

Background

- The Stony Brook Medicine Healthy Libraries Program (HeLP) is an innovative interprofessional education (IPE)¹ program for health professional students in public libraries in Suffolk County, NY
- Students develop IPE and collaborative practice competencies.
- Library patrons are provided increased access to health education, health screenings, and care services.
- IPE initiatives are not often rigorously evaluated for both learning outcomes and community impact.

This poster presents the mixed-methods evaluation of HeLP for both student IPE outcomes and community impact.



For more info about our IPE model:

Implementation and Evaluation Methods*

- **Implementation:** Following training on IPEC core competencies² students (n=103) participated on in 13 public libraries in '22-'23 which met course requirements...
 - Population Health Clinical (BS in Nursing) (n=64)
 - Community health for Physician Assistant (PA) (n=24)
 - Practicum/internship for Public Health (MPH) (n=5)
 - Field education for Social Welfare (BSW/MSW) (n=9)
- **Evaluation:** Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to evaluate student learning and community impact.
 - Student learning measures:
 - IPEC Competency Self-Assessment³ (pre vs. post)
 - SPICE-R2⁴ tools (pre vs. post)
 - short-answer reflection questions (post only)
 - semi-structured interviews (post only, n=12)
 - Community impact:
 - Records of team/patron encounters (n=799 encounters)
 - Recorded semi-structured interviews with library patrons (n=8).
- **Analysis methods:**
 - Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to summarize aspects of patron/team encounters in SAS (v.9.4).
 - Interviews were audio-recorded (lasted ~ 20-60 minutes) and transcribed.
 - Qualitative data will be analyzed using inductive thematic analysis.

* Approved by the IRB at Stony Brook University.

Results




Figure 1. Paired t-tests compared pre- versus post- mean IPE domain scores from the IPEC Competency Self-assessment Tool; where 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree. The blue boxes represent the IP interaction domain while the red boxes represent the IP values domain.
* Responses showed significant improvement in the IP Interaction domain ($p < 0.05$).

Library Staffs' Perceptions of the HeLP team

Preliminary impressions from qualitative interviews indicates that:

- Library staff have a positive opinion of the HeLP team.
 - HeLP is friendly, professional, collaborative and knowledgeable.
 - HeLP is important to support library patrons.
 - Some library staff do not fully understand the role of each profession on the team.
 - Some library staff feel relieved having HeLP to address patron's needs.
 - Some library staff use HeLP services themselves.

"I, uh, jokingly, uh, on a stressful day had them take our blood pressure. Uh, and then it was little bit less funny once we realized how high it was (laughs). Um, and other staff members have had their blood pressure taken by, uh, by the team and, um, it's made us have conversations sort of about like, not only our personal health but like, stress and managing stress and managing workload and the appropriate way to manage workload and stress. And, um, I mean also I, you know, went to my doctor and I was like, "My blood pressure's high at work sometimes." And we had a conversation and now on a statin for my health and protection. So, uh, there is that aspect of it, uh, where you know, because it's there and the staff sees it, they're a little bit more likely to go and get checked out and then we find out, oh hey, maybe I need to take a little bit better care of what I'm eating or what I'm doing."

- Librarian

Pictures of the HeLP Team at Public Libraries



Discussion

This poster outlines a mixed-methods approach for evaluating IPE for both student learning outcomes and community impact.

Strengths:

- Mixed-methods
- Interviews with multiple stakeholders

Limitations:

- Community impact is limited by a lack of data for follow-up.
- The number of patron encounters may be underestimated as some were not documented.
- Selection bias in patrons who volunteered for an interview compared to those who did not.
- Though not the focus of this presentation, IPE initiatives should include a process evaluation to confirm the program was implemented as intended.

This innovative IPE model has an evaluation strategy that can be adapted to provide evidence-based data for other IPE initiatives and adds to IPE outcome literature by including community impact data.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank:

- The Suffolk Cooperative Library System
- Public Library Directors and staff members
- Public library patrons
- HeLP students
- Collaborating faculty and staff from Stony Brook University.

This project is funded in part by a grant from the Association of Schools Advancing Health Professionals.

References

1. Pandolfelli G, Hammock A, Topek-Walker L, et al. An Interprofessional Team-Based Experiential Learning Experience in Public Libraries. *Pedagogy in Health Promotion*. 2021;0(0). doi:10.1177/23733799211048517
2. Interprofessional Education Collaborative. (2016). *Core competencies for interprofessional collaborative practice: 2016 update*. Interprofessional Education Collaborative. <https://ipec.memberclicks.net/assets/2016-Update.pdf>
3. Lockeman, K., Dow, A. W., DiazGranados, D., McNeilly, D. P., Nickol, D., Koehn, M. L., & Knab, M. S. (2016). Refinement of the IPEC Competency Self-Assessment survey: Results from a multi-institutional study. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 30(6), 726–731. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820>.
4. Domínguez, D.G., Fike, D.S., MacLaughlin, E.J., & Zorek, J.A. (2015). A comparison of the validity of two instruments assessing health professional student perceptions of interprofessional education and practice. *J Interprof Care*, 29(2): 144-149.

Find us here:

