

Tools for structured team communication in pre-registration health professions education: a Best Evidence Medical Education (BEME) review

Buckley, Sharon; Coleman, Jamie; Hensman, Marianne; Hirsch, Christine; Hodson, James; Morley, David

DOI:

[10.1080/0142159X.2016.1215412](https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2016.1215412)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Buckley, S, Coleman, J, Hensman, M, Hirsch, C, Hodson, J & Morley, D 2016, 'Tools for structured team communication in pre-registration health professions education: a Best Evidence Medical Education (BEME) review', *Medical Teacher*, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 966-980. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2016.1215412>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Eligibility for repository: Checked on 18/7/2016

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

**TOOLS FOR STRUCTURED TEAM COMMUNICATION IN PRE-REGISTRATION HEALTH
PROFESSIONS EDUCATION: A BEST EVIDENCE MEDICAL EDUCATION (BEME) REVIEW**

Sharon Buckley¹, Lucy Ambrose², Elizabeth Anderson³, Jamie J Coleman¹, Marianne Hensman¹, Christine Hirsch¹, James Hodson⁴, David Morley¹, Sarah Pittaway¹, Jonathan Stewart⁵,

¹University of Birmingham, UK

²The Tutbury Practice, Burton-on-Trent, (formerly Keele University, UK)

³University of Leicester, UK

⁴University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust

⁵Learning to be Safer Expert Group, Health Education England, UK

Corresponding author:

Dr. Sharon Buckley

Senior Lecturer in Medical Education

University of Birmingham

B15 2TT

s.g.buckley@bham.ac.uk

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Sharon Buckley (Senior Lecturer in Medical Education), Jamie Coleman (Professor of Medical Education), Marianne Hensman (Clinical Tutor in Physiotherapy) Christine Hirsch (Senior Lecturer in Pharmacy) and David Morley (Education Development Specialist) are based at the University of Birmingham, UK. Lucy Ambrose is a General Practitioner and former Director of Clinical Skills at Keele University and Elizabeth Anderson is Professor of Interprofessional Education at the University of Leicester.

Jonathan Stewart (retired) was a consultant surgeon at Heart of England NHS Trust and is now a member of Health Education England 'Learning to Be Safer' expert group.

Sarah Pittaway is an information scientist and Team Leader for Academic Services at the University of Worcester; and James Hodson is a statistician based at University Hospitals Birmingham.

ABSTRACT

Standardised protocols for information exchange between health professionals, such as Situation Background Assessment Recommendation (SBAR), are being introduced into clinical practice. Often described as ‘tools for structured communication’, introduction of these protocols is, in part, the result of efforts to apply good practice from aviation safety to health care.

Calls for trainee health professionals to understand and be able to use such tools when they enter clinical practice have accompanied these developments. In order to help clinical educators to decide how best to respond to these calls, we have reviewed the educational literature reporting the integration of one or more tools for structured communication into an educational intervention for pre-registration health professions students.

Searches of 10 databases (1990-2014) were supplemented by hand searches and by citation searches (to January 2015). Studies involving pre-registration students from any clinically focussed profession and reporting evaluation of an intervention incorporating one or more tools were included. We assessed the methodological quality of included studies using a generic checklist of 11 indicators and undertook a narrative synthesis of study findings. Fifty studies met our inclusion criteria, of which just over half met seven or more quality indicators. In 21 studies (42%), evaluations considered the specific effect of a tool on educational outcomes. The remainder evaluated the whole intervention, of which the tool(s) were a part.

Our review indicates that pre-registration students, particularly those in the US, are learning to use tools for structured communication, either in specific sessions or integrated into more extensive courses or programmes; and that they are mostly learning to use SBAR and its

variants. Interventions are mostly for uni-professional groups and often use simulation. There is some evidence that learning to use one or more tools can improve the clarity and comprehensiveness of student communications, their perceived self-confidence and their sense of preparedness for clinical practice. However, there is as yet little evidence relating to the transfer of these skills to the clinical setting or for any influence of teaching approach on learning outcomes. Educators will need to consider the positioning of such learning with other skills such as clinical reasoning and decision-making.

Key words: SBAR, tool, structured communication, standardised protocol, multi-disciplinary team, initial training, systematic review.

INTRODUCTION

Poor communication between members of the health care team is a recognised contributor to patient harm (Gordon et al., 2012; The Joint Commission, 2015). To improve team communication, standardised protocols for information exchange between health professionals are being introduced into clinical practice (Haig et al., 2006; Weller et al., 2014).

Situation Background Assessment Recommendation is an example of a standardised protocol that can be used in a variety of situations to ensure that important items of information are not lost or miscommunicated (Leonard et al., 2004; Haig et al., 2006; De Meester et al., 2013). This protocol is often abbreviated to 'SBAR', the mnemonic acting as a cognitive aid for remembering the protocol sequence. SBAR is one of many such cognitive aids: indeed recent reviews have identified more than 20 different mnemonics for team communication protocols, ranging from 'GRRR' to 'Just Go NUTS' (Riesenberg et al., 2009; Riesenberg et al., 2010).

These developments are, in part, the result of efforts to apply lessons learned in aviation safety to health care. Following major air disasters in the 1970s and 1980s, strenuous efforts to improve aviation safety led to the development of *crew resource management (CRM)*, a comprehensive training programme that encourages the use of standardised protocols to enhance communication between members of the flight crew (Gordon et al., 2013). Initiatives to apply CRM principles to healthcare began in the 1990s, gaining momentum following the publication in the U.S. of '*To Err Is Human: Building a safer Health System*' (Institute of Medicine, 2000), which crystallised growing concern about the impact of medical error on patient safety.

Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance Performance and Patient Safety (TeamSTEPPS®) is a CRM-based programme for the training of healthcare teams that aims to improve teamwork through training in leadership, situation monitoring, mutual support and communication. In its ‘tools and strategies’, TeamSTEPPS® includes a range of standardised protocols for information exchange between members of the health care team, including SBAR (King et al., 2008). Throughout our review, we will follow the TeamSTEPPS® convention of referring to such standardised protocols as ‘tools for structured communication’.

In 2011, the World Health Organisation recommended that trainee health professionals become familiar with and be able to use tools for structured communication before they enter clinical practice (World Health Organisation, 2011); and similar calls have been made by other clinical educators (Armitage et al., 2011; Keller et al., 2013; Hynes et al., 2015; Stojan et al., 2015). In order to help clinical educators to decide how best to respond to these calls in their particular circumstances, we have reviewed the educational literature reporting the integration of tool(s) for structured communication into an educational intervention for pre-registration health professions students. We have investigated the influence of such interventions on students’ knowledge, skills and attitudes and the evidence for any influence of teaching method on the nature or extent of student learning. We have considered both interventions in which the tool(s) are the main focus of the learning and those in which they are component(s) of a more extensive module or course.

This paper reports the findings of our review, highlights areas for clinical educators to consider when planning the integration of tools for structured communication into their pre-registration curricula and suggests avenues for further research.

Table 1 gives a glossary of terms and abbreviations used in this review. Further information about CRM, TeamSTEPPS® and SBAR can be found in Appendix 1 (available online as Supplementary Materials).

Insert Table 1 here.

REVIEW METHODOLOGY

Framing the question

We defined pre-registration health professions education as any course of initial, undergraduate (or equivalent) training taken by students not yet qualified to practice. We defined an educational intervention as an event, activity or series of activities that formed a discrete component of a course or module. Specific characteristics of educational interventions included the aims and/or learning outcomes, subject content, setting, timing and duration, instructional methods and assessment.

Our concept of a tool for structured communication was that of a standardised protocol for information exchange i.e. *‘a process that structures information exchange in such a way that the provider of the information and/or the recipient of the information can systematically present/recall information in a focussed manner’* (Herschel et al., 2001).

We defined a health care team as two or more individuals, from the same or different professions, working together to complete a given task (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2005). Given the extensive focus of health professions education on communication with patients (Von Fragstein et al., 2008), our review focussed on tools for structured communication between health care professionals.

Our concept of learning was based on the aspects of competence outlined in Miller’s framework for clinical assessment (Miller, 1990). We explored studies of the contribution of structured tools to students’ knowledge (‘knows’ and ‘knows how’) and skills and behaviours (‘shows how’ and ‘does’). Given the importance of attitude-based competencies for effective team working (Flin et al., 2008), we also considered reports of the effect of such tools on

students' self-perceptions and attitudes, including their perceived preparedness for clinical practice.

Since the introduction of tools for structured communication into healthcare settings is relatively recent, we adopted an exploratory approach that considered a broad overall question: *how does the teaching of a tool for structured communication within and between teams contribute to student learning?*

Pilot phase

Initial scoping searches with two databases yielded approximately 2,000 citations, from which the lead reviewer and the information scientist identified 20 as potentially relevant to our review. All reviewers discussed these articles, in order to clarify our inclusion criteria and build consistency of interpretation. This exercise resulted in eight articles agreed for inclusion. Citations for these articles were used to refine and check the appropriateness of our full search strategies and to inform the construction of our data extraction form.

