

Table S2. Teamwork Day Course and Exercise Evaluations Across the Years

| | Count / Missing | Mean ± (SD) | Median (IQR) | Signif. Change 2007 to 2008? | 2008 vs. 2007 (ref) | Signif. Change 2008 to 2009? | 2009 vs. 2008 (ref) | Signif. Change 2009 to 2010? | 2010 vs. 2009 (ref) | |
|---|-----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------|
| | | | | | OR (95% CI) P | OR (95% CI) P | OR (95% CI) P | OR (95% CI) P | OR (95% CI) P | |
| Overall Course Evaluation Questions | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The course developed skills and techniques required to effectively collaborate with other team members | 2007 | 103 / 0 | 6.0 ± (0.8) | 6.0 (2.0) | | 1.19 (0.74–1.91) 0.48 | 1.30 (0.82–2.05) 0.27 | | 1.04 (0.67–1.60) 0.87 | |
| | 2008 | 100 / 0 | 6.0 ± (1.0) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 110 / 1 | 6.2 ± (0.8) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | 6.1 ± (0.9) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| 2. Handouts and other distributed materials were valuable supplements to the course | 2007 | 103 / 0 | 5.4 ± (1.1) | 5.0 (1.0) | Revised syllabus and changed some readings | 1.09 (0.65–1.81) 0.75 | Major revision of syllabus and new readings 0.004 * | 2.11 (1.28–3.50) 0.53 | 0.85 (0.50–1.42) 0.53 | |
| | 2008 | 100 / 0 | 5.4 ± (1.1) | 5.5 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 111 / 0 | 5.8 ± (1.1) | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 100 / 1 | 5.8 ± (1.0) | 6.0 (1.2) | | | | | | |
| 3. The course resulted | 2007 | 103 / 0 | 5.6 ± (0.9) | 6.0 (1.0) | Improved | 1.69 | | 1.23 | | 0.81 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| in further development of my decision-making abilities | 2008 | 99 / 1 | 5.8 ± (1.0) | 6.0 (1.0) | several exercises | (1.07–2.67) 0.026 * | | (0.75–2.03) 0.41 | | (0.47–1.41) 0.46 |
| | 2009 | 111 / 0 | 5.9 ± (1.1) | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | 5.8 ± (1.1) | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| 4. Team facilitator was effective | 2007 | 101 / 2 | 6.6 ± (0.6) | 7.0 (1.0) | | 1.00 (0.58–1.71) 0.99 | Culled out facilitators with the lowest evaluations | 2.01 (1.09–3.71) 0.025 * | Several of the best facilitators from 2009 were unavailable in 2010 | 0.52 (0.28–0.97) 0.040 * |
| | 2008 | 99 / 1 | 6.4 ± (1.1) | 7.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 109 / 2 | 6.7 ± (0.7) | 7.0 (0.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 99 / 2 | 6.5 ± (0.9) | 7.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| 5. The facilitators and instructors provided useful feedback | 2007 | 103 / 0 | 6.4 ± (0.7) | 6.0 (1.0) | | 0.86 (0.52–1.41) 0.54 | Culled out facilitators with the lowest evaluations & added dedicated debriefers for all exercises | 1.97 (1.20–3.24) 0.008 * | | 0.76 (0.45–1.27) 0.29 |
| | 2008 | 100 / 0 | 6.2 ± (1.0) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 111 / 0 | 6.5 ± (0.7) | 7.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | 6.4 ± (0.9) | 7.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| 6. I gained more insight into my own strengths and weaknesses as a team member | 2007 | 103 / 0 | 5.8 ± (1.1) | 6.0 (2.0) | | 1.25 (0.69–2.25) 0.46 | | 1.21 (0.72–2.02) 0.47 | | 1.03 (0.61–1.74) 0.90 |
| | 2008 | 100 / 0 | 5.8 (1.1) | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 110 / 1 | 6.0 (1.1) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | 5.9 (1.2) | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------|-------------|-----------|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| 7. I learned to identify the essential behaviors which make a team effective | 2007 | 103 / 0 | 5.8 ± (0.9) | 6.0 (1.0) | | 0.97 (0.60– 1.57) 0.89 | | 1.43 (0.87– 2.34) 0.15 | | 1.16 (0.70 – 1.94) 0.56 |
| | 2008 | 100 / 0 | 5.7 ± (1.1) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 111 / 0 | 5.9 ± (1.0) | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | 6.0 ± (0.9) | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| 8. This course will help me to become a more effective team member of the health care team | 2007 | 101 / 2 | 5.9 ± (0.9) | 6.0 (2.0) | | 1.25 (0.77– 2.03) 0.37 | | 1.53 (0.94– 2.50) 0.09 | | 1.07 (0.63 – 1.84) 0.80 |
| | 2008 | 100 / 0 | 6.0 ± (1.0) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 111 / 0 | 6.2 ± (0.9) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | 6.2 ± (1.0) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |

Teamwork Day Exercise

3

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------|---------|-------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. Getting to know who? | 2007 | 100 / 3 | 5.3 ± (1.3) | 5.0 (1.0) | | 0.83 (0.52– 1.35) 0.46 | | 0.76 (0.47– 1.21) 0.24 | Replaced by Name Game and Get to Your Spot | |
| | 2008 | 97 / 3 | 5.2 ± (1.3) | 5.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 110 / 1 | 4.9 ± (1.5) | 5.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| 2. Name Game | 2010 | 101 / 0 | 5.2 ± (1.3) | 5.0 (1.0) | | Changed exercise order so this one always preceded | 1.72 (1.02– 2.89) 0.041 * | 0.76 (0.48– 1.20) 0.23 | | 0.76 (0.46 – 1.27) |
| 3. Get to Your Spot | 2010 | 100 / 1 | 4.1 ± (1.8) | 4.5 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| 4. Williams County Medical Center | 2007 | 100 / 3 | 5.2 ± (1.4) | 5.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2008 | 97 / 3 | 5.8 ± (1.1) | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 110 / 1 | 5.5 ± (1.4) | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |

3

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------|-----------------|-----------|--|---|---|--|--|----------------------------------|
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | $5.3 \pm (1.5)$ | 6.0 (2.0) | <i>Ward Rounds</i> | | | | | 0.29 |
| 5. <i>Mission to Burundi</i> | 2007 | 100 / 3 | $5.4 \pm (1.3)$ | 6.0 (1.0) | | 0.92 (0.56– 1.49) 0.72 | <i>Replaced by Pediatric Surgery Scramble</i> | | | |
| | 2008 | 97 / 3 | $5.3 \pm (1.1)$ | 5.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. <i>Pediatric Surgery Scramble</i> | 2009 | 110 / 1 | $5.8 \pm (1.2)$ | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | Reduced number of tasks required to be completed | 1.29 (0.73 – 2.28) 0.39 |
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | $5.8 \pm (1.4)$ | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| 7. <i>Ward Rounds at Jefferson County Medical Center</i> | 2007 | 100 / 3 | $6.5 \pm (0.8)$ | 7.0 (1.0) | | 1.05 (0.58 – 1.90) 0.88 | 0.75 (0.43 – 1.31) 0.31 | | | 1.04 (0.61 – 1.79) 0.88 |
| | 2008 | 97 / 3 | $6.5 \pm (0.9)$ | 7.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 110 / 1 | $6.4 \pm (0.9)$ | 7.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | $6.5 \pm (0.8)$ | 7.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| 8. <i>Crisis on Flight 1974</i> | 2007 | 99 / 4 | $5.1 \pm (1.6)$ | 5.0 (2.0) | <i>Cut team size from 10 to 5 & changed from mannequin to SP</i> | 3.92 (2.24 – 6.86) <0.001 * | 1.13 (0.69 – 1.85) 0.62 | | | 0.83 (0.50 – 1.38) 0.47 |
| | 2008 | 97 / 3 | $6.0 \pm (1.1)$ | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 109 / 2 | $6.0 \pm (1.3)$ | 6.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |

| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | 5.9 ± (1.2) | 6.0 (2.0) | passenger (see text for details) | | | | | |
|---------------------|------|---------|-------------|-----------|--|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Colour Blind</i> | 2007 | 100 / 3 | 6.0 (1.1) | 6.0 (1.0) | | 1.19 (0.72- 1.98) 0.50 | | 1.23 (0.71- 2.11) 0.46 | | 1.44 (0.85 - 2.44) 0.18 |
| | 2008 | 97 / 3 | 6.1 (1.0) | 6.0 (2.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2009 | 109 / 2 | 6.2 (1.1) | 7.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 101 / 0 | 6.4 (1.0) | 7.0 (1.0) | | | | | | |

5

Evaluation scores ranged from 1 (worst) to 7 (best).

Temporal comparisons of course evaluations. Two ordinal (proportional odds) logistic regression models were estimated, along with their robust standard errors, to characterize the association between scores and the course evaluations and between scores and exercises while adjusting for year and exercise order number. Linear combinations of estimates were calculated to summarize temporal differences.

* = P<0.05 indicating statistically significant difference for this comparison