



ISWP Professional Standards Board (PSB) January 31, 2019 Meeting Recap

The ISWP Professional Standards Board (PSB) met by conference call on Thursday, January 31, 2019 from 10:30 a.m. to 11:35 a.m. U. S. Eastern Time. This provides a recap.

Link to Meeting Recording: <https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/pbde3keijjy/>

Next Meeting: Please select your preferred timing for the next meeting here:
<https://doodle.com/poll/piqx5866ai8a27yn>

Discussion: Action items are shown in bold/underline.

1. **Continuing Professional Development Form:** The form, which will be available under the Resources (include description) section of the WIN main page, incorporates changes the Board suggested in November 2018. Board members offered these suggestions:

Self-study section:

- a. Combine fields for date and duration of self-study into one field, labeled “period of self-study” or something similar. Also, consider indicating the format, e.g., day/month/year or year/month/day so it is input consistently.
- b. Separate “identify learning objectives” and “description of learning objectives” and move “describe how learning objectives were achieved” to the end.
- c. Describe learning objectives achieved – perhaps say using “key points.”
- d. Indicate if there is word limit for sections and consider limiting to facilitate review.

Mentorship section:

- a. Change “mentor details” to “type of mentor” since examples are tight. Include other details we are looking for.
- b. Change “please mention mentor’s experience...” to “describe details of mentor’s experience...” to be consistent with the self-study form.
- c. For the method of mentorship, include more examples, such as observational versus practical, hands on; with real client, mock client or no client.
- d. Put method before activities.
- e. Include a mentor drop-down list including “other” and field for a person to explain.

- f. Describe learning objectives achieved – perhaps say using “key points.”
- g. Be specific on what is requested in the Diagnosis section. It seems it would be important to know the full evaluation, including physical, environment, activities/occupations person wants to do in the wheelchair. Perhaps add a drop-down box under diagnosis to include these additional points.
- h. Indicate if there is word limit for sections and consider limiting to facilitate review.

Discussion: Perry Loh suggested we consider non-English speakers’ ability to find the section on the website, read and complete forms successfully. Krithika explained the section will be translated into Spanish after the credential launch and well before recertification occurs in 2020. Perry Loh cautioned about the translation since it is a big job that requires vigilance and consistent, simultaneous updates as English version is updated.

Paul Rushton offered to translate the information into French-Canadian.

- 2. **Seating Assessment Form:** The goal of the form is to verify that people understand how to assess different clients for ISWP to review and archive. Assessments could be uploaded as they are completed or all at one time. (Recertification requires the certificant to conduct 9 assessments during the two-year period and upload de-identified information.) Board offered these comments:

Patience Mutiti explained many service providers do not have reliable internet access so unlikely would not be able to upload assessment forms as they are completed; however, uploading all at once during the recertification process may make the certificant anxious. Also, certificants may find it onerous to complete this step on top of the work they are doing already since wheelchair service provision is not a full-time job for many people. It may become a barrier to recertification for some.

Paula and Rosie mentioned that whether the certificant uploads a seating assessment form versus completing the Google sheet will depend on the types of assessments and forms; some forms may be more complete and detailed than others. WHO offers a seating assessment form as part of the 8 steps, but many organizations adapt to their settings.

- 3. **Re-certification Criteria:** Board members identified these questions for consideration in developing re-certification criteria:
 - a. What happens if the review team finds that one of the nine assessment forms is not acceptable; does the person not meet the certification requirements? What is the threshold for passing?
 - b. Will any seating assessment form be accepted? What if a form/submission is missing key information, such as diagnosis? Krithika explained that ISWP staff will follow up with the certificant if information isn’t complete or doesn’t appear to be sufficient. Also, if ISWP has further questions, we would contact two PSB members to determine

if the entry qualifies for re-certification and, if not, recommend actions to correct.

- c. Is the goal to certify and recertify as many wheelchair service providers as possible? If so, we should offer basic forms and procedures. If we are looking to have high standards for recertification, are we OK if the recertification percentage is low initially, until individuals who apply for re-certification understand the requirements and process?
- d. A person will go through re-certification if he/she understands and appreciates the benefits/value it adds. In less-resourced settings, wheelchair service provision does not have a high profile; there is no additional marketable value to having the additional skills.
- e. Would it be helpful to talk with individuals who completed the certification pilot to obtain their thoughts on the re-certification process? Paula has students who are looking for summer projects and could assist with focus groups.

4. **Credential Launch Timeline:** Krithika reviewed the timeline (recap). Board members are asked to test the credential paywall being developed for accepting registration fees. Krithika will provide a dummy credit card number to be used, and the process for registering with payment by check does not require actually sending a check. **Krithika** to follow up with Board members who volunteered during the call: Rosie, Paula and Perry.

5. **PSB Tenure:** The topic of Professional Standards Board members’ tenure will be discussed during a future call.

Participants (check mark indicates participation on call)

	Robertangelo Ciccone, ICRC
✓	Susan Cwiertnia, VARILITE
✓	Rosemary Joan Gowran, University of Limerick
✓	Perry Loh, Loh Medical
✓	Patience Mutiti, Motivation
	Karen Reyes, WHO
✓	Paula Rushton, University of Montreal
	CJ Stanfill, Pencils of Promise
	Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh
✓	Krithika Kandavel, University of Pittsburgh
✓	Nancy Augustine, University of Pittsburgh