

---

## EDITORIAL

---

### Interprofessional collaboration in research, education, and clinical practice: *working together for a better future*

Bart N. Green, DC, MEd and Claire D. Johnson, DC, MEd

---

Interprofessional collaboration occurs when 2 or more professions work together to achieve common goals and is often used as a means for solving a variety of problems and complex issues. The benefits of collaboration allow participants to achieve together more than they can individually, serve larger groups of people, and grow on individual and organizational levels. This editorial provides an overview of interprofessional collaboration in the areas of clinical practice, education, and research; discusses barriers to collaboration; and suggests potential means to overcome them.

**Key Indexing Terms:** Collaboration; Relations, Interprofessional; Role, Professional; Trust

---

#### INTRODUCTION

*Individual commitment to a group effort—that is what makes a team work, a company work, a society work, a civilization work.*

—Vince Lombardi

Collaboration is a term commonly used in research, clinical practice, and health professions education. There are collaborations in almost every aspect of health, such as patient advocacy and health care collaboratives, collaborative learning, interprofessional collaboration in practice and in education, health care value collaborations, business collaborations, collaborative efforts in research and funding. With the increasing use of computers, mobile devices, and social media, collaboration seems to be present more than ever before. At its core, collaboration occurs when 2 or more entities work together to produce a desired and shared outcome. The fields of research, education, and clinical practice are interrelated; research informs education, which in turn influences clinical practice and patient care. In a complementary manner, the needs of practitioners, patients, and educational systems should inform what research may be needed. If we wish to succeed in improving outcomes for students, practitioners, patients, and populations, then we need to consider working together in these environments through collaborations. Therefore, the purpose of this editorial is to discuss interprofessional collaboration in research, educa-

tion, and practice, particularly with regard to problems to avoid and practices that help to achieve collaboration.

#### **What Is Collaboration?**

Collaboration may occur at virtually any level of an organizational structure. People can collaborate within an organization, between organizations, between one another, between countries, and between professions.<sup>1,2</sup> More commonly referred to as interorganizational collaboration in the business domain,<sup>2,3</sup> the principles are similar in the health professions and are often referred to as interprofessional collaboration (IPC). There are several key concepts relevant to collaboration, including sharing, partnership, interdependency, and power.<sup>4</sup> Mattesich and Monsey<sup>5(p7)</sup> nicely summarize the essence of collaboration:

- Collaboration is a mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship entered into by 2 or more organizations to achieve common goals.
- The relationship includes a commitment to a definition of mutual relationships and goals, a jointly developed structure and shared responsibility, mutual authority and accountability for success, and sharing of resources and rewards.

Creating successful collaborations is no mean task, and naysayers may scoff at the idea. However, there are several exemplars of successful large and international collaborations in research, education, and practice to show that it can be done. A sampling is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1 - Exemplars of Interprofessional Collaboration**

Name	Purpose	Topic	URL
The Cochrane Collaboration	“Cochrane is a global independent network of health practitioners, researchers, patient advocates and others, responding to the challenge of making the vast amounts of evidence generated through research useful for informing decisions about health.”	Evidence	www.cochrane.org
U.S. Preventive Services Task Force	“. . . the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force is an independent, volunteer panel of national experts in prevention and evidence-based medicine. The Task Force works to improve the health of all Americans by making evidence-based recommendations about clinical preventive services such as screenings, counseling services, and preventive medications.”	Public Health	www.uspreventive servicestask force.org
The Bone and Joint Decade	“The Bone and Joint Decade is a network of more than a thousand national and international patient, professional, scientific organisations with National Action Networks in over 60 countries. Together this network is driving the agenda of the Bone and Joint Decade to position musculoskeletal conditions as a public health issue.”	Clinical Practice	www.boneandjoint burden.org
National Clinical Guideline Centre	“The National Clinical Guideline Centre (NCGC) is a multidisciplinary health services research team funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). We produce evidence based clinical practice guidelines on behalf of NICE.”	Guidelines	www.ncgc.ac.uk
Canadian Interprofessional Health Collaborative (CIHC)	“To foster better patient care, CIHC members across Canada are working together to strengthen the interprofessional education for collaborative, patient-centred practice (IEPCP) knowledge base. Our goal is to share this knowledge with those who make policy, planners in the health and education systems, health professionals and educators to ensure all Canadians benefit.”	Education	www.cihc.ca
Best Evidence Medical Education Collaboration	“. . . an international group of individuals, universities and professional organisations committed to the development of evidence informed education in the medical and health professions . . .”	Education	www. bemecollaboration. org

**Benefits of Collaboration**

Collaborating usually provides a means for organizations, institutions, or professions to achieve more than they can on their own. Business has used collaboration for many years to share costs, spread risk, and reduce supply chain uncertainty while forming strategic economic alliances that also serve as fertile grounds for innovation and learning.<sup>2,6</sup> Collaboration potentially reduces self-sufficiency in environments demanding great flexibility and innovation.<sup>7</sup> Several benefits of collaboration are listed in Figure 1.

