recommendations

Drawing on the thematic framework proposed by Knudsen *et al.* [41]—buying in, allocating time and space, and keeping it going—the following recommendations outline a comprehensive strategy for embedding G.R.A.C.E. within clinical practice.

**Buying in: cultivating engagement and leadership support.** Fostering institutional buy-in requires cultivating a culture that values compassion and mindfulness as integral to high-quality patient care, beginning with visible endorsement and modeling by organizational leaders and respected clinical role models [41]. Successful implementation requires identifying key stakeholders across all organizational levels—executive leadership, department heads, charge nurses, and influential frontline staff—who can serve as champions for change. Champions should receive comprehensive training in G.R.A.C.E.'s theoretical foundations and practical applications, equipping them to address concerns and demonstrate value to colleagues. Communication strategies must frame G.R.A.C.E. not as an additional burden but as a tool for enhancing existing skills and improving job satisfaction. Buy-in strengthens when G.R.A.C.E. principles are integrated into existing quality improvement initiatives, demonstrating contributions to patient satisfaction scores, staff retention, and safety metrics.

**Allocating time and space: addressing practical barriers.** Hospitals should embed brief two- to three-minute structured pauses into existing routines—pre-shift huddles, handovers, and post-incident debriefings—making these practices habitual rather than optional. Given acute care's unpredictable nature, scheduling should emphasize flexibility, allowing clinicians to access abbreviated versions of the five-step process. Simple steps such as gathering attention can occur during hand hygiene or charting, while attuning naturally fits within patient interactions. Physical infrastructure should include designated quiet spaces for uninterrupted practice, supplemented by mobile solutions such as meditation apps and identified quiet corners on each unit. Policies should prioritize adequate staffing and workload management, including realistic patient-to-nurse ratios and mandatory break policies.

**Keeping it going: ensuring sustainability and integration.** G.R.A.C.E. principles must be embedded into daily routines and interprofessional dynamics rather than treated as supplementary activities. Sustainability depends on developing internal capacity through train-the-trainer programs that prepare local champions to provide peer-to-peer mentoring. Integration strategies should systematically

incorporate G.R.A.C.E. principles into institutional structures: performance evaluations can include compassion-related competencies, professional development plans can feature mindfulness goals, and incident debriefing protocols can incorporate G.R.A.C.E.-based reflection questions. Formal peer support structures—compassion rounds, mindfulness circles, and buddy systems—support the social embedding of the practice.

### 6.4. Outcome Measures and 90-Day Evaluation Plan

A central limitation of prior G.R.A.C.E. implementation has been the absence of standardized outcome measurement. The following plan specifies validated instruments mapped to a 90-day implementation roadmap, supporting both local quality improvement and the future controlled trials needed to close the G.R.A.C.E.-specific evidence gap identified in Section 5.4.

**Core outcome measures.** Five instruments are recommended. 1) The Professional Quality of Life Scale (ProQOL) yields three subscale scores—compassion satisfaction, burnout, and secondary traumatic stress—capturing the principal affective domains the G.R.A.C.E. mechanism targets [15]. 2) The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) provides the gold-standard measurement of burnout across emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment [10]. 3) The Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale provides a validated, trauma-specific measure for staff with high-trauma exposure [19]. 4) The WHO-5 Well-Being Index provides a brief (five-item), low-burden measure of general well-being suitable for repeated administration [44]. 5) Organizational metrics—unplanned absenteeism rate, voluntary turnover rate, and patient satisfaction scores—are drawn directly from existing institutional dashboards and capture the system-level signals through which empathic distress propagates.

**Days 1 - 30: Foundation building and baseline measurement.** Identify three to five clinical champions, deliver initial training, and pilot a single micro-intervention (e.g., integrating a G.R.A.C.E. pause into hand hygiene). All consenting unit staff complete baseline ProQOL, MBI, STS, and WHO-5 within the first week. Organizational metrics (absenteeism, turnover, patient satisfaction) are extracted for the preceding 90 days as the comparator baseline.

**Days 31 - 60: Expansion and 30-day check-in.** Expand the initiative by introducing brief G.R.A.C.E. pauses during shift huddles and establishing a mindfulness corner; launch compassion-buddy partnerships. At day 30, all participants complete the WHO-5 and a brief practice-fidelity self-report (frequency and perceived helpfulness of G.R.A.C.E. use over the prior month). Qualitative feedback is collected via focus groups with champions.

