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Background of the Project

Background: The IPE movement focuses on medical doctors and allied health professions associated with conventional academic health centers. Little exploration has been engaged in the perspectives and practices relative to IPE in CAM programs and institutions associated with the five complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) fields with a U.S. department of education recognized accredituty agency. These five are acupuncture (DC), chiropractic and Oriental medicine (ACOM), massage therapy (MT), naturopathic medicine (ND) and direct-entry (humbly) midwifery (DEM). While lumped as "CAM," they are known to fight over scope issues in state legislatures. What are the IPE practices in these fields, relative to each other and conventional disciplines?

About ACCAHC and the CEDR: The Academic Consortium for Complementary and Alternative Healthcare (ACCAHC) is a not-for-profit 501(c)3 organization; the core membership of which is academic organizations from these five disciplines; ACCAHC views IPE as a key requirement for bettering human health. In 2006, ACCAHC published the Clinicians’ and Educators’ Desk Reference on the Licensed Complementary and Alternative Healthcare Providers (CEDR) in collaboration with the councils of colleges for the five licensed CAM disciplines. As a tool for moving the integration dialogue from integrating "therapies" to the IPE practice of integrating professionals from distinct disciplines.

Purpose: Introduce CAM schools to IPE, to the CEDR, and to each adoption of the CEDR, ideally as a required text.

Description: In March 2010, complimentary copies of the CEDR were sent to presidents, deans, faculty and/or other appropriate contacts in CAM schools/programs. The lists were provided by ACCAHC member councils of colleges (ACOM, DC) or academic agencies (DEM, MT, ND). From October 2010 to November 2010, each of the schools/programs were contacted by phone and email to confirm the CEDR had been received, the explore the courses in which it might be a good fit, whether any material was covered, and who teaches those courses. In many cases multiple people in each institution were contacted.

Categories of Response: Respondents were placed in one of these three categories: 1) ADOPTED the CEDR (purchased multiple copies, for use with a specific student population); 2) CONVERSATION ENGAGED - did not adopt but ACCAHC staff found interest in IPE and engaged dialogue; or 3) NO CONVERSATION ENGAGED - no or minimal responses despite an average 7 contacts via email and phone. Typically 2 or 3 different individuals per institution were contacted.

CEDR Marketing Campaign

Survey Results & Conclusions

Respondents and Response Rate: Table #2 shows the total number of programs/schools/institutions involved (more than one individual from some schools were on the list), and the number and percent of respondents for each group. With the exception of the ND group in which 58% (83) indicated they were institutions with at least two programs of the ACOM/ND/DC; the other four non-CEDR purchasing groups were overwhelmingly single discipline (69% -AOM, 83% -DC, 79% -MT, 100% -DEM). Roughly 50% of personnel responding in DC/MT/DEM were administrators; just 19% of AOM. Those indicating they were officers/dean/presidents-owner were 63%-AOM, 50%-DC, 31%-MT, 17%-ND, 26%-24%-MT, and 17%-59%-DEM. The CEDR purchasing groups were overwhelmingly single discipline (69%-AOM, 83%-DC, 79%-MT, 100%-DEM). Those indicating they have classroom programs (58%) in which students learn "with, from and about" each other; just under half (49%) state that they offer clinical instruction that meets this IPE definition. As an average response per discipline, IPE is deemed marginally more important in the classroom on the 1-6 scale (4.34) than in the clinical environment (3.58). Virtually no difference was found in perceptions of how well other CAM professions were educated about the CAM disciplines in the surveyed institutions (41% vs 43%). Both categories of responses had mixed perspectives on the importance of IPE with conventional medical and allied health disciplines ranked marginally higher than that regarding CAM disciplines as an average across the five disciplines (4.58). A question on the type of information that is typically included in content ABOUT other disciplines ranked highest in perceived importance of the surveys institution; see Table 2 for a tabulation of the survey responses. The bars reveal the extent to which your institution operates on the belief that other CAM health care professions are adequately educated about the value of CAM disciplines in your institution. The extent to which your institution operates on the belief that CAM educators have a research-based knowledge in health care profession. The results are overwhelmingly positive for those who report having IPE programs or curricula. The results for those who are not engaged in IPE are not as positive, with some notable exceptions. The CEDR marketing campaign had a significant impact on the adoption of IPE in CAM education.

