

Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Interprofessional Education & Practice

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jiep





Interprofessional education faculty development survey: Perspectives on IPE and collaborative practice and COVID-19

Amy M. Yorke ^{a,*}, Diane C. Hoelscher ^b, Caren M. Stalburg ^c, Tazin Daniels ^d, Michelle Aebersold ^e, Vani Patterson ^f, Karen L. Keune ^g, Emily C. Capellari ^h, Elizabeth A. Duffy ⁱ, Meghan Thiel ^j

- ^a University of Michigan-Flint, Physical Therapy Department, 303 East Kearsley Street, 2157 William S. White, Flint, MI, 48502, USA
- b University of Michigan School of Dentistry, Clinical Assistant Professor of Dentistry, Director of Innovation in Teaching and Learning, Department of Cariology, Restorative Sciences and Endodontics, 1011 North University Ave., Ann Arbor, MI, 48109, USA
- ^c Medical School, University of Michigan, Associate Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Learning Health Sciences, Director, Health Infrastructures & Learning Systems Online Master of Science Degree, 224 Victor Vaughan Building, 1111 E. Catherine Street, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109, USA
- d Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, Assistant Director, 1071 Palmer Commons, 100 Washtenaw Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109, USA
- e School of Nursing, University of Michigan, Clinical Professor School of Nursing, 426 North Ingalls, Room 4112, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-5482, USA
- f Center for Interprofesssional Education, University of Michigan, 428 Church Street, Rm 2567, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109, USA
- g Lourdes University, Toledo, OH, USA
- h Taubman Health Sciences Library, University of Michigan, Informationist 1135 Catherine St. Ann Arbor, MI, 48109, USA
- i School of Nursing, University of Michigan, 426 North Ingalls, Room 4134, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109, USA
- ^j Department of Social Work, Michigan Medicine, Clinical Social Worker, Adult Palliative Care Consult Service, Social Work Education Lead, Michigan Medicine Social Work Internship Program, 1500 E. Medical Center Drive, SPC 5233, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-5233, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Interprofessional education Faculty development COVID-19 Interprofessional education competencies Survey

ABSTRACT

The cancellation of in-person classes in March 2020 due to COVID-19 caused a sudden shift in the educational experiences of health profession students enrolled at the University of Michigan (U-M). With the move to remote learning, educators engaging in interprofessional education (IPE) were faced with the challenge of preparing students for interprofessional collaboration from a distance. A survey was designed to investigate the impact of the pandemic on IPE practices and discover educator development needs. Faculty and staff from 10 health sciences schools within the U-M and Michigan Medicine were invited to complete a survey investigating their use of IPE competencies prior to, during, and after the pandemic; their development needs; and their ideas for future implementation of IPE and collaborative practice. Fifty-six percent of respondents reported their ability to teach IPE competencies was impacted by changes related to COVID. There was a significant (p \leq 0.001) difference between self-report of incorporating IPE competencies prior to and during pandemic and during and into the future across all five competencies. Technology was reported as a challenge when teaching IPE, and a need for future faculty development. Leveraging virtual and case-based learning and increasing collaboration between schools were identified as ideas for future implementation.

1. Introduction

The arrival of the COVID-19 virus in the United States in early 2020 caused a significant and sudden shift in the educational activities of health profession students and clinical and academic faculty. On March 11, 2020 the University of Michigan (U-M) joined more than 100

colleges and universities across the country in announcing a switch to remote teaching. This resulted in the cancellation of face-to-face interprofessional education (IPE) activities. This phenomenon was noted across the health professions education spectrum. ^{2–4}

By mid-March 2020, stay at home orders issued by the state of Michigan and the closing of non-essential health care facilities

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: amyorke@umich.edu (A.M. Yorke), dhoelsch@umich.edu (D.C. Hoelscher), carens@med.umich.edu (C.M. Stalburg), tazdan@umich.edu (T. Daniels), mabersol@umich.edu (M. Aebersold), vanims@med.umich.edu (V. Patterson), kkeune@lourdes.edu (K.L. Keune), eginier@umich.edu (E.C. Capellari), eaduffy@umich.edu (E.A. Duffy), thielmm@med.umich.edu (M. Thiel).

