OHSU Multiprofessional Education Task Force
Faculty Survey Results

April 2013

For questions about this summary please contact:

- *Drs. Beth Habecker or Kirsten Lampi, Co-chairs of OHSU Interprofessional Initiative's Multiprofessional Education Task Force, or*
- *Dr. Tanya Ostrogorsky, Assistant Vice Provost for Assessment and Evaluation*

PURPOSE OF SURVEY:

The purpose of this survey was to make an initial determination of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the OHSU faculty in the area teaching basic sciences, teaching methodologies, and interest in engaging in multiprofessional education (MPE) teaching team.

Survey respondents were recruited from the official OHSU faculty roster (*n* = 2503) provided by the OHSU Office of Academic Affairs. Of the 2503 faculty invited to participate, 1351 (54%) opened the e-mail invitation that explained the purpose of the survey and provided the survey link. The survey was open from March 13th to April 7th and several follow-up reminders were sent to encourage participation. Additionally, task force members encouraged faculty participation through personal connections within their respective units. Of those faculty members that opened the survey, 701 completed portions of the survey and 632 faculty members completed all survey items.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS:

When asked to indicate highest *earned* degree, 85% percent (*n* = 582) of respondents have a doctorate, 18% have a masters, and 3% have a bachelors. Degrees in progress were excluded and reports of multiple degrees at the same level were considered a single response (e.g., Master of Public Health and Master of Science were coded as Masters Degree).

Seventy-eight percent (*n* = 497) of respondents have primary faculty appointments in the School of Medicine, 15% (*n* = 92) from School of Nursing, 7% (*n* = 42) from School of Dentistry, and 2% (*n* = 10) from College of Pharmacy. In addition to the above categories, 56 respondents indicated primary affiliations in areas such as clinical operations, Oregon National Primate Research Center, or OHSU central offices/units such as Student Health, Teaching & Learning Center, Library, or Provost's Office. This response pattern follows the respective size of each of the four schools/colleges at OHSU and the task force was satisfied with the numbers of responses per school/unit. Of these respondents, 42% have served as a course coordinator of course director in the past.

Thirty-eight percent (*n* = 245) of respondents hold the rank of Assistant Professor, 24% (*n* = 156) Associate Professor, 22% (*n* = 139) Professor, and 16% (*n* = 100) Instructor. Fifty-eight respondents identified themselves as other ranks including scientist, veterinarian, were unranked, or held emeritus status. Although the intention was that respondents would respond based on rank, not series some indicated their rank to include the series (e.g., Clinical Associate Professor). In the future we will be mindful to make that more clear to ensure more accurate data collection.

SCIENCE TOPICS:

Fifty-six percent of respondents (*n* =393) answered the question regarding science topic teaching. Table 1 provides a summary of respondents that answered this question and include the science topics currently taught, *in any setting*, as well as topics the respondents indicated s/he could teach.

As the summary indicates, many respondents teach or could teach anatomy, epidemiology/population health, cardiovascular physiology or pathophysiology, neuroscience, and other physiology or pathophysiology topics indicting a strong capacity to address OHSU learning needs, potentially in MPE teams.

The next set of science topics are rated as OHSU having moderate capacity to teach in MPE teams and includes topics such as cell biology, genetics, and nutrition. The final set of science topics needs further exploration to determine the ability to teach these topics with MPE teams and include topics such as biochemistry, endocrinology, informatics, statistics, and pharmaceutics. However, the topics in which there are fewer faculty prepared to teach in these areas may be an important point to explore to ensure that the teaching expertise in these areas are being used effectively across OHSU. Another 202 responses were collected in the "other science topic" field. Those responses have not fully analyzed at this time but will be addressed upon further review and use of these survey results.

Table 1. OHSU Faculty Science Topics – Teaching (*n* = 393)