Survey Purposes & Methods

Purpose: Both the CEDR marketing campaign (2010-see box below left) and the surveys (2012) support ACCAHC’s mission to foster better healthcare through enhancing mutual understanding and respect among the disciplines. Specifically: 1) gain understanding of perceptions and practices of CAM educational institutions/programs relative to IPE and other CAM fields; 2) discover IPE-related perceptions and practices toward conventional disciplines; 3) provide baseline information on readiness for both IPE and learn care; 4) understand the experience with the CEDR and other IPE products; and 5) begin to frame strategies to help move these fields toward better integration via IPE.

Methods: The survey instrument was developed by a multidisciplinary team. A link was sent via email to contacts of individuals at accredited U.S. programs. The lists obtained from ACCAHC partner organizations. (See Table #1) Two reminders were sent. Individuals were called when phone numbers were available. Survey Monkey was utilized. Two similar versions of the survey were sent to institutions from the five disciplines: one to 24 individuals in 16 Institutional Purchasing (IP) institutions (institutions that had purchased the CEDR); a second to 170 individuals in 120 (non-CEDR purchasing) institutions. Both surveys asked the same IPE questions; the IP survey asked more detailed questions about usage of the CAM disciplines. Questions used the "with, from and about" language of the definition of IPE. Others specifically asked about "with" questions. Individuals were asked to respond on behalf of their institutions.

Table 2: Responses to the Survey by Group

| Group | # Participants | % Academic Institutions | % Program/Institution | % Respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OMM</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of respondents that agreed or strongly agreed with statements:

1. How important to have IPE programs and curricula in their institution? From 2012:
- Yes: 60% (OMM), 50% (DC), 50% (MT), 60% (ND), 70% (DEM)
- No: 30% (OMM), 40% (DC), 40% (MT), 40% (ND), 40% (DEM)

2. How important to have IPE programs and curricula in their institution?
- Yes: 60% (OMM), 50% (DC), 50% (MT), 60% (ND), 70% (DEM)
- No: 30% (OMM), 40% (DC), 40% (MT), 40% (ND), 40% (DEM)

3. How important to have IPE programs and curricula in their institution?
- Yes: 60% (OMM), 50% (DC), 50% (MT), 60% (ND), 70% (DEM)
- No: 30% (OMM), 40% (DC), 40% (MT), 40% (ND), 40% (DEM)

4. How important to have IPE programs and curricula in their institution?
- Yes: 60% (OMM), 50% (DC), 50% (MT), 60% (ND), 70% (DEM)
- No: 30% (OMM), 40% (DC), 40% (MT), 40% (ND), 40% (DEM)

5. How important to have IPE programs and curricula in their institution?
- Yes: 60% (OMM), 50% (DC), 50% (MT), 60% (ND), 70% (DEM)
- No: 30% (OMM), 40% (DC), 40% (MT), 40% (ND), 40% (DEM)

Overall, the survey results indicate a strong interest in IPE among CAM professionals. The majority of respondents indicated that they offer clinical instruction that meets this IPE definition. As an average response per discipline, IPE is deemed marginally more important in the classroom (4.34) than in the clinical environment (3.58). Virtually no difference was found in perceptions of how well other CAM professions were educated about the CAM disciplines. The results for those who report having IPE programs or curricula are overwhelmingly positive. The results for those who are not engaged in IPE are not as positive, with some notable exceptions. The CEDR marketing campaign had a significant impact on the adoption of IPE in CAM education.

Table #3: Sample Results by Disciplines/Group on Perceptions and Practices on IPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Academic Institutions</th>
<th>Program/Institution</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOM</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

The CEDR marketing campaign and survey were each engaged, principally, to assist ACCAHC in clarifying its next steps relative to IPE. These findings call for focused reflection, and potentially educational practice changes, for some of these CAM fields if perceived importance of IPE is to be aligned with current offerings. The gaps between perception and practice, including the use of the highly-regarded but poorly-utilized CEDR, suggest that ACCAHC, and other organizations or institutions interested in providing resources or programs for engaging the CAM fields in IPE, will find opportunities as well as challenges in this endeavor.