

# **CANWHEEL 2010 MEETING MINUTES**

**May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2010, UBC ICICS**

**June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010, ICORD**



## CanWheel Meeting Minutes

May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2010

### Discussion on Mission statement:

- Add reference to 'caregiver' to the statement
- After the statement include the 3 key areas/questions to be addressed:
  - How are power wheelchairs used
  - How can power wheelchairs be better
  - How can power wheelchairs be used better

### Discussion on Website:

- The website is currently at [www.canwheel.ca](http://www.canwheel.ca)
- A point was made to register the .com, .org domains to ensure someone who is searching for the CanWheel information will find it on the internet.
- A point was made to spend more resources on the 'public' side of the website ie. marketing and communications of CanWheel, and less on the 'private' side ie. document storage and sharing.
  - The point was that there are other and better ways to connect team members than through the website. Through the use of Abode connect for example.
- A webpage on calendar of events and submission deadlines would be helpful
  - **ACTION:** The projects leads need to make a final decision regarding CanWheel website and discuss it with Mike McAllister.

### Discussion on Intellectual Property

- All CanWheel team members will sign a non-disclosure agreement (NDA).
  - **ACTION:** Ian will work with the UILO to develop a data sharing agreement between UBC and UoT

### Discussion on Authorship

- There was disagreement with 'CanWheel' being identified as the last author on publications.
  - One issue was related to the fact that not all people are working on all the projects but yet will be given credit as an author on publications through their affiliation with 'CanWheel'.
  - Another issue was if CanWheel is identified as an author, how are individuals affiliated with CanWheel at that time recognized.
  - A point was made that in some areas, the person who contributed the most is typically identified as the last author. Having CanWheel as the last author would diminish an individual's contribution.
  - A comment was made that it would be a good idea to have CanWheel in the list of authors such that if a person simply searched for 'CanWheel' all the publications would result.

- A comment was made that having the team listed as an author has worked well in other projects as it has created a team identity and helped to promote the project.
- CanWheel identified in the acknowledgements was offered as a possible solution, but no final solution was agreed upon.
- It was encouraged to give trainees the opportunity to lead the development of publication resulting in first authorship, but it was agreed that overall, authorship will be determined by each individuals overall contribution, which could result in trainees as first author.

CanWheel Next Year's Meeting:

- Alex Mihailidis and Bill Miller will be the organizing members for the next year's CanWheel meeting in Toronto on June, 2011.

June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010

## CanWheel P2 and P5 Meeting Minutes

### Measures

#### Datalogger:

- There are issues with the need to take off a wheel and install the sensor. Only Quebec City, Montreal, and Halifax have wheelchair techs to do this. Francois says it is simple to take the wheel off and install and that any trained individual can do this.
- Seat sensors:
  - there are issues with these types of sensors not detecting pressure, especially with the rogo (?) cushions
  - the sensors are well adapted for wheelchairs in Montreal
  - seat sensors are important to have in the event that people are in/using their chairs, but not wheeling around.
- Joystick sensor:
  - There are issues with the need to temporarily replace the joystick with one that has a sensor
- Time to set up the data-logger
  - 1 – 1.5 hours
  - 2 – 3 hours to set up and take off the loggers
  - 2 RAs to conduct the assessments
- Important data to collect:
  - Gps (Ben)
  - Accelerometer (Ben)
  - Distance (Ben)
  - Bouts (Lee)
- If different data loggers are used to collect the same data, can the data be merged?
  - Francois noted that P4 is looking into this.
- Consider only have data loggers in QC and Montreal to start and then implement at other sites later on.
  
- Need to consider subject burden with all the measures being implemented
- Need to develop a hierarchy of measures to determine which measures are the most important to administer first.
  - Louise noted: ATOP/M, WheelCon, and LSA

#### ATOP/M

- Based on ICF; developed to assess outcomes of wheelchair interventions
- Computer adaptive testing available which improves the measure's efficiency and reduces subject burden.
  - If ATOP/M is administered on-line, is the data stored on-line for others to use? There are issues if the data is stored in on-line databases in the US

- Need to find out if ATOP/M can be accessed on-line without storing data in US databases.
  - Those who have used Survey Monkey noted that they got around this issue by using temporary storage and non-identifiers.

#### Life Space Assessment

- There is a computer algorithm to correct scores if the inputted scores do not make sense.
  - This will be used in CanWheel
  - Raw scores will also be used
- For CanWheel purposes, an item was added inquiring about wheelchair use in the subject's own environment.
- Need RAs with good geographic knowledge
- Subjects get credit for movement out of their town to the rehab center for their assessment/participation in the study.