In health care it is generally believed that collaborative efforts yield better health services and outcomes for the populations that are served.<sup>4</sup> Littlechild and Smith<sup>9</sup> state that collaboration leads to improved efficiency, improved skills mix, greater levels of responsiveness, more holistic services, innovation and creativity, and a more user-centered practice. The World Health Organization (WHO) has linked IPC with better outcomes in family health, infectious disease, humanitarian efforts, responses to epidemics, and noncommunicable diseases.<sup>10</sup> Further studies have shown improvements in access to care and coordination of services, appropriate use of specialty care,

chronic disease outcomes, and safety.<sup>10,11</sup> Important indicators of safety, patient care, and environment of care, such as complications and error rates, length of hospital stay, conflict among caregivers, staff turnover, and mortality rates, have all been shown to decrease in collaborative care environments.<sup>10</sup>

**Interprofessional Collaboration in Research**

Science and knowledge are foundational for a health care profession to exist, and research is one means of achieving these requirements. The problems that must be solved in the modern era are complex, and solutions may not be available if one is working alone. The National Academies suggest that interprofessional or interdisciplinary collaboration may offer solutions when trying to solve multifaceted issues.<sup>12</sup> Interprofessional/interdisciplinary research collaboration occurs when researchers from more than 1 profession/discipline are “working together to achieve the common goal of producing new scientific knowledge.”<sup>13</sup>

The National Academies defines research collaboration as follows<sup>12</sup>:

1. Opportunities to learn and go beyond traditional ways of thinking<sup>2</sup>
2. Access to people we would not normally reach in order to serve a larger body of people
3. Potential to develop lifelong relationships and bonds that may be beneficial in the future<sup>1</sup>
4. Gain from the wisdom of others<sup>6</sup>
5. Access to new resources and the potential to develop new skills
6. Increased productivity through doing more work in less time
7. Sharing recognition and accolades
8. Association with others who are successful
9. Sharing costs<sup>2</sup>
10. Improved access to moneys; some funding bodies only support collaborative projects
11. Cross fertilization across disciplines<sup>8</sup>
12. The “pooling knowledge for tackling large and complex problems”<sup>8</sup>

**Figure 1** - Benefits of collaboration.

Interdisciplinary research (IDR) is a mode of research by teams or individuals that integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or field of research practice.

Collaborating parties benefit not only in accomplishing research studies, but also in other, less tangible areas. IPC among researchers can help build informational networks, encourage different ways of thinking, and stimulate new solutions to old problems.

Each profession’s research community faces various obstacles, such as limited workforce, resources, and expertise. For researchers who work in the isolation of their own profession, there are limitations and risks for not collaborating. On the profession or discipline level, working in a research silo can create a false sense of security because ideas are not likely to be challenged. This can result in a small fish who thinks to be a big fish simply because he is in a small pond. When working in seclusion, work will likely go only so far and will not reach as wide an audience as might be possible as when working with others. As well, there is the possibility that a solution may have already been found elsewhere; thus, isolated research efforts may waste limited resources. Research done in segregation likely can benefit from better

infrastructure. Finally, without collaboration, some research may result in poor-quality studies.

Collaboration can be a significant catalyst to positive advancement in research, as it allows access to resources so that more complex, and perhaps more meaningful, investigation may be possible. Research that may not have been possible if done by a single profession may be possible when done in collaboration with others.<sup>14</sup> Resnick<sup>15</sup> states that “while multidisciplinary research brings disciplines together, interdisciplinary research cuts across the disciplines and fosters the integration of ideas.” It has been suggested that there is a correlation between collaborative research and prestige,<sup>16</sup> increased success of publication,<sup>8</sup> and citability (ie, impact).<sup>17,18</sup> As stated by Frenken et al<sup>19</sup> “Research collaboration enhances the quality of research, which leads papers with more authors to be cited more often.” Results of research may have a better chance of being implemented if there are multiple professions to disseminate the findings. This is especially important if the results have direct application to clinical practice.