Sources of papers and search strategies

MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, Web of Science (Science Citation Index & Social Science Citation Index), CINAHL Plus, ASSIA, British Education Index, Australian Education Index, ERIC and TIMElit (Topics in Medical Education Database) were searched electronically, from January 1990 to March 2014. Key words and synonyms used are summarised in Appendix 2; an example of a full search strategy in Appendix 3 (available online as supplementary materials). All citations retrieved were entered into an EndNote database (Endnote X5.01 (Bld5774) Thomson Reuters 2011, Philadelphia, PA, London, UK) and then into Distiller SR systematic review software (Distiller SR Evidence Partners, Ottawa,

Canada), for screening. Duplicate citations were removed. Reference lists of all included papers and relevant systematic reviews were hand searched for additional citations. To reduce the risk of missing recent articles not in standard databases, a search of Google Scholar for 2013 onwards was undertaken using the terms SBAR (or) ISBAR. A search for citations of studies meeting seven or more quality indicators was undertaken using SCI Web of Science (to end January 2015). Other than conference proceedings cited in electronic databases or reference lists of included articles, 'grey' literature (Grey Literature Network Service, 2015) was not searched.

Inclusion/exclusion criteria

Our inclusion/exclusion criteria (see Appendix 4 for summary, available online as Supplementary Materials) were as follows:

Population: undergraduate students from any clinically (i.e. patient-focussed) health care profession. Undergraduates were considered to be students engaged in a course of initial, pre-registration training regardless of their qualification on entry.

Intervention: any educational activity or series of activities that included teaching of a [tool for](#) structured communication of sufficient substance to be reported as such in the primary literature. A recognisable acronym or mnemonic for the tool was not required. Interventions involving 'tools' such as Medical Early Warning System (MEWS), whose primary purpose is to reduce patient harm through routes other than communication, but which have been used as the basis for communication, were excluded, as were tools designed to assist communication between professional and patient and those designed primarily to assess students' communication skills.

Study types: primary research articles of any study type that described and evaluated an intervention that incorporated a tool for structured communication. Studies were not excluded on the grounds of study design, geographical location or language.

Outcomes: whilst we anticipated that educational interventions that incorporated tool(s) for structured communication would advance student learning primarily in the area of patient safety, we recognised that such learning could be transferable to other situations. We therefore considered all reported outcomes from such educational interventions and did not exclude studies on the grounds of outcome type.

Study selection

Screening and initial data extraction was undertaken using Distiller SR systematic review management software (Distiller SR Evidence Partners, Ottawa, Canada).

Title and abstract screening: All identified studies were screened against our inclusion/exclusion criteria by two independent reviewers. Studies were rejected if both reviewers agreed on lack of relevance. Where at least one reviewer thought the citation potentially relevant, retrieval of the full article was undertaken, unless it was not easily available, in which case the citation was screened by a third reviewer and a consensus about whether to pursue retrieval reached. Authors were contacted directly when other channels of retrieval failed.

Full text screening: Two independent reviewers assessed retrieved articles against our inclusion/exclusion criteria. Wherever possible, reviewers with a clinical background were teamed with those with an educational background. Agreement between reviewer

pairs was quantified using Kappa statistics with quadratic weights (Fleiss et al., 1969). Discrepancies were resolved by discussion and consensus. Where necessary, articles in languages other than English were screened by the lead reviewer working with a fluent or native speaker. If the use or nature of a tool were not apparent from the article, authors were contacted for further information where possible.

Data extraction

A comprehensive data extraction form was prepared and tested with the pilot sample of eight articles. The final form (Appendix 5, available online as Supplementary Materials) was assembled in Distiller SR and data extraction undertaken by reviewer pairs. Discrepancies in data extraction were resolved by consensus following transfer of data to a spread-sheet (Microsoft Excel Version 14).

Quality assessment of studies

Our pilot phase suggested that the literature relating to the teaching of tools for structured communication would be relatively recent, diverse and often descriptive (Cook et al., 2008). We wished to assess the quality of our included studies in a way that allowed in depth consideration of the most rigorous studies available, yet retained an element of ‘breadth’ that captured the scope of this emerging literature. We assessed study quality during data extraction, using a generic checklist of quality indicators (Table 2 Appendix 6, available online as Supplementary Materials) that were designed to reflect qualities of intellectual rigour applicable to all studies (Buckley et al., 2009; Passi et al., 2013). Having considered the range of quality indicators met by included studies, we agreed that studies meeting seven or more quality indicators would provide the balance we sought. These studies were then considered in greater depth.

Evidence synthesis

We undertook a narrative synthesis of our review findings (Popay, 2006). Recommended narrative synthesis tools were considered and those appropriate to our review selected. A preliminary synthesis of data from all studies that met our inclusion criteria was prepared by tabulation, grouping and clustering and drafting of short textual summaries of aspects of the data set. Where appropriate, sub-group analyses and tests for statistical significance were carried out. A thematic analysis of the main messages from studies meeting seven or more quality indicators was undertaken, with members of the review team working in pairs to identify themes, with subsequent consolidation of themes identified into major areas of interest.

For our synthesis, we adopted a ‘weight of evidence’ approach that considered both methodological quality and relevance of included studies (Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre, 2010). Overall methodological quality was assessed during data extraction using our quality indicators.

RESULTS

A: study search and selection

Figure 1 (Appendix 7, available online as Supplementary Materials) summarises the process of literature searching and selection. Database searches identified 5,977 citations as potentially relevant to our review and a further 46 were obtained from hand/citation searches (44) or other sources (2), giving a total of 6,023. Screening of titles and abstracts identified reduced this number to 759, of which 727 were retrieved as full articles. Eight citations were not available in the UK, 20 contained insufficient information to allow retrieval and four were books.

Of the 727 full text articles screened, 50 met our inclusion criteria and so were included in our review ('Included Studies'). The most common reasons for exclusion were that studies did not refer to the teaching of a tool for structured communication (513), did not involve students in initial training (129) or were not considered to be primary research (25). One text was excluded, as it was an early report of a later included study.

Of the 759 articles identified for full screening, 27 were in languages other than English. Full texts of all except one of these (which was not available in the UK) were obtained. Of these, 11 contained sufficient information in an English abstract to be excluded without further translation. A further 15 (nine French, three German and one each of Swedish, Italian and Danish) were screened by the lead reviewer working with a fluent or native speaker.

There was good agreement between reviewers during full text screening (Weighted Kappa = 0.73 (95% CI: 0.71 – 0.76)).

B: Overview of included studies

Of our 50 included studies, 38 (76%) were from the USA or Canada, eight (16%) were from UK/Europe and the remainder Australia or the Far East. All were either description (22) or justification (28) studies (Cook et al., 2008). Study designs reported were mostly 'before and after' (40%) or case studies (34%). Four studies (8%) were classified as randomised-controlled trials and six (12%) reported the use of mixed methods as defined by Johnson (Johnson et al., 2007). Reporting of a theory or framework to inform study design or evaluation was rare (de Feijter et al., 2012).

Twenty-seven (54%) of our included studies met seven or more of our quality criteria. The number of quality indicators met did not differ according to year of publication (mean quality scores of 6.1, 5.8 and 5.9 in 2007-2010, 2011-2012 and 2013-2014 respectively (Jonckheere-Terpstra test: $p=0.978$)) or by profession (mean score of 6.2 in medicine, 5.6 in nursing/other allied health and 6.1 in interprofessional studies (ANOVA: $p=0.690$)).

In 21 studies (42%) the evaluation undertaken provided specific evidence of the contribution of one or more tools for structured communication to the educational outcomes of the intervention. In the remaining 29 studies (58%), the evaluation only considered the educational intervention as a whole. In the synthesis that follows, we have distinguished between these, referring to them as 'tool-specific' and 'whole intervention' evaluations respectively.

C: educational interventions

The following sections describe the educational interventions reported by all studies that met our inclusion criteria ($n=50$, see Tables 3a-3d), including the aims of the intervention, the

tools reported, the student groups involved, the educational settings and teaching approaches employed and the educational outcomes identified.

Aims of the interventions

Apart from a general desire to improve students' communication skills (13 studies, 26%), improving handover/handoff was the most commonly reported aim of reported educational interventions (11 studies, 22%) (Figure 2). Fewer studies reported other aims, such as improvement in the management of deteriorating patients or telephone referral skills. One study involving SBAR aimed to improve the quality of communication at surgical morbidity and mortality conferences (Mitchell et al., 2013).

Insert Figure 2 here

The Tools

Tools derived from CRM concepts were the most frequently reported, being the tool(s) of choice in the educational interventions of 40 (80%) included studies (Table 3a-3d). SBAR and its variations were most common, with fewer studies reporting the teaching of tools designed to support the raising of concerns or the management of conflict. Only fourteen (35%) studies taught these tools as part of a wider CRM/TeamSTEPPS® training programme, the remaining 26 (65%) in an intervention devised by the educational provider. Reports of the teaching of CRM-derived tools increased significantly over the period covered by our review, from 56% (9/16) of studies published between 2007 and 2010 to 85% (11/13) in 2011-2012 and 95% (20/21) in 2013-2014 (Fisher's exact test $p=0.011$).

