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To search, extract, and synthesize research completed in the last five years to report the current state of the science related to interprofessional education in nursing
- **Interprofessional Education**: “When students from two or more professions learn about, from, and with each other to enable effective collaboration and improve health outcomes” (World Health Organization, 2010, p. 7)

- **Interprofessional Collaborative Practice**: “When multiple health workers from different professional backgrounds work together with patients, families, carers, and communities to deliver the highest quality of care” (Interprofessional Education Collaborative, 2011, p. 7)

- **Interprofessional Teamwork**: “The levels of cooperation, coordination and collaboration characterizing the relationships between professions in delivering patient-centered care” (Interprofessional Education Collaborative, 2011, p. 7)
Institute of Medicine Charge

1. identification of main barriers to collaboration between nurses and other healthcare staff in range of settings

2. identification and testing of new or existing models of care teams that have the potential to add value to the healthcare system if widely implemented

3. identification and testing of education innovations that will have the potential to increase healthcare professionals’ ability to serve as productive, collaborative care team members

(IOM, 2011, p. 275)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Citation</th>
<th>IOM Rec 1: Identification of barriers to interdisciplinary teams</th>
<th>IOM Rec 2: Identification and testing of new or existing models of care teams</th>
<th>IOM Rec 3: Identification and testing of education innovations that will promote teamwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bareil et al., 2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondevik et al., 2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand et al., 2016</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czarnecki et al., 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doucet et al., 2016</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leccott, 2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ericson et al., 2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltham et al., 2016</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandes 2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzsimmons et al., 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia-Huidobro et al., 2013</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobgood et al, 2010</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koskinen &amp; Aijö, 2013</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee et al 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaw et al., 2014a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaw et al., 2014b</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machin &amp; Jones, 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald et al., 2010</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mager &amp; Lange, 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAleffrey et al 2013</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFayden et al 2010</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenna 2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missen et al., 2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohaupt et al., 2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville et al., 2013</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogino-Fan, 2013</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paige et al., 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park et al., 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitier et al., 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese et al., 2010</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riesen et al., 2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosler &amp; Kimble, 2016</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherer et al., 2013</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigalet et al., 2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scionarelli &amp; Seth, 2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spence et al., 2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart et al., 2010</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al., 2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watters et al., 2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteley et al., 2014</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams et al., 2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams et al., 2010</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson et al., 2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwarenstein et al., 2013</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods for Systematic Review

- Eligibility/Inclusion Criteria
  - Nurses
  - Original research
  - English language
  - January 2011 - August 2016

- Search
  - 7 databases
209 citations identified through database

124 records excluded
Publication abstract did not meet a priori inclusion

85 full text articles retrieved, screened, and reviewed for eligibility

33 citations excluded
- 9 articles not related to interprofessional education
- 7 articles did not include nurses or nursing students
- 7 articles only included nurses and no other health care disciplines
- 5 articles not research
- 3 articles dissertations
- 2 articles a systematic review of articles prior to 2011

52 full text articles retrieved, screened, and reviewed for eligibility

7 citations excluded
Did not address an essential area of research as indicated by the IOM

45 final citations
Methods for Systematic Review
Data Collection Process

1. Designs of Studies
2. Sample and Setting
3. Interventions
4. Measurement Instruments
5. Outcomes
6. International Presence
Results

Professions Represented in Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>N (number of studies)</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>• Doucet et al., 2016&lt;br&gt;• Kolb et al., 2016&lt;br&gt;• Hoogood et al., 2010&lt;br&gt;• Law et al., 2014&lt;br&gt;• Mager &amp; Lange, 2014&lt;br&gt;• Paige et al., 2014&lt;br&gt;• Reese et al., 2010&lt;br&gt;• Rovers &amp; Kimble, 2016&lt;br&gt;• Scherer et al., 2013&lt;br&gt;• Sinclair et al., 2012&lt;br&gt;• Solomon &amp; Sain, 2011&lt;br&gt;• Stewart et al., 2010&lt;br&gt;• Wang et al., 2015&lt;br&gt;• Watters et al., 2013&lt;br&gt;• Williams et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Group Session(s)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>• Barcel et al., 2015&lt;br&gt;• Brand et al., 2016&lt;br&gt;• Doucet et al., 2016&lt;br&gt;• Fernando et al., 2015&lt;br&gt;• Fitzsimmons et al. (2014)&lt;br&gt;• Machin &amp; Jones, 2014&lt;br&gt;• Mager &amp; Lange, 2014&lt;br&gt;• Neville et al., 2013&lt;br&gt;• Rijos et al., 2012&lt;br&gt;• Whiteley&lt;br&gt;• Wilson et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture(s)/Curriculum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>• Fernando et al., 2015&lt;br&gt;• Fitzsimmons et al. (2014)&lt;br&gt;• Hoogood et al., 2010&lt;br&gt;• Machin &amp; Jones, 2014&lt;br&gt;• McKendyn et al. 2010&lt;br&gt;• Neville et al., 2013&lt;br&gt;• Poirier et al., 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experiences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>• Brand et al., 2016&lt;br&gt;• Castelucci et al., 2014&lt;br&gt;• Doucet et al., 2016&lt;br&gt;• Koskinen &amp; Soini, 2013&lt;br&gt;• Lee et al., 2014&lt;br&gt;• Ong et al., 2013&lt;br&gt;• Ong et al., 2013&lt;br&gt;• Opitz-Tan, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Learning Experience(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>• McKenna 2015&lt;br&gt;• Rijos et al., 2012&lt;br&gt;• Smith, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