Breaking past professional barriers to achieve research collaboration can be challenging. A profession that has few resources and little access to funding may not be invited, or even considered, to participate in larger studies or projects. Some health professions do not have many (or any) experts in particular areas within their profession to perform certain areas of research, especially those in emerging fields. It is also difficult to initiate a collaborative effort when one has few resources to bring to the relationship. Those with few resources are often the professions and disciplines that especially need to collaborate in order to improve and may find that larger organizations are receptive to including them, especially if it helps build more collaborative infrastructure.

Trust is an important factor for collaboration in research. The culture of science has traditionally been secretive. Scientists must compete for funding; sharing novel ideas may risk that a fundable project is “stolen,” either intentionally or unintentionally. Therefore, trust and respect of others in a collaboration are necessary to prevent withholding of ideas and assistance. There may also be a funding advantage to participating in collaborative research. There has been a movement by major funding agencies to reward and value multidisciplinary collaborations.<sup>20</sup> So, if helping humanity is not a big enough motivator for collaboration, then better funding may be a motivating stimulus.

Value continues once the research is done. After a collaborative study is complete, the communications among researchers often will continue. Skills and ways of thinking that were shared among group members across the disciplines can have long-lasting effects. The traditional approaches of 1 discipline are expanded by working with other professions; thus, the problem or the approach will have been seen in a new light. As Lee et al<sup>14</sup> suggest, “There is a general consensus that interdisciplinary collaboration is important in solving large scale, complex biomedical questions.” If we wish to tackle the big problems that we are facing, then we need to consider

seeking out and developing better and more interprofessional and interdisciplinary relationships in research.

### **Interprofessional Collaboration in Practice**

*We have trained, hired and rewarded people to be cowboys, but it's pit crews that we need.*  
—Atul Gawande, MD, MPH

Interprofessional collaborative practice (IPCP) has emerged in health care over several decades,<sup>21,22</sup> but has garnered more support, particularly in the past 15 years, as a means to address medical error.<sup>21,23</sup> Also, the advent of patient-centered medical homes<sup>21</sup> and family home teams<sup>24</sup> and a global shortage of primary care providers in areas with major health disparities<sup>10</sup> have made IPCP an attractive model to, it is hoped, provide better care to populations of health care users.

IPCP has been defined by WHO<sup>10</sup> as follows:

Collaborative practice in health-care occurs when multiple health workers from different professional backgrounds provide comprehensive services by working with patients, their families, careers and communities to deliver the highest quality of care across settings.

IPCP involves more than different health care providers applying their unique skills and knowledge to the management of a patient. Collaboration occurs when individuals have mutual respect for one another and one another's professions and are willing participants in a cooperative atmosphere.<sup>25</sup> It has been suggested that IPCP is different from interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary practice, all terms used within the recent past to denote care provided by more than 1 health care provider for the benefit of a patient.<sup>26–28</sup> While these practices are indeed noteworthy for their contributions to health care, the unit of study is a single patient and the model is focused on the health care provider(s), whereas the unit of study in IPCP is often a community of patients and the model is focused on improving health outcomes. Thus, when we look at IPCP, we must think of the bigger picture and health in populations.

Traditionally, an individual patient has sought care for a disease or disorder from a reputable health care provider.<sup>29</sup> Under such a model, it was conceived that this singular health care provider working in the “silo” of his or her own office could meet the needs of the patient. Today, with chronic and complex diseases requiring multiple specialty providers<sup>30</sup> and the role of primary care increasingly shifting toward the provision of services to populations of people with massive disparities, there is a great need for team-based community care more reminiscent of public health practice than health care. From a social perspective, practices that focus on the skill set and charisma of a singular health care provider are inefficient and costly. As has been noted in the Institute of Medicine's<sup>30</sup> landmark report *The Future of the Public's Health*, “smaller practices

have great difficulty in organizing the array of services and support needed to efficiently manage chronic disease.”


In many countries, health care systems are fragmented and unable to meet the health care needs of the population.<sup>10</sup> A chief force driving the use of IPC is the shortage of primary care providers that is occurring globally. This is a critical barrier to achieving the health-related Millennium Development Goals.<sup>10</sup> Part of the United Nations Millennium Development Declaration, several of these 8 international goals have health-related indicators, such as reducing child mortality rates, improving maternal health, and decreasing common and endemic infectious diseases.<sup>31</sup> Gostin and colleagues<sup>32</sup> poignantly state, “Siloed models centered on temporary fixes are not sufficient to greatly alleviate the overall burden of disease in developing countries.”

