

**ISWP Training Working Group  
July 15, 2015 Morning Meeting Recap**

The ISWP Training Working Group (WG) met by conference call on Wednesday, July 15, 2015 from 4:00 a.m. to 5:30a.m. (meeting option #1) and 11:45a.m. to 1:15p.m. (meeting option #2) U.S. Eastern Time. A participant's list follows. This provides a recap.

**Morning meeting recording link:** no recording link as meeting took place on skype

**Afternoon meeting recording link:** <https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/p6ak01gq6eg/>

**Next Meeting:** Conference call to be scheduled by Doodle poll.

**Action Items:**

1. **Lauren and Tamsin** to have follow up discussion regarding ISPO and selecting one integration SC member to sit on ISPO education committee
2. **Lauren and Catherine** discuss ideas for MOOC and other online learning approaches.
3. **Tamsin Langford** to submit Working Group funding proposal to cover travel and related expenses for in-person Training Working Group meeting on September 8, preceding AAATE Conference.
4. **Nancy Augustine** to send Training WG members instructions for downloading the Adobe Connect plug-in, which may facilitate better/faster access to Working Group meetings.

*Note: in meeting option #2 there was discussion about taking question of 'the need for Hybrid course' to wider training group members. Follow up discussions between SC co-chairs and TWG chair have agreed that this will be discussed in sub committee first and, if they recommend significant changes to remit of SC, this will be then be brought back to wider group for discussion and agreement*

**Meeting option #1/Morning Meeting Discussion:**

1. ***Minutes from previous meeting (3<sup>rd</sup> June 2015):*** no changes needed to minutes, group agreed them. No outstanding actions (after this meeting where SC updates given!).
2. ***Updates from sub-committees.***
  - a. ***Integration, presented by Lauren:*** Group have formed and met twice. Started discussions with desire to pilot integration of courses in 1-2 places, but realized that it would only move us forward in a select number of places and the group feels we need a longer term impact. They have identified the need to find out more of what is currently happening as first priority. Key first step will therefore be mapping exercise. After this the group will be able to identify tools that need to be developed (based on what is being used as well as development of new tools to fill gaps).

One of the key issues the group is grappling with is that they need to look at integration from a number of places (ie low and high resource settings) – which by nature are very different. Want tools to be useful in a range of settings. After tools developed they will pilot use in a number of institutions (which will need resources, ideally they will submit for this in funding round two). See draft workplan for more details of plans:



ISWP Integration SC  
work plan RevA.pdf

### Questions/comments

Q: Is there a priority for which tools need to be developed first? (Ritu)

A: Hopefully this will come out of survey (ie identification of what priorities should be based on gaps)

Q: Should we prioritise working with ISPO as they are open? (Ritu)

A: Agreed that we have a key opportunity now (with ISPO guidelines being reviewed) so do need to think about how to engage. Lauren and Tamsin to follow up regarding ISPO and selecting one SC member to sit on ISPO education committee

Q: What info can we share at this point? (Tchai)

A: Tools are not yet developed so need to wait. Some members have a lot of information in their heads, so can respond to individual enquiries. Integration SC is open to having enquiries referred to them and they can attempt to respond on case by case basis in interim.

The MOOC (massive open online courses) methodology was raised as a potential tool for upskilling people. It would be useful to review other electronic methods to help with integration. Survey/mapping exercise will help to identify these. (Catherine)

Discussion on integration needed with acknowledgement that the SC can't move at speed if want to do properly. Also, it is a massive task and we have to be realistic about what we can achieve.

- b. **Testing, presented by Celia** Group have formed and met twice (once some members met face to face in Washington during ToT stakeholders meeting. Celia gave comprehensive overview:



Testing\_subcommitte e\_2015\_07\_15.pptx    TestingSubcommittee MeetingRecap7-8-15\_

### Questions/comments

Q: Who will the assessors be? (Ritu)

A: SC recognize this as issue, but discussion still pending

Comment: few participants of training will have access to mentoring and some therefore may not want to sit the test or submit a case study. We need to ensure there is a clear added value in taking the test (Ritu).

