

Utilizing an Interprofessional Value Scale to Optimize Team Assessment

Wayne State University

Jennifer Mendez, Ph.D., School of Medicine

ag3928@wayne.edu



Objectives

- To utilize the Interprofessional Socialization and Valuing Scale (ISVS) to determine students' readiness to function in teams.
- Differences between nine disciplines of students comfort in working in teams



Background

- Over 13 years Wayne State University's Interprofessional Team Visit Program has grown to encompassing nine disciplines: Medicine, Pharmacy, Social Work, Nursing, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Athletic Therapy, Physician Assistant Program & Dentistry.

Annually teams of three students randomly selected visit one older adult annually.

Pre and post visits students are administered the Interprofessional Socialization and Valuing scale (ISVS)



During the visit they conduct discipline specific assessments

Recruitment of Patients

During blood screening in the community

Friends, family and neighbors

Community Agencies

Feedback from patients

- like educating the future health care professionals of their needs
- no drop outs



Methodology

Instrument: Interprofessional Socialization and Valuing scale (ISVS) measures:

- Self-Perceived Ability to Work with Others,
- Value in Working with Others, and
- Comfort in Working with Others.

This empirically derived scale showed good fit with the conceptual basis of the measure.

DATA ANALYSIS:

- Data was analyzed with SPSS, version 26 using descriptive statistics for student teams



A paired sample t-tests was used to compare pre/post data

At this point in time, based on my participation in interprofessional education activities and/or clinical practice . . .	To a Very Great Extent	To a Great Extent	To a Fairly Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Small Extent	To a Very Small Extent	Not at All	N/A
I have gained an enhanced awareness of my own role on a team	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
I feel comfortable being the leader in a team situation	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
I see myself as preferring to work on an interprofessional team	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
I have a better appreciation for the value in sharing research evidence across different health professional disciplines in a team	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
I believe that it is important to work as a team	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
I am able to negotiate more openly with others within a team	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
I feel comfortable in being accountable for the responsibilities I have taken on	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
I have gained a better understanding of the client's involvement in decision making around their care	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
I feel comfortable in clarifying misconceptions with other members of the team about the role of someone in my profession	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

© King, Orchard, & Khalili (2016)



Results: Participants

	Frequency	Percent
AT	5	.5
BSN	137	13.0
BSW	121	11.5
DEN	142	13.5
M2	292	27.7
OT1	34	3.2
OT2	34	3.2
P2	44	4.2
P3	161	15.3
PA	47	4.5
PT	38	3.6
Total	1055	100.0

N = 1055 students

9 professional programs

- AT=Athletic Training
- BSN=Nursing
- BSW= Social Work
- DEN=Dentistry
- M2=Medicine
- OT1, OT2=Occupational Therapy
- P2, P3=Pharmacy
- PA= Physician Assistant
- PT= Physical Therapy



Results: Team composition

	Frequency	Percent
AT,BSN,BSW	9	.9
AT,BSW,DEN	6	.6
BSN,BSW,DEN	87	8.2
BSN,BSW,PT	15	1.4
BSN,DEN,OT2	12	1.1
BSN,DEN,P3	10	.9
BSN,DEN,P3,PT	60	5.7
BSN,M2,P2	250	23.7
BSN,M2,P3	108	10.2
BSN,P3	1	.1
BSW,PT,P3	3	.3
BSW,DEN,OT2	86	8.2
BSW,DEN,P3	121	11.5
BSW,DEN,PT	40	3.8
DEN,P3	1	.1
DEN,P3,OT2	3	.3
M2,OT1	3	.3
M2,OT1,P2	80	7.6
M2,OT1,P3	43	4.1
M2,OT1,PA	107	10.1
M2,P2	2	.2
M2,P3	2	.2
M2,PA	6	.6
Total	1055	100.0



Results: Pre / Post ISVS Data

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
PreQ1	1055	5.73	1.039
PreQ2	1055	5.37	1.285
PreQ3	1055	5.61	1.182
PreQ4	1055	6.27	.896
PreQ5	1055	5.84	1.048
PreQ6	1055	5.43	1.311
PreQ7	1055	5.81	1.383
PreQ8	1055	5.74	1.222
PreQ9	1055	5.95	1.029
PreQ1B	1055	5.56	1.265
PreQ2B	1055	5.40	1.269
PreQ3B	1055	5.51	1.268
PreQ4B	1055	5.69	1.292
PreQ5B	1055	6.34	.894
PreQ6B	1055	5.68	1.188
PreQ7B	1055	5.96	1.007
PreQ8B	1055	5.63	1.398
PreQ9B	1055	5.72	1.144

PostQ1	1055	6.24	.924
PostQ2	1055	6.07	1.150
PostQ3	1055	6.17	1.078
PostQ4	1055	6.48	.855
PostQ5	1055	6.37	.901
PostQ6	1055	6.14	1.192
PostQ7	1055	6.23	1.200
PostQ8	1055	6.33	.934
PostQ9	1055	6.41	.858
PostQ1b	1055	6.13	1.155
PostQ2b	1055	6.15	1.030
PostQ3b	1055	6.09	1.145
PostQ4b	1055	6.17	1.205
PostQ5b	1055	6.51	.889
PostQ6b	1055	6.21	1.075
PostQ7b	1055	6.37	.939
PostQ8b	1055	6.26	1.163
PostQ9b	1055	6.31	.979





Paired Samples Test

Paired Differences

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	PreQ1 - PostQ1	-.511	1.178	.036	-.582	-.440	-14.092	1054	.000
Pair 2	PreQ2 - PostQ2	-.702	1.459	.045	-.791	-.614	-15.633	1054	.000
Pair 3	PreQ3 - PostQ3	-.563	1.427	.044	-.649	-.477	-12.812	1054	.000
Pair 4	PreQ4 - PostQ4	-.204	1.054	.032	-.267	-.140	-6.279	1054	.000
Pair 5	PreQ5 - PostQ5	-.526	1.208	.037	-.599	-.453	-14.140	1054	.000
Pair 6	PreQ6 - PostQ6	-.712	1.560	.048	-.806	-.618	-14.817	1054	.000
Pair 7	PreQ7 - PostQ7	-.419	1.579	.049	-.514	-.324	-8.617	1054	.000
Pair 8	PreQ8 - PostQ8	-.596	1.323	.041	-.676	-.516	-14.633	1054	.000
Pair 9	PreQ9 - PostQ9	-.459	1.166	.036	-.529	-.388	-12.775	1054	.000





Paired Samples Test

Paired Differences

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
PreQ1B - PostQ1b	-.569	1.467	.045	-.657	-.480	-12.591	1054	.000
PreQ2B - PostQ2b	-.747	1.413	.043	-.832	-.662	-17.173	1054	.000
PreQ3B - PostQ3b	-.582	1.442	.044	-.669	-.495	-13.112	1054	.000
PreQ4B - PostQ4b	-.483	1.558	.048	-.578	-.389	-10.080	1054	.000
PreQ5B - PostQ5b	-.175	1.042	.032	-.238	-.112	-5.466	1054	.000
PreQ6B - PostQ6b	-.535	1.316	.041	-.614	-.455	-13.191	1054	.000
PreQ7B - PostQ7b	-.413	1.202	.037	-.486	-.341	-11.164	1054	.000
PreQ8B - PostQ8b	-.633	1.565	.048	-.728	-.539	-13.137	1054	.000
PreQ9B - PostQ9b	-.589	1.314	.040	-.668	-.509	-14.552	1054	.000



Discussion

- Self-Perceived Ability to Work with Others
 - Confidence in the ability to work with others associated with positive outcomes in teams.
- Value in Working with Others
 - More meaningful social interactions.
- Comfort in Working with Others
 - More meaningful task-related outcomes.



Discussion Continued

- Students have higher self-perceived ability, value, and comfort about working with others after the older adult visits.
- The experience of collaborating with students, from other disciplines, has positive learning impact.
- Wayne State's Interprofessional Team Visit Program can be used as a model for interprofessional team development to prepare the future workforce.



Limitations

- No control group
 - Limited in making causal claims.
- One experience only
 - More research needed to support similar effects over time or to replicate at additional time points.
- There were fifteen teams of 2 students vs three hundred and forty teams of 3 students



Future research

- Virtual environment vs face-to-face visit using same tool
- Experimental research design



References:

- King, G., Orchard, C., Khalili, H., & Avery, L. (2016). Refinement of the Interprofessional Socialization and Valuing Scale (ISVS-21) and development of 9-item equivalent versions. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 36(3), 171-177. doi:10.1097/CEH.0000000000000082
- King, G., Shaw, L., Orchard, C. A., & Miller, S. (2010). The Interprofessional Socialization and Valuing Scale: A tool for evaluating the shift toward collaborative care approaches in health care settings. *Work: A Journal of Prevention, Assessment & Rehabilitation*, 35(1), 77-85. doi:10.3233/WOR-2010-0959
- SPSS IBM Corp. Released 2018. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.



Questions

Contact Information:

Jennifer Mendez, ag3928@wayne.edu