Researchers at WHO have found that health care workers who are team players are the ones who succeed in austere situations dealing with extremely complex issues.<sup>10</sup> IPC relies upon the ready integration of people with diverse talents, including those not often associated with health care, who may assist in the improved health care outcomes of the group being served. In a collaborative environment, the input of economists, logisticians, informatics specialists, technology experts, and others may be critical to success. This perspective is something common in public health but foreign to most patient care environments.<sup>23</sup> Collaboration at this level requires participants to work together with open minds and to value what each team member brings to the team. Such collaboration is evident in a proposed interprofessional oath suggested by Brown and colleagues<sup>33</sup>: “We will work with others to provide care, recognizing the unique skills of each, and we will seek to collaborate effectively on the healthcare team.” This environment is perhaps best summarized by Hall,<sup>34</sup> when she says, “The milieu for collaborative practice must foster a status-equal basis between the various team members.”

### **Interprofessional Collaboration in Education**

Interprofessional education (IPE) “occurs when students from 2 or more professions learn about, from, and with each other.”<sup>10</sup> It has been suggested that to be a genuinely interprofessional education experience such interaction requires purposeful integration and collaboration among the disciplines, whether in an educational or practice environment.<sup>23</sup>

IPCP and IPE are related. Advocates state that IPE must be a part of the professional training of health care workers in order to reach the goal of IPCP. In its widely acclaimed and often-cited publication, *Framework for Action on Interprofessional Education and Collaborative Practice*,<sup>10</sup> WHO clearly outlines the necessary elements and relationships inherent to IPE and IPCP. As shown in Figure 2, the health and education systems exist in a local context and are there to provide the health care needs of the local population. Within this environment, future health care workers ought to be trained to work together as members of a “collaborative, practice-ready workforce”<sup>10</sup> (ie, IPE) that provides collaborative health care to



**Figure 2** - The model of relating interprofessional education and collaborative practice as presented by the World Health Organization. Figure reproduced with permission from World Health Organization, *Framework for Action on Interprofessional Education and Collaborative Practice*; 2010: 9, figure 1.

the population. A workforce that is ready for IPC therefore emerges from IPE training experiences. The goal of the IPC health care system is to deliver better health outcomes to the population.<sup>10</sup>

Receiving formal IPE training has benefits. While some people without training in collaborative practice might be able to figure out how to function or thrive in IPCP, it has been shown that training people using IPE leads to “members who show respect and positive attitudes towards each other and work towards improving patient outcomes.”<sup>25</sup> While health care systems have moved toward IPC, teamwork training in health professions education has not kept pace with such changes.<sup>21</sup> IPE and IPCP are linked to what society needs; through IPE, the workforce is trained to work better as a team to deliver better health outcomes to the community being served.

Collaborative work in IPE and IPCP has been done across geographic and political boundaries. Much of the work that has been published related to IPE and IPCP originates from Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia.<sup>35</sup> However, attention has been garnered for IPE from around the world since WHO made it an essential component of health professions education.<sup>10</sup> In an international survey of WHO’s 193 member states, Rodger and colleagues<sup>36</sup> found evidence of IPE in 41 different countries, with varying levels of complexity noted in collaborative efforts. This makes sense given the shortage of primary care services occurring globally. Opportunities for involvement in various IPCP and IPE groups are widely

distributed, including those in Canada ([www.cihc.ca](http://www.cihc.ca)), Europe ([www.eipen.eu](http://www.eipen.eu)), the United Kingdom (<http://caipe.org.uk>), United States ([www.aihc-us.org](http://www.aihc-us.org)), Australia and New Zealand ([www.aippen.net](http://www.aippen.net)), Japan ([www.jaipe.jp](http://www.jaipe.jp) and <http://jipwen.dept.showa.gunma-u.ac.jp>), Scandinavia ([www.nipnet.org](http://www.nipnet.org)), and Eastern and African countries ([www.ecipen.org](http://www.ecipen.org)). Furthermore, annual international conferences focus on IPCP and IPE, such as the All Together Better Health conferences that are supported by 8 different organizations with international representation ([www.atbh.org](http://www.atbh.org)). There are also the Collaborating Across Borders conferences, a joint IPCP/IPE effort between Canada and the United States (<http://www.aihc-us.org/collaborating-across-borders>) and the New Zealand Interprofessional Health Conference (<http://www.nziphc.co.nz>).

