

Interprofessional Education: An Exploration in Physical Therapist Education

Holly H. Wise, PT, PhD, Jody S. Frost, PT, DPT, PhD, FNAP, Cheryl Resnik, PT, DPT,
Beth P. Davis, PT, DPT, MBA, and Z. Annette Iglarsh, PT, PhD, MBA, FNAP

consider

(ACAPT) to con-

H is a professor of physical therapy in the Department of Health Professions, Medical University of South Carolina, 151 Rutledge Avenue B 312, MSC 962, Charleston, SC 29425-9620 (wisehh@musc.edu). Please address all correspondence to Holly Wise.

J F is program director of the Education Leadership Institute Fellowship and the lead academic affairs specialist with the American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

C R is an associate professor of physical therapy and associate chair, Division of Biokinesiology and Physical Therapy, University of South California, Los Angeles, CA.

B D is an assistant professor in the Division of Physical Therapy, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

A I is a professor and associate dean of Interprofessional Education at Endicott College in Beverly, MA.

The Institutional Review Board at the Medical University of South Carolina reviewed this study and acknowledged that the study was exempt from review.

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

findings, at least 62 (58.5%) of the 106 (50.7%) respondents reported that IPE is a focus of their physical therapist education curriculum. Eighty respondents (75.5%) identified up to 3 reasons for the success of their initiatives. Faculty buy-in/champions was the most frequently cited reason followed by institutional support, student support, curriculum, and external factors, respectively. The majority of respondents (n = 56) did not identify a collaborative practice partnership in which their students obtain interprofessional experience.

Discussion and Conclusion. Based on the work of national and international organizations and forums, and the results of this survey, physical therapist education programs developing IPE within their institutions typically elect to first target IPE within classroom experiences before integrating IPE within clinical

ing higher education in dentistry, medicine (allopathic and osteopathic), nursing, pharmacy, and public health formed the Interprofessional Education Collaborative (IPEC) to help advance IPE and promote team-based care. In 2011, the collaborative published Core Competencies for Interprofessional Collaborative Practice (Core Competencies) to help guide development of health professions curricula and prepare students to effectively practice teamwork and team-based health care.¹²⁻¹³ These core competencies are grouped into 4 domains: (1) values/ethics, (2) roles/responsibilities, (3) interprofessional (IP) communication, and (4) teams/teamwork. For a complete listing of the core competencies, please refer to Appendix A.

Although many health care professions, including physical therapy, were not represented directly in the development of these core competencies, the competencies are widely applicable. Many

imilarly,

(IPE) has been a topic of national and international discussion for several decades.¹⁻⁸ As defined by the World Health Organization (WHO), IPE is education in which “students from two or more professions learn about, from, and with each other to enable improved health outcomes.”⁵ Widely accepted as being integral to the provision of safe, high-quality, and accessible patient-centered care, IPE has gained momentum and support during the past decade and has been adopted and promoted by many health profession organizations.⁹⁻¹⁶ In 2009, 6 national organizations represent-

terprofessional education and collaborative practice). Thus, IPECP initiatives have included professional development activities, participation at inter-

(80.2%) provided a total of 120 examples of IPE initiatives (Table 1). The most frequently reported example was IP courses ranging from a single course to a sequence of 3-4 courses (n = 31), followed, in descending frequency, by case collaboration (n = 17), university IP days (n = 14), IP lab classes including those with simulation (n = 13), volunteer/service learning (n = 8), and pro bono clinics (n = 7). Seventy-nine respondents (74.5%) cited a total of 74 examples of support for IPE initiatives (Table 2). Funding either through the university budget, extramural, or intramural grants was the most frequently cited example of support (n = 40) followed by inclusion of IPE in the annual review process (n = 25).

IPE Success. Seventy-seven respondents (72.6%) identified examples of evidence of the success of IPE at their institutions.

were associated with a clinical experience, community-based experience, pro bono/student-run clinic, or outpatient clinic. Clinical experience was the most frequently identified site for partnerships (Table 6).

IPEC Core Competencies. Eighty-two individuals (77.4%) reported familiarity with the IPEC Core Competencies¹² and 75 of the 82 (91.5%) supporting endorsement of these general competencies by the profession in both education and clinical practice.

Follow-Up Survey

The initial survey identified 46 key contacts for follow-up. Of these, 30 (65.2%) responded to the follow-up survey.

IP C D C E. Fifteen key contacts (50%) responded that IP competencies are not addressed during clinical experiences. Three key contacts (10%) mentioned that they were in the planning or beginning stages of addressing competencies, and 1 respondent indicated the institution was seeking guidance from APTA. Twelve key contacts (40%) reported that IP competencies are being addressed during the clinical experiences at their institutions, and 9 of those gave examples of competencies that students are expected to achieve. Cumulative-

233

that their state practice

for the initial survey of 209 ACAPT member institutions makes the results difficult to gen-



Appendix C. IPE Organizational Resources

Organization Name	Website
American Interprofessional Health Collaborative (AIHC)	