Authors used a range of mnemonics and abbreviations to describe the tools taught in their educational interventions (Table 3). Some authors' adapted standard formats such as SBAR to meet particular student need, by adding new components or by altering the meaning of existing items. Examples include the addition of Introduction (ISBAR) and Read Back (ISBARR) (Shanks et al., 2013) and changing Assessment to Agree plan/Actions (Brewer & Stewart-Wynne, 2013) One study, (Senette et al., 2013), used I PASS THE BATON which the authors felt was particularly appropriate for their interprofessional student groups; and one study used SAIF-IR, a tool that includes components for both off-going and in-coming clinicians, as clinical educators felt that SBAR did not provide a suitable structure for handover (Chu et al., 2010).

Educational interventions in 43 (86%) included studies considered oral communication between members of the healthcare team (33 studies, 66%); or a combination of oral and written communication (10 studies, 20%). A further six (12%) reported an intervention that included a tool specifically for written communication, most commonly the Subjective, Objective, Assessment, Plan (SOAP) note (four studies, 8%). One study (Kearney et al., 2010) used SBAR primarily as a tool to facilitate reflection.

Insert Tables 3a-3d here

The students

Interventions involving medical or nursing students in single profession groups were most common (19 studies, 38%; and 17 studies, 34% respectively). Twelve studies (24%) (Tables 3a-3d) reported interventions involving other health professions (paramedics, pharmacists, physicians' assistants, physiotherapists and respiratory care practitioners). In 13 studies (26%), the participants' stage of training was not clear. Of the remainder, 21 (42%) reported interventions for senior students (year three or above). Interventions for junior students (year

one or two) or for both junior and senior students were reported by 11 (22%) and five (10%) studies respectively.

Educational settings and teaching approaches

Table 4 (Appendix 8, available online as Supplementary Materials) summarises the educational settings and teaching approaches used. Over half of reported interventions (27 studies, 54%) used more than one educational setting and over three-quarters (38 studies, 76%) a combination of teaching approaches. Educational settings or teaching approaches chosen did not differ significantly between professions (Fisher's exact tests, see Appendix 10, available online as Supplementary Materials), although the limited statistical power of these tests meant that only strong relationships between these factors would have been detectable.

Thirty studies (60%) reported an intervention that used a simulated clinical environment for teaching, whilst 29 (58%) used a non-clinical/classroom setting (Table 4, Appendix 8 available online as Supplementary Materials). Specific teaching approaches reflected this, with 37 (74%) of studies using simulation/role play and 32 (64%) small group tutorials or workshops. Teaching during clinical placements was less common (16 studies, 32%), as was web-based or e-learning (8 studies, 16%). Artefacts, such as pocket cards or lanyard reminders, were sometimes used (14 studies, 28%).

Twenty-six studies (52%) reported pilot initiatives. Requirements for student attendance reflected this, with 22 (44%) reporting voluntary participation. Interventions lasted from half a day or less (18 studies, 36%) to more than one week, (17 studies, 34%). Thirty-four studies (68%) reported the nature of their assessment: formative assessment was common (21 studies, 42%), summative assessment relatively rare (9 studies, 18%).

Underlying educational theories, models and frameworks

The educational theories and frameworks informing reported educational interventions ranged from general theories such as situated learning, to more specific models such as Jeffries' framework for simulation (Appendix 9, available online as Supplementary Materials). Interventions based on CRM/ TeamSTEPPS® principles tended to refer to these frameworks rather than to underlying theoretical principles. Whilst not explicitly citing an underpinning model, some studies commented on aspects of learning or educational theory as informing their work. These included the cognitive, affective and psychomotor aspects of learning, experiential, adult and collaborative learning theories and mastery learning (data not shown). Active learning, with the opportunity to practise, share personal experiences and reflect on performance was thought to contribute to the success of a telephone referral intervention (Marshall et al., 2012).

Educational outcomes

Studies identified a range of benefits resulting from completing an intervention that included one or more tools for structured communication (Tables 3a-3d). Only one study (Shanks et al., 2013) reported no benefit from their intervention and no studies reported negative effects.

'Tool-specific' evaluations of interventions that aimed to improve oral or both oral and written communication reported statistically significant improvement in clarity of communication (eight studies, four statistically significant) and preparedness for clinical practice (seven studies, three statistically significant). They also reported improved awareness of the need for effective communication (six studies), of the usefulness of standardised forms of communication (seven studies) and of the importance of collaborative team working (three

studies). Four studies reported improved self-confidence; three reported improvements in students' ability to raise concerns and one study in their ability to adjust the communication to the content being delivered. Evaluations of interventions that aimed to improve written communication reported improvement in the clarity of communication (one study), greater appreciation of the usefulness of standardised forms of communication (one study) and awareness of own communication styles (one study, statistically significant).

The frequency of reporting of educational outcomes (knowledge, skills or attitudes) was not found to be significantly associated with the types of educational setting or teaching approach used (Fisher's exact tests, see Appendix 10, available online in the Supplementary Materials). However, due to the low statistical power of this analysis, only strong relationships would have been detectable.

D: main messages for clinical educators

The sections that follow outline the main themes to be drawn from studies that met seven or more of our quality indicators.

i. Content and clarity of communication

Tool-specific evaluations provided some evidence that tools for structured communication can improve students' ability to give clear and comprehensive messages and/or to receive and understand information. The clarity and content of telephone referrals made by final year medical students significantly improved following training in the use of ISBAR (identify, Situation, Background, Assessment, Request) compared with a control group and much of this improvement was still apparent six months later (Marshall et al., 2009; Marshall et al.,

2012); and medical students attending surgical morbidity and mortality conferences demonstrated significantly improved understanding of patient safety issues when presenters were required to use an adapted SBAR format to structure their presentations (Mitchell et al., 2013). Whole intervention evaluations reported similar benefits: medical students' communication skills were significantly improved following a surgical simulation curriculum based on the 'TeamSTEPPS® Essentials' course, which included the use of SBAR and the 'two-challenge' rule (Meier et al., 2012); and the use of ISOBAR in an interprofessional training ward facilitated communication at handover (Brewer & Stewart-Wynne, 2013).

In one study, introduction of ISBARR across a pre-registration nursing curriculum resulted in no significant difference in students' ability to report a videotaped critical incident (Shanks et al., 2013). These authors suggest that the lack of improvement may have resulted from methodological limitations (small sample size and timing of the evaluation) and variations in the ability or willingness of faculty to implement the new curriculum. Methodological limitations notwithstanding, it is interesting to note that this study, unlike those that reported positive effects on the content and clarity of communication, attempted to measure the effect of incorporating SBAR into a whole curriculum, rather than introducing it as part of a discrete intervention.

ii. Preparedness for clinical practice

'Tool-specific' evaluations also provide some evidence for improvements in students' perceptions of their preparedness for clinical practice; and suggest that this may be linked to increased self-confidence, including student perceptions of their ability to manage the situations that they will meet on placement. Nursing students who took part in a virtual clinical simulation that required the use of ISBAR (Foronda et al., 2014) reported increased

self-confidence; and students who took part in an interprofessional course based on TeamSTEPPS® found that that SBAR was a valuable way to structure communication (Keller et al., 2013). Again ‘Whole intervention’ evaluations report similar outcomes: a TeamSTEPPS® based interprofessional simulation course significantly increased students’ perceived self-efficacy and, by implication, their preparedness for clinical practice (Brock et al., 2013); and a TeamSTEPPS® based course to enhance safe care for a deteriorating patient improved students’ confidence in their ability to communicate effectively with other clinicians (Liaw et al., 2014b). A pre-rotation simulation programme that included use of SBAR reduced anxiety among pre-registration nursing students (Lehr & Kaplan, 2013); student confidence and preparedness for clinical practice were significantly increased following a CRM-based non-technical skills training programme that included the use of a mnemonic/memory aid (Kruger et al., 2009); and by participation in a transitions in care curriculum relating to discharge that included a standardised medication discrepancy tool (Bray-Hall et al., 2010).

iii. Transfer of learning into practice

Finally, tool-specific evaluations provide evidence that students intend to transfer their learning to their clinical work (Aebersold et al., 2013; Darcy Mahoney et al., 2013) and that, in some cases at least, they are able to do so several months after an educational intervention on the use of SBAR in telephone referrals; over 90% of the medical student participants reported that they had actually used SBAR whilst on placement (Marshall et al., 2012). However, medical students found inconsistent demonstration of TeamSTEPPS® communication techniques by qualified staff a barrier to them implementing these approaches in their clinical practice (Keller et al., 2013).

iv. Choice of tool(s)

Several studies suggest that educators need to balance a desire to introduce students to authentic tool(s) that they will meet in clinical practice with the need to introduce them to tool(s) that they can use effectively at their stage of training. Just over 10% of the medical students who had used SBAR to make a telephone referral whilst on placement experienced problems with doing so, including difficulties remembering the acronym and in ordering their thoughts; and interruptions from the recipient (Marshall et al., 2012). Paramedic students, participating in an interprofessional course to improve collaborative handoff, experienced difficulty in organising patient data into the I PASS THE BATON format (Senette et al., 2013), leading these authors to suggest that students find it easier to receive information in this format than to give it. Difficulties they observed with their students using SBAR led Aebersold and colleagues (Aebersold et al., 2013), to introduce an adapted version which they called ‘nursing crew resource management’. Their adaptation used ‘What I see, What I want, What I’m concerned about’ (3Ws) and the four step assertiveness tool, which encouraged students to ‘get attention, state the concern, offer a solution and pose a question’. These authors report that the uptake of the adapted tool by students increased compared to that of SBAR (50% and 16% respectively).

v. Positioning of teaching within the curriculum

In discussing their results, several authors expressed their support for positioning teaching about structured forms of communication later in pre-registration curricula, when students were ‘starting to be asked to make referrals’ (Marshall et al., 2012) or when it could provide ‘just in time learning’ that has ‘the potential for immediate effect on their behaviour’ (de Feijter et al., 2012).

