

Educational Research Priorities for Pediatric Physical Therapy: A Consensus Study

Moerchen et al. (2020)

<https://doi.org/10.1097/PEP.0000000000000666>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

educational research for pediatric physical therapy

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

North America - USA

Why was it conducted at all?

Despite this growing commitment to educational research, one historic barrier to establishing valid evidence for best practices in pediatric physical therapy education has been the absence of educational research as a specific research priority in the APPT's research agenda. This omission limited the availability of funding to support and promote educational research.

What was the objective?

to engage internal and external stakeholders in a consensus exercise toward determining and refining priorities for educational research for pediatric physical therapy

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 4 research topics

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

Delphi

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: Delphi round 1: survey with 3 open-ended questions intended to initiate development of an educational research agenda for pediatric physical therapy by focusing on unanswered questions, gaps, and special considerations in pediatric physical therapy education. Step 2: data processing. Step 3: Delphi round 2: survey with 46 items along 8 categories, participants were asked to identify and provide comments with regard to clarity, redundancy, or fit for each of the categories and items. Step 4: Delphi round 3: participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement, also asked to indicate whether they felt each priority and consideration was (a) unique, specifically important, or nuanced to pediatric physical therapy education, (b) a concept that could be sufficiently captured in a broad educational research agenda for the profession, or (c) both. Step 5: Delphi round 4: participants were asked to rank those items that achieved consensus in round 3

Which stakeholders took part?

Physical therapists. Delphi round 1: 54 participants. Delphi round 2: 48 participants. Delphi round 3: 49 participants. Delphi round 4: 46 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Five stakeholder groups were identified to achieve comprehensive and diverse viewpoints. A purposive sampling technique was used to select relevant experts and to ensure equal representation among the stakeholder groups. Potential participants were identified through accessing publicly available resources including: rosters of key APPT leaders from the past 5 years; lists of editorial teams for Pediatric Physical Therapy and the Journal of Physical Therapy Education for the past 5 years; a directory of pediatric physical therapy residency directors; a list of educator authors who submitted proposals for the 2017-2018 special series on Pediatric Education in the Journal of Physical Therapy Education; lists of participants in the APPT's Education Summits I and II; the directory of physical therapists who are currently board-certified pediatric specialists and certified clinical instructors; and electronic searches of the physical therapy educational research literature. In total, 101 physical therapists were identified as potential participants representing the 5 stakeholder groups. In each of the 4 rounds, all participants, regardless of their participation in past rounds, received an e-mail.

Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?

Stakeholders were mere participants of the research prioritization process; they were not actively involved in the process.