PEACH: A VALIDATED TOOL TO ASSESS PHYSICAL THERAPISTS' PROFICIENCY IN ASSESSING "HIPS AT RISK" IN CHILDREN WITH CEREBRAL PALSY

Chan, Jessie P.¹; Cheng, JenFu^{2,7}; Scher, David³; Jezequel, Jennifer⁴; Assip, Bridget A.⁴; Armento, Michael^{2,7}; Shoval, Hannah^{2,7}; Selber, Paulo⁵; Murphy, Kathleen², Edobor-Osula, Folorunsho⁶

¹Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Piscataway, NJ, USA; ²Children's Specialized Hospital, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁴Hospital for Special Surgery, Pediatric Rehabilitation, New York, NY, USA; ⁵Columbia University Medical Center, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁵Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Newark, NJ, USA; ⁶Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Newark, NJ, USA; ⁸Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Newark, NJ, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Newark, NJ, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, NY, USA; ⁹Rutgers NY, USA; ⁹

Objectives

The purpose of this study is to develop a validated assessment tool, the Physiotherapist Educational Assessment of Cerebral Palsy Hips (PEACH), for evaluation of physical therapists' proficiency in assessing "hips at risk" in children with cerebral palsy.

Design

Develop Assessment

- Write preliminary assessment
- Identify expert panel of 3 orthopaedic surgeons, 3 physiatrists, and 3 PTs
 - Write protocol for validation using modified Delphi method

Validate Assessment

- 2 rounds of email evaluations of vignettes by voting "agree" or "disagree" with ≥80% consensus for inclusion 2 rounds of email evaluations of questions using Likert scale with ≥4 rating for inclusion
- Round table meeting for final round of voting on vignettes and questions with ≥80% consensus for inclusion Pilot test full assessment with 10 PTs at CSH
 - Pilot test final assessment with group of PTs at CP schools throughout NJ

Conclusions

This proposed PEACH tool evaluates clinically important topics for assessing "hips at risk" in children with CP. Educators can use the assessment to guide pediatric physical therapy curriculum development and establish consistent best practices. Future goals include developing an educational intervention for school-based pediatric physical therapists and using the PEACH tool to assess the effectiveness of the intervention in improving proficiency in assessing hips in children with CP and making appropriate and timely referrals.

Results START of ROUND 1: 2 demographic questions, 10 vignettes, 25 knowledge-based questions circulated to SMEs 1 demographic question was accepted without modification Additional demographic questions were developed Knowledge-based questions were restructured END of ROUND 1: 1 demographic question incorporated into final assessment tool START of ROUND 2: 7 demographic questions, 1 vignette, 16 knowledge-based questions circulated to SMEs 2 demographic and 1 knowledge-based questions were accepted without modification 1 demographic question, 2 knowledge-based questions, and 1 vignette were modified and accepted 4 demographic and 13 knowledge-based questions did not reach consensus END of ROUND 2: 3 demographic questions, 1 vignette, and 3 knowledge-based questions incorporated into final assessment tool START of ROUND 3: 4 demographic questions and 8 knowledge-based questions for discussion 4 demographic questions and 8 knowledge-based questions were modified and accepted 2 demographic questions were developed END of ROUND 3: 6 demographic and 8 knowledge-based questions incorporated into final assessment tool Final assessment tool: 10 demographic questions, 1 vignette, and 11 knowledge-based questions

