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### The Problem

- Educators need to assess how IPE influences collaboration among pre-clinical students.
- Instruments are scarce and lack the theoretical foundation and utility for use in IPE settings.

### Can a clinical tool serve as an effective IPE measure?

**The Team Development Measure (TDM):**

- A 31-item performance measure to promote quality improvement
- Developed by Peace Health, grounded in teamwork literature, tested extensively in clinical workplace settings:
  - Used with > 150 teams and > 1000 team members
  - Executive teams, outpatient clinics, inpatient hospital care units
  - Teams as small as 3-4 people and as large as 43 people
- Measures the degree to which a team has and uses **four components of effective teamwork:**
  - Cohesiveness
  - Communication
  - Roles Clarity
  - Goals and Means Clarity
- Describes stages based on the level at which each component has been achieved

### Background

- In 2015-16, VCU and CU independently began using the TDM to assess teams of learners in classroom-based IPE.
- CU found evidence that the TDM is valid and helpful for assessing student teams and evaluating IPE experiences, but further testing is needed.

### TDM Refinement Project Overview

**Phase 1**
- Exploratory factor analysis and internal consistency reliability
- 3 samples from CU and 1 sample from VCU

**Phase 2**
- Cognitive interviewing at CU
- Item applicability survey at VCU
- Item revisions

**Phase 3**
- Test using repeated measures design at VCU
- Confirmatory factor analysis
- Publish to National Center for IPE Measurement Instrument Collection

### Phase 1-3 Results

**Phase 1**
- 3-factor solution using 22 of 31 items
- Solution explains 67% of the variance: Factor 1 (61%), Factor 2 (4%), Factor 3 (+ < 2%)
- High scale reliability for each factor
- Factors highly correlated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Between Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2**
- 1 item dropped, 6 items revised
- Items grouped by original domains to improve flow and ordered by difficulty
- Added response option of 0 (N/A or No Opportunity) for when item development was not available

**Phase 3**
- Normed Chi-square values for the CFA at each time point (3.50, 4.07, 4.42) were acceptable
- SRMR values (0.05, 0.04, 0.03) indicated good fit for the original four-factor model
- Scale reliability was high for all four factors at time points 1 and 2 (Cronbach’s alpha values > 0.91 for each domain).
- Other fit indices were poor, and scale reliability was lower for responses during time point 3 (Cronbach’s alpha ranging from 0.72 to 0.84).

### Discussion & Next Steps

- Many team development concepts from the clinical workplace are similar in pre-clinical IPE
- Some team development concepts do not translate seamlessly from clinical to pre-clinical IPE
- Rasch modeling to analyze Phase 3 data to see if item difficulty scores are consistent with prior research on original TDM
- Testing of revised tool with longitudinal IPE teams
- Determine whether further revisions are needed to improve the utility of the TDM for IPE