



## ISWP Integration Subcommittee November 8, 2019 Meeting Recap

The ISWP Integration Subcommittee met by conference call on Wednesday, October 8, 2019 from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. U. S. Eastern Time. This provides a recap.

**Link to Meeting Recording:** <https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/ppa7sf65y431/>

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, December 11 at 7:30 am U.S. EST

### Discussion:

**1. Agenda Approval:** Agenda was approved.

**2. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:** October 9, 2019 minutes were approved.

**3. New Member:** Vanessa Wiesner-Luna is an OT and teaches at National School for Rehabilitation in Bogota, Colombia. She will be collaborating with Maria Toro is a project on how to include wheelchair education in Colombia.

**4. Educators' Package:** This meeting was focused only on the Educator's Package. The purpose of the meeting was to hear initial thoughts on what the package will look like and how we move forward with the development.

Paula introduced the package. The package is more of a how to integrate wheelchair content but it differs from the WHO WSTP as they are focused on the content whereas the educator's package is primarily focused on the "how to". The purpose of the educator's package is to guide the integration wheelchair service provision education into professional rehabilitation academic programs and regional training centers. The audience are the educators of regional training centers from high, medium and low income settings, those who have experience in wheelchair service provision and those who do not.

The core integration knowledge will look at and include the model of Integration and 5 states of integration of wheelchair content (advocacy, planning, course development, first-time implementation and improvement). It would be a web-based living package so we can modify as new information/evidence comes to light.

The model of integration came from the integration interview project where we looked at the barriers and facilitators and essentially what this model describes is that the wheelchair content is "context-dependent", and what's being currently provided in terms of education, what's



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



IMPLEMENTATION SCIENCE  
COLLABORATIVE



being planned based on the local population needs, wheelchair supply-chain and service delivery, the governance, and the barriers and facilitators, through these 3 primary aspects to the education that is being provided.

The initial thoughts on what would be provided in the package are

- A. Core knowledge
  - a. Current state of wheelchair education
  - b. Facilitators and barriers
  - c. Evidence-based Model of Integration
  - d. 5 states of integration
- B. Advocacy
- C. Planning
- D. Course Development
  - a. 8 steps of WHO Wheelchair Service Training Package
- E. First-time Implementation
- F. Improvement

She then presented on the facilitators and barriers of wheelchair education that came out of the Integration interview project, the slide presented on factors that were addressed by SMART and those that weren't addressed by SMART (SMART is the Seating and Mobility Academic Resource Toolkit, an online platform which is primarily used to share resources among educators.). For example, some of the factors for providing inadequate wheelchair service provision education is lack of awareness, limited expertise within universities or regional training centers, limited funding, limited local wheelchair service delivery, limited physical space, limited support, limited wheelchair education resource, limited wheelchairs and related equipment, missing wheelchairs in education standards and time constraints. Some of these barriers will be addressed in the educators package.

**Process and Timeline:**

The tentative project timeline is from June 2020-May 2021. Paula will be on sabbatical from June 2020 to May 2021 and this will be one of her primary activities during that time.

Stage	Step	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Planning	Create package development team	X ←			
	Package planning meeting	X			
Development	Package sections completed by working groups		X		
	Package review / refinement meeting			X	
	Package external review			X	
Pilot	Package pilot x 3				X →
Publication & Promotion	Finalize Package, launch website				X →

# Budget Components

HUMAN RESOURCES	
Administrative Support Person	0.2 FTE (1 day/wk.)
Stipends for Package development tasks	Examples: authoring sections, developing online modules
Package website development	Website development company
Final Package preparation	Examples: illustrations, photos, formatting, editing
TRAINEES	
MSc / PhD / Summer students	To do systematic reviews, package development, pilot
CONSUMABLES	
Materials & Supplies	Examples: Print-outs of materials for in-person trainings
Software	Examples: data analyses (SPSS), online module dev (Articulate)
Communication	Zoom, Dropbox
Promotional Materials	Examples: Hard copy materials, thumb drives, social media posts
IN-PERSON MEETINGS	
2 Meetings x 10 people	Flights, accommodations, meals, incidentals
PILOTS	
3 Pilots	WIN & Training Event Coordination, Trainers, Attendee costs
KNOWLEDGE TRANSLATION	
Publications, Presentations, Webinars	Open access fees, conference registration, travel, accommodation

## Discussion:

Lee suggested if possible to include only evidence-based process and content, and also have a plan for the content to be reviewed on a regular basis. Paula added that the integration process (how to teach, etc) and the educators package might also need a systematic review.

Barb is concerned about finding evidence-based content at the basic level to teach for the pre-professional students. She agrees performing a systematic review with expert's review is a good idea and wonders if it could be done ahead of the official start date. She asked if the goal is to look into the online materials that she has developed and also Paula's online modules to see what might be useful or if we are going to start from scratch? Paula responded that it's good to start with what we have especially since the online modules were developed with lots of efforts and they are evidence-based. She also added that it would be great to have the systematic review before the start date so that we're not delayed by the lengthy systematic review process. **Paula** to work on the topics and the plan (forming the group, if a student would be involved) for systematic review.

Mary added it would be helpful to provide a bibliography or a reference list for open comment with a 1-page perspective of what we are looking to do and send it to interested ISWP stakeholders so they are engaged from the beginning. We could request reviewers to add to

the drafted list so we are not starting from scratch. Barb added that we could also share that with RESNA SIG, APTA SIG on wheelchairs, AOTA SIG and broadly distribute to other groups. This might also be an opportunity for us to recruit members for the systematic review. Paula summarized that based on the reference list, we would develop systematic review topics and then widely distribute it to recruit members for the forming group. Lee added that the Wheelchair Skills Training is up-to-date online.