However, timing of teaching may also be instrumental to the ability of students to learn to use tools effectively. In an intervention to improve nursing students' ability to recognise and manage a rapidly deteriorating patient (Liaw et al., 2011b), participants used an Airway Breathing Circulation Disability Exposure (ABCDE) protocol to assess the patient and SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) to report their findings. The simulation training improved students' ability to use SBAR effectively due, in large measure, to an improvement in their ability to communicate the 'Assessment' part of the tool. These authors suggested that it was the concurrent teaching of the ABCDE protocol for patient assessment that allowed the students to use SBAR effectively.

vi. Teaching through simulation

Simulation, including role-play, was the teaching approach most commonly reported by included studies. Both tool specific and whole intervention evaluations of simulation-based activities provide some evidence of educational benefit from this approach. Medical and nursing students who took part in role plays requiring the use of TeamSTEPPS® tools, such as SBAR, felt increased competence and confidence in their ability to communicate effectively and to handle conflict, having been able to practice their skills in a 'safe' environment (Keller et al., 2013); and taking part in a virtual clinical simulation using avatars significantly improved nursing students ability to give an ISBAR-based oral report (Foronda et al., 2014). TeamSTEPPS®-based interprofessional education for team communication that included simulation led to significant improvements in students' self-confidence (Brock et al., 2013); as did a similar simulation to improve students' ability to care for a deteriorating patient (Liaw et al., 2014b).

Evidence to support the use of simulation in preference to other teaching approaches is sparse. Students who had participated in role-play training were significantly better at communicating with SBAR than those who had received didactic teaching alone (Kesten, 2011). Specifically, they were significantly better at reporting the patient's treatment compared to the control group.

vii. Teaching in mixed professional groups (interprofessional education)

Several whole intervention evaluations suggest that tools for structured communication can be integrated successfully into interprofessional education (IPE). Reported effects of IPE incorporating tools such as SBAR include significant improvement in students' perceptions of interprofessional collaboration (Shrader & Griggs, 2014) and improved confidence and attitudes towards interprofessional learning (Gough et al., 2013). TeamSTEPPS® based IPE that included a range of tools improved attitudes towards collaborative working, team work and mutual support (Robertson et al., 2010; Brock et al., 2013); and significant improvements in students' self-reported confidence in their ability to communicate effectively with other team members (Liaw et al., 2014b). Cahan and colleagues (Cahan et al., 2010), who included '*perspective taking, a structured approach to team communication*', into their interprofessional curriculum found that medical students who took part were significantly more likely to ask for the nurses' perspective and to seek agreement on an action plan.

In their evaluation of an intervention to teach effective handoff strategies to nursing and paramedic students (Senette et al., 2013) noted that, whilst nursing students preferred SBAR to I PASS THE BATON, paramedic students preferred other strategies, such as active listening, check-back and allowing opportunities for questions. This suggests that the mix of

groups participating in an interprofessional intervention may influence the choice of tool(s) taught.

DISCUSSION

Our review suggests that a focus on standardised protocols for communication between members of the healthcare team is a relatively recent phenomenon in pre-registration health professions education. Our earliest included study was published in 2007 and just over half of included studies reported pilot initiatives. However, the fact that we have been able to identify 50 reports of educational interventions for pre-registration students that incorporate a tool for structured communication is testament to the growing interest in this area. Our review considered all relevant studies regardless of geographical location or language. That most included studies were from North America is perhaps also testament to the extensive work of U.S. government agencies in developing CRM based patient safety programmes (see Appendix I, available online as Supplementary Materials).

A substantial proportion of evaluations relied on self-reporting by participants, which may not reflect actual performance, particularly for inexperienced individuals (Meier et al., 2012; Stojan et al., 2015) and is a limitation common to many areas of health professions educational research. Where evaluations observed student communication directly, assessment instruments commonly included checklist items relating to students' use of the tool itself, which may lead to bias or limited assessment of wider communication skills (Marshall et al., 2009). Comparative studies were mostly before and after evaluations of a single group rather than evaluation of parallel groups (Cook, 2012); and a considerable proportion of studies evaluated the whole intervention of which the tool for structured communication was a part, rather than the specific contribution of the tool itself to the educational outcomes. Reporting of theoretical frameworks to inform intervention design or evaluation approach was limited.

Our review suggests that educational interventions that incorporate tools for structured communication may improve students' ability to communicate effectively, their self-confidence and their perceived preparedness for clinical practice. Although our studies do not demonstrate causal links between these findings, it is plausible to suggest that understanding and skill in using a tool can give a novice clinician a tangible way of approaching communication with colleagues, reducing their anxiety and building their confidence in their ability to negotiate such situations successfully. However, whilst students intend to incorporate their learning into their clinical practice, whether they are able to do this successfully is perhaps open to question.

Despite a perception that tools for structured communication are vehicles for standardisation (Thomas et al., 2009), our review suggests that students are likely to experience discrepancies between their learning and their experience in clinical setting. Where structured communication approaches are used inconsistently in the practice setting or when minor variations of standard tools are employed, this could reinforce a 'theory v. practice gap' in the minds of some students and impact on future use of the tools by the learners.

Our review also suggests that, whilst standardised communication protocols can provide a structure within which messages can be framed, they cannot compensate for underlying weaknesses in clinical reasoning. As educational models and approaches to the development of clinical reasoning skills are developed (Bowen, 2006; Levett-Jones et al., 2010; Posel et al., 2014), clear articulation of their relationship with communication is therefore appropriate. More practically, our findings suggest that the relative timings of communication and clinical reasoning teaching are an important consideration.

In a substantial proportion of our included studies, CRM-derived tools were part of unique intervention of the tutors' own devising, rather than part of a recognised CRM-based programme, with very limited information given about how students were introduced to supporting CRM principles. This may indicate that tools such as SBAR are being used out of the context for which they were originally designed, potentially losing the supporting principles that foster their effective use.

Given that the *raison d'être* of many tools is to improve communication between different healthcare professions (Leonard et al., 2004) and, consequently, to improve patient outcomes (De Meester et al., 2013), their incorporation into pre-registration IPE is a logical development. Our review indicates that such teaching to date has been primarily within uni-professional groups of medical or nursing students, but does include examples of successful incorporation into interprofessional programmes. In their perceptive account of IPE involving nursing and paramedic students, Senette and colleagues (Senette et al., 2013) highlight some of the complexities associated with teaching tools for structured communication inter-professionally, particularly the potential for differences in approach and perspective between professions. Their observations echo concerns that application of CRM to the interprofessional setting '*should be undertaken with a degree of thoughtfulness and care*' (Reeves et al., 2013) and suggest that such integration should be undertaken with due regard to recognised principles for effective IPE (Centre for the Advancement of Interprofessional Education, 2015).

Our review provides only limited information about the influence of teaching approach on the nature or extent of student learning. Although our included studies cite a variety of educational theories and models as underpinning their interventions, a focus on active

learning through interactive teaching methods, particularly simulation, was apparent. The potential benefits of simulation in giving students the opportunity to practice their skills in a 'safe' environment, are well recognised (Issenberg et al., 2003); and a recent review of simulation-based education for teaching CRM principles has reported improved learning compared to didactic methods (Fung et al., 2015). Our review is consistent with these findings; and suggests that clinical educators planning to incorporate tools for structured communication into their pre-registration curricula may wish to consider the use of simulation as a teaching approach.

Incorporation of tools for structured communication into pre-registration health professions curricula is a young but expanding field of interest. Whilst some evidence of the educational effects and implications of these innovations is available, there is still a great deal to be learned about how such tools can best be used to enhance student learning. There is a need to strengthen the evidence base for the reported benefits of structured tools by assessing the outcome of the communication as a whole, rather than students' adherence to the tool itself; and to explore how and why the use of a tool for structured communication leads to educational benefits. This latter could perhaps begin with investigation of the role of critical reflection, which has been identified as a mechanism that supports student thinking about patient safety more broadly (Ambrose & Ker, 2014). Our review did not identify any 'clarification studies' (Cook et al., 2008) and relatively few of our included authors speculated on the reasons for the effects they observed. Ways of maximising translation of the use of structured tools into practice would also be a useful area of enquiry given that our review provided mixed evidence for transfer of tools into clinical placement and did not identify any longitudinal studies of use beyond qualification.