**Days 61 - 90: Systematic integration and post-intervention assessment.** G.R.A.C.E. practices are incorporated into handover processes and additional staff are trained. At day 90, all participants complete the full battery (ProQOL, MBI, STS, WHO-5). Organizational metrics are re-extracted for the 90-day intervention window. Pre-post change is evaluated for each measure with attention to

clinically meaningful difference, not only statistical significance.

This 90-day cycle is designed as the smallest unit of meaningful evaluation. Sustained outcomes are best assessed through 6- and 12-month follow-up administrations of the same battery, supporting longitudinal interpretation and informing the design of subsequent randomized controlled trials.

### 6.5. Future Research

Despite the theoretical grounding and practical appeal of the G.R.A.C.E. model, a critical limitation remains in the current scientific literature: a notable lack of rigorously validated, evidence-based interventions specifically designed to foster compassion in nurses, physicians, and other clinicians [39]. Future research should prioritize the systematic evaluation of G.R.A.C.E. using robust methodological approaches. Randomized controlled trials and other rigorous experimental designs are needed to assess the impact on the outcome measures specified in Section 6.4. Mixed-methods studies could provide valuable insights into the mechanisms underlying the model's effects, and longitudinal studies are needed to understand long-term effects on both individual and organizational outcomes. Finally, continued development and validation of measurement instruments—particularly fidelity measures specific to G.R.A.C.E. practice rather than to mindfulness training in general—will facilitate rigorous evaluation across diverse healthcare settings.

## 7. Conclusion

This paper illuminates a fundamental paradox: as medical technology advances, the human capacity for compassion faces unprecedented threats. Compassion fatigue and burnout in acute care represent not merely an occupational hazard but a crisis undermining the foundational principles of medical practice. Joan Halifax's G.R.A.C.E. model emerges as both a practical tool and a philosophical reframing. By reconceptualizing compassion fatigue as empathic distress and positioning compassion as renewable rather than finite, Halifax offers healthcare professionals a path toward sustainable caring. Yet individual interventions alone cannot address the systemic factors contributing to clinician distress; the success of compassion-based approaches depends on organizational commitment to cultures that value contemplative practice alongside clinical excellence. This requires leadership investment in staff well-being, policies protecting time for reflection, and recognition that compassionate care is essential rather than optional. The path forward demands both individual commitment to practices that cultivate compassion and systemic changes that make such practices sustainable. While rigorous research is needed to validate effectiveness—and the outcome measures and 90-day roadmap in Section 6.4 specify how that validation can begin—G.R.A.C.E.'s theoretical grounding and practical applicability suggest significant potential to help clinicians discover that compassion, properly cultivated, can be a source of strength rather than depletion.

## Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

## References

[1] National Academy of Medicine (2017) Burnout among Health Care Professionals: A Call to Explore and Address This Underrecognized Threat to Safe, High-Quality Care. https://nam.edu/perspectives/burnout-among-health-care-professionals-a-call-to-explore-and-address-this-underrecognized-threat-to-safe-high-quality-care/

[2] Yi, L., Hu, S., Liao, M., Cheng, L., Liu, Y., Tian, X., *et al.* (2024) Prevalence and Related Factors of Compassion Fatigue among Registered Nurses and Nursing Students during the Internship: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *BMC Nursing*, **23**, Article No. 597. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02597-2

[3] TEND Academy (2024) Defining Compassion Fatigue, Vicarious Trauma and Burnout. https://www.tendacademy.ca/what-is-compassion-fatigue/

[4] Jeanmonod, D., Irick, J., Munday, A., Awosika, A. and Jeanmonod, R. (2024) Compassion Fatigue in Emergency Medicine: Current Perspectives. *Open Access Emergency Medicine*, **16**, 167-181. https://doi.org/10.2147/oaem.s418935

[5] Hooper, C., Craig, J., Janvrin, D.R., Wetsel, M.A. and Reimels, E. (2010) Compassion Satisfaction, Burnout, and Compassion Fatigue among Emergency Nurses Compared with Nurses in Other Selected Inpatient Specialties. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, **36**, 420-427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2009.11.027