Science Topics Area	Do You Currently Teach	Could You Teach	Response Count	Response Percentage	Capacity to Address OHSU Learning Needs
Anatomy	43	64	**107**	27%	**Strong**
Epidemiology/Population Health	36	43	**79**	20%	**Strong**
Cardiovascular physiology or pathophysiology	46	26	**72**	18%	**Strong**
Neuroscience	30	40	**70**	18%	**Strong**
Other physiology or pathophysiology	30	30	**60**	15%	**Strong**
Cell Biology	19	37	**56**	14%	**Moderate**
Immunology/auto-immune/infectious disease	23	31	**54**	14%	**Moderate**
Development/embryology/reproduction	27	25	**52**	13%	**Moderate**
Pulmonary physiology or pathophysiology	30	20	**50**	13%	**Moderate**
GI physiology or pathophysiology	25	22	**47**	12%	**Moderate**
Genetics/Gene Regulation	25	21	**46**	12%	**Moderate**
Musculo-skeletal/Skin	24	20	**44**	11%	**Moderate**
Nutrition	21	22	**43**	11%	**Moderate**
Biochemistry	21	17	**38**	10%	**Needs Exploration**
Renal physiology or pathophysiology	20	15	**35**	9%	**Needs Exploration**
Endocrinology	21	13	**34**	9%	**Needs Exploration**
Informatics	14	20	**34**	9%	**Needs Exploration**
Pharmacodynamics	18	16	**34**	9%	**Needs Exploration**
Receptors/Signal transduction	11	22	**33**	8%	**Needs Exploration**
Metabolism and weight regulation	19	13	**32**	8%	**Needs Exploration**
Pharmacokinetics	15	17	**32**	8%	**Needs Exploration**
Statistics/Bio-statistics	11	20	**31**	8%	**Needs Exploration**
Microbiology	12	16	**28**	7%	**Needs Exploration**
Pharmaceutics	16	10	**26**	7%	**Needs Exploration**

TEACHING AND LEARNING:

In addition to the respondent demographics and science topic teaching status, it was critical that the MPE Task Force determine the level of faculty interest in being part of a MPE teaching team (defined as a team of faculty from different schools/professions). Seventy percent (*n* = 438) responded *Yes* with an additional 25% (*n* = 158) responding *Not Sure*. These results indicate significant level of faculty interest in being part of these initiatives and activities. Given the results from the survey item regarding interested in teaching in MPE teams, it was not surprising that respondents indicated willingness to teach a range of students from across the academic programs and levels (i.e., undergraduate, master, doctorate, post-doc). There was no level or type of student in which respondents indicated a strong preference to remain or refrain from teaching.

When asked about the types of teaching methods used, there were a broad range of responses and a substantial number of comments regarding the response options and interpretation of teaching methods. Those open-ended responses and underlying teaching philosophies will be reviewed in more detail as future analysis informs professional development programs and the structure of MPE teaching opportunities. Nearly all (92%) respondents (*n* = 621) have used lectures as a teaching method. Eighty percent used small group discussion and 73% used active learning strategies. Large numbers of faculty also reporting teaching in clinical settings (63%) or used large group discussions (55%). Fewer faculty respondents have experience with team teaching (38%), simulation (24%), or online courses/activities (24%). Many faculty members provided specific examples of teaching strategies used in their classroom in the 'other' response option. In general those could be categorized as types of active learning strategies or an area that was not originally listed, one-on-one mentoring. Table 2 summarizes the responses.

Table 2. Teaching Methods

	Response Percent	Response Count
Lecture	91.9%	571
Small group discussion	79.4%	493
Active learning strategies (e.g., case studies, team based learning)	73.1%	454
Clinical oversight or supervision	63.3%	393
Large group discussion	54.6%	339
Team teaching	**38.0%**	236
Simulation	**24.2%**	150
Online courses or learning activities	**22.9%**	142
Other (please specify)		35

SUMMARY:

OHSU faculty members are overwhelmingly willing to teach students from different academic degree programs than their 'home' school/department and there were quite a few positive comments from faculty about interprofessional education, and the importance of collaborative practice.

In order to achieve the vision of MPE teaching teams, the MPE Task Force recommends a faculty development program to be developed that develops knowledge and fosters appropriate use of the team teaching, simulation, and online education as those were reportedly used the least by the

faculty respondents and likely methods that will be relied on as we move towards MPE teaching teams.

Additionally, an in-depth analysis of the goals and opportunities of MPE from the business planning perspective needs to be conducted. Linked with this analysis, the MPE Task Force recommends that a transparent funding flow be developed for the teaching mission – particularly as it relates to faculty teaching students from multiple professions and schools. This should include realistic assessments of time needed for faculty development and learning new teaching methods.

MEMBERS OF THE IPI-MULTIPROFESSIONAL EDUCATION (MPE) TASK FORCE INCLUDE:

JJ Furuno, PhD (COP)
Jeff Gold, MD (SOM)
Beth Habecker, PhD (SOM)
Kirsten Lampi, PhD (SOD)
Kathie Lasater, EdD, RN, ANEF (SON)
Vishnu Mohan, MD, MBI (DMICE, SOM)
Antoinette Polito, MHS, PA-C (PA, SOM)
Amy Ross, PhD, RN, CNS (SON)
Diane Stadler, PhD, RD (SOM)
Laura Zeigen, MA, MLIS, AHIP (Library)