Comment: the timeline is tight so ability to deliver was questioned (multiple members)

- c. **Hybrid course development, presented by Tchai:** Group have formed and met once this week – on 7<sup>th</sup> July (so not as far ahead as others). The group has some questions they feel need answering before they are ready to move forward with development of work plan.

Questions include:

- What is the need for this course? What gap is it meeting?
- What is the goal of the course?
- What is the role of WHO? How will this course link to other WTSPs



Hybrid SC Meeting  
#1 minutes July 7, 2016

3. **Proposed face to face meeting:** Tamsin shared update on plans for face to face meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> September in Budapest. Currently just over 57% of members (11 have said they can attend). We are waiting to hear from two others. Members agreed that was sufficient to make a face to face useful. We agreed that agenda would make sense for the meeting agenda to be planned around those that can attend, which would likely mean a focus on integration as majority of SC members being able to attend (while other groups have more limited representation).
4. **Funding applications:** SCs are not in position to request funds for this round and all will therefore be working to round two. Only submission for round one is the face-to-face meeting in Budapest. Tamsin to lead submission
5. **Update on ToT stakeholders meeting:** Tamsin shared overview of ToT stakeholders meeting held in Washington DC 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> July. Was very positive meeting and group now have shared vision for development of ToT. Key outcomes of meetings was WHO endorsement of training and core author group to be established to take forward.
6. **Upcoming/Recent Events:**  
**Upcoming**
- a. Xavier shared that there will be some HI training in Mali coming up. It will not be WSTP but will use some of the materials of WSTPb & I. Marc shared that ICRC are active in Mali, supporting the National Centre so great to include in this training
  - b. ICRC and Motivation will deliver ToT 10-12 in Ethiopia, followed by WSTPb
  - c. MI will deliver WSTPb from 25<sup>th</sup> July in INdia, which will include an extra day for participants to undertake basic test
  - d. Motivation will deliver a WSTPi in Tanzania in September and a Basic in Brazil in September. We are delivering Referral Network Training in India in July
  - e. WCPT congress July 1-4 2016 in Cape Town. Calls will open at the end of the year. Could be a really good opportunity to share integration tools
7. **AOB : meeting times:** Members were asked regarding timing for meetings and this group felt that this time (9am GMT was best for them). They felt that having two times (one early and one late)

was useful to enable full attendance at each meeting (rather than having to miss alternate meetings). We agreed to continue trailing this to see if it worked

**Meeting option #2/Afternoon Meeting Discussion:**

1. **Minutes from previous meeting (3<sup>rd</sup> June 2015):** no changes needed to minutes, group agreed them.
2. **Hybrid Course Subcommittee Update (from Lee, co-chair):** Subcommittee has been corresponding by e-mail and met by conference call on July 7. The Subcommittee's draft Terms of Reference is: Determine need for and design of Hybrid course. The group is developing a list of questions related to the project; examples (not a complete list):
  - a) Should the name "Hybrid Course Development" be changed to better reflect what the subcommittee would like to do?
  - b) If a Hybrid course is needed, who is the target audience? What would be the admission criteria be?
  - c) What are the course objectives and goals? (e.g. decrease cost, increase content, increase number of individuals trained)
  - d) What is the most appropriate curriculum?
  - e) Should the course be developed before the WSTP packages are evaluated for review in 2017? If so, information should be revised? What is missing from the current packages that should be included?
  - f) Who will offer the hybrid course if one is developed? In what languages should the course be offered?
  - g) Is there a way to integrate with objectives from other organizations working in the area? (For example, RESNA has assistive technology practitioner certification -- 1 ½ day course before each annual meeting.)
  - h) Will the ToT process be brought under the Training WG umbrella?

Next Hybrid Course SC meeting will be in early August, and the group hopes to have a face-to-face meeting in Budapest. There might be a need down the road to fund a pilot study of the hybrid course materials. Tamsin encouraged the group to not look at questions other groups will consider (ie testing and ToT). Also, if the group recommends widening the focus beyond Hybrid course development (ie question one raised) it would be important for the full Training Working Group to consider and agree on this, not just the SC.