[6] Shanafelt, T.D. and Noseworthy, J.H. (2017) Executive Leadership and Physician Well-Being: Nine Organizational Strategies to Promote Engagement and Reduce Burnout. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, **92**, 129-146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2016.10.004

[7] Azadfallah, P., Kalani, S., Oreyzi, H. and Adibi, P. (2018) Interventions for Physician Burnout: A Systematic Review of Systematic Reviews. *International Journal of Preventive Medicine*, **9**, Article 81. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijpvm.ijpvm_255_18

[8] Epstein, R.M. and Krasner, M.S. (2013) Physician Resilience: What It Means, Why It Matters, and How to Promote It. *Academic Medicine*, **88**, 301-303. https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0b013e318280cff0

[9] Halifax, J. and Upaya Zen Center (n.d.) Halifax G.R.A.C.E. © Process of Compassion-Based Interactions in the Clinical Encounter. https://www.upaya.org/uploads/pdfs/HalifaxGRACEintervention.pdf

[10] Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E. and Leiter, M.P. (1996) Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual, 3rd Edition, Consulting Psychologists Press.

[11] Shapiro, S.L., Astin, J.A., Bishop, S.R. and Cordova, M. (2005) Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction for Health Care Professionals: Results from a Randomized Trial. *International Journal of Stress Management*, **12**, 164-176. https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.12.2.164

[12] Ho, A.H.Y., Tan-Ho, G., Ngo, T.A., Ong, G., Chong, P.H., Dignadice, D., *et al.* (2021) A Novel Mindful-Compassion Art-Based Therapy for Reducing Burnout and Promoting Resilience among Healthcare Workers: Findings from a Waitlist Randomized Control Trial. *Frontiers in Psychology*, **12**, Article ID: 744443. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.744443

[13] Goetz, J.L., Keltner, D. and Simon-Thomas, E. (2010) Compassion: An Evolutionary Analysis and Empirical Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, **136**, 351-374.

https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018807

[14] Halifax, J. (2018) Standing at the Edge: Finding Freedom Where Fear and Courage Meet. Flatiron Books.

[15] Stamm, B.H. (2010) The Concise ProQOL Manual. 2nd Edition, ProQOL.org.

[16] Sabery, M., Hosseini, M., Zagheri Tafreshi, M., Mohtashami, J. and Ebadi, A. (2017) Concept Development of "Compassion Fatigue" in Clinical Nurses: Application of Schwartz-Barcott and Kim's Hybrid Model. *Asian/Pacific Island Nursing Journal*, **2**, 37-47. https://doi.org/10.9741/23736658.1057

[17] APA Dictionary of Psychology (n.d.) Dictionary.apa.org. https://dictionary.apa.org/compassion-fatigue

[18] Figley, C.R. (2013) Compassion Fatigue: Coping with Secondary Traumatic Stress Disorder in Those Who Treat the Traumatized. Routledge.

[19] Bride, B.E., Robinson, M.M., Yegidis, B. and Figley, C.R. (2004) Development and Validation of the Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale. *Research on Social Work Practice*, **14**, 27-35. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731503254106

[20] Jameton, A. (1984) Nursing Practice: The Ethical Issues. Prentice-Hall.

[21] Halifax, J. and Varela, F. (n.d.) Enactive Compassion. https://www.upaya.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Enactive-Compassion.pdf

[22] Halifax, J. (2012) A Heuristic Model of Enactive Compassion. *Current Opinion in Supportive & Palliative Care*, **6**, 228-235. https://doi.org/10.1097/spc.0b013e3283530fbe

[23] Halifax, J. (n.d.) Understanding and Cultivating Compassion in Clinical Settings (Chapter 12). https://www.ajustnhs.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Compassion-in-Clinical-Settings-2013.pdf

[24] Babaei, S. and Taleghani, F. (2019) Compassionate Care Challenges and Barriers in Clinical Nurses: A Qualitative Study. *Iranian Journal of Nursing and Midwifery Research*, **24**, 213-219. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijnmr.ijnmr_100_18

[25] Pehlivan, T. (2020) Compassionate Care: Benefits, Barriers and Recommendations. *Journal of Psychiatric Nursing*, **11**, 148-153. https://doi.org/10.14744/phd.2020.88557

[26] Dev, V., Fernando, A.T., Kirby, J.N. and Consedine, N.S. (2019) Variation in the Barriers to Compassion across Healthcare Training and Disciplines: A Cross-Sectional Study of Doctors, Nurses, and Medical Students. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, **90**, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2018.09.015

[27] Naseri, S., Ghafourifard, M. and Ghahramanian, A. (2022) The Impact of Work Environment on Nurses' Compassion: A Multicenter Cross-Sectional Study. *SAGE Open Nursing*, **8**, 1-9.