### Potential Barriers to Collaboration

*The secret is to gang up on the problem, rather than each other.*  
—Thomas Stallkamp

Given the core elements of collaboration (participants from different cultures, high level of interaction, mutual authority, sharing of resources), it has its potential problems. What may start out as a well-meaning endeavor can lead to conflict.<sup>3</sup> In fact, due to the very nature of a

collaborative environment, conflict should be expected; but with this comes the opportunity for better understanding. IPC is essentially a melting pot of professions, and each profession has its own unique history, culture, attitudes, values, customs, and beliefs. How professionals in collaborations come to understand and appreciate these nuances can pose several challenges.<sup>34</sup> For example, 1 profession may see another profession as an outsider or rival and not want to involve this profession in collaboration. There also may be professional groups that are afraid to interact with other professional groups for various reasons, not the least of which could be historical isolation or low status within the social hierarchy. There are also situations in which a culturally dominant profession may have attitudes that are prejudiced against other professions, as has been stated by Gaboury and colleagues<sup>37</sup>: “It is plausible that practitioners who belong to occupational groups that have obtained, or are in the process of obtaining, legitimacy through licensing, certification, or registration may be seen differently by their biomedical peers.” The aforementioned are all relatively minor obstacles compared to that of bringing together professions that historically have been at odds with one another. In summary, the ideological differences and power relations brought to collaboration from different professions can be potentially problematic.<sup>4,38</sup>

Boundary disputes, status issues, language barriers, customer service orientations, and reporting structures are all potential challenges.<sup>9,39-41</sup> Other authors warn of problems with IPC in areas where the physical space is not adequate or appropriate in design,<sup>42</sup> where role overlap and confusion exist,<sup>4,38</sup> and where there is territorialism.<sup>42,43</sup> The conclusion is that collaboration<sup>44</sup> will lead to conflict. However, the management of any conflict to arrive at a benefit for the customer is a necessary step in building an effective collaboration.<sup>44,45</sup> It is recommended that collaborative groups have an agreed-upon method for resolving conflict, starting with resolution at the level of individual participants and working out toward the larger levels of organization.<sup>44</sup>

There are also concerns that IPC can lead to the loss of uniqueness of a profession or professional identity.<sup>23</sup> When participants focus on the team goals and the people that they are serving, then differences between professions can be seen as unique opportunities to bring a valuable and different point of view or skill set to the collaboration.<sup>23</sup> The collaboration may result in overlap, to some degree, of the activities of any 1 profession involved in it, but the collaboration should not duplicate the efforts of any particular profession.<sup>5</sup> As stated by D’Amour and colleagues,<sup>4</sup> working together in this way requires “implementing a logic of collaboration rather than a logic of competition.”

### Getting to Collaboration

*If everyone is moving forward together, then success takes care of itself.*  
—Henry Ford

Like other things that are valued but difficult to attain, such as exalted leadership, fine wine, or an enduring marriage, working collaborations are perhaps as much an art as they are a science. Experts suggest that the process of building a culture of collaboration is not exactly methodical, is somewhat organic, and requires a great deal of practice and nurturing.<sup>2,46,47</sup> It is suggested to start small and first learn to work collaboratively at a local level. Examples might be collaborating within an office, department, or group. Once skills in collaboration are developed (not tolerance or just working in the same building, but actually accomplishing a task together), then reaching out to larger circles of influence and other professions may be easier.

Many books and articles have been written on the topic of collaboration, and several are cited in this article; thus, we refer the reader to these sources for comprehensive discussions about attaining quality collaborations. However, there are some cogent points relevant to forging collaborations across disciplines that are expressed by several experts, and we briefly review them here and provide a checklist for assessing readiness for collaboration in Appendix A.

1. Know when to use collaboration and when not to. Effective leaders can identify when it is the right time to collaborate. Essentially, collaboration is a tool to employ to achieve a desired outcome and it will not be a good tool to use in all situations. Collaboration tends to work best in diverse groups where the people participating in the collaboration have authority to make final decisions and when innovation and creativity are desired.<sup>45</sup> As stated by Hansen,<sup>1(p15)</sup> “The goal of collaboration is not collaboration, but better results.”
2. Know what the collaborating professions or organizations stand to gain from the alliance and what the costs are to get there.<sup>1,48</sup> One expert has suggested that collaboration should only be engaged if the net value of the partnership is more than the sum of the return on the venture, minus the costs and the opportunity costs, such as manpower and time spent on the collaboration that could be spent in other endeavors.<sup>1</sup> In short, some effort needs to be expended in advance of the collaboration to determine if the value/benefits outweigh the costs.<sup>48</sup>
3. Be aware of the factors that drive the strength of collaboration: alignment of mission/values,<sup>47,48</sup> personal connections,<sup>48</sup> value generation for each collaborating organization or profession,<sup>48</sup> and improved outcomes.<sup>10</sup>
4. Become familiar with the factors that lead to successful collaborations.<sup>5</sup> Such factors include attitudes, environmental concerns, communication, resources and trust.<sup>2,7,46</sup>
5. Recognize the intangible elements, such as tacit knowledge, social capital, ownership, disclosure, transparency, motivation, and commitment, that strongly influence peoples’ decisions.<sup>46,49</sup>