Mary explained the hybrid course would be an alternative to – not a replacement for – current training programs. It would be less expensive to hold a 2-3 day in-person training than 5 days and could increase the number of trainings an organization can hold. Activities in the Hybrid course are a way to check knowledge and to demonstrate trainee is putting in time/effort. Activities give

trainees feedback as they move through the course. There also is an opportunity to provide activities which could be integrated into class curricula, which is cross-over with the Integration subcommittee.

Lee explained that the more money that is put into the Hybrid Course, the more reluctant people will be make changes as with the WHO package. He stated that since WHO has already put a package together, trainees should use and be tested on those materials.

Mary responded that ISWP is open to hybrid course feedback, as it is just a prototype, and would welcome a discussion involving the subcommittee and Working Group as to whether the project should proceed or take a different direction.

Additional Working Group members' comments:

Elsje Scheffler suggests using existing WSTP materials to prepare the Hybrid course as there is an immediate need to increase number of people trained. When WSTP packages are reviewed, ISWP would review the Hybrid course content simultaneously. Also, some portions of the Hybrid course could be self-study materials for university programs.

Eric Wunderlich suggests making the course available on DVD or Flash drive for those who are not able to access via internet. Arrangements would need to be made for the trainee to connect to an instructor for testing and other reasons. He sees benefits to the Hybrid course, such as training more people and ensuring people are better prepared for in-person training sessions. Considering that WSTP package revisions will not happen right away, he advises moving forward with the Hybrid course, with the subcommittee guiding the overall structure.

3. **Testing Subcommittee Update** (*Elsje Scheffler, chair*): (see presentation embedded above) Two meetings have taken place to date: In person on July 1-2 in Washington, DC and by phone on July 8.

In the last few meetings, the structure of the skills assessment was discussed and the group determined the following:

- a) A minimum of two case study submission: Considering using WSTP wheelchair service delivery form as template, with additional fields to complete, such as types of wheelchairs available. Most trainees should be comfortable with the forms. Photo submissions would be required. The individual evaluating the case study should be able to request additional information. Committee members will identify assessment points and scoring rubric during the next meeting.
- b) Submissions should be flexible due to accessibility; e.g., online, written, typed, via smartphone.
- c) Recommendation of 3 months after intermediate course for trainees to take the skills assessment, however, no decision has been reached. Should mentor approval be needed before someone engages in the assessment?

- d) Mentorship: There was an agreement that mentorship is needed, but this is not part of the committee's charge. However, mentorship but could be a part of training requirements and TOT recommendations. This could be offered by the trainer, the trainees' organization, or peers.
- e) Definition of where Intermediate level ends and Advanced begins should be determined.
- f) User privacy guidelines were also discussed and included a standard consent form, an option to digitally block out faces in photos, and the deletion of files once they have been submitted.

Lee mentioned assessing practical skills remotely may be a challenge; however, Elsje suggests that the focus would be on assessing whether the client had a successful outcome.

4. ***Integration Subcommittee Update*** (presented by Tamsin; as Lauren Flaherty, chair was absent due to time zone):

Group have formed and met twice. Started discussions with desire to pilot integration of courses in 1-2 places, but realized that it would only move us forward in a select number of places and the group feels we need a longer term impact. They have identified the need to find out more of what is currently happening as first priority. Key first step will therefore be mapping exercise. After this the group will be able to identify tools that need to be developed (based on what is being used as well as development of new tools to fill gaps).

One of the key issues the group is grappling with is that they need to look at integration from a number of places (ie low and high resource settings) – which by nature are very different. Want tools to be useful in a range of settings. After tools developed they will pilot use in a number of institutions (which will need resources, ideally they will submit for this in funding round two). See draft workplan embeded above for more details of plans:

ISPO's education subcommittee is reviewing its curriculum and is receptive to including wheelchair training elements into guidelines for review. It is a timely opportunity to integrate packages into P&O institutions and training. Further discussion is needed to determine who to sit on ISPO education subcommittee to help take this forward.

Regarding challenges of different contexts (less and more resource settings) Elsje suggested that what is achievable in a less-resourced setting should be the baseline in a resourced setting and that there should be room to contextualize the content.

