# C-ICE 2.0 Instrument Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

**1. What preparation should evaluators complete before using the C-ICE 2.0?**
Evaluators should:
- Watch the introductory video on the Creighton CIPER website:
(https://www.creighton.edu/healthsciences/interprofessional/resources).
- Complete the C-ICE 2.0 evaluator survey:
(https://blueq.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3e0ZdjfbUvYUVwO)
- Review the C-ICE 2.0 evaluation tool with all evaluators involved to clarify which items are applicable and what constitutes a 'met' or 'not met' behavior. Note key expected behaviors for team performance.
- Use the provided worksheet during the pre-activity discussion to guide expectations.

**2. Should evaluators assess team members as individuals or as a team?**
The C-ICE 2.0 is designed to evaluate the team as a whole. Individual comments may be documented in the comments section or provided separately to the team member.

**3. When should evaluators document their observations?**
Evaluators can choose to document observations in real time or take notes during the activity and transfer them to the C-ICE 2.0 tool afterward. Both approaches are acceptable.

**4. What if a patient is present during the activity?**
If a patient is present, evaluators should assess the team member's interaction with that patient as part of the overall evaluation.

**5. Are the goals being evaluated patient goals, team goals, or both?**
All goals—whether they are patient-specific or related to team dynamics—should be identified and evaluated.

**6. What should an evaluator do if no patient is present during the activity?**
If no patient is present, all patient-specific items on the tool should be marked as 'Not Applicable (N/A)'.

**7. What does 'avoiding profession-specific jargon' mean?**
When working with an interprofessional team, it is important to refrain from using discipline-specific jargon. If such terminology must be used, please provide clear explanations to avoid confusion.

**8. What should occur when conflict arises within the interprofessional team?**

Healthy conflict can be beneficial and should be addressed during the activity. However, if conflict is not managed or escalates inappropriately, the team should not be marked as competent in that domain. This may require further discussion during debriefing.

### 9. When should debriefing occur?
Debriefing can take place immediately after the activity or after completing the evaluation, at the discretion of the evaluator. It is an opportunity to review observations and address any gaps in the evaluation.

### 10. How is a final score calculated using the C-ICE 2.0 tool?
The final score is calculated by dividing the total number of points earned by the number of applicable items (excluding any items marked 'NA').
For example, if a team scores 17 points out of 19 applicable items, the score would be 17/19. Each institution may have different criteria for a passing score.

### 11. How can I understand the terms used in the C-ICE 2.0 (e.g., 'Team Science')?
The terms and definitions used in the C-ICE 2.0 align with those provided by the Interprofessional Education Collaborative (IPEC) Core Competencies for Interprofessional Collaborative Practice: Version 3. Please refer to Appendix C in the IPEC glossary (starting on page 31) for detailed definitions. ([IPEC Core Competencies for Interprofessional Collaborative Practice: Version 3](#)

### 12. What if different evaluators score the same team differently?
Some variation between evaluators is natural and expected. To promote consistency, evaluators should discuss and review the C-ICE 2.0 instrument and performance expectations before the activity begins. Shared understanding of the tool and definitions will improve alignment, even if minor differences in scoring occur.

### 13. Can I use the C-ICE 2.0 to evaluate individual team members' performance?
The C-ICE 2.0 is designed to assess the team's collective performance. It is not intended to formally evaluate individual members. However, evaluators may record individual observations in the comments section or provide separate feedback to support individual development.

### 14. How should I handle items that feel only partially met?
If an item is demonstrated inconsistently or only partially, use your professional judgment. Consider whether, overall, the team has sufficiently demonstrated the behavior to meet expectations. If there is uncertainty, document the partial achievement in the comments and score conservatively if the behavior was not fully met.

### 15. What if time constraints prevent observing all behaviors?

Evaluators should base their assessment on the behaviors observed during the scheduled activity time. If key behaviors are missed due to time constraints, mark them accordingly on the tool and use the comments section to provide context.

16. **How do we handle 'Not Applicable (N/A)' items when scoring?**
Items marked as 'NA' should be excluded from both the numerator and denominator during score calculation. Only items that were applicable and observed should be counted when determining the final score.

17. **How should I adapt the evaluation if students are at different educational levels (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate)?**
Focus on team behaviors appropriate to the collaborative activity. While communication styles or leadership approaches may vary based on the learners' stage, the core competencies—such as teamwork, respect, and shared decision-making—should be consistently expected across all levels.

18. **Should a team be evaluated based on a single comment or behavior?**
No. Teams should be evaluated based on their overall performance throughout the entire interprofessional activity. One-time comments or isolated behaviors—whether positive or negative—should not disproportionately influence the overall evaluation.

## Common Mistakes to Avoid When Using the C-ICE 2.0
**Overemphasizing isolated behaviors.**
Avoid allowing a single positive or negative comment to dominate the evaluation. Assess the team based on sustained behavior over the course of the activity.

**Ignoring quieter team members.**
Remember that contributions may be subtle. Active listening, supportive behavior, and quiet leadership are also important indicators of effective teamwork.

**Applying the instrument inconsistently.**
Ensure that all evaluators calibrate their expectations before the activity to maintain a shared understanding of the scoring criteria.

**Failing to document 'Not Applicable (N/A)' decisions.**
Always provide context in the comments section when marking items as 'NA' to maintain clarity in the evaluation.

**What if I have additional questions?**
For further inquiries, please contact Dr. Lindsay Iverson (liverson@creighton.edu)