



Welcome

General Meeting

Canadian Interprofessional Health Collaborative
Collaborating Across Borders VI Conference

October, 2017.



Agenda

Introductions

Introductory remarks

Overview of CIHC Membership Survey

Member's comments and questions about results

Other business



Board of Directors

Will Webster (Chair)

Ivy Bourgeault

Maria Tassone

John Gilbert

Ivy Oandasan

Kathleen Klassen*

Leslie Bainbridge*

Joshua Tepper*

Sharla King

Shelley Doucet

Ruby Grymonpre



2017 CIHC Member Survey

Prepared for the CIHC Board of Directors

by

**Mariam Stitou, Chantal Demers & Ivy Bourgeault
University of Ottawa, Canada**



Objectives of the Survey

To survey CIHC members with respect to their demographics, perceptions of the organization and its services/resources, and hopes/wishes of the membership for future directions and priorities of the organization.



Methodology

❖ What ?

- Online survey

❖ When ?

- May, 10th to June, 16th, 2017

❖ Who ?

- Target population : 3054 CIHC members
(Members are those who have registered on-line in order to use the website resources—current membership is about 3700))
- Response rate : 13.22% (n=404 surveys completed)



Demographics

❖ Among the survey respondents:

- Female (80%)
- Canadian (51%)
- Aged of 31-50 (47%)

❖ Primary workplace of respondents:

- Academic setting (60%)
 - University Faculty/Staff (44%)
 - College/Staff (12%)
 - Students (4%)
- Frontline Healthcare delivery (17%)

❖ Is there a Central IPC Office at the respondents' workplaces:

- Among the University/College respondents, the percentage of those that have indicated that they do not have a central IPC Office was almost equal to those that do (37% vs. 33%).



Key Take-Home Messages

❖ Knowledge of CIHC

- 80% of respondents reported having knowledge of the CIHC
 - 57% indicated having some knowledge of the CIHC
 - 20% reported good knowledge of the CIHC.
- 22% reported little or no knowledge of CIHC

❖ Membership

- 83% of respondents have indicated that they have been a member of the CIHC for less than 10 years
 - 35% indicated having been a member for less than 2 years.
 - 27% indicated having been a member for 2 to 5 years
 - 21% indicated having been a member for 5 to 10 years

❖ Membership Fee

- 71% of respondents indicated that they would be willing to pay annual membership fee.
- Less than \$50 (73% of respondents)



Key Take-Home Messages

❖ **Organizational Salience with IPE/IPC:**

- Respondents indicated that in comparison to 5 years ago, there has been a significant shift in the characterization of members' organizations with respect to the salience of IPE/IPC. On 7 point scale):
- 1 (“None”), 2, and 3: 26.5% vs. 10.6% today
- 4 (“Pockets of Development and Implementation”: 42.6% vs.. 31.9% today
- 5, 6 and 7 (“Comprehensive or strategic development”: 23.8% vs. 48.5% today

❖ **Committee participation**

- 49% of respondents have indicated that they would be willing to consider serving on a CIHC committee.

❖ **Knowledge Mobilization**

- 81% of respondents do not follow CIHC on Facebook nor Twitter.



Benefits of CIHC

Benefits:

- 56.8% identified the online IPE/IPC resources as being of particular benefit
- 37.7% identified the CAB conferences as being of particular benefit
- Almost half of respondents identified their participation in study groups (46%) and support for research grant applications (44%) as having **no real benefit**.



Future Developments

❖ Potential Roles for the CIHC Over Next Five Years:

- Central platform for resources/toolkits (54%),
- Role of the CIHC in supporting IPE/IPC accreditation (28%),
- Knowledge collection/dissemination (25%),
- Advocating funding for IPE/IPC research (24%).

❖ Additional Potential Roles:

- Communication: Newsletters, website updates, webinars, etc.
- National IPE Standards: including accrediting and licensing bodies
- Academic Institution Support: promotion and implementation of IPE



Thank you for your attention



T
h
a
n

Our thanks to CHHRN