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Workshop Objectives

1. Differentiate between formative and summative evaluation/assessment approaches;
2. Identify data collection strategies for evaluating/assessing interprofessional education (IPE) programs;
3. Describe how program-specific evaluation/assessment plans contribute to an IPE Center’s overall evaluation plan; and
4. Develop a program-specific logic model to guide evaluation planning.
Agenda

• 15 minutes - Background and overview
• 30 minute - Guided activity
  • Share IPE activities at table
  • Choose one of those activities
  • Develop a sample logic model for the activity
• 10 minutes - Discussion of activity and how the individual logic models would tie into an overall Center or Office Assessment Plan
• 5 minutes - Wrap up and Q&A
Background

• Recent Guidance Document
  • Endorses requirement for a “coordinated strategy for assessing learners on their development and mastery of interprofessional collaborative competencies.”
  • Notes it is “critical to monitor and evaluate the process of IPE plan implementation.”

• Strategies to assess the collective impact of IPE programs on the overall effectiveness of IPE centers are lacking.
Formative and Summative
Formative and Summative

- Assessment of individual learners’ mastery of interprofessional (IP) competencies
- Evaluation of the IPE plan for quality improvement purposes; and if appropriate, education and practice outcomes research and scholarship

- Formative - oftentimes not associated with consequences such that it may not be taken seriously; defined as existing to improve future performance; feedback for improving the program/center

- Summative - does not always allow for reflection and improvement as the endpoint is ‘final’; defined as existing to determine overall performance; identifies the program/center’s effectiveness

- A combination of the two is ideal
Assessment Strategies in IPE
Learning Theory as a Foundation

- Professional Identity
- Socio-Cultural Theory
- Social Contact Theory
- Authentic Learning
- Reflective and Experiential Learning
Strategies - Learner

- Scope of learner assessment
  - Student reactions to IPE
  - Changes in learner attitudes and perceptions of other professions
  - Acquisition of IP collaborative practice knowledge and skills
  - Demonstration of collaborative practice behaviors in training
  - Performance of collaborative practice behaviors in practice
- Variety of assessment strategies
  - Self-report
  - Instructor-observed
  - Objective measures (ie., knowledge tests)
- Timing

Strategies - IPE Plan

- **Stakeholder-based**

- Designed to address identified questions/needs
  - Institutional program leaders
  - Faculty
  - Accreditors

- Robust = learner assessment data + perceptions of IPE plan stakeholders and neutral observers + information related to costs/benefits

Program-Specific Evaluation and its Connection to an Overall Assessment Plan
The Logic Model Approach - Program Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs/Resources</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson University provides funding for program and program staff</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Orientation Session</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>High-functioning healthcare teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Center for Interprofessional Education (JCPE) administers HMP</td>
<td>HMP Curriculum (iCE platform and in-person) - Three modules over 18 months (two year program) - Two modules over 12 months (one year program)</td>
<td># of types of students attending orientation</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction (student)</td>
<td>Healthcare professionals equipped to advocate for patient and address the social determinants of health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Life Sciences</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Orientation Session</td>
<td># of types of faculty facilitators</td>
<td>Positive patient outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Professions</td>
<td>Module 1: Health Mentor Visit 1</td>
<td>Module 1: Health Mentor Visit 1</td>
<td># of composition of teams</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>Module 2: Health Mentor Visit 2</td>
<td>Module 2: Health Mentor Visit 2</td>
<td># of types of ground rules established</td>
<td>Inputs/Resources used to pursue HMP objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>Module 3: Health Mentor Visit 3</td>
<td>Module 3: Health Mentor Visit 3</td>
<td>IPE Learning Activities</td>
<td>Activities/Processes used to pursue HMP objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Rehabilitation Sciences</td>
<td>IPE Learning Activities</td>
<td>IPE Learning Activities</td>
<td># of returning community members</td>
<td>Outputs/Targeted results/goals of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Kimmel Medical College</td>
<td>Small group sessions and at-large Team Presentations</td>
<td>Small group sessions and at-large team presentations</td>
<td># of new community members</td>
<td>Outcomes/Expected changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Health Mentor</td>
<td>Increased collaboration among team members</td>
<td>Impact/Anticipated solution to the defined problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>Increased understanding of effective team functioning/improved teamwork skills</td>
<td>Health Mentor</td>
<td>Increased understanding of effective team functioning/improved teamwork skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare professionals and organizations</td>
<td>Increased level of recognition of the diverse perspectives of multiple healthcare professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive patient outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased knowledge of the varying roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased respect for the roles and responsibilities of multiple professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of understanding of person-centered care principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of understanding of social determinants of health/impact on health and wellness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of understanding of the advocacy process</td>
<td>Health Mentor</td>
<td>Increased involvement in care planning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved perception of health and well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Logic Model Approach - A Center Example

**Inputs**
- Jefferson Grants and Philanthropy provide funding for staff and programming
- JCOPE
  - Strategic objectives and communications
  - College of Biomedical Sciences
  - College of Health Professions
  - College of Nursing
  - College of Rehabilitation Sciences
  - College of Pharmacy
  - College of Population Health
  - Sidney Kimmel Medical College
  - Alumni
  - Community members, patients, and families
  - Healthcare professionals and organizations

**Activities**
- Design
  - Strategic plan/timeline
  - Performance monitoring
- Goals
  - Enhance local impact of JCOPE
  - Increase the national and global visibility and reputation of JCOPE
  - Diversify the revenue streams of JCOPE
- Implementation
  - JCOPE pursues its goals through four areas:
    - Administration
      - Budget
      - Personnel
      - Physical space
      - Technology
    - Business development
      - Business plan
      - Marketing
    - Consultations/Trainings
    - ITP app
    - Strategic partnerships
    - Virtual programs
  - Curriculum
  - Clinical training
  - Faculty development
  - Graduate coursework
  - Internship/Externship/Student programs
  - Assessment
    - Program evaluation
    - Competency-based evaluation
    - Workplace-based evaluation

**Outputs**
- Administration
  - Balance budget driven by priorities
  - Types of revenue
  - Number of PI TEs
  - Use of physical space
  - Use of technology
- Business development
  - ITP newsletter
  - Online newsletter
  - E-mail newsletter
  - Increased number of online conferences
  - Increased number of participants at annual conference
  - Increased participation at annual conference
  - Increased participation at thought leader conferences
  - Increased number of consultation/training engagements
  - Increased ITP usage
  - Increased number of academic and practice strategic partnerships
  - Increased number of fellowship applications
  - Curriculum
    - Clinical training
    - Graduate coursework
    - Internship/Externship/Student programs
    - Assessment
    - Number and types of evaluations conducted
    - Number and types of products disseminated

**Outcomes**
- Administration
  - Increased revenue and diversity of revenue
  - Increased TEs
  - New space acquired
  - New and enhanced technology used
- Business Development
  - Increased subscriptions to newsletter
  - Increased number and types of social media platforms
  - Increased participation at annual conference
  - Improved patient outcomes
  - IPE Center with national and global reputation

**Impact**
- Graduates prepared to collaborate with diverse health care professionals to provide safe, high-quality care to patients
- Faculty and clinicians equipped to educate students in IPE competencies
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Developing a Program-Specific Logic Model
Create your own....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs/ Resources</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guided Activity Discussion
Questions....

• What are your overall impressions on completing the activity? Its utility? Buy-in from stakeholders?

• How might this individual activity tie into a comprehensive assessment plan?
Wrap Up and Questions

JCIPE@Jefferson.edu

@JeffCIPE