The Caregiver Assistive Technology Outcome Measure, LLFDI, ISEL, HADS, WST and Wheelcon were also presented.

- A videotape with examples of how to administer all the measures would be helpful.

#### **P5 as an RCT**

- There was support from all site leads to conduct an RCT

#### **Merging of P2 and P5**

- there was clarification on how the merge would work:
  - recruited individuals will be randomized into either P2 or P5. Those randomized into P2 become the control group, and those in P5 will receive the intervention.
  - Follow-up will be after 6-mos.
  - Those in P2 may be offered the intervention after P2 ends (2 years), but this is questionable.
- There was discussion on ethics:
  - A question was: can randomization occur before recruiting? Answer, NO, have to tell subjects that there are two projects, and that they could be in a 6 month study with an intervention, or in a 2 year study without an intervention
  - Ethic committees may questions why the P2 study is for 2 years and without an intervention, and the P5 study is only for 6 months with an intervention. Need justification for 1 study to piggy-back off of the other.
  - Preparation of ethics will begin and submitted for a September 2010 start for P2.
    - P5 can start after P2
    - There may be issues with recruitment strategies and materials with a staggered start of the projects.

- There are plans to submit an RCT proposal to the CIHR open competition
  - If P2 and P5 merge, discussion is needed on the inclusion criteria (as at the moment if there is no merge P5 will submit an application with inclusion criteria for individuals <60 years).

## **CanWheel P1 and P3 Meeting Minutes**

**June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010**

The focus of the meeting was on the exchange of ideas, updates, and brainstorming for how to most effectively and usefully coordinate the two projects.

### Projects 1 & 3 Updates:

- P1 has received ethics approval. Laura, Alex K. and Krista are in the process of revising the interview schedules. Bitia is developing a recruiting poster for P1. The plan is to submit the changes to ethics in the next few days once all the documents are ready to go.
  - **ACTION:** Laura, Alex K. and Krista to meet on Wednesday, June 2<sup>nd</sup> to further refine the interview schedules (power wheelchair users, caregivers, and occupational therapists). They will also solicit input from Rosalie Wang about these schedules via email. Bitia to prepare the recruiting poster. Bitia to also prepare and submit the amendments.
- P1 members plan to start data collection over the summer and analyze the data as they go on to revise the interview script accordingly.
- Ideally, P1 would like to conduct multiple interviews (at 12 month intervals) over the next two years with the same individuals to see what types of new information we can get from the same people over time.
- MOT students' project (Wayne & Matt) served as a pilot for P1. Wayne and Matt are yet to interview two additional subjects each. Laura, Alex K., and Krista need to analyze these data once they receive them. Additionally, they will use the information to further refine the interview schedules.
- It was discussed whether we should consider recruiting adults with dementia to broaden the range of population of people who use PWC. The existing problem with this is adults with dementia may not be allowed to use PWC. Prescribing PWC seems to be a subjective issue among OTs.

- **ACTION:** Krista to ask OTs about PWC prescription among older adults with dementia. Depending on what information we glean from the first round of interviews we may also look at expanding our sample population to include individuals with mild cognitive impairments.
- P1 will not start focus groups until interviews are completed. Various ideas for the focus groups were discussed including exposing participants to the types of technology that exist. P3 can provide pictures or videos of the technology they have (e.g. collision avoidance, and indoor path planning). Garry has experience and people resources for assisting with the recruiting of subjects and conducting of the focus groups. There was some discussion about whether or not focus groups would even be necessary or if it would be more useful to simply do observational studies with key informants/participants.
- P3 has been working on anti-collision, vocal prompting, and path planning technology. One key problem at the moment is dealing with negative space.
- Ian suggested adding a few questions to the P1 interview script (e.g. would you like your PWC to be able to detect and warn you about the potential collisions?).
  - **ACTION:** Laura, Alex, and Krista to meet tomorrow to further refine the interview schedules and to build these questions into the existing schedules. Laura to ask Rosalie for her input regarding questions we could add to the interview script.
- P3 members suggested that “indoor path planning technology” might be useful for people with cognitive impairments.
  - **ACTION:** P1 members to ask OTs and caregivers whether this option is appropriate for adults with dementia as well as to ask power wheelchair users if they would like this feature.

Future Communications:

- **ACTION:** Laura to convene a teleconference in September 2010 for the P1 and P3 members to get together to discuss projects’ progress.
- **ACTION:** Laura to send P1 updates to everyone over the summer.