Paula asked if it's worthwhile to include the members from the ISWP evidence-based working group. Mary mentioned we can reach out to Padmaja Kankipati who is the chair for this group and hear her thoughts. Mary wondered if we can find a student who needs a scholarly paper before graduation, **Mary** to look for such students and let Paula know. We can also look for such students through Belmont, Plymouth State University, etc.

Maria asked if we are thinking of the content that should be taught and investigate the process to teach? Her question is related to the scope of the educator's package if we are thinking of the systematic review. Paula responded that her thoughts are of two parallel streams of systematic reviews, one would be wheelchair education content focused (for example, maybe doing an updated systematic review of the Wheelchair Skills Training), another would be reviews on the how to integrate wheelchair content into curricula, she suggests it's best to have at least one systematic review on the process (example, use of online modules, different practical evaluations). Mary added that the first step is to draft the questions. Paula summarized that its looking at the annotated bibliography, drafting questions and sending it out for feedback because for the most part what we will find in that bibliography is wheelchair content versus the how to teach.

Paula asked if ISWP will help WHO in updating the WSTP guidelines. Mary answered that if we wait to do both projects together then we might be delaying on this one.

Maria suggested if we can include follow-ups after May 2021 for the pilots and try to think so we can measure the impact. Maria asked if the pilot sites needs to be a place where the instructors are already trained to teach the content? Mary responded that we should think about inclusion criteria for the sites prior to training. Bogota, Colombia could be one cohort if the June 2020 instructors training happens. Paula added that we should also acknowledge that the package itself is not only applicable for those with expertise but also for those who don't have any. She thinks that in the packages, there could be tips/resources to get this training in order to use the package.

Maria asked if we could then pilot both scenarios, with expertise and those who don't have any. Paula's thought is to have different pilots at different stages for the wheelchair education content.

Mary mentioned of the instructor guide that is being developed for the additional online modules that ISWP recently developed, she wonders if a flowchart on recommendations of flow of activities with cautions and in-between steps at the beginning of this document could be

added. For example, ToT materials can just be downloaded and implemented without going through the basic packages. Piloting with people who have not been traditionally trained and the in-between steps is a good idea. Paula agreed that there should be subsequent pilots so we build in the learnings from the previous pilots. We will also need to look into the funding for piloting and the implementation.

Ilse mentioned that it would be good to have both on the pilot to compare, persons with no expertise on the subject could bring other perspectives and identification of key needs. Paula agrees with that.

**Package development team:** Mary suggested that the priority will depend if it's a funded activity or not, largely going to depend on the approval of the budget from the USAID. Barb said she will have to give some thought to it to come up with specifics. Small team with dedicated people will often work better, covering some kind of support for expenses will be useful. For her online modules development, she did compensate the clinical experts to get initial product done but there were some members who did not want to be compensated. It is easier to focus and find dedicated time if they are compensated. Paula agrees. Barb suggested to have a mixture of clinical experts and educators who are already teaching in university settings.

Paula asked if a package team and then a smaller team and perhaps members of those team would have different sections? Barb mentioned some of them depends on the scope and what the ultimate goal for the materials is. For her online development project, she had a small team and everyone worked on that one module. Barb sees both pros and cons for both approaches, sub-divisions vs one big team. Mary added that in the ToT development, the group of authors had specific sections for them to complete and a broader (global stakeholders) review was facilitated by a coordinating agency which was MSH in this case, but the initial content development was completed by individuals who were compensated.

The group agrees that the educator's package should be the goal of the Integration Subcommittee and so discussions will continue in the next meeting. Maria suggested to request the members who did not participate in today's meeting to provide feedback before the next meeting to keep the discussions going. Mary suggested to create a short survey to gather responses.

**Participants** (check mark indicates participation on call)

√	Paula Rushton, University of Montreal (Chair)
	Alia Alghwiri, University of Jordan
	Hasan Alkhaldeh, University of Jordan
	Gail Freidhoff-Bohman aka Cookie, AT-Retired
√	Ilse Caballeros, Free Wheelchair Mission
√	Barbara Crane, University of Plymouth
	Rosy Dorman, Motivation
	Karen Fung, University of Montreal
	Ritu Ghosh, Mobility India
	Michelle Hollier, UCPRUK
√	Lee Kirby, Dalhousie University
	Kylie Mines, Motivation Australia
	Thais Pousada, Universidad de la Coruña
	Uta Prehl, Humanity & Inclusion
	Teresa Plummer, Belmont University
	Hassan Sarak, University of Jordan
	Nicky Seymour, Motivation
√	Samantha Shann, WFOT
	Traci Swartz, Emory University
	Catherine Sykes
	Hanan, University of Jordan
	Jon Pearlman, University of Pittsburgh
√	Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh
√	Maria Toro Hernandez, University of Pittsburgh
√	Krithika Kandavel, University of Pittsburgh
	Yohali Burrola, University of Pittsburgh
	Alex Miles, University of Pittsburgh
	Megan D’Innocenzo, University of Pittsburgh
	Nancy Augustine, University of Pittsburgh

Prepared by: Krithika Kandavel

Reviewed by: Paula Rushton