

ISWP Integration Subcommittee

March 9, 2016 Meeting Recap

The ISWP Integration Subcommittee met by conference call on Wednesday, March 9, 2016 from 3:00pm to 4:00pm U. S. Eastern Time. This provides a recap.

Meeting Recording Link: <https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/p9qz7v2msa4/>

Next Meeting: **Wednesday, April 13, 2016 at (time to be confirmed once new chair confirmed)**

Action Items

1. Mary to follow up WHO lead about a place in DAR meeting.
2. Subcommittee members should email Lauren comments on the high-level meeting proposal by **Friday, March 18, 2016**. (Note: This has changed from Wednesday to Friday due to the delay in sending out the minutes).
3. Lauren is to revise the high-level meeting proposal and send to Tamsin who will review and submit to ISWP by **mid March**.
4. Subcommittee members should provide feedback on the follow-up integration survey by **Wednesday, March 23, 2016**
5. Lauren to then revise draft of follow-up integration survey.
6. Rachel to upload follow-up integration survey in Survey Monkey and include in The Hub newsletter.
7. Tamsin to send email asking for subcommittee chair nominations.

Discussion

1. New Members

We have two new members who joined the Integration Subcommittee. Thomas Leblanc is a prosthetics specialist who works for Handicap International. He supervises P&O trainings and wheelchair provision trainings at the basic and intermediate level. He is interested in further developing wheelchair services in less-resourced areas. Michelle is an occupational therapist who worked with UCPRUK in Indonesia last year. This year she is working in Brisbane, Australia. She is excited to integrate wheelchair training into universities' curriculums.



2. Feedback on High-Level Meeting Proposal

Tamsin updated there were some comments regarding the focus of the high-level meeting through email. Thomas agreed that the high-level meeting was a good idea.

Lauren stated for the high-level meeting, we need to clarify if the integration initiatives are aimed at undergraduate allied-health students or for the continuing education of practicing professionals, or both. During initial discussions, the focus was at the university level for undergraduate students; therefore, we needed to gain buy in from the universities and high-level individuals who determine the curriculum. Lauren asked the group if we should narrow the scope to only focus on undergraduates or should we also include professional development.

Nicky responded that if same groups were responsible for both, and at the meeting. we should consider focusing on both. Individuals engaged in professional development could act as mentors for new graduates. Undergraduate could focus on the basic level course, while post-graduate or professional development could focus on the intermediate level course. It would be beneficial to hear the perspectives of others at the high-level meeting. Lauren agreed.

Tamsin said she doesn't have a strong opinion for either position, however, the key of the high level meeting is to gain buy in by those that drive decisions in allied-health professions. Continuing education could be included, however, it depends on who is involved in the meeting.

Lauren said in Fiji, the basic training package was integrated in the undergraduate PT programs, however, graduates became aware and wanted to be involved in the trainings.. The focus at the high level meeting will be for undergraduates, however, we want to also discuss the legacy of allied health professionals in the field.

Mary said highlighting the hybrid course and making the materials more accessible would also help organizations give insight on whether the course could be taken for credit.

Tamsin asked about the status and purpose of the high-level meeting versus the DAR meeting.

Lauren responded the DAR meeting would be used to raise awareness and start a conversation about the high-level meeting, including who would be participating. The DAR meeting is not replacing the high-level meeting as we need quite a bit of time to prepare. Mary added, through discussions at DAR, someone more appropriate who handles the education initiatives of these organizations, would be appointed to attend the high-level meeting.

Mary stated there is a lead with WHO (referred by Chapal) who she contacted to get into the DAR meeting. It has been about 2 weeks, therefore, she will initiate contact again.

Lauren stated comments on the high-level meeting proposal should be emailed to her by Wednesday next week. She will submit to Tamsin for review, who will then submit to ISWP.

Nicky stated she believes we should have a CBR representative involved in the high-level meeting. Hopefully WHO or Chapal can recommend someone.

2. Review of Workplan and Follow-Up Survey

Holding to the subcommittee's workplan, which was agreed in September, Tamsin asked members if we should follow up with the 39 people who responded to the initial integration survey or wait until after the high-level meeting. These individuals expressed interest in integrating, but did not know how to do so. Our plan was to follow up using another survey, which is almost complete, to great greater level of information (eg on challenges to integration and what they would find useful in tools).

Nicky responded the subcommittee should move forward with the follow-up survey to not hold back progress. Also, it would provide good information for moving on to the next steps. Lauren agreed and added it would also allow us to connect with each of the regions as well as help develop a list of people to invite to the high-level meeting.

Lauren stated subcommittee members should provide comments on the follow-up integration survey in two weeks.

Tamsin proposed to put a number on how many schools commit, at least 2, and asked if we should revise the timeline to receive commitment.

Lauren said the survey won't go out to mid-March at the earliest, and we should give people a month to respond; therefore, June may be too early. Now, we should start developing relationships with universities and then work to integrate materials for the new cohort of students next semester.

Nancy commented we have received approval from JSI, who is administering the grant on behalf of USAID, for a no-cost extension until December 2016. ISWP will be developing a list of activities to propose another extension at no cost. We can add the integration activity to the list if this is something that can't complete by December. She added ISWP recognizes the importance of integration, therefore, we will revisit the timeline to ensure it aligns with what we want to accomplish. We do, however, need to remain conscience of deadlines.

Nicky asked if we should shift integration over until next year in order to develop tools that will support integrating the courses. Tamsin responded we may want to start developing tools before then. Lauren is concerned that the process will take time, so the first step would be to determine what resources are already at the universities. The subcommittee could do this while awaiting the high-level meeting.

Thomas asked if the survey could be available in other languages, French specifically. Mary responded that he try an automated translation option, and that ISWP would look into having someone translate the survey.

Lauren and Mary have the contacts of people we will follow up with regarding the second survey. Nicky suggested targeting people not included in initial survey

Mary agreed and suggested we can include the second survey in The Hub so that more people can participate.

3. Google Community

Olga, a contracting officer with JSI through USAID, is apart of the google community. She is monitoring subcommittee activities as an outsider.

The google community will be discussed further over email.

4. Subcommittee Membership and Chair

Lauren said she will be stepping down from chair of the Integration Subcommittee and the Training Working Group due to work commitments. She will continue until we finalize the high-level meeting proposal and the follow-up survey. Her CEO, Kylie, will take her place in the subcommittee. Tamsin thanked Lauren for her contribution to the group – it has been vital during the infancy of this key SC. We could not have moved this far without her. Tamsin will email the group and ask people to nominate themselves/others as chair if they are interested.

Suggested revised (top level) workplan:

Jan. – March	April – June	July – Sept.	Oct - Dec
Appoint chair to take up Lauren’s place and try and get additional members in SC			
Follow up with 39 individuals who responded to recent ISWP survey regarding their interest in integration (and others we target specifically).	Analyze results of follow up survey/undertake a couple of face to face interviews	Start to draft tools for integration	Continue to draft tools for integration
Share Google community group and increase membership and use	Engage with other projects/activities of integration ensure learning/sharing		
Revise and re-submit funding request for High Level Meeting	Attend DAR meeting for awareness raising Hold pre-discussion with senior representatives at ISPRM, ISPO, WCPT, WFOT and	High level meeting (could in Oct –Dec depending on timing of approval)	Receive commitments from a target number of schools to integrate WSTP into their programs.

	WHO to engage them and discuss integration opportunities		
--	--	--	--

Participants *(check mark indicates participation on call)*

✓	Lauren Flaherty, Motivation Australia
	Barbara Crane, Hartford University
	Marc Zlot, ICRC
✓	Catherine Sykes, WCPT
	Longini Mtaló, TATCOT
✓	Tamsin Langford, Motivation
	Paula Rushton, University of Montreal
✓	Nicky Seymour, Motivation
✓	Michelle Hollier, UCPRUK
✓	Thomas Leblanc, HI
✓	Nancy Augustine, University of Pittsburgh
✓	Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh
✓	Alex Miles, University of Pittsburgh
✓	Yohali Burrola, University of Pittsburgh

Prepared by: Alexandria Miles, Tamsin Langford and Lauren Flaherty