




Spring Conference 2023



Building the Future of the Profession Through Collaborative Clinical Education Processes


Content Leaders: Tonya Apke, PT, DPT; Jamie Bayliss, PT, MPT, DHSc;
 Cara Berg-Carramusa, PT, MSPT, EdD; Amy Both, PT, DPT, MHS; Janice Howman, PT, DPT, MED;
 Mari Kneille, PT, DPT, EdD; Alison Matson, PT, DPT; Karen McIntyre, PT, DPT;
 Trisha Renner, PT, DPT; Emily Reynolds, PTA






Course Objectives


1. Explain the design of a centralized Physical Therapist Clinical Education Placement Process (PT-CEPP).
2. Compare implementation of a centralized PT-CEPP from the lens of academic and clinical partners.
3. Evaluate preliminary results of the PT-CEPP for relevance to traditional processes.
4. Compare and contrast approaches to PT clinical education processes.







Operational Definitions and Acronyms

Operational Definitions	Acronyms
(Academic) Program	ACAPT
Capacity	CAPTE
Central Office Manager	CE
Clinical Education Site	CEE
Confirmation and	CESIG
Release	CCN
Phase	DCE
Demand	DPT
First Come, First Served	GBC
offers	NCCE
Give Back Coordinator	OKCPTP
Offer Phase	PPTF
Oversight Committee	PTCEPP
Placement Phase	SCCE
Platform	
Participant	
Partnership	








Project Purpose

To develop a collaborative, **Consortium Core Network (CCN)** through which clinical education (CE) sites and academic programs can collectively design, utilize, and assess a newly established **physical therapist clinical education placement process (PT-CEPP)** using a web-based platform accessible to all stakeholders.

Aims:


1. Create a CCN within the Ohio Kentucky Consortium of Physical Therapy Programs (OKCPTP).
2. Design and implement a centralized PT-CEPP during the 2022-23 CE placement cycle to improve efficiency and satisfaction of the placement process within the region.
3. Assess the effectiveness of the innovative CCN's PT-CEPP.

OPTA Ohio Physical Therapy Association



Background

OPTA Ohio Physical Therapy Association




Impetus for change and the CCN Project


```


graph TD
    COVID19[COVID-19] --- P1[12% cohort expansion in accredited Physical Therapist (PT) programs]
    COVID19 --- P2[Proliferation of new and developing PT programs]
    COVID19 --- P3[Duration of CEEs]
    COVID19 --- P4[Complexity in organizational structure]
    COVID19 --- P5[Increased productivity demands coupled with staffing reductions]
    COVID19 --- P6[Reductions in reimbursement rates]
    P1 --- P2
    P2 --- P3
    P3 --- P4
    P4 --- P5
    P5 --- P6
    P6 --- COVID19
  
```


OPTA Ohio Physical Therapy Association















Phase #1: Request

INNOVATION: Preparation

- Solicitation
 - Academic Programs
 - SCCEs/Clinical Partners
 - Calendar Preparation
- Education and Training
 - Webinar
 - FAQ's
 - Postings on Website
- Set up on Exxat

INNOVATION: March 1 Mailer

- Two parallel processes
 - Consortium Mailer → CCN Clinical Partners
 - Individual Program Mailers → non-CCN Clinical Partners
- CCN form is very elongated version of individual program forms
- Retained use of the March 1st date




Phase #2: Offer

Responses from Clinical Partners:

- Same deadline request for returns : April 30th
- SCCE still needs to keep record of offers made

INNOVATION: Information to Academic Programs

- Information in CCN accessed by DCEs via Exxat Platform
- DCE interface with two platforms/systems to gather offers




Phase #3: Placement

Process:

- Academic Programs use typical placement methods
- Continued soliciting for some needs outside CCN

INNOVATION: Logistics

- Timing (two rounds)
 - June/July
 - September/October
- Shift in DCE workload due to change in timing requirements to complete placements
- DCE interface with two platforms/systems
- Placements not immediately released to clinical partners




Phase #4: Reallocation

INNOVATION: Process and Logistics

- ID a 'Give Back Coordinator'
- Gather spreadsheet of data
- Establish guidelines for reallocation
- Completed in two rounds

Experience:

- Success – a start, but not fully realized benefit
- Most reallocation came within inpatient settings
- Change and trust



Phase #5: Confirmation and Release

Letters:

- Individual Academic Program uses usual process

INNOVATION: Process and Logistics

- Interface with two platforms/systems
- Completed in two rounds
- Challenge for DCEs to be comfortable to move together

Outcomes: Calendar Year 2023 for OKCPTP Region After Request Phase – Participation data

• Participating Academic Programs (14)

- Bellarmine University
- Cleveland State University
- Mount St. Joseph University
- Mount Union University
- The Ohio State University
- Ohio University
- University of Cincinnati
- University of Dayton
- The University of Findlay
- University of Kentucky
- The University of Toledo
- Walsh University
- Western Kentucky University
- Youngstown State University

• Participating CE Sites

- 364 sites invited to participate (affiliate with 2 or more OH-KY academic programs)
- 101 CE sites agreed to participate (28% participation rate)

Outcomes: Calendar Year 2023 for OKCPTP Region After Offer Phase – Supply and Demand Data

Demand = 2353 CEEs


- Average academic program demand = 168 CEEs (range = 90 – 289 CEEs)

Supply appears to exceed demand... But, does it really?!