More broadly, there is a need to explore further the extent to which tools for structured communication should be incorporated into pre-registration curricula, particularly their integration with wider teaching of decision-making and clinical reasoning; and to consider more specifically how the incorporation of such tools influences IPE outcomes. Given that translation of tools such as SBAR into languages other than English is beginning (Amalberti, 2016), exploration of their value to pre-registration students in non-English speaking contexts would also be valuable. Our review identified few examples of interventions incorporating tools specifically for written communication, despite the importance of good written communication for patient safety (Kripalani et al., 2007) and none considered tools for structured communication in the context of mobile communications and other rapidly developing information technologies that are beginning to influence team communication in clinical practice (Johnston et al., 2015).

Whilst we have conducted our review in line with current best practice, our work has several limitations. Although we have made strenuous efforts to search the available literature, it is possible that some interventions are teaching tools for structured communication, but that these are not reported in sufficient detail to be captured by our searches. This may have led to some under-reporting of the extent of such teaching, particularly of early studies prior to 2007. Whilst we have tried to encompass the scope of this emerging literature by considering all outcomes reported by relevant studies, this has resulted in a heterogeneous set of studies for which only limited synthesis is appropriate. Our quality checklist was designed to reflect intellectual rigour in approach and to be applicable to all studies (Buckley et al., 2009), and did not favour studies from one profession or year of publication. However, it could be argued that separate checklists for particular study designs and/or weighting of particular quality indicators would provide a more nuanced assessment of study quality. Whilst we were

mindful that our chosen checklist did not include all possible quality indicators for qualitative studies (Tong et al., 2007; Tracy, 2010), most included studies were descriptive or justification studies with qualitative investigations often not theoretically framed (Keller *et al.*, 2013). In our narrative synthesis, our selection of emerging themes from the data was necessarily subjective, and was based on our judgement of what would be most relevant to clinical educators and future researchers.

CONCLUSIONS

Pre-registration students, particularly in the US, are learning to use tools for structured communication, either in specific sessions or integrated into wider educational interventions. Reports suggest that students are mostly learning to use SBAR and its variants, in uni-professional groups and often in simulation. Learning to use one or more tools may improve the clarity and comprehensiveness of student communications, their perceived self-confidence and their sense of preparedness for clinical practice. However, there is as yet little evidence relating to the transfer of these skills to the clinical setting. Clinical educators need to consider the positioning of such learning with that for other skills such as clinical reasoning and decision-making. This is an early but growing literature in which reported evaluations of interventions are mostly descriptive or justification studies using self-reporting of changes in knowledge, skills or attitudes.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Our review group included individuals with expertise in health professions education, education research, literature searching and information retrieval, systematic review methods and statistics. All reviewers conceived and designed the review and contributed to the final report. Additional responsibilities were: Sharon Buckley (lead reviewer, all aspects); James Hodson (statistical analysis); Sarah Pittaway (literature searches), Lucy Ambrose, Elizabeth Anderson, Jamie Coleman, Marianne Hensman, Christine Hirsch, David Morley, Jonathan Stewart (article selection, data extraction and evidence synthesis).

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

This study was funded in part by a National Teaching Fellowship awarded to Sharon Buckley by the Higher Education Academy, UK.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Frances Annull, Adrian Buckley, Alessandro Lazdins, Jens Murphy and Flemming Jakobsen for assistance with translation; Lisa Hill for assistance with retrieval of articles; and Kathryn Buckley for clerical support. We would also like to thank Rhona Patey, Stuart Marshall and Marilyn Hammick for their advice during the preparation of our review protocol.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Jonathan Stewart is a qualified TeamSTEPPS® instructor. No conflicts of interest are known to the authors.

Table 1:

Glossary of terms and abbreviations

Explanations of relevant approaches to education and training are given, together with clarification of common mnemonics that summarise tools for structured communication. We define tool for structured communication as a standardised protocol for information exchange between members of the health care team, the aim of which is to improve the effectiveness of communication. For terms marked*, further information can be found in Appendix 1 (available online as Supplementary Materials)

(a) Education and training approaches in aviation and health care

Term	Descripti on	Definition
CRM*	Crew Resource Managem ent	An approach to the training of flight crews that aims to improve aviation safety by harnessing the power of teamwork to reduce the negative consequences of human error. CRM training programmes focus on developing the cognitive and interpersonal skills needed for effective teamwork, encouraging contributions from all team members whilst maintaining appropriate authority and a chain of command (Wiener et al., 2010)
TeamSTEPPS® *	Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance	A comprehensive CRM-based programme for the training of healthcare teams developed by the US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) and US Department of Defence. TeamSTEPPS® aims to improve teamwork through training in four main domains:

	Performan ce Patient Safety	leadership, situation monitoring, mutual support and communication (King et al., 2008).
IPE	Interprofe ssional Education	An approach to health professions education in which ‘two or more professions learn about, from and with each other to enable effective collaboration and improved health outcomes’ (World Health Organisation, 2010). IPE contrasts with traditional health professions education, in which individual professions learn in isolation from other professions.

(b) Tools for structured communication

Mnemonic	Components
SBAR*	Situation, B ackground, A ssessment, R ecommendation (or R equest or R esponse)
ISBAR	Introduction (or I dentify, S ituation, R ecommendation (or R equest)
ISBARR	Introduction (or I dentify), S ituation, R ecommendation, R ead back
ISOBAR	I dentify, S ituation, O bservation, B ackground, A gree plan/actions, R ead back
ISOBARR	Introduction, S ituation, B ackground, A ssessment, R ecommendation, R ead back
IPASS (the) BATON	Introduction - P atient, A ssessment, S ituation, S afety concerns - B ackground, A ctions, T iming, O wnership, N ext
SIGN- OUT	S ick (or DNR?), I dentifying data, G eneral hospital course, N ew events - O verall status, U pcoming possibilities, T asks

SAIF-IR	Summary statement(s), A ctive issues, I f-then contingency planning, F ollow up – Interactive questioning, R ead-backs
DESC	D escribe, E xplain, S hare, C ompromise
CUS	C oncerned, U ncomfortable, S cared
The 3Ws	W hat I see, W hat I'm concerned about , W hat I want
4-step tool	A ttention, C oncern, S olution, Q uestion
SOAP	S ubjective, O bjective, A ssessment, P lan
ITEP	I ndividual T herapy and E valuation P lan
GRRR	G reeting, R espectful listening, R eviewing, R ecommending or R equesting more information,
Just Go NUTS	N ame, U nique, T ubes, S afety

Table 3: Summary of included studies

Tools for structured communication reported by all included studies are listed according to type of tool and of evaluation, together with the profession(s) involved (x) and the effect on knowledge, skills and/or attitudes: (significantly) positive (S)+; no change (0). No studies reported negative effects.

Table 3a: SBAR and variations only (Tool-specific evaluations)

Author	Tool	Description	Profession(s)			Effect on knowledge						Effect on skills				Effect on attitudes				
			Medicine	Nursing	Other Health	Need for effective comm'n	Team/collaborative working	Own comm'n styles	Structured tools	Handover	Patient safety	Clarity of comm'n	Ability to voice concerns	Active listening/comm'n	Adjustment to content	Comm'n skills (general)	Towards use of tools	Self-confidence	Team working/mutual support	Professionalism
(Bagnasco et al., 2011)	SBAR	Situation Background Assessment Recommendation		X												+				
(Berg et al., 2010)		" "	X	X		+	+									+	+			
(Darcy Mahoney et al., 2013)		" "		X												+				+
(Fay-Hillier et al., 2012)		" "		X		+	+	+				+	+			+				+
(Jenkins et al., 2011)		" "		X								+					+			+
(Kesten, 2011)		" "		X							+									
(Krautschied, 2008)		" "		X												+				
(Liaw et al., 2011a)		" "		X												+				
(Mitchell et al., 2013)		" "	X													S+				
(Keller et al., 2013)	SBARR	SBAR (Request)	X	X		+	+									+	+	+		+
(Marshall et al., 2012)	ISBAR	(Identify)SBA(Request)	X			+					+					+				
(Foronda et al., 2014)	ISBAR	(Identification)SBA(Recommendation)		X		+				+						S+	+			
(Marshall et al., 2009)	ISBAR	(Identify)SBA(Recommendation)	X													S+	S			
(Shanks et al., 2013)	ISBARR	(Identify)SBAR(Recommendation Read back)		X												0				

Table 3b: Included studies: SBAR and variations only (Whole intervention evaluations)

Author	Tool	Description	Profession(Effect on knowledge						Effect on skills				Effect on attitudes					
			Medicine	Nursing	Other Health	Need for effective commun'n	Team/collaborative working	Own commun'n styles	Structured tools	Handover	Patient safety	Clarity of commun'n	Ability to voice concerns	Active listening/commun'n	Adjustment to content	Commun'n skills (general)	Towards use of tools	Self-confidence	Team working/mutual support	Professionalism	Prep'ness for clinical practice
(Bartges, 2012)	SBAR	Situation Background Assessment Recommendation		X								+			S+						
(Brock et al., 2013)	SBAR	" "	X	X	X	0	S	S								S	S	S			
(Darbyshire et al., 2013)	SBAR	" "	X				+	+				+									
(Kearney et al., 2010)	SBAR	" "	X	X	X		+						+					S			+
(Ramirez et al., 2013)	SBAR	" "		X														+		+	
(Shrader & Griggs, 2014)	SBAR	" "	X	X	X													S			
(Lehr & Kaplan, 2013)	SBAR	SBA(Response)		X														+			+
(de Feijter et al., 2012)	SBAR	" "	X			+							+					+			
(Gough et al., 2013)	SBAR	" "	X	X	X													+	+		
(Masters et al., 2013)	ISBAR	(Introduction)SBA(Recommendation)		X	X		+							+		+	+	+			
(Jones, 2013)	ISBAR R	(Introduction)SBA(Recommendation Read back)		X									S						+		
(Brewer & Stewart-Wynne, 2013)	ISOBAR	(Identify)S(Observations)B(Agree plan Read back)	X	X	X	+									+						