Table 1 Survey respondent demographics.

	Entire sample (n = 166)	Previous experience with IPE (n = 100)	Taught IPE between March–July 2020 (n = 44)	
Primary Role within School or College	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Faculty	131 (78.9%)	81 (81.0%)	35 (79.5%)	
Staff	35 (21.1%)	19 (19.0%)	9 (20.5%)	
Profession				
Dentistry	28 (16.9%)	15 (15.0%)	8 (18.2%)	
Medicine	40 (24.1%)	21 (21.0%)	11 (25.0%)	
Nursing/Advanced Nurse Practitioner	20 (12.0%)	14 (14.0%)	4 (9.0%)	
Pharmacy	7 (4.2%)	3 (3.0%)	1 (2.3%)	
Physical Therapy	6 (3.6%)	4 (4.0%)	3 (6.8%)	
Social Work	43 (25.9%)	28 (28.0%)	12 (27.3%)	
Other (Public Health,	22	15 (15.0%)	5 (11.3%)	
Physician Assistant, Respiratory Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Kinesiology, Dental Hygiene, Other)	(12.0%)			
Respondent Reported Location	n of Learners'	Academic Affiliation	1	
Ann Arbor	111 (66.9%)	68 (68.0%)	31 (70.5%)	
Michigan Medicine	30 (18.1%)	16 (16.0%)	8 (18.2%)	
Flint	21 (12.7%)	15 (15.0%)	5 (11.2%)	
Dearborn/Other/Missing Academic Appointment	4 (2.4%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Clinical Track	80 (48.2%)	53 (53.0%)	24 (54.5%)	
Tenured Track/Tenured	32 (19.3%)	19 (19.0%)	7 (15.9%)	
Lecturer	20 (12.0%)	11 (11.0%)	5 (11.4%)	
No academic appt/Other	34 (20.5%)	17 (17.0%)	8 (18.2%)	

continued to provide challenges to clinical faculty and students who were working and learning in these environments. A majority of students were excluded from the clinical environment, pausing learner activities for the health professions. Academic and clinical faculty and staff were immediately challenged in how to best continue to deliver IPE opportunities for their students. Concerns about progression towards degree as well as issues for licensure also came to the forefront. As solutions emerged, focus on technology, curriculum, educational adaptations and lessons learned for the future were shared by leaders in health professions education. 6–8

However, much like before the pandemic, addressing the unique needs of many educators engaged in IPE and collaborative care curricula

remained limited. In addition, IPE initiatives strive to achieve a unique set of competencies. In order to further understand the needs of clinical and academic faculty and staff, the U-M Center for Interprofessional Education Faculty Development Committee developed and distributed a survey to gather information about integration of IPE competencies, faculty development needs and ideas for future implementation of IPE within the context of COVID-19. The goal of this survey was to explore the impact of the pandemic on IPE and collaborative practice as well as generate ideas for future faculty development needs.

2. Methods

2.1. Survey development and dissemination

The survey was developed by a faculty team utilizing the interprofessional competencies espoused at U-M which include the Interprofessional Education Collaborative Competencies (IPEC®) and an additional competency on intercultural humility. The survey (Appendix 1) was reviewed by experts with expertise in IPE and faculty development. The survey consisted of three sections, demographics (4 questions), self-report of ability to teach IPE competencies prior to the pandemic, during the pandemic, and in the future (9 questions), and two questions related to needs for faculty development and ideas for future implementation of IPE. Executive Committee members of the U-M Center for Interprofessional Education were requested to forward the recruitment email with the survey link (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) to their academic and clinical faculty two times in order to maximize response rate from all schools, colleges, and clinical environments. Faculty and staff who received the email were encouraged to forward the survey invitation to others. Participants provided electronic consent before accessing the rest of the survey. The survey remained open from August through September 2020. The study was considered exempt by the Institutional Review Board at U-M (HUM00182594).

