Distance Learning that Works for All Professions: A Model of Student and Faculty Engagement
objectives

Describe how leveraging student involvement optimizes disciplinary content neutrality and technical functionality of interprofessional distance modules.

Reflect on practical examples of inputs, processes, outputs, and outcomes associated with a student advisory committee for relevance to other interprofessional curriculum projects.
Overview of distance module project
- How, why
- Phases, timelines
- Development team

Student Advisory Committee (SAC) magic
- Who, how, when
- Timeline, process
- Focus, norms

Then this happened...
- Engagement
- Applying feedback
- Examples

Final reflections
- Takeaways
- Student reviewer reflection
- Future forward
Overview of distance module project
Project support

The Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation as part of the
Interprofessional Primary Care Curriculum: Implementation and Evaluation Project
http://macyfoundation.org/about

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) as part of the
Arizona Graduate Nurse Education Demonstration Project
http://www.azgne.org/about-the-azgne/
Goals

Develop, implement, and evaluate distance education modules on interprofessional practice that are:

1) Foundational to effective collaboration
2) Central to effective primary care practice
3) Aligned to IPEC® core competencies*

*These modules were developed prior to the release of the ‘2016 Update’ edition of the IPEC® core competencies. While the module contents largely reflect the 2011 edition, each module includes information about the 2016 edition.
Guiding principles

✓ **Discipline-neutral**: avoid singular world views, bias
✓ **Relevant and meaningful**: improve competence, patient care
✓ **Student-centered**: provide interactive and engaging learning experiences
✓ **Flexible**: fit with diverse IPE curricula
✓ **Practical**: emphasize practice- and case-based when applicable
✓ **Usable**: present easily accessible, asynchronous, and mobile compatible materials
Audience

Preceptors and faculty in our environment

The broader IPE universe

Students from diverse health professions
Core Interprofessional Modules

cover the foundational knowledge of team-based care and collaborative practice:

- What is Interprofessional Education?
- Interprofessional Communication: Communication in Healthcare Settings
- Roles and Responsibilities: It Takes a Team
- Four Habits of High Performance Teams and Teamwork from a Person-Centered Perspective*

*This module is cross-referenced in both sets.
Interprofessional Primary Care Modules emphasize team-based decisions and skills required for current and evolving primary care practice and continuum-based care:

- Introduction to Team Decision Making in Primary Care
- Involving Team Members in Primary Care Practice
- Developing an Integrated Plan of Care
- Care Coordination in Primary Care Practice
- Four Habits of High Performance Teams and Teamwork from a Person-Centered Perspective*

*This module is cross-referenced in both sets.
Interprofessional project team

- Project coordinator
- Instructional designer (module development)
- Instructional designer (planning, quality control)
- Primary authors/subject matter experts (SMEs)
- Student advisory committee (SAC)
- Expert (peer) content reviewers

Student advisory committee (SAC)
Another perspective & role overlap
Project timeline

Project planning
• mid 2014

Activation of review processes, committees
• late 2014

Phase I development
• early 2015 – early 2016

Phase II development
• late 2016 – early 2017

Comprehensive release
• late 2017
Development cycle & timing

- **Content Development**
  - SME
  - 16 days

- **Expert (Peer) Content Review**
  - Peer review team
  - 5 days

- **Content Revision**
  - SME
  - 5 days

- **Development & Testing**
  - Instructional designer
  - 12 days

- **End User Testing & Review**
  - SAC
  - 12 days

- **Revision & Publishing**
  - Instructional designer
  - 5 days

= approximately 55 business days per module!
Student Advisory Committee magic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 12 students</td>
<td>- 10 students*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 professions</td>
<td>- 4 professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DNP</td>
<td>- DNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MD</td>
<td>- OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PharmD</td>
<td>- PharmD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SW</td>
<td>- SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oriented to project in person</td>
<td>- Oriented to project via online presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One student participated across both phases. All other participants were unique to each phase.
Students entered the cycle...........HERE

- **Content Development**
  - SME
  - 16 days

- **Expert (Peer) Content Review**
  - Peer review team
  - 5 days

- **Content Revision**
  - SME
  - 5 days

- **Development & Testing**
  - Instructional designer
  - 12 days

- **End User Testing & Review**
  - SAC
  - 12 days

- **Revision & Publishing**
  - Instructional designer
  - 5 days
Students were asked to apply several lenses...

- Clarity, relevance of information
- Engagement, active learning
- Professional bias, stereotypes
- Technical issues, navigation (aka “beta tester”)

[Diagram showing a magnifying glass focusing on various elements related to the lenses applied by students.]
...and provided with feedback norms

**Specific**

Clearly identify and describe the item/section for which you are providing comments and recommendations. Be specific in terms of whether you are addressing a point related to instructional content or an issue with the module delivery platform (technical issues, navigation controls, visual layout, etc.).

**Constructive**

Suggest solutions for improvement; don’t simply point out problems in isolation. Provide a rationale, and connect it to the specific points of your observation.

**Balanced**

Describe strengths as well as areas for improvement. Help the development team to understand what is working well, and what still needs refinement.

(Schwegler & Altman, 2015)
Collection of student feedback online
Then this happened...
By the numbers

80% Completion Rate
By the numbers

87 Pages of comments
“Every attempt was made to ensure that the information being presented was not skewed and included highlighting the importance of other disciplines. The reference section and the ICSI video in section 2, slide 9 illustrated inclusion of evidence-based information and viewpoints from other individuals/organizations.”

“I really liked where we had to put our own definition of what interprofessional education means to us. It really prompted me to think about its importance on my own first and then learn more about it.”
# Analyzing and applying written feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Action Items</th>
<th>Content-Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items to revise, research, or archive for implementation in future modules.</td>
<td>Items to be followed up on by project team and potentially SMEs (as needed).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left Field/Unattainable Wish List</th>
<th>Affirmations/Positive Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments shared for informational purposes but that do not translate to action items.</td>
<td>Information that helps us assess what is successful and provide ideas for future development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many fixes & improvements

Numerous minor mechanical and technical errors

Suggestions for maximizing effectiveness and engagement of interactive activities

Recommendations on navigation/interface improvements (YES on sidebar!)

Early in Phase I - persistent and overwhelming agreement on desired features to support learning (YES on interactive glossary!)
Final reflections
To date

6000+

Module views
Our team takeaways (I)

SAC = Big impact for low cost, but it requires significant coordination (be prepared for project creep and respond strategically)

Putting students in the driver’s seat as “learning experts” can greatly improve the quality of the final product

The enthusiasm and commitment students bring to this work is amazing
Our team takeaways (II)

Bringing in the student voice is of additive value to both the final product and the reviewers’ learning process.

Everyone was enthusiastic and willing to participate - consider inviting contributors liberally.

Working as an interprofessional project team to create interprofessional learning materials enhances both neutrality and quality.
Reflection from student reviewer

“I think the module review process improved my understanding of interprofessionalism and helped me better understand what is needed in order to provide the best care possible for patients. I feel [I] learned a lot about different disciplines on how they view things. I especially gained this perspective when I reviewed the published finished product.”
Future forward

Ongoing evaluation processes

Plan and design complementary facilitator materials

Phase III and beyond?
All modules available at http://ipe.asu.edu

For more information about Quality Matters:

- Applying the Quality Matters Rubric (APPQMR):
  
  https://www.qualitymatters.org/professional-development/workshops/higher-ed-appqmr

- Course Design Rubric Standards:
  
  https://www.qualitymatters.org/qa-resources/rubric-standards/higher-ed-rubric
Thank you!