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‘An evaluation of an inter-agency interprofessional education partnership for long term care and retirement living settings’

A partnership between:

- George Brown College (GBC) and,
- Revera Inc. (long term care and retirement living services)

- Funded by Ontario MHLTC and MTCU through the Interprofessional Health Education Innovation Fund (2007-2010)
- Approved by GBC Research Ethics Board
Program Overview

• Phase 1 of the program involved a pilot evaluation of one of 9 educational module offerings:
  • **Interprofessional Ethical Decision-Making** (delivered May 2008)
  • developed in collaboration with members of the Toronto-area Community Ethics Network

• Phase 2: Full IPE program delivered in Fall 2008
  • 9 workshops (3 hours each):
    • 5 IPE modules
    • 4 IPE sessions: orientation, IP team observation and interactive activities
## Fall 2008 Schedule and Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9-Sept</td>
<td>Introduction to Learning To Care Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16-Sept</td>
<td>Interprofessional Ethical Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23-Sept</td>
<td>Interprofessional Non-Abuse Behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30-Sept</td>
<td>Creating Safe Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7-Oct</td>
<td>Healthy Living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14-Oct</td>
<td>Interprofessional End of Life Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21-Oct</td>
<td><strong>Intersession Week - no program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28-Oct</td>
<td>Interprofessional Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4-Nov</td>
<td>Putting it All Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11-Nov</td>
<td>Celebrate Caring Together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Realistic Evaluation (Pawson & Tilly 1997)

Goals:

- Explore & report on issues for learners, facilitators, leaders linked to learning about, developing, implementing, teaching, practicing and sustaining IPE/IPC
- Generate new knowledge and scholarship specific to IPE programming across a community college health science training program and a community-based long-term care organization
Evaluation Questions

1. What is the initial impact of IPE on participating GBC students and Revera staff? (Phase 1)

2. What were the experiences of facilitating IPE workshops/courses for GBC faculty and Revera staff?

3. What are the benefits and disadvantages of delivering IPE courses/workshops within the context of an education/service delivery partnership?

4. How do presage factors affect learner success and the development and delivery of IPE at GBC?
### Framework

#### Presage, Process, Product (3P Model)
Modified by Freeth & Reeves (2004, p. 766)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presage (Contextual Factors)</th>
<th>Process (Teaching/Learning)</th>
<th>Product (Outcomes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g., organizational policies and values and philosophies, learner demographics, learners’ prior training and experiences with collaboration leading to certain beliefs, facilitator/module developer characteristics and knowledge about IPE, work context and environment</td>
<td>e.g., styles of facilitation are used, whether programs are offered once or in a series, if certain educational theories are adopted, where the education takes place (in the classroom setting or workplace), if participation is voluntary or mandatory</td>
<td>e.g., changes in attitudes, perceptions, knowledge, skills or practice by learners and organizations related to the educational program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

Learners:
- Health Sciences **students** from George Brown College
- **Employees** from the Harold and Grace Baker Centre (Revera Inc.)

Facilitators & Module Developers:
- **Employees** from the Harold and Grace Baker Centre (Revera Inc.)
- **Faculty** from George Brown College

Program Leaders:
- Executives, Senior leaders, Management leaders, and Project leaders from both organizations
May 2008 – January 2010
- **Participant observation** of IPE Modules
- Pre/Post **survey** data collection with learners (N=20)
- Post-program **focus group** with learners Phase1 Pilot (N=6) and Phase 2
- **Document** review (logs, meeting minutes, learner **reflective papers**)
- Early and post-program **interviews** with facilitators, module developers & project leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Project Leader Interviews</th>
<th>Late Project Leader Interviews</th>
<th>Early Module Developer-Facilitator Interviews</th>
<th>Late Module Developer/ Facilitator Interviews</th>
<th>Learner Focus Groups (Phase 2)</th>
<th>Learner Reflective Papers</th>
<th>Total units of evaluation data collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents (N=20)

- Of 10 who responded to ‘Occupation’: ‘frontline direct care’ worker category (n=5); ‘allied health direct care’ profession (n=2); ‘other health care related’ (n=2) participant; ‘clinical/organizational leader’ (n=1)

- **Age Group**: 18 to 34 years of age (n=13), between 35 to 39 years old (n=2), and between 40 and 49 years of age (n=4)

- The majority of responses indicated favourable perceptions (IEPS) and attitudes (IAQ) towards other professional groups - **no statistically significant changes pre & post on both scales**

IEPS: Leucht et al. (1990)
IAQ: (1995a&b) and Carpenter and Hewstone (1996)
Qualitative Findings: High-level Themes

- Partnership context & challenges
- Learning and Teaching Context
- Presage
- Learner perceptions by developers and facilitators
- Teacher/Developer Characteristics
High level of commitment by each organization

Initial Expectations and Goals of Each Partner Agency

“I think that there was a lot of enthusiasm and I think there was great hope and great aspirations for partnering between a business and an academic environment(...) I think both initially were very excited about learning about each other and both felt that it was a really good fit for each other”
1 - Orientation to the partner agency and operationalizing the proposal and crafting a partnership agreement, versus moving right into the work...

2 - Renewed partnership building and re-establishing project goals from the perspective of both organizations due to restructuring and turnover of leadership at the long term care agency

3 - Determining a process for decision-making:
   - Seeking stakeholder input from individuals at various levels of the project
   - Differences in ‘culture’ between ‘academia’ and the business sector

4 - Ongoing gaps in mutual understanding about the nature and context of each organization and expectations and goals for the IPE program
Qualitative Findings:
High-level Themes

Process Factors
(Approaches to Learning and Teaching)

Classroom-based learning –
Seating arrangements and IPE

Timelines and focusing on content versus process
Pre/post qualification
Co-facilitation issues
Course Materials

IP Engagement
Qualitative Findings: Product

- Product
  - Learner Collaborative Competencies
  - Changes in Attitudes/Perceptions
- Developer/Facilitator Outcomes
  - Changes in Knowledge
  - Changes in Behaviour
- Shared Outcomes
  - College Outcomes
  - LTC Agency Outcomes
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A ‘bridge’ and new relationships built between the College and LTC sector

LTCT Program has ‘mushroomed’ into a number of different activities

Learning about the other organization and how to be ‘in partnership’ – enthusiasm to continue

“When you’ve got those relationships it’s easy to go back time and time again to build new projects together and to kind of rekindle the old ones. So, I anticipate that our relationship with [the College] will be a very long lived one. (...) I know that we’re trying to explore and look for other opportunities to work together. I think that’s key, honestly, I think for the success of any project (...) it really does come down to relationships quite often.”
Recommendations: Lessons Learned

‘Early’ orientation to the partner agency

Formal process for decision-making and professional development for this process

Professional development for IPE curriculum development and IPE facilitation
Recommendations: Sustainability

- Senior leadership, management and coordinator support for IPE
- Formal structures to enable staff opinion leaders to teach other staff
- Structures and Processes in Place to support IPC and other practices taught in the modules
- Increased funding for educational programming in the long-term care sector to sustain IPE
- Adapt the model of education for the ‘real world’


Questions?