[28] van den Berg, N.M., van der Wal-Huisman, H., van Leeuwen, B.L., Paans, W. and Schroevers, M.J. (2025) Enablers and Barriers of Compassionate Care from a Nurses' Perspective: A Scoping Review. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, **39**, e13319. https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.13319

[29] Tang, Y., Hölzel, B.K. and Posner, M.I. (2015) The Neuroscience of Mindfulness Meditation. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, **16**, 213-225. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3916

[30] Davidson, R.J. and McEwen, B.S. (2012) Social Influences on Neuroplasticity: Stress and Interventions to Promote Well-Being. *Nature Neuroscience*, **15**, 689-695. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3093

[31] Fuchs, E. and Flügge, G. (2014) Adult Neuroplasticity: More than 40 Years of Research. *Neural Plasticity*, **2014**, Article 541870. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/541870

[32] Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T.B. and Layton, J.B. (2010) Social Relationships and Mortality Risk: A Meta-Analytic Review. *PLOS Medicine*, **7**, e1000316. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316

[33] Konrath, S., Fuhrel-Forbis, A., Lou, A. and Brown, S. (2012) Motives for Volunteering Are Associated with Mortality Risk in Older Adults. *Health Psychology*, **31**, 87-96. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025226

[34] Weng, H.Y., Fox, A.S., Shackman, A.J., Stodola, D.E., Caldwell, J.Z.K., Olson, M.C., *et al*. (2013) Compassion Training Alters Altruism and Neural Responses to Suffering. *Psychological Science*, **24**, 1171-1180. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612469537

[35] Seppala, E. (2013) The Compassionate Mind. Association for Psycho-Logical Science. https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/the-compassionate-mind

[36] Tripathi, S.K. and Mulkey, D.C. (2023) Implementing Brief Mindfulness-Based Interventions to Reduce Compassion Fatigue. *Critical Care Nurse*, **43**, 32-40. https://doi.org/10.4037/ccn2023745

[37] Eriksson, T., Germundsjö, L., Åström, E. and Rönnlund, M. (2018) Mindful Self-Compassion Training Reduces Stress and Burnout Symptoms among Practicing Psychologists: A Randomized Controlled Trial of a Brief Web-Based Intervention. *Frontiers in Psychology*, **9**, Article ID: 2430. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02340

[38] Halifax, J. (2013) G.R.A.C.E. for Nurses: Cultivating Compassion in Nurse/Patient Interactions. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, **4**, 121-128. https://doi.org/10.5430/jnep.v4n1p121

[39] Roberts, L.W. (2021) Advancing Understanding of Compassion and Compassion Training. *Academic Medicine*, **96**, 929-930. https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0000000000004131

[40] Lau, W. (2023) Inner Practice of Medicine. Mountains Walking LLC.

[41] Knudsen, R.K., Skovbjerg, S., Pedersen, E.L., Nielsen, C.L., Storkholm, M.H. and Timmermann, C. (2024) Factors Affecting Implementation of Mindfulness in Hospital Settings: A Qualitative Meta-Synthesis of Healthcare Professionals' Experiences. *International Journal of Nursing Studies Advances*, **6**, Article 100192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnsa.2024.100192

[42] Micklitz, K., Wong, G. and Howick, J. (2021) Mindfulness-based Programmes to Reduce Stress and Enhance Well-Being at Work: A Realist Review. *BMJ Open*, **11**, e043525. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043525

[43] Kriakous, S.A., Elliott, K.A., Lamers, C. and Owen, R. (2021) The Effectiveness of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction on the Psychological Functioning of Healthcare Professionals: A Systematic Review. *Mindfulness*, **12**, 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01500-9

[44] Topp, C.W., Østergaard, S.D., Søndergaard, S. and Bech, P. (2015) The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, **84**, 167-176. https://doi.org/10.1159/000376585