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Headline conclusions
This review found that key education issues related to organisational context, participant characteristics, and teaching and learning processes identified in the previous review were further supported in the update. The growing interprofessional education (IPE) evidence base suggests that learners react positively to IPE, reporting improvements in attitudes/perceptions as well as collaborative knowledge/skills. However, there is still less evidence about the effects of IPE on changes in behaviour, organisational practice and benefits to patients/clients.

Background and context
IPE aims to bring together different professionals to learn with, from and about one another in order to collaborate more effectively in the delivery of safe, high quality care for patients/clients. Given its potential for improving collaboration and care delivery, there have been repeated calls for the wider scale implementation of IPE across education and clinical settings. Increasingly, a range of IPE initiatives are being implemented and evaluated which are adding to the growth of evidence for this form of education.

Review objective
To update a previous BEME systematic review (Hammick et al., 2007) to consider the effects of IPE on a range of outcomes, including changes to collaborative learner attitudes, knowledge and skills as well as changes in organisational practice and/or benefits to patients/clients.
Review methodology

Search Strategy: Medline, CINAHL, BEI and ASSIA were searched from May 2005 to June 2014. Hand searches of three interprofessional journals were also undertaken covering this period.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: All abstracts generated from the searches (n=3,387) were reviewed independently by two reviewers to determine if they met the inclusion criteria (for further information see: Reeves et al., 2014). Full articles were obtained (n=392) if the abstract met these criteria. These articles were similarly screened which resulted in 258 papers that underwent a quality assessment. Papers which were deemed ‘low quality’ were excluded, resulting in the inclusion of a final set of 25 ‘high quality’ IPE studies.

Data Extraction: This process consisted of extracting descriptive information from each included paper covering: the nature of the IPE initiative; the methods of evaluation and all reported outcomes.

Data Synthesis: The 25 studies identified from the updated search were added to the 21 studies from the previous review. These papers were synthesised by use of Biggs’ (1993) presage-process-product model of learning and teaching to understand the nature of the IPE studies in relation to contextual factors, educational processes and associated outcomes.

Implications for practice

Faculty development is critical to prepare and support IPE facilitators in order to deliver effective IPE; IPE developers and facilitators should be aware that the learners’ view of IPE is related to multiple factors which can affect their engagement in this type of education; Learning about being interprofessional in a context that reflects the students’ current or future practice is important for effective learning; In order to enhance learning experiences for students, educators should consider underpinning their IPE courses and programmes with the explicit use of educational theory.
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