1. Barriers to Interprofessional Education Research
2. Research Designs
3. Methods of Delivery of Instruction
4. Evaluation of Effects on Patient Outcomes
5. International Perspectives
Results

Validated IPE Measurement Instruments

- Attitudes Toward Healthcare Teams Scale
- Attitudes Toward Interdisciplinary Team Scale
- Hartford Geriatric Interdisciplinary Team Training
- Interdisciplinary Education Perception Scale
- Jefferson Scale of Attitudes Toward Physician-Nurse Collaboration
- Mayo High Performance Teamwork Scale
- McMaster-Ottawa TOSCE (Team Observed Structured Clinical Encounter)
- Readiness for Interprofessional Learning Scale
- revised Readiness for Interprofessional Learning Scale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>N (number of studies)</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes/Stereotyping/Hierarchical Roles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>• Fernandes, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaw et al., 2014b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• MacDonnald et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Park et al., 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sigalet et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stewart et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing/Timetabling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Eccott, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaw et al., 2014a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wang et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Mager &amp; Lange, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stewart et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Zwarenstein et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Doucet et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Missen et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Opina-Tan, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Poirier et al., 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Gaps

- Lack of rigorous comparable research designs
- Outcomes for interprofessional interventions
- Measurement of patient outcomes r/t IPE & Team STEPPS
State of Interprofessional Education in Nursing
A Systematic Review
Tonya Rutherford-Hemming, EDD, RN, ANP-BC, CHSE • Lori Lloce, DNP, FNAPC, CHSE, FAANP

The aim of this systematic review was to synthesize research in the last 5 years to report the current state of the science related to interprofessional education (IPE) in nursing. Findings suggest that more studies with rigorous research designs are needed to compare outcomes for interprofessional interventions and to determine the effectiveness of IPE on patient outcomes.

Keywords: health professions education; interprofessional education; nursing education; systematic review; teamwork

The National Academy of Medicine’s (formerly the Institute of Medicine [IOM]) The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health called for a fundamental transformation of the nursing profession in practice, education, and leadership and the need for data on the health care workforce. Teamwork was cited as a key factor in transforming the area of practice. Interprofessional education (IPE) is a strategy to address teamwork to transform practice.1 The World Health Organization2 defines IPE as “where students from 2 or more professions learn about, from, and with each other to enable effective collaboration and improve health outcomes.” The aim of this systematic review was to search, extract, and synthesize research completed in the last 5 years to report the current state of the science related to IPE in nursing.

Methods
This review was conducted and reported in line with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses.8

Eligibility Criteria
The inclusion criteria were IPE that included nurses (students, faculty, or practicing nurses) in the sample population and original research, either national or international. The search was limited to English-language articles from January 2011 to August 2016.
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Search
A literature search was completed with assistance of a professional academic librarian in 7 databases: PubMed (MEDLINE), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature; ProQuest Health and Medicine; Evidence-Based Medicine Reviews (from Ovid); Education Resources Information Center (ERIC/EBSCOhost); Science Direct; and Scopus (a combination of medical subject headings, or MeSH terms, as well as key words to retrieve nonindexed citations). The Table, Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/NNE/A555, provides the search strategies for each database.

Study Selection
The database search strategy yielded 202 citations. These results were narrowed to 49 studies based on inclusion criteria. An illustration of study selection is presented in the Figure, Supplemental Digital Content 2, http://links.lww.com/NNE/A556. References of the final 49 articles were reviewed for additional articles. No additional articles were added. Thirty-two of the studies reviewed were conducted in countries other than the United States—predominantly Canada (n = 15) and Australia (n = 8) (see Figure, Supplemental Digital Content 3, http://links.lww.com/NNE/A557).

Data Collection Process
A data extraction form was created for the 49 identified research studies. The authors equally divided the studies and initially extracted the following data: design, purpose, sample, intervention, control, measurements, outcomes, limitations, and notes. The data were then checked by both authors, and consensus was reached. A meta-analysis could not be performed because of the lack of similarities in study characteristics. A narrative summary was conducted.

Results
The biggest gaps discovered in this review include a lack of rigorous comparable research designs, outcomes for interprofessional interventions, and patient outcomes.
Conclusion

- Research and share empirical evidence must be
- Further inquiry needed all 3 areas
- No clear methods to advance IPE in nursing
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Great vision without great people is irrelevant. ~Jim Collins
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