Table 3c: Included studies: other CRM-derived tools and combinations including SBAR (all evaluations)

Type	Author	Tool(s)	Professions			Effect on knowledge						Effect on skills				Effect on attitudes				
			Medicine	Nursing	Other Health	Need for effective comm'n	Team/collaborative working	Own commun'n styles	Structured tools	Handover	Patient safety	Clarity of commun'n	Ability to voice concerns	Active listening/commun'n	Adjustment to content	Commun'n skills (general)	Towards use of tools	Self-confidence	Team working/mutual support	Professionalism
Tool specific	(Horwitz et al., 2007)	SIGN-OUT	X			+														S+
	(Farnan et al., 2010)	SIGN-OUT, ANTiC, Read-back	X																	S+
	(Aebersold et al., 2013)	WWW, 4-step assertiveness tool		X								+			+					+
Whole intervention	(Meier et al., 2012)	SBAR, 2 challenge rule	X											S+		S+				
	(Senette et al., 2013)	I PASS the BATON		X	X	+	+	+							+		+			
	(Robertson et al., 2010)	SBAR, check back	X	X			S+										S+			
	(Liaw et al., 2014b)	SBAR, check back, call-out	X	X												S+	S+			
	(Liaw et al., 2014a)	SBAR, check back, call-out		X			S+													S+
	(Debourgh, 2012)	SBAR, check back, call out, 2 challenge rule, DESC, CUS		X			S+									+				+
	(Johnson et al., 2011)	SBAR, check back, call out, 2 challenge rule, DESC		X														+		
	(Gordon, 2013)	SBAR, check back, call out	X								S+									
	(Chu et al., 2010)	SAIF-IR	X				S+	S+	S+	S+		S+		S+	0					S+
	(Kruger et al., 2009)	CRM mnemonic (not specified)	X				S+										S+			S+
(Baker & Durham, 2013)	Team STEPPS* tools (not specified)	X	X	X						S+		S+					+			


Table 3d: Included studies: SOAP notes and other tools (all evaluations)

Type	Author	Description	Profession(s)			Effect on knowledge/understanding						Effect on skills				Effect on attitudes				
			Medicine	Nursing	Other Health	Need for effective comm'n	Team/collaborative working	Own comm'n styles	Structured tools	Handover	Patient safety	Clarity of comm'n	Ability to voice concerns	Active listening/comm'n	Adjustment to content	Comm'n skills (general)	Towards use of tools	Self-confidence	Team working/mutual support	Professionalism
Tool specific	(Chen et al., 2014)	Subjective, Objective, Assessment, Plan (SOAP)	X													+				
	(Franson et al., 2009)	Individual Therapy and Evaluation Plan (ITEP)	X					S+												
Whole intervention	(Klamen et al., 2009)	<i>Subjective Objective Assessment Plan (SOAP)</i>	X							+						+				
	(Medina et al., 2008)	“ “			X							+								
Tool specific	(McGlade et al., 2012)	Structured template for written case reports	X									+								+
	(Lavsa et al., 2009)	Template for implementing the modified systematic approach to drug information queries			X							S+								S+
Whole intervention	(Bray-Hall et al., 2010)	<i>Medication Discrepancy Tool (MDT)</i>	X														S+			+
	(Ellison et al., 2008)	<i>Communication and Interpersonal Skills Checklist (CIPS)</i>	X												+					
	(Cahan et al., 2010)	<i>Perspective taking (a structured approach to communication)</i>	X										S+					S+		
	(Eskildsen et al., 2012)	<i>Ideal Discharge for an Elderly Patient: a hospitalist checklist (adaptation)</i>	X			+						+				+				

Figure 2:

The aims of educational interventions incorporating tools for structured communication

The frequency of particular educational aims is shown as a proportion (%) of the number of interventions reported (n=50). Seven studies cited two main aims rather than one: both of these were included in the analysis. 'Communication' includes all studies that cited general improvement in communication as their main aim, without further clarification.



Practice Points

- Pre-registration students, particularly in the US, are learning to use tools for structured communication, either in specific sessions or integrated into wider educational interventions.
- Students are mostly learning to use SBAR and its variants, in uni-professional groups and often in simulation.
- There is some evidence that learning to use one or more tools can improve the clarity and comprehensiveness of student communications, their perceived self-confidence and their sense of preparedness for clinical practice.
- As yet, there is little evidence relating to the transfer of these skills to the clinical setting.
- Reported studies suggest that clinical educators will need to consider the positioning of such learning with that for other skills such as clinical reasoning and decision-making.

REFERENCES

- Aebersold, M., Tschannen, D., & Culli, G. (2013). Improving nursing students' communication skills using crew resource management strategies. *J. Nurs. Educ.*, 52(3), 125.
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. (2005). Chapter 2 Training Teams. *Medical Teamwork and Patient Safety: the Evidence Based Relation*. from <http://archive.ahrq.gov/research/findings/final-reports/medteam/chapter2.html>
- Amalberti, R. (2016). I practice SAED...and you? *La Prevention Medicale* from <https://www.prevention-medicale.org/Chiffres-et-Methodes-de-prevention/Methodes-de-prevention/sbar>
- Ambrose, L., & Ker, J. (2014). Levels of reflective thinking and patient safety: an investigation of the mechanisms that impact on student learning in a single cohort over a 5 year curriculum. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 19(3), 297-310. doi: 10.1007/s10459-013-9470-8
- Armitage, G., Cracknell, A., Forrest, K., & Sandars, J. (2011). Twelve tips for implementing a patient safety curriculum in an undergraduate programme in medicine. *Medical Teacher*, 33(7), 535-540. doi: doi:10.3109/0142159X.2010.546449
- Bagnasco, A., Poletto, C., Proverbio, R., Rosa, F., & Sasso, L. (2011). Doctor-nurse effective communication: Situation background assessment recommendation (SBAR) survey between students of an Italian paediatric nursing degree program. *Acta Paediatrica, International Journal of Paediatrics*, 100, 111-112. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1651-2227.2011.02488.x>
- Baker, M. J., & Durham, C. F. (2013). Interprofessional Education: A Survey of Students' Collaborative Competency Outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 52(12), 713-718. doi: 10.3928/01484834-20131118-04
- Bartges, M. (2012). Pairing students in clinical assignments to develop collaboration and communication skills. *Nurse Educator*, 37(1), 17-22. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0b013e318238372c>
- Berg, B. W., Wong, L., & Vincent, D. S. (2010). Technology-enabled interprofessional education for nursing and medical students: A pilot study. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 24(5), 601-604. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/13561820903373194>
- Bowen, J. L. (2006). Educational Strategies to Promote Clinical Diagnostic Reasoning. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 355(21), 2217-2225. doi: doi:10.1056/NEJMra054782
- Bray-Hall, S., Schmidt, K., & Agaard, E. (2010). Toward safe hospital discharge: a transitions in care curriculum for medical students. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 25(8), 878-881. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11606-010-1364-3>
- Brewer, M. L., & Stewart-Wynne, E. G. (2013). An Australian hospital-based student training ward delivering safe, client-centred care while developing students' interprofessional practice capabilities. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 27(6), 482-488. doi: 10.3109/13561820.2013.811639
- Brock, D., Abu-Rish, E., Chia-Ru, C., Hammer, D., Wilson, S., Vorvick, L., Blondon, K., Schaad, D., Liner, D., & Zierler, B. (2013). Interprofessional education in team communication: working together to improve patient safety. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 22(5), 414-423. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2012-000952
- Buckley, S., Coleman, J., Davison, I., Khan, K. S., Zamora, J., Malick, S., Morley, D., Pollard, D., Ashcroft, T., Popovic, C., & Sayers, J. (2009). The educational effects of portfolios on undergraduate student learning: A Best Evidence Medical Education (BEME) systematic review. BEME Guide No. 11. *Medical Teacher*, 31(4), 282-298. doi: 10.1080/01421590902889897
- Cahan, M. A., Larkin, A. C., Starr, S., Wellman, S., Haley, H. L., Sullivan, K., Shah, S., Hirsh, M., Litwin, D., & Quirk, M. (2010). A Human Factors Curriculum for Surgical Clerkship Students. *Archives of Surgery*, 145(12), 1151-1157. doi: 10.1001/archsurg.2010.252