show obvious improvements in patient outcomes or safety.<sup>55</sup> Faculty development programs should be developed using the same educational principles required to teach students: team-based learning, active learning, problem solving, utilization of available resources, and feedback mechanisms.<sup>55</sup> Buring and colleagues<sup>56</sup> have published an excellent article on faculty training, including desired attributes of IPE educators, faculty development resources, and a rubric containing selected topics mapped to Institute of Medicine competencies, teaching methods, and learning objectives. Mackenzie and colleagues<sup>57</sup> also offer an informative account of the key elements of success of their IPE program by linking successful organizational structure and actions with the Canadian Interprofessional Health Collaborative competency domains.<sup>57</sup>

## CONCLUSION

When discussing collaboration, the key issues include putting the community or client first, the organization second, oneself last, and prejudices aside. Shortages in primary care providers and the challenges of managing chronic, complex diseases, such as musculoskeletal problems, are excellent opportunities for the health professions to bring unique skills to collaborative environments. Times are changing, silos are falling, national health burdens are being shared, and it is going to take much more than a single practitioner or paradigm to solve the serious health care issues confronting humanity today and in the future. Through collaboration, we can work together for a better future.

## FUNDING AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

BNG and CDJ receive a stipend for services provided to the *Journal of Chiropractic Education* and Association of Chiropractic Colleges Research Agenda Conference (AC-CRAC) meeting, respectively. However, this work was performed independent of these relationships, and the authors have no conflicts of interest to declare relevant to this work. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, or the United States Government.

## About the Authors

Bart Green is with the Department of Physical and Occupational Therapy, Chiropractic Services, and Sports Medicine at the Naval Medical Center San Diego; serves as the editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Chiropractic Education*; is the associate editor in the Publications Department of National University of Health Sciences; and is a doctoral candidate in public health at Walden University (Marine Corps Air Station Miramar Branch Health Clinic, San Diego, CA 92145-2002; bart.green@med.navy.mil). Claire Johnson is a professor at the National University of Health

Sciences and a doctoral candidate in public health at Walden University (200 E. Roosevelt Rd, Lombard, IL 60148; cjohnson@nuhs.edu). Address correspondence to Bart Green, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar Branch Health Clinic, San Diego, CA 92145-2002; bart.green@med.navy.mil. This article was received and accepted December 9, 2014.

## Author Contributions

Concept development: BNG, CDJ. Design: BNG. Supervision: BNG. Literature search: BNG, CDJ. Writing: BNG, CDJ. Critical review: BNG, CDJ.

© 2015 Association of Chiropractic Colleges

## REFERENCES

1. Hansen MT. *Collaboration: How Leaders Avoid the Traps, Create Unity, and Reap Big Results*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press; 2009:xi, 231.
2. Vangen S, Huxham C. Nurturing collaborative relations: building trust in interorganizational collaboration. *J Appl Behav Sci*. 2003;39:5–31.
3. Kumar K, vanDissel HG. Sustainable collaboration: managing conflict in interorganizational systems. *Manag Inf Syst Q*. 1996;20(3):279–300.
4. D'Amour D, Ferrada-Videla M, San Martin Rodriguez L, Beaulieu MD. The conceptual basis for interprofessional collaboration: core concepts and theoretical frameworks. *J Interprof Care*. 2005;(suppl 1):116–131.
5. Mattessich PW, Monsey BR; Wilder Research Center. *Collaboration—What Makes It Work: A Review of Research Literature on Factors Influencing Successful Collaboration*. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation; 1992:53.
6. Powell WW, Koput KW, Smith-Doerr L. Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: networks of learning in biotechnology. *Adm Sci Q*. 1996;41(1):116–145.
7. Inkpen AC. Creating knowledge through collaboration. *Calif Manage Rev*. 1996;39(1):123–140.
8. vanRijnsoever FJ, Hessels LK. Factors associated with disciplinary and interdisciplinary research collaboration. *Res Policy*. 2011;40(3):463–472.
9. Littlechild B, Smith R. *A Handbook for Interprofessional Practice in the Human Services: Learning to Work Together*. New York, NY: Routledge; 2013.
10. World Health Organization. *Framework for Action on Interprofessional Education and Collaborative Practice*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010.
11. Lemieux-Charles L, McGuire WL. What do we know about health care team effectiveness? A review of the literature. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2006;63(3):263–300.
12. Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research, Committee on Science Engineering and Public Policy (US), National Academy of Sciences (US), National

- Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine (US). *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2005:xxv, 306.
13. Katz JS, Martin BR. What is research collaboration? *Res Policy*. 1997;26(1):1–18.
  14. Lee ES, McDonald DW, Anderson N, Tarczy-Hornoch P. Incorporating collaborative concepts into informatics in support of translational interdisciplinary biomedical research. *Int J Med Inform*. 2009;78(1):10–21.
  15. Resnick JC. Increasing opportunity through interdisciplinary research: climbing down and shattering a tower of babel. *Front Psychiatry*. 2011;2:20.
  16. Bozeman B, Corley E. Scientists' collaboration strategies: implications for scientific and technical human capital. *Res Policy*. 2004;33(4):599–616.
  17. Nomaler Ö, Frenken K, Heimeriks G. Do more distant collaborations have more citation impact? *J Informetrics*. 2013;7(4):966–971.
  18. Didegah F, Thelwall M. Which factors help authors produce the highest impact research? *J Informetrics*. 2013;7(4):861–873.
  19. Frenken K, Hözl W, deVor F. The citation impact of research collaborations: the case of European biotechnology and applied microbiology (1988–2002). *J Eng Technol Manage*. 2005;22:9–30.
  20. Nagarajan R, Kalinka AT, Hogan WR. Evidence of community structure in biomedical research grant collaborations. *J Biomed Inform*. 2013;46(1):40–46.
  21. Interprofessional Education Collaborative Expert Panel. *Core Competencies for Interprofessional Collaborative Practice: Report of an Expert Panel*. Washington, DC: Interprofessional Education Collaborative; 2011.
  22. WHO Study Group on Multiprofessional Education of Health Personnel. *Learning Together to Work Together for Health: Report of a WHO Study Group on Multiprofessional Education of Health Personnel: The Team Approach*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1988: 72.
  23. Institute of Medicine (US). Global Forum on Innovation in Health Professional Education. Workshop. (2012: Washington DC). Cuff PA, Institute of Medicine (US), Board on Global Health, National Research Council (US); 2013.
  24. Mior S, Gamble B, Barnsley J, Cote P, Cote E. Changes in primary care physician's management of low back pain in a model of interprofessional collaborative care: an uncontrolled before-after study. *Chiropr Man Ther*. 2013;21(1):6.
  25. Bridges DR, Davidson RA, Odegard PS, Maki IV, Tomkowiak J. Interprofessional collaboration: three best practice models of interprofessional education. *Med Educ Online*. 2011;16.
  26. Boon H, Verhoef M, O'Hara D, Findlay B. From parallel practice to integrative health care: a conceptual framework. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2004;4(1):15.
  27. Johnson C. Health care transitions: a review of integrated, integrative, and integration concepts. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2009;32(9):703–713.
  28. Stone J. *Interprofessional Collaborative Practice: Definitions and Terminology*. Canberra: Australian Capital Territory Health; 2009.
  29. Allan J, Barwick TA, Cashman S, et al. Clinical prevention and population health: curriculum framework for health professions. *Am J Prev Med*. 2004; 27(5):471–476.
  30. Institute of Medicine. *The Future of the Public's Health in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2003.
  31. United Nations. *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2014*. New York, NY: United Nations; 2014.
  32. Gostin LO, Boufford JI, Martinez RM. The future of the public's health: vision, values, and strategies. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2004;23(4):96–107.
  33. Brown SS, Garber JS, Lash J, Schnurman-Crook A. A proposed interprofessional oath. *J Interprof Care*. 2014; 28(5):471–472.
  34. Hall P. Interprofessional teamwork: professional cultures as barriers. *J Interprof Care*. 2005;19(suppl 1):188–196.
  35. Thistlethwaite JE, Forman D, Matthews LR, Rogers GD, Steketeer C, Yassine T. Competencies and frameworks in interprofessional education: a comparative analysis. *Acad Med*. 2014;89(6):869–875.
  36. Rodger S, Hoffman SJ, World Health Organization Study Group on Interprofessional Educational and Collaborative Practice. Where in the world is interprofessional education? A global environmental scan. *J Interprof Care*. 2010;24(5):479–491.
  37. Gaboury I, Bujold M, Boon H, Moher D. Interprofessional collaboration within Canadian integrative healthcare clinics: key components. *Soc Sci Med*. 2009; 69(5):707–715.
  38. Caldwell K, Atwal A. The problems of interprofessional healthcare practice in hospitals. *Br J Nurs*. 2003; 12(20):1212–1218.
  39. Lawlis TR, Anson J, Greenfield D. Barriers and enablers that influence sustainable interprofessional education: a literature review. *J Interprof Care*. 2014; 28(4):305–310.
  40. Gulati R. Silo busting: how to execute on the promise of customer focus. *Harv Bus Rev*. 2007;85(5):98–108, 45.
  41. Headrick LA, Wilcock PM, Batalden PB. Interprofessional working and continuing medical education. *BMJ*. 1998;316(7133):771–774.
  42. Lawn S, Lloyd A, King A, Sweet L, Gum L. Integration of primary health services: being put together does not mean they will work together. *BMC Res Notes*. 2014;7:66.
  43. Chung CL, Manga J, McGregor M, Michailidis C, Stavros D, Woodhouse LJ. Interprofessional collaboration and turf wars: how prevalent are hidden attitudes? *J Chiropr Educ*. 2012;26(1):32–39.
  44. Weiss J, Hughes J. Want collaboration? Accept—and actively manage—conflict. *Harv Bus Rev*. 2005;83(3): 92–101, 49.
  45. Ibarra H, Hansen MT. Are you a collaborative leader? *Harv Bus Rev*. 2011;89(7–8):68–74, 164.