2.2. Data analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using IBM, SPSS version 26.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY). Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the dispersion of responses. Comparisons of frequency of teaching IPE competencies for the periods before, during the pandemic, and in the future were completed with the Friedman test with post-hoc pairwise comparisons using Wilcoxon signed-rank tests. A significance level of p < 0.05 was used for Friedman test, and due to the multiple post-hoc comparisons was adjusted using the Bonferroni method to p < 0.017. Qualitative data was generated using Qualtrics software. Qualitative data analysis was completed by three of the authors using a thematic analysis approach to identify emergent themes and patterns within the dataset. 10

 Table 2

 Survey Respondents Report of Frequency of Integrating IPE Competencies in Practice Prior to, During the Pandemic, and in Future.

Frequency	Always/Most of	f the time		About half the	time/Sometimes		Never		
Competency	Prior to (n = 100)	During (n = 44)	Future (n = 96)	Prior to (n = 100)	During (n = 44)	Future (n = 96)	Prior to (n = 100)	During (n = 44)	Future (n = 96)
Value/Ethics	90 (90.0%)	31 (70.5%)	87 (90.6%)	8 (8.0%)	8 (18.1%)	7 (7.3%)	2 (2.0%)	5 (11.4%)	2 (2.1%)
Roles/ Responsibilities	89 (89.0%)	30 (68.1%)	86 (89.6%)	10 (10.0%)	10 (22.7%)	8 (8.3%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (9.1%)	2 (2.1%)
Interprofessional Communication	91 (91.0%)	28 (63.6%)	87 (90.6%)	8 (8.0%)	13 (29.5%)	7 (7.3%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (6.8%)	2 (2.1%)
Teams/Teamwork	89 (89.0%)	28 (63.6%)	86 (89.6%)	10 (10.0%)	13 (29.5%)	8 (8.3%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (6.8%)	2 (2.1%)
Intercultural Humility	80 (80.0%)	24 (54.5%)	83 (86.5%)	19 (19.0%)	16 (36.4%)	11 (11.5%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (9.1%)	2 (2.1%)

Table 3 Themes and selected quotes identified from open-ended data.