- Centre for the Advancement of Interprofessional Education. (2015). Principles of Interprofessional Education. from <http://caipe.org.uk/resources/principles-of-interprofessional-education/>
- Chen, D. T., Green, S. A., & McCollum, M. A. (2014). Practising standardised team communication in the anatomy laboratory. *Medical Education*, 48(11), 1109-1110. doi: 10.1111/medu.12581
- Chu, E. S., Reid, M., Burden, M., Mancini, D., Schulz, T., Keniston, A., Sarcone, E., & Albert, R. K. (2010). Effectiveness of a course designed to teach handoffs to medical students. *Journal of Hospital Medicine (Online)*, 5(6), 344-348. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jhm.633>
- Cook, D. (2012). If you teach them, they will learn: why medical education needs comparative effectiveness research. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 17(3), 305-310. doi: 10.1007/s10459-012-9381-0
- Cook, D. A., Bordage, G., & Schmidt, H. G. (2008). Description, justification and clarification: a framework for classifying the purposes of research in medical education. *Medical Education*, 42(2), 128-133. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2007.02974.x
- Darbyshire, D., Gordon, M., & Baker, P. (2013). Teaching handover of care to medical students. *Clin. Teach.*, 10(1), 32.
- Darcy Mahoney, A. E., Hancock, L. E., Iorianni-Cimbak, A., & Curley, M. A. Q. (2013). Using high-fidelity simulation to bridge clinical and classroom learning in undergraduate pediatric nursing. *Nurse Education Today*, 33(6), 648-654. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2012.01.005>
- de Feijter, J. M., de Grave, W. S., Hopmans, E. M., Koopmans, R. P., & Scherpbier, A. (2012). Reflective learning in a patient safety course for final-year medical students. *Medical Teacher*, 34(11), 946-954. doi: 10.3109/0142159x.2012.714873
- De Meester, K., Verspuy, M., Monsieurs, K. G., & Van Bogaert, P. (2013). SBAR improves nurse-physician communication and reduces unexpected death: A pre and post intervention study. *Resuscitation*, 84(9), 1192-1196. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2013.03.016>
- Debourgh, G. A. (2012). Synergy for patient safety and quality: academic and service partnerships to promote effective nurse education and clinical practice. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 28(1), 48-61. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2011.06.003>
- Ellison, S., Sullivan, C., Quaintance, J., Arnold, L., & Godfrey, P. (2008). Critical care recognition, management and communication skills during an emergency medicine clerkship. *Medical Teacher*, 30(9-10), e228-e238. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01421590802334259>
- Eskildsen, M. A., Chakkalakal, R., & Flacker, J. M. (2012). Use of a virtual classroom in training fourth-year medical students on care transitions. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 7(1), 14-21. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jhm.915>
- Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre. (2010, 2010). Methods for Conducting Systematic Reviews. from <https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=hQBu8y4uVwI%3D&tabid=88>
- Farnan, J. M., Paro, J. A., Rodriguez, R. M., Reddy, S. T., Horwitz, L. I., Johnson, J. K., & Arora, V. M. (2010). Hand-off education and evaluation: Piloting the Observed Simulated Hand-off Experience (OSHE). *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 25(2), 129-134. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11606-009-1170-y>
- Fay-Hillier, T. M., Regan, R. V., & Gallagher Gordon, M. (2012). Communication and patient safety in simulation for mental health nursing education. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 33(11), 718-726. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/01612840.2012.709585>
- Fleiss, J., Cohen, J., & Everitt, B. (1969). Large sample standard errors of kappa and weighted kappa. *Psychological Bulletin*, 725.
- Flin, R. H., O'Connor, P., & Crichton, M. (2008). Safety at the sharp end a guide to non-technical skills. from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=590581>

- Foronda, C., Gattamorta, K., Snowden, K., & Bauman, E. B. (2014). Use of virtual clinical simulation to improve communication skills of baccalaureate nursing students: A pilot study. *Nurse Education Today*, 34(6), e53-e57. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.10.007>
- Franson, K. L., Dubois, E. A., de Kam, M. L., Burggraaf, J., & Cohen, A. F. (2009). Creating a culture of thoughtful prescribing. *Medical Teacher*, 31(5), 415-419. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01421590802520931>
- Fung, L., Boet, S., Bould, M. D., Qosa, H., Perrier, L., Tricco, A., Tavares, W., & Reeves, S. (2015). Impact of crisis resource management simulation-based training for interprofessional and interdisciplinary teams: A systematic review. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 29(5), 433-444. doi: 10.3109/13561820.2015.1017555
- Gordon, M. (2013). Non-technical skills training to enhance patient safety. *The clinical teacher*, 10(3), 170-175. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-498X.2012.00640.x
- Gordon, S., Mendenhall, P., & O'Connor, B. B. (2012). *Culture and Politics of Health Care : Beyond the Checklist : What Else Health Care Can Learn from Aviation Teamwork and Safety*. Ithaca, US: ILR Press.
- Gordon, S., Mendenhall, P., & O'Connor, B. B. (2013). Beyond the checklist what else health care can learn from aviation teamwork and safety. from <http://site.ebrary.com/id/10629485>
- Gough, S., Jones, N., & Hellaby, M. (2013). Innovations in interprofessional learning and teaching: providing opportunities to embed patient safety within the pre-registration physiotherapy curriculum. A Pilot Study. 18(6), 416. doi: 10.1179/1743288X13Y.0000000103
- Grey Literature Network Service. (2015). About GreyNet. from <http://www.greynet.org/home/aboutgreynet.html>
- Haig, K. M., Sutton, S., & Whittington, J. (2006). SBAR: A Shared Mental Model for Improving Communication Between Clinicians. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 32(3), 167-175.
- Herschel, R., Nemati, H., & Steiger, D. (2001). Tacit to explicit knowledge conversion: knowledge exchange protocols. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(1), 107-116. doi: 10.1108/13673270110384455
- Horwitz, L. I., Moin, T., & Green, M. L. (2007). Development and implementation of an oral sign-out skills curriculum. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 22(10), 1470-1474. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11606-007-0331-0>
- Hynes, H., Stoyanov, S., Drachsler, H., Maher, B., Orrego, C., Stieger, L., Druener, S., Sopka, S., Schröder, H., & Henn, P. (2015). Designing Learning Outcomes for Handoff Teaching of Medical Students Using Group Concept Mapping: Findings From a Multicountry European Study. *Academic Medicine*, 90(7), 988-994. doi: 10.1097/acm.0000000000000642
- Institute of Medicine. (2000). 3, Why Do Errors Happen? *To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System*. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US) for the Institute of Medicine Committee on Quality of Health Care in America;
- Issenberg, S. B., Pringle, S., Harden, R. M., Khogali, S., & Gordon, M. S. (2003). Adoption and integration of simulation-based learning technologies into the curriculum of a UK Undergraduate Education Programme. *Medical Education*, 37, 42-49. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2923.37.s1.10.x
- Jenkins, S., Blake, J., Brandy-Webb, P., & Ashe, W. (2011). Teaching patient safety in simulated learning experiences. *Nurse Educator*, 36(3), 112-117. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0b013e31821611dc>
- Johnson, M., Hamilton, M., Delaney, B., & Pennington, N. (2011). Development of team skills in novice nurses through an athletic coaching model. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 6(4), 185-189. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2011.05.005>
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 112-133. doi: 10.1177/1558689806298224