Supply from March mailing = 4193 CEEs

- 1005 CEEs offered within the CCN (24% of total OKCPTP offers)
 - All programs received CEE offers
 - Average 71.8 CEE offers per program (range = 33-123)
- 3188 CEEs offered outside the CCN (76% of total OKCPTP offers)

Supply Consideration: First Come, First Served




Supply Consideration: Setting




*data only from w/in
CCN (N=1005)
*data includes
program-specific offers
and FCFS

Supply Consideration: Setting
*closer look at settings offered



Supply Consideration: Level of Experience




*data only from w/in
CCN (N=1005)
*data includes
program-specific offers
and FCFS

Supply Consideration: FCFS by setting and level

Setting	Total offered	# FCFS offers	% FCFS offers
I N P T IP rehab & neuro	82	18	22%
Acute care	199	5	2.5%
SNF & sub acute	11	0	0%
O U T P T OP ortho & sports	588	260	44%
OP neuro & ortho/neuro mix	71	14	20%
Specialty slots	54	11	20.4%
Level	Total offered	# FCFS offers	% FCFS offers
First	203	53	26%
Intermediate	376	101	27%
Terminal	426	122	29%

Supply Consideration: AP Follow-up Requests



Outcomes: Calendar Year 2023 for OKCTP Region Reallocation Phase Data

	Number of unused slots available for reallocation	Number of unused slots successfully reallocated
ROUND 1	92 slots (27 CE sites) ➤ Average reallocated slots/site was 3.4 (Range = 1-20)	4 programs submitted 1-2 top choices All 4 programs received #1 choice ➤ All 4 re-allocated slots were inpatient settings (3 acute care, 1 IPR)
ROUND 2	82 slots (21 CE sites) ➤ Average reallocated slots/site was 3.9 (Range = 1-12)	4 programs submitted 1-2 top choices All 4 programs received #1 choice ➤ All 4 re-allocated slots were inpatient settings (4 acute care)
TOTAL	174 slots (44 CE sites) ➤ Average reallocated slots/site was 3.95 (Range = 1-20)	6 programs submitted 1-2 top choices ➤ All 8 re-allocated slots were inpatient settings (7 acute care, 1 IPR)

Outcomes: Calendar Year 2023 for OKCPTP Region Post Confirmation & Release Survey – SCCE Feedback

Benefits	Challenges	Suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visualization of all slot requests in same document Access to consortium's annual calendar Centralized location for all placements Direct submission and ease working through Exxat Increased efficiency working on placements at one time Satisfaction w. communication prior to (93%) and throughout (83%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to access slots offered in the system after initial offers were made Determining which program used a reallocated slot offer Variability of clinic site notification for accepted or released slots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeliness from programs regarding the use of placement offers Inability to log back in to look at slots offered Improve communication/confirmation regarding placements/declined offers Determine best way for facilities with multiple locations to make offers in the system

Outcomes: Calendar Year 2023 for OKCPTP Region Post Confirmation & Release Survey – DCE Feedback

Benefits	Challenges	Suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiencies and organization – moving through a timeline Collaboration – reduced need to reach out to additional sites Use of resources (90%) Communication from CCN steering committee prior to and during process – effective and efficient (90%) Overall satisfaction with process (82%) Pulling offers from CCN Exxat into AP system New clinical affiliations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of integration between CCN Exxat and AP system Changes in original timeline Process of reporting used/unused slot offers for reallocation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce inconsistency of site naming Integration between CCN and AP Exxat systems Remove FCFS as an option in system Reallocation process More regular communications throughout the process

Small Group Facilitated Discussion



Small Group Facilitated Discussion Topics

2023 CCN PT-CEPP Participants

- What were the benefits of participation/the process?
- What were the barriers of participation/the process?

Non-participants of CCN PT-CEPP

- Is there a barrier/determent to participating?
- Do you have questions that could provide clarity and increase consideration to participate?

How can we enhance the process?

Large Group Report Out



QUESTIONS??





Thank you!


- Ohio Kentucky Consortium of Physical Therapy Programs
- clinicaleducation@okptce.com

Spring Conference

2023

Ohio Physical Therapy Association





References

- ACAPT. (2014). Summit Report and Recommendations. Retrieved September 18, 2022 from <https://acapt.org/docs/default-source/pdf/clinical-education-summit-2014-final-report-1.pdf>
- PPTF. (2020). Clinical Education Placement Process Task Force: Final Report. Retrieved September 19, 2022 from https://acapt.org/docs/default-source/consortium/docs/clinical-education-placement-process-taskforce-final-report-rev10-23.pdf?sfvrsn=448992d8_2
- Kezar, A. (2016). Higher Education Change and Social Networks: A Review of Research. *Journal of Higher Education*, 85(1), 91-125.
- Knoke, D., & Yang, S. (2008). *Social network analysis*. CA: Sage Publications.
- Mishra, S. (2020). Social networks, social capital, social support and academic success in higher education: A systematic review with a special focus on 'underrepresented students'. *Elsevier Educational Research Review*, 29, 1-24.
- Moreno, J.L. (1941). Foundations of Sociometry: An Introduction. *JSTOR*, 4(1), 15-31.
- Liu, W., Sidhu, A., Beacom, A. M., Valente, T. W. (2017). *The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects*. Fowler, P. (Editor-in-Chief) & Heather, C. A., van Zoonen, L. (Associate Editors). *Social Network Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. DOI: 10.1002/978118783764
- Isba, R., Woolf, K., Hanneman, R. (2017). Social network analysis in medical education. *Medical Education*, 51, 81-88.

