

Supplemental File 1

I-PASS Observation tool (available in paper and Smartphone versions) *

I-PASS Observation tool		yes	no
	<p>Illness Severity Stable, “watcher,” unstable</p>	Was illness severity conveyed in a concise, structured manner?	
	<p>Patient Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary statement • Events leading up to admission • Hospital course • Ongoing assessment • Plan 	<p>Were the patient’s history, reason for admission, active clinical problems, and general plan for the hospitalization conveyed in an orderly, clear, and concise fashion?</p> <p>Were there any major omissions of information, or misinformation conveyed</p>	
	<p>Action List</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To do list • Timeline and ownership 	Did the handover “giver” convey a set of action items to be completed, along with priorities, time frame, and other responsible parties (if any)?	
	<p>Situation Awareness and Contingency Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Big picture” of patient and care team • Plan for what might happen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the overall “big picture” of the patient and the care team presented? • Were specific potential problems presented, along with suggested management (e.g., what has worked, what hasn’t)? 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was code status discussed? 		
	<p>Synthesis by Receiver</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires active listening Receiver summarizes what was heard Asks questions Potential to re-synthesize the facts Restates key action/to do items 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the receiver of the handover give an accurate “read back” Did the receiver have any new perspectives or questions about the patient 		

General observations

- Was the handover in a relatively quiet, uninterrupted environment? Yes No
- Was the giver of the handover prepared to present the information efficiently, accurately, and in an organized fashion? Yes No
- Was there extraneous conversation, wasted time? Yes No
- Was the receiver actively engaged in listening? Yes No
- Did the handover contribute to a better understanding and management of the patient? Yes No

- Time for the handover _____min

***Questions adapted from I-PASS development team; Smartphone app developed using *Socrativ* by MasteryConnect, 222 South Main, Suite 200, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101**

Supplemental File 2
Kirkpatrick Levels 1 and 2 survey results, June 2014 intern training

	6/13/14 Dept of Medicine Interns (N = 50)		6/17/14 Dept of Surgery Interns (N = 35)	
EVALUATION QUESTIONS	AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE	
Kirkpatrick Level 1: Favorable trainee response to training?	No.	%	No.	%
Provided me with knowledge and skills relevant to my patient care activities	50	100	35	100
Was designed with an appropriate balance of didactic and interactive elements	40	80	34	97
Had an appropriate pace	39	78	30	86
Seemed to be the correct length to address the content	40	80	27	76
Kirkpatrick Level 2				
Acquisition of intended knowledge,				

skills and attitudes: Post training ability to...				
Describe the relationship of situation monitoring, situation awareness, and the development of a shared mental model	49	98	35	100
List the circumstances in which you would utilize briefs, huddles, and debriefs	41	82	34	97
Recite and describe the individual elements of the I-PASS mnemonic	47	94	33	93
Compare and contrast the differences of a verbal handoff and a written handoff document	46	92	33	93
Articulate the features of a high quality patient summary, such as the use of semantic qualifiers	39	78	34	97
Describe the importance of using contingency plans in verbal and written handoffs	50	100	35	100

Supplemental File 3

Department I-PASS Observation Report April 2016 (9 Observations)

Compiled Data:

I	P	A	S	S	Correct Sequence	Giver Prep/Organized	Receiver Engaged in Listen/Clarifying	Overall Quality	Comments
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Good	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	
Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Acceptable	
No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Acceptable	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Very Good	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Very Good	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Very Good	all the elements of IPASS were there, they just weren't in sequence.
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Very Good	

Percentage Totals:

I	P	A	S	S	Correct Sequence	Giver Prep/Organized	Receiver Engaged in Listen/Clarifying
89%	100%	100%	89%	56%	56%	100%	100%