Lee is concerned with how materials will be getting out to different settings and the involvement of ISWP in the review of WHO training packages. Tamsin suggests that the training working group be ahead of the review process and be prepared to give feedback to WHO. Mary indicated there are ongoing discussions with Chapal about this topic as well.

5. ***Working Group Funding Proposals*** (presented by Tamsin): ISWP has funding available to the working groups, which will be issued in two rounds. The first round will be decided by August 10, 2015 and the second round will be decided October 12, 2015. A funding proposal will be submitted for a Training Working Group meeting on September 8, 2015 preceding the AAATE conference in

Budapest. The Integration subcommittee will be well represented, so the meeting focus may be on Integration.

6. **ToT Meeting Recap** (presented by Mary): MSH hosted a very productive meeting on July 1-2, 2015 in Washington, DC. Attendees included trainers and those who lead strategic aspects of training. Meeting attendees broke into subgroups which addressed these topics: Pre-requirements of participating in ToT; content of TOT package; what co-training would include, and what an assessment would look like. A seven-member author group, along with ISWP, will develop the assessment form and criteria for master trainers. Members of the author group – who also are ISWP Training WG members – will serve as liaisons and keep everyone informed.

**Participants:** (check indicates participation)

AM	PM	
		Dave Calver, UCP Wheels, <i>U.S</i>
	✓	Barbara Crane, University of Hartford, <i>U.S.</i>
	✓	Eliana Ferretti, Federal University of Sao Paulo (UNIFESP), <i>Brazil</i>
✓		Lauren Flaherty, Motivation Australia, <i>Samoa</i>
✓		Ritu Ghosh, Mobility India, <i>India</i>
	✓	Lee Kirby, Dalhousie University, <i>Canada</i>
✓	✓	Tamsin Langford, Motivation UK, <b>Chair</b> , <i>United Kingdom</i>
		Mtalo Longini, TATCOT, <i>Tanzania</i>
		Abdullah Munish, Motivation Africa, <i>Africa</i>
	✓	Jamie Noon, Consultant, <i>U.S.</i>
	✓	Elsje Scheffler, DARE Consult, <i>South Africa</i>
		Samantha Shan, Northumbria University, <i>England</i>
✓		Catherine Sykes, World Confederation for Physical Therapy, <i>United Kingdom</i>
	✓	Eric Wunderlich, LDS, <i>U.S.</i>
✓		Tchai Xavier, Consultant, <i>Phillippines</i>
✓		Marc Zlot, ICRC, <i>Switzerland</i>
✓		Xavier Lemire, HI, <i>Mozambique</i>
		Judith van der Veen, CBM, <i>South Africa</i>
✓		Celia Stubbs, Motivation, <i>UK</i> (Competency testing co-chair and guest at this week's TWG meeting to report back)
	✓	Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh
		Jon Pearlman, University of Pittsburgh
	✓	Alexandria Miles, University of Pittsburgh
	✓	Nancy Augustine, University of Pittsburgh

**Annex 1 – Sub committee members**

**Hybrid Subcommittee members are:**

Dave Calver, UCP Wheels

Rob Mattingly, Consultant

Eliana Ferretti, UNIFESP  
Lee Kirby, Dalhousie University (co-chair)  
Xavier Lemire, Handicap International msin  
Yohali Burrola, Pitt

Eric Wunderlich, LDS Charities  
Tchai Xavier, Consultant (co-chair)  
Mary Goldberg, Pitt

**Competency Testing Subcommittee members are:**

Ritu Ghosh, Mobility India  
Elsje Scheffler, DARE Consult (chair)  
Jamie Noon, Consultant  
Rachel Gartz, Pitt

Celia Stubbs, Motivation UK  
Abdullah Andrea Munish, Motivation  
Mary Goldberg, Pitt

**Integration Subcommittee members are:**

Barbara Crane, University of Hartford  
Lauren Flaherty, Motivation Australia  
Longini Mtaló, TATCOT  
Nicky Seymour, Motivation Africa

Catherine Sykes, WCTP  
Samantha Shan, Northumbria  
University  
Rachel Gartz, Pitt

*Prepared by: Tamsin Langford, Nancy Augustine, Alexandria Miles*