46. Schuman S, International Association of Facilitators. *Creating a Culture of Collaboration: The International Association of Facilitators Handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 2006:xxxiv, 498.
47. Adler P, Heckscher C, Prusak L. Building collaborative enterprise. *Harv Bus Rev*. 2011;89(7–8):94–101, 64.
48. Austin JE. Strategic collaboration between nonprofits and business. *Nonprofit Volunt Sect Q*. 2000;29:69–97.
49. Grabher G. Cool projects, boring institutions: temporary collaboration in social context. *Regional Studies*. 2002;36(3):205–214.
50. McDermott R, Archibald D. Harnessing your staff's informal networks. *Harv Bus Rev*. 2010;88(3):82–89.
51. Fulmer T, Gaines M. *Partnering With Patients, Families, and Communities to Link Interprofessional Practice and Education*. New York, NY: Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation; 2014.
52. Bainbridge L, Nasmith L, Orchard C, Wood V. Competencies for interprofessional collaboration. *J Phys Ther Educ*. 2010;24(1):6–11.
53. Goldblatt E, Wiles M, Schwartz J, Weeks J. Competencies for optimal practice in integrated environments: examining attributes of a consensus interprofessional practice document from the licensed integrative health disciplines. *Explore*. 2013;9(5):285–291.
54. Canadian Interprofessional Health Collaborative. *A National Interprofessional Competency Framework*. Vancouver, BC: Canadian Interprofessional Health Collaborative; 2010.
55. Silver IL, Leslie K. Faculty development for continuing interprofessional education and collaborative practice. *J Contin Educ Health Prof*. 2009;29(3):172–177. doi:10.1002/chp.20032.
56. Buring SM, Conway S, Hansen L, Westberg S. Keys to successful implementation of interprofessional education: learning location, faculty development, and curricular themes. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2009;73(4):60.
57. MacKenzie DE, Doucet S, Nasser S, Godden-Webster AL, Andrews C, Kephart G. Collaboration behind-the-scenes: key to effective interprofessional education. *J Interprof Care*. 2014;28(4):381–383.

## Appendix A - A Checklist to Assess for an Organization's Readiness for Collaboration

Readiness for collaboration	Yes	No
1. Would the situation (research, education, or clinical issue) of interest be best solved through collaboration?		
2. Who should be included in the collaboration? Are the appropriate collaborators (disciplines and professions) being considered and invited?		
3. Have you identified the benefits that each of the collaborators will gain from the relationship?		
4. Have you identified the potential barriers to working effectively (eg, culture, vocabulary, approaches, distance, technology, etc)?		
5. Have you developed a plan for how these barriers will be overcome?		
6. Have the following been assessed for key team members regarding collaboration: attitudes, environmental concerns, communications, resources, and trust?		
7. Have you considered the intangible elements for each collaborator (eg, tacit knowledge, social capital, transparency, motivation)?		
8. Have the organizational learning objectives been clearly stated and agreed upon (what do you hope to learn from the collaboration)?		
9. Is there support and commitment across all levels for this collaboration to be successful, including administrators, collaborators and any involved staff?		
10. Have all members of the collaborative team agreed on the goals and the shared purpose?		
11. Does everyone in the collaboration have adequate and available time, resources, and skills in order to accomplish the goals?		
12. Is there an overt environment and culture of mutual respect amongst all members? If not, what is the plan to develop this?		
13. Have you developed and agreed upon the plan to manage and resolve conflict or disagreement when it occurs?		
14. Have the collaborators agreed to share in all of the following: planning, decision making, problem solving, responsibility, working together cooperatively, communicating, and coordinating openly?		