Themes	Selected Quotes from Open Ended Questions	who had previous experience teaching IPE, 44.0% (n = 44) completed
COVID-19 Impact on Teaching		an IPE course/event/activity between March–August 2020.
Cancellation of in-person events, including clinical rotations	 Clinical outreach and rotations were halted. Students glean a great deal of IPE experiences during these learning opportunities. Simulations were not able to be in person 	3.2. Practice of IPE before, during, and after COVID-19 pandemic
	changing the dynamic of the experience with the patient/family as well as the interdisciplinary colleague. Not able to debrief after the simulation experience.	Prior to the pandemic, the majority of faculty who taught IPE were able to "always/most of the time" incorporate the five IPE competencies into their teaching, with intercultural humility being the least frequently incorporated at 80% (n = 80). Fifty-six percent of the faculty reported
Learning how to use technology quickly	Time spent focusing on technology and accessibility took away from other course material. Different than what I had planned, but necessary all the same.	their ability to teach IPE competencies was impacted by changes related to COVID-19. The Friedman Test was completed in order to assess differences in self-report frequency in teaching IPE competencies across the
Time constraints	 Time and incorporating remote teaching/ learning provided challenges Teams were too busy for education, still are to some degree. 	44 respondents who answered all three time points (prior to, during, future). There was a statistically significant difference in self-report of teaching values/ethics $[X^2(2) = 22.1, p = 0.001]$, roles and responsibilities $[X^2(2) = 22.3, p = 0.001]$, interprofessional communica-
Separation/distance	 Moving off-site has decreased the amount of interaction within my interdisciplinary team. Most interactions happen via email or phone which does not allow for organic IPE to take place in the same way as in-person interactions. Inability to get disciplines together 	tion [$X^2(2) = 25.2$, $p = 0.001$], teams/teamwork [$X^2(2) = 28.0$, $p = 0.001$], and intercultural humility [$X^2(2) = 19.7$, $p = 0.001$] as compared to prior, during and into the future. There was a statistically significant difference between self-report of incorporating IPE compe-
IPE Competencies that Need to be	Emphasized	tencies prior to and during the pandemic (decrease in reported fre-
All competencies	It is impossible to pick one or only a couple from	quency), and during and into the future across all five competencies (p
	this list. In order to provide a high standard of care for our patients and families, it is vital that	\leq 0.001); however, there was no difference in reporting of frequency
	caregivers of all disciplines work within the	prior to and into the future (Table 2). The majority of respondents
	context of all of these competencies. To leave	(84.3%, n = 129) strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that as a result of
	even one off would negatively impact the care a	COVID-19 the need to teach IPE competencies is more important than
	patient/family would receive.	ever.
Intercultural humility	• They are all important, if I had to choose one, it	
	would be intercultural humility. Our country is very divided and understanding cultural humility is vital.	3.3. Qualitative results
Communication	Without communication, I strongly believe, none of these other areas are feasible.	Respondents were given the opportunity to provide open text
Faculty Development Needs	none of these other weas we feasible.	regarding how their ability to teach IPE was impacted by the mandated
Time/Opportunity	 I would like to see more opportunities for 	changes related to COVID-19, which IPE competencies should be spe-
	collaborative learning experiences and for faculty to have the opportunity to teach in other	cifically emphasized, skills needed to support IPE/collaborative practice, and future ideas. Key themes (Table 3) impacting respondents'
	programs. I would also like increased faculty	ability to teach IPE included the cancellation of face-to-face events
	training and opportunities to participate in formal IPE training.	(including clinical rotations), time constraints, distancing, and the need
Technology challenges	 Engaging audiences in a virtual setting. It is 	to learn how to use technology. Two-thirds of respondents reported that all the IPE competencies are valuable and that no one competency
	hard to know if people are learning when their names are the only thing up on a Zoom lecture.	should be emphasized over others when preparing students for practice.
	 More experience with telehealth and it's 	The other third of respondents specifically identified communication,
	processes and associated skills	intercultural humility, and teamwork as competencies that should be
	 Broadening the development of online IPE courses to learn these skills, would be helpful in 	emphasized. Faculty identified needs included time, additional collab-
	making courses and techniques more accessible	orative opportunities and support for use of technology. Future ideas for
	to students.	IPE highlighted the need for collaborations across various health pro-
Online opportunities	 We need to offer more accessibility to the IPE 	fessions schools, leveraging online technology to make connections, and
	courses offered in Ann Arbor (AA) to the smaller campuses (Flint). There are many	case-based activities.
	opportunities in AA that are not available to the other campuses in part due to location, timing and program schedules. Consider offering	4. Discussion
	virtual or on-line options that truly allow more	Self-reported teaching of IPE competencies at U-M, in faculty who
	students the opportunity to participate. • Building online virtual simulations	taught before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, significantly
	- Danielly office of the streethers	decreased. The drop in the ability to integrate IPF competencies during

3. Results

3.1. Demographics

A total of 166 respondents completed the survey (Table 1) giving an estimated return rate of 17%. The majority of respondents identified as

synchronously.

Leveraging the advantage distance learning gives us in promoting interactions that do not

have to occur face to face or even necessarily

faculty (77.1%, n = 128). Half of the sample came from the schools of medicine (24.1%) and social work (25.9%). For those faculty (n = 100) who had previous experience teaching IPE, 44.0% (n = 44) completed

taught before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, significantly decreased. The drop in the ability to integrate IPE competencies during the pandemic speaks to the complexity of integrating IPE in teaching and curricula. IPE can be seen as "in addition to" or integrated with other components of the curriculum. When the pandemic hit, there was a swift shift to address critical issues such as ensuring students were able to graduate on time and modifying existing courses to the online environment. In fact, several respondents spoke to this in their comments.

The rapid change to online instruction presented additional challenges. Respondents reported difficulty pivoting to a digital environment when integrating the IPE competencies. This was obviously true for those activities requiring students to work in groups or in clinical or simulation environments. However, since a considerable proportion of IPE instruction at U-M occurs in classrooms and small groups, this also identified opportunities for the future. It is often difficult to gather students from two or more programs in the same physical space. The lessons learned using online meeting technologies may inform future models of instruction in a virtual environment. Virtual models could also support or leverage clinical or experiential (face-to-face) opportunities.

A limitation of this study is the potential for bias in the sample. Medical School and School of Social Work respondents made up about half the sample, though they do not comprise half the numbers of healthcare faculty and staff at the university. The survey was distributed through representatives at each of the schools. The decentralized nature of U-M with three campuses, 10 schools and medical center, means there is not one common listserv for all health professions faculty and staff. This inevitably led to variability in dissemination and follow up and may have impacted sample size and distribution. Also, due to survey design, only 44 respondents completed all questions related to teaching IPE before, during and after the pandemic. Constructing the survey differently may have increased the number of faculty responding for all three time periods. Nevertheless, these results do provide insight into factors that may have impacted faculty ability to incorporate IPE competencies during the pandemic and ideas for the post-COVID future.

5. Conclusions

Faculty reported a significant reduction in incorporation of IPE competencies into their teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. Technology was reported as a challenge when teaching IPE and was listed as a need for future faculty development. Leveraging virtual and case-based learning and increasing collaboration between schools were identified as ideas for future implementation.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Amy M. Yorke: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Diane C. Hoelscher: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Caren M. Stalburg: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Tazin Daniels: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Vani Patterson: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation. Karen L. Keune: Formal analysis, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Elizabeth A.

Duffy: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Meghan Thiel:** Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest. The authors alone are responsible for the content and writing of this article.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Ghaidaa Najjar for her work in assisting in the development of the survey and the members of the University of Michigan Center for IPE Executive Committee for their support.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xjep.2022.100529.

References

- College closings: more than 100 colleges cancel in-person classes and move online. Chris Quintana, USA Today. https://www-usatoday-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/story/news/education/2020/03/11/coronavirus-college-closings-list-online-classes/5022256002/; March 11, 2020. Accessed February 15, 2021.
- Deery C. The COVID-19 pandemic: implications for dental education. Evid Base Dent. 2020;21(2):46–47. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41432-020-0089-3.
- Langlois S, Xyrichis A, Daulton BJ, et al. The COVID-19 crisis silver lining: interprofessional education to guide future innovation. *J Interprof Care*. 2020;34(5): 587–592. https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820.2020.1800606.
- Rose S. Medical student education in the time of COVID-19. JAMA. 2020;323(21): 2131–2132. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.5227.
- Winship JM, Falls K, Gregory M, et al. A case study in rapid adaptation of interprofessional education and remote visits during COVID-19. *J Interprof Care*. 2020;34(5):702–705. https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820.2020.1807921.
- Jones TA, Vidal G, Taylor C. Interprofessional education during the COVID-19 pandemic: finding the good in a bad situation. *J Interprof Care*. 2020;34(5):633–646. https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820.2020.1801614.
- Hays R, Jennings B, Gibbs T, Hunt J, McKay K. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic: the perceptions of health professions educators. *MedEdPublish*. 2020;9(1). https://doi.org/10.15694/mep.2020.000142.1.
- Sklar DP. COVID-19: lessons from the disaster that can improve health professions education. *Acad Med.* 2020;95(11):1631–1633. https://doi.org/10.1097/ ACM.0000000000003547.
- Interprofessional Education Collaborative. Core Competencies for Interprofessional Collaborative Practice: 2016 Update. Washington, DC: Interprofessional Education Collaborative: 2016.
- Graneheim UH, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. Nurse Educ Today. 2004;24(2):105–112.