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Background of this study

Study proposed at the MLA 2017 IPE-SIG meeting by Kristine Alpi.

Call for volunteers from the MLA Research Section and the IPE-SIG to work on a comparative survey design learning project.

We want to thank all of those who worked on the conceptualization of this research project:

- Francesca Allegri, Emily Ginier, Rebecca McCall, Heather McEwen, Zsuzsanna Nemeth, Roland Bernard Welmaker, Sr.
Preparing a collaborative practice-ready workforce

Interprofessional Education (IPE)

Two or more professions learn about, from, and with each other to enable effective collaboration

Interprofessional Collaboration (IPC)

When multiple health workers from different professions work together to provide comprehensive, coordinated services by working with patients, families, caregivers, and communities to deliver high quality care across settings

Improved Patient Outcomes

Coordinated care improves patient outcomes

WHO (2010), Framework for Action on Interprofessional Education & Collaborative Practice
Librarians’ Role

Librarians are natural partners to IPE programs and IPC in health care settings, and have a unique vantage point on the value of working with other professions.

Academic settings:
- Instruction, space, committee work, event planning

Clinical settings:
- Part of the interprofessional healthcare team
Purpose of study

Despite librarians’ involvement with IPE, no study has assessed our attitudes and perceptions toward IPE using a standardized scale.

We set out to:

1. Make a baseline assessment of the attitudes of health sciences librarians toward IPE using a standardized scale.
2. Evaluate differences in attitude based on membership in the IPE-SIG, years of experience as a librarian, previous experience as a health professional, and experience teaching/supporting IPE.
3. Compare librarians’ scores on the standardized scale to other health professionals’ scores (Hawk, 2002).
4. Gather responses on how librarians have taught or supported IPE.
IEPS

Interdisciplinary Education Perception Scale (IEPS) is an 18-item questionnaire consisting of four subscales:

1. competence and autonomy
2. perceived need for cooperation
3. perception of actual cooperation
4. understanding others' values

Figure from: Hawk C, Buckwalter K, Byrd L, Cigelman S, Dorfman L, Ferguson K. Health professions students' perceptions of interprofessional relationships. Acad Med. 2002;77(4):354-357.
Population Selection

IPE-SIG selected as the survey population for their likely interest in and involvement with IPE.

MLA Research Section was selected as a comparison group.

IEPS scores would be compared between these populations to ascertain if librarians interested in and involved with IPE had different attitudes toward IPE compared to health sciences librarians generally.

Estimated response rate - 15% based on previous study (Mazure & Alpi, 2015)
Survey Distribution and Analysis

IRB Exemption from NC State University

Recruitment emails were sent to the MLA Research Section and IPE-SIG on October 1st with reminders after 2 weeks and 1 week before closing. The survey was open for a month.

Demographic information was collected and categories collapsed to protect participant privacy

65 responses

Quantitative data analyzed using ANOVAs, qualitative data analyzed with open coding

No statistical significance between IPE and RS members found
Overlap between RS and IPE SIG

RS - 18% response rate
n=46

IPE-SIG - 10% response rate
n=11

Overlap n=8

added to analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Competency &amp; Autonomy</th>
<th>Perceived Need for Cooperation</th>
<th>Perception of Actual Cooperation</th>
<th>Understanding others’ value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73.2 (9.7)</td>
<td>62.8 (8.2)</td>
<td>78.7 (8.4)</td>
<td>48.1 (8.0)</td>
<td>262.9 (25.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPE SIG</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74.2 (7.9)</td>
<td>62.7 (8.8)</td>
<td>79.3 (6.9)</td>
<td>49.8 (5.4)</td>
<td>266.0 (23.2)</td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72.7 (10.5)</td>
<td>62.9 (8.0)</td>
<td>78.4 (9.0)</td>
<td>47.4 (8.8)</td>
<td>261.6 (27.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74.7 (4.9)</td>
<td>60.4 (11.7)</td>
<td>79.1 (5.8)</td>
<td>50.9 (4.9)</td>
<td>263.7 (20.6)</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70.5 (13.3)</td>
<td>63.6 (6.7)</td>
<td>77.0 (12.0)</td>
<td>47.5 (10.9)</td>
<td>258.6 (34.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73.3 (9.7)</td>
<td>61.5 (8.3)</td>
<td>77.8 (8.3)</td>
<td>46.4 (6.9)</td>
<td>261.1 (24.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73.7 (11.6)</td>
<td>66.0 (4.2)</td>
<td>79.3 (7.1)</td>
<td>45.3 (9.4)</td>
<td>264.3 (28.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74.9 (5.8)</td>
<td>65.1 (4.1)</td>
<td>82.7 (5.2)</td>
<td>50.3 (5.1)</td>
<td>273.0 (12.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous experience as a non-librarian health professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.4 (7.9)</td>
<td>57.3 (8.0)</td>
<td>79.5 (6.4)</td>
<td>48.0 (8.5)</td>
<td>262.0 (24.6)</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72.6 (10.0)</td>
<td>63.7 (7.9)</td>
<td>78.6 (8.7)</td>
<td>48.1 (7.9)</td>
<td>263.1 (26.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience teaching or supporting IPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73.7 (9.1)</td>
<td>63.8 (7.3)</td>
<td>80.0 (6.6)</td>
<td>49.2 (7.3)</td>
<td>266.7 (22.4)</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71.0 (10.9)</td>
<td>61.8 (9.6)</td>
<td>76.9 (9.1)</td>
<td>46.5 (9.1)</td>
<td>254.7 (28.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75.3 (6.7)</td>
<td>62.4 (7.6)</td>
<td>79.1 (11.9)</td>
<td>48.4 (7.1)</td>
<td>272.0 (22.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession or Discipline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Competence &amp; Autonomy</td>
<td>Perceived need for cooperation</td>
<td>Perception of actual cooperation</td>
<td>Understanding others’ value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician assistant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>291.9</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteopathy</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>277.8</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical therapy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>270.9</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>262.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>260.6</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podiatry</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>257.6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>256.8</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiropractic</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>238.9</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most positive responses**

Individuals in my profession need to cooperate with other professions (5.8)

Individuals in my profession are willing to share information and resources with other professionals (5.7)

**Least positive responses**

Individuals in my profession have a higher status than individuals in other professions (2.4)

Individuals in other professions think highly of my profession (3.9)
Qualitative findings

Ways librarians reported being involved in IPE included:

● **Teaching and/or facilitating required learning activities for students**
● Committee membership
● Non-curricular activities (e.g. book clubs, Grand Rounds participation)

Respondents also commented on

● Respect for librarians within IPE
● Undervalued role of librarians
● Desire for more involvement in IPE
Takeaways

This study provides the first baseline assessment of health sciences librarians’ perceptions and attitudes toward IPE.

Librarians report highly positive attitudes towards IPE in line with other health professionals regardless of level of support, experience, or previous careers.

Some librarians feel undervalued and underutilized in terms of IPE.
Thank you!
Questions?

Rachel Hinrichs | rhinrich@iupui.edu
Caitlin Bakker | cjbakker@umn.edu