- Johnston, M. J., King, D., Arora, S., Behar, N., Athanasiou, T., Sevdalis, N., & Darzi, A. (2015). Smartphones let surgeons know WhatsApp: an analysis of communication in emergency surgical teams. *The American Journal of Surgery*, 209(1), 45-51. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2014.08.030>
- Jones, A. D. (2013). The impact of integrating Quality and Safety Education for Nurses' safety competency in first-year associate degree nursing students. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 8(4), 140-146. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2013.06.001>
- Kearney, A., Adey, T., Bursey, M., Cooze, L., Dillon, C., Barrett, J., King-Jesso, P., & McCarthy, P. (2010). Enhancing patient safety through undergraduate inter-professional health education. *Healthcare Quarterly*, 13 Spec No, 88-93.
- Keller, K. B., Eggenberger, T. L., Belkowitz, J., Sarsekeyeva, M., & Zito, A. R. (2013). Implementing successful interprofessional communication opportunities in health care education: a qualitative analysis. 4, 253. doi: 10.5116/ijme.5290.bca6
- Kesten, K. S. (2011). Role-play using SBAR technique to improve observed communication skills in senior nursing students. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 50(2), 79-87. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20101230-02>
- King, H., Battles, J., Baker, D., Alonso, A., Salas, E., Webster, J., Toomey, L., & Salisbury, M. (2008). Team STEPPS: Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance Performance and Patient Safety. *Advances in Patient Safety: new directions and alternative approaches*, 3: Performance and Tools, 5-19.
- Klamen, D. L., Reynolds, K. L., Yale, B., & Aiello, M. (2009). Students learning handovers in a simulated in-patient unit. *Medical Education*, 43(11), 1097-1098. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03488.x>
- Krautschied, L. C. (2008). Improving Communication among Healthcare Providers: Preparing Student Nurses for Practice. 5, 1. doi: 10.2202/1548-923X.1647
- Kripalani, S., LeFevre, F., Phillips, C. O., Williams, M. V., Basaviah, P., & Baker, D. W. (2007). Deficits in communication and information transfer between hospital-based and primary care physicians: Implications for patient safety and continuity of care. *JAMA*, 297(8), 831-841. doi: 10.1001/jama.297.8.831
- Kruger, A., Gillmann, B., Hardt, C., Doring, R., Beckers, S. K., & Rossaint, R. (2009). [Teaching non-technical skills for critical incidents: Crisis resource management training for medical students]. *Anaesthetist*, 58(6), 582-588. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00101-009-1511-6>
- Lavsa, S. M., Corman, S. L., Verrico, M. M., & Pummer, T. L. (2009). Effect of drug information request templates on pharmacy student compliance with the modified systematic approach to answering drug information questions. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy*, 43(11), 1795-1801. doi: 10.1345/aph.1M293
- Lehr, S. T., & Kaplan, B. (2013). A Mental Health Simulation Experience for Baccalaureate Student Nurses. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 9(10), e425-e431. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2012.12.003>
- Leonard, M., Graham, S., & Bonacum, D. (2004). The human factor: the critical importance of effective teamwork and communication in providing safe care. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 13(suppl 1), i85-i90. doi: 10.1136/qshc.2004.010033
- Levett-Jones, T., Hoffman, K., Dempsey, J., Jeong, S. Y.-S., Noble, D., Norton, C. A., Roche, J., & Hickey, N. (2010). The 'five rights' of clinical reasoning: An educational model to enhance nursing students' ability to identify and manage clinically 'at risk' patients. *Nurse Education Today*, 30(6), 515-520. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2009.10.020>
- Liaw, S. Y., Koh, Y., Dawood, R., Kowitlawakul, Y., Zhou, W., & Lau, S. T. (2014a). Easing student transition to graduate nurse: A SIMulated Professional Learning Environment (SIMPLE) for final year student nurses. *Nurse Education Today*, 34(3), 349-355. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.04.026>

- Liaw, S. Y., Rethans, J. J., Scherpbier, A., & Piyanee, K. Y. (2011a). Rescuing A Patient In Deteriorating Situations (RAPIDS): A simulation-based educational program on recognizing, responding and reporting of physiological signs of deterioration. *Resuscitation*, *82*(9), 1224-1230. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2011.04.014>
- Liaw, S. Y., Scherpbier, A., Klainin-Yobas, P., & Rethans, J.-J. (2011b). Rescuing A Patient In Deteriorating Situations (RAPIDS): an evaluation tool for assessing simulation performance on clinical deterioration. *Resuscitation*, *82*(11), 1434-1439. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2011.06.008>
- Liaw, S. Y., Zhou, W. T., Lau, T. C., Siau, C., & Chan, S. W.-c. (2014b). An interprofessional communication training using simulation to enhance safe care for a deteriorating patient. *Nurse Education Today*, *34*(2), 259-264. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.02.019>
- Marshall, S., Harrison, J., & Flanagan, B. (2009). The teaching of a structured tool improves the clarity and content of interprofessional clinical communication. *Quality & Safety in Health Care*, *18*(2), 137-140. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2007.025247>
- Marshall, S. D., Harrison, J. C., & Flanagan, B. (2012). Telephone referral education, and evidence of retention and transfer after six-months. *BMC Medical Education*, *12*, 38. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-12-38>
- Masters, C., O'Toole Baker, V., & Jodon, H. (2013). Multidisciplinary, Team-Based Learning: The Simulated Interdisciplinary to Multidisciplinary Progressive-Level Education (SIMPLE©) Approach. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, *9*(5), e171-e178. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2011.11.007>
- McGlade, K., Cargo, C., Fogarty, D., Boohan, M., & McMullin, M. (2012). Handwritten undergraduate case reports. *The clinical teacher*, *9*(2), 112-118. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-498X.2011.00494.x>
- Medina, M. S., Stark, J. E., Vesta, K. S., & Lockhart, S. M. (2008). Evaluating the impact of a pre-rotation workshop on student preparation for clinical advanced pharmacy practice experiences. *Pharmacy Practice*, *6*(4), 219-223.
- Meier, A. H., Boehler, M. L., McDowell, C. M., Schwind, C., Markwell, S., Roberts, N. K., & Sanfey, H. (2012). A surgical simulation curriculum for senior medical students based on TeamSTEPS. *Archives of Surgery*, *147*(8), 761-766. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archsurg.2012.1340>
- Miller, G. E. (1990). The assessment of clinical skills/competence/performance. *Academic Medicine*, *65*(9), S63-67.
- Mitchell, E. L., Lee, D. Y., Arora, S., Kenney-Moore, P., Liem, T. K., Landry, G. J., Moneta, G. L., & Sevdalis, N. (2013). Improving the Quality of the Surgical Morbidity and Mortality Conference: A Prospective Intervention Study. *Academic Medicine*, *88*(6), 824-830. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0b013e31828f87fe
- Passi, V., Johnson, S., Peile, E., Wright, S., Hafferty, F., & Johnson, N. (2013). Doctor role modelling in medical education: BEME Guide No. 27. *Medical Teacher*, *35*(9), e1422-e1436. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2013.806982
- Popay, J., Roberts, Helen, Sowden, amanda, Petticrew, Mark, Arai, Lisa, Rodgers, Mark, Britten, Nicky, Roen Katrina, Duffy, Steven. (2006). Guidance on the Conduct of Narrative Synthesis in Systematic Reviews: a product from the ESRC Methods Programme
- Posel, N., McGee, J. B., & Fleiszer, D. M. (2014). Twelve tips to support the development of clinical reasoning skills using virtual patient cases. *Medical Teacher*, *37*(9), 813-818. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2014.993951
- Ramirez, Y., Zimmerman, R., & Judson, L. (2013). A Student Nurse Externship Program: Academia and Service Collaboration. *4*(1), 39.
- Reeves, S., Kitto, S., & Masiello, I. (2013). Crew resource management: How well does it translate to an interprofessional healthcare context? *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *27*(3), 207-209. doi: 10.3109/13561820.2012.748722

- Riesenberg, L. A., Leisch, J., & Cunningham, J. M. (2010). Nursing Handoffs: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *AJN The American Journal of Nursing*, 110(4), 24-34. doi: 10.1097/01.naj.0000370154.79857.09
- Riesenberg, L. A., Leitzsch, J., & Little, B. W. (2009). Systematic Review of Handoff Mnemonics Literature. *American Journal of Medical Quality*. doi: 10.1177/1062860609332512
- Robertson, B., Kaplan, B., Atallah, H., Higgins, M., Lewitt, M. J., & Ander, D., S. . (2010). The use of simulation and a modified TeamSTEPS curriculum for medical and nursing student team training. *Simulation in Healthcare: The Journal of The Society for Medical Simulation*, 5(6), 332-337. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/SIH.0b013e3181f008ad>
- Senette, L., O'Malley, M., & Hendrix, T. (2013). Passing the Baton: Using Simulation to Develop Student Collaboration. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 9(2), e39-46. doi: 10.1016/j.ecns.2011.08.005
- Shanks, L. C., Enlow, M., & Guhde, J. (2013). Students' ability to communicate a critical situation after implementation of ISBARR in an undergraduate nursing curriculum. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*.
- Shrader, S., & Griggs, C. (2014). Multiple Interprofessional Education Activities Delivered Longitudinally Within a Required Clinical Assessment Course. 78(1), 14. doi: 10.5688/ajpe78114
- Stojan, J. N., Schiller, J. H., Mullan, P., Fitzgerald, J. T., Christner, J., Ross, P. T., Middlemas, S., Haftel, H., Stansfield, R. B., & Lypson, M. L. (2015). Medical school handoff education improves postgraduate trainee performance and confidence. *Medical Teacher*, 37(3), 281-288. doi: doi:10.3109/0142159X.2014.947939
- The Joint Commission. (2015). Sentinel Event Data - Root Causes by Event Type. from http://www.jointcommission.org/Sentinel_Event_Statistics/
- Thomas, C. M., Bertram, E., & Johnson, D. (2009). The SBAR communication technique: teaching nursing students professional communication skills. *Nurse Educator*, 34(4), 176-180. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0b013e3181aaba54>
- Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851.
- Von Fragstein, M., Silverman, J., Cushing, A., Quilligan, S., Salisbury, H., & Wiskin, C. (2008). UK consensus statement on the content of communication curricula in undergraduate medical education. *Medical Education*, 42(11), 1100-1107. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03137.x
- Weller, J. M., Torrie, J., Boyd, M., Frengley, R., Garden, A., Ng, W. L., & Frampton, C. (2014). Improving team information sharing with a structured call-out in anaesthetic emergencies: a randomized controlled trial. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 112(6), 1042-1049. doi: 10.1093/bja/aet579
- Wiener, E. L., Kanki, B. G., & Helmreich, R. L. (2010). *Crew resource management*: Academic Press.
- World Health Organisation. (2010). Framework for action on interprofessional education and collaborative practice.
- World Health Organisation. (2011). Patient Safety Curriculum Guide Multi-Professional Edition. from <http://www.who.int/patientsafety/education/curriculum/en/index.html>