

CMAS AGM: Monday 14th March 2005. St Anne's College, Oxford

Chair: Caroline Stewart

1. Approval last year's minutes

Proposed: Jill

Seconded: Tim

Vote from the floor:

In favour: all

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

2. Chairman's report

a). It was explained that all members of the committee have responsibility for particular posts. The names of the committee and the offices they currently hold were listed on a power point slide. The names of members of the committee about to stand down were noted. Jeremy, John and Nicky were thanked for their contributions to the society.

Zoe Robertson was welcomed to the committee. Penny Hewart and Linda Eve were welcomed back for a second term.

A final reminder was issued to anyone wishing to stand for election that they should come forward on that same day (14th March 2005).

b). Constitutional changes. These are to be sent out, to the membership, in full, by email. It was out-lined such that each office term is 2 years and committee membership is also 2 years. A plan has been proposed to increase the committee term but leave office term at 2 years. We currently also have a requirement for committee members not to have any commercial affiliations. We are aware that there are those who may have such affiliations and who have much to offer. Therefore a plan has been proposed which would require a declaration of commercial interest rather than making it a ban. Concerns/ comments were invited.

c). Main events of 2005

i). Standards Exercise. This was described as "tiring and exciting". There have been many people involved. It was noted that we are as far ahead with this exercise as any country in Europe.

ii). Web Site (Penny).

iii). Education and Training. This is a new area for the society. Martin Gough is to follow up on ideas for this.

iv). Philosophical aspects of society: We are still trying to establish our identity, our role in gait analysis, our representativeness of the gait analysis community, our communication with other professional bodies and how to establish links with e.g. ESMAC. The national reps' committee of ESMAC will give us an opportunity for national representation. Comments were invited.

3). Secretary's Report: Nil

4). Treasurer's report

Wendy Dickens was absent. The report was presented by Caroline Stewart.

Our current financial position was summarised as follows;

date	amount in bank account (pounds)
01.03.2004	1,379.14
01.03.2005	8293.96
Predicted after 2005 meeting	4734.52

It was proposed that the current balance should be used to fund working groups etc. Detailed information regarding expenditure can be sought from Wendy.

Acceptance of treasurer's report was

- i). Proposed: Marion
- ii). Seconded: Martin and
- iii). Universally carried by floor.

5). Standards Working Group Report

Presented by Linda Eve.

The need for standards was outlined as the need to develop and ensure "common language" and to break down any technical barriers to communication between the specialities represented within gait analysis.

The back ground to the standards working group was outlined. There was unanimous support for the need for standards at the 2004 meeting. Following this, during the summer of 2004, the possibility was explored of making CMAS's standards BSI compliant. The standards were piloted by gait labs from October to December 2004 enabling the work so far to be reviewed and developed. Feedback from this period is imminent. The plan for 2005 is for auditing and accreditation of labs.

With respect to the planned involvement of BSI it was explained at this would cost us 22 thousand pounds, and that it would take 12 – 18 months to produce a BSI publicly available specification. On top of this, it would cost more to make revisions to the document produced. At this time, this idea has been rejected by the committee.

Piloting the Standards

The standards laid out by the working group are a minimum requirement for a particular task, which are then to be interpreted locally to devise a process, by which that task may be completed, in the form of a protocol. The aims of this pilot study were defined as

- Testing the clarity of the standards
- Identifying any weak points
- Assessing the level of documentation produced with relation to audit

Once the piloting process is complete it will allow feedback to the standards group which can then review and develop the standards and use them for auditing and accreditation of the gait labs.

Thirteen labs took part in the pilot study. Thirty-three protocols were submitted and eight questionnaires completed. The main concerns expressed about the process were in relation to the risk to intellectual property and time costs. Eight labs completed the questionnaires regarding twenty-two standards protocols. These were concerned with;

Environment	2
Staffing	1
Administration	1
Clinical examination	4
Equipment	3
Data collection	3
Data processing	3
Normal data	2
Interpretation and reporting	3

The documentation produced was in the form of;

Lab protocol only	3
Protocol and supporting documentation	9
Documentation dealing with compliance	6
Audits	2
Lab protocol + audit	2

Most labs felt that producing the documentation had not greatly increased their workload with none finding that totally new documentation was required. Four labs reported no addition to their usual workload, twelve found that any additional work could be completed in half a day and six finding it took longer than that.

Most labs found that they complied to the greater part with the standards tested in this pilot (14/22), seven felt they complied fully and one lab felt they complied only partly with one particular standard. No lab reported that the standards being tested were irrelevant to their practice. In fact all 22 standards tested were considered totally relevant! Only four standards were felt difficult to interpret. It was felt that the standards set out for equipment and data processing may be too specific. In five of the seventeen cases, it was felt that insufficient information was provided to enable the labs to produce their protocols, however, it was the unanimous decision of those taking part that this was a worthwhile exercise. Seven of the eight participating labs felt that the standards provided a good facility for audit.

In terms of taking the process forward, the participating labs supported

Continuing existing process	3/8
Set up CMAS accreditation	4/8
Set up more formal accreditation	6/8
Pursue national organisation e.g. NHS, CSP, IPEM, BSI	4/8

Six of the eight labs thought that funding for accreditation should come from the applying lab, one thought commercial sponsorship may be useful and five thought the NHS should provide it as part of a national scheme.

Aside from concerns on cost the other perceived difficulties included the need to clarify standards and protocol definitions, the need to include exam results on the normal database, time and the need to decide how CMAS standards will relate to established systems.

A summary of the feedback from this pilot study is to be distributed to the membership after this meeting. If there are no objections by the end of April then this set of standards will stand. There have been good examples of good practice and we need to know how best to use this with due regard for intellectual property. We also need to understand how things will translate between different labs. Labs using good practice might issue paper copies on request to other labs.

More work needs to be done in relation to audit and accreditation. We need to decide how frequently audit will occur, whether it should be an internal or external process and who the auditors will be. To bring the process forward it was suggested we need volunteers for audit development. It was further suggested that we might need a couple of national meetings with workshops to guide us through audit process

In relation to accreditation we need to identify an accreditation body, determine the type of accreditation required and how it should be maintained. In the US, there is a separate accreditation body made up of surgeons and physios. It may be easier for us to adopt this model than asking an existing body to accredit us. We need to tailor accreditation to the actual work any given lab does, e.g. video/ vector analysis, full 3D gait analysis.

The discussion was then opened to the floor.

Interest in an audit workshop was elicited from the floor and there was a fair response in favour of such.

A discussion was conducted from the floor on the matter of CMAS's ability and responsibilities with respect to accreditation (of gait analysis facilities). This is a role to which the society would aspire but is probably not quite ready for yet.

Martin Gough contended that because of the multi-disciplinary nature of gait analysis, no particular group e.g. engineers or physios can accredit everything. Linda Eve suggested we should set up our own accreditation body. Martin proposed that this should be taken from a multi-disciplinary group. Adam Shortland questioned whether do we need particular legal status to accredit other bodies? Tim Theologis suggested that if we appoint ourselves as an accreditation body we cannot actually prevent any one from setting up a gait lab which does not conform to our standards. He suggested that this would be Dept Health business to do this. Penny Hewart asked whether it would be possible for us to apply pressure, by a cohesive

approach, to ensure standards. She further suggested that CMAS could be used as an instrument to “flag up problems”.

Caroline Stewart used the example of anaesthetic gas pipe lines. The manufacturers of these defined their own standards and published them. They were eventually adopted by the NHS as only suppliers accepted. We need to recognise external audits, of our own gait labs, by a process of certification.

Damien Bennett felt that most professional bodies will provide legal protection for individuals but not for a whole lab because of the multi-disciplinary nature of the work force. Therefore, it could be that CMAS is the only organisation which can accredit a lab. The NHS might eventually adopt CMAS standards.

Linda Eve explained that the end product of any of the working groups’ deliberations could be directed by BSI. However, this would be an expensive process. The concept was considered by the committee but rejected at this time. By setting our own standards at this time we would hope to pre-empt any advance by NICE but it was felt that we are not ready to approach NICE ourselves yet. It was suggested that we could apply to become an official accreditor to a given body. This idea has previously been discussed with BSI who feel that most accrediting bodies become so largely by reputation. The problem that we are too diverse a group to go to a single body was reiterated.

It was suggested that we could register CPD points etc with our own accreditation.

Tim Theologis: pointed that we cannot apply for CME points for either CMAS or ESMAC at the moment because their societies are not affiliated with professional bodies.

Adam Shortland proposed that we need to get professional bodies to recognise CMAS.

6). Teaching/ Training: Martin Gough

Martin posed the question “Should we bother with education?” He pointed out that in the U.S. gait analysis is getting more difficult except as a research tool. This is largely because there is no hard evidence that treatment guided by GA is better than that not.

Training: this would provide links between those already established in gait labs, provide the means to pass on knowledge to new comers, and increase the interest of those on the margins. There is the concern that clinicians may see gait analysis as a paper exercise and that administrators will be concerned only with the cost.

We have diverse collection of individuals. Each group should be able to identify what is important from their own area for the gait lab. We should identify where we are solid but also where we are practising that for which we have no evidence. We need evidence.

A recruitment call was made. If any one is interested in education they should contact Martin. As a group we need to know what we want to teach and to determine how best to teach it.

Adam Shortland spoke about national occupational standards which can be used to determine the standards required to perform a particular task. These can be very generic e.g. report writing.

James Robb mentioned the Scottish packages which are to be produced imminently for motion analysis education from Strathclyde, Queen Margaret and Dundee.

7). Communication: Penny Hewart

We were concerned with how the committee communicates with the membership. This could be via newsletter or short announcement emails (as is current practice).

The Web-site. Most delegates have accessed the It has been running for just over a year. It contains info re CMAS and re gait analysis. It explains what to expect if one goes for a gait analysis assessment. It includes information on meetings, links to other societies and contacts to the committee. There are notes re standards and education committees. We have agreed to advertise jobs on the site. This is free at present but we may charge for it in the future. The membership can place articles of interest on the site.

Marion Harrington: suggested, in respect of standards and accreditation that these could be added to the web site together with a list of “accredited” gait labs. This would not have any legal standing but would guide anyone looking for such.

Tim Theologis cautioned awareness in respect of the legality of any wording on the web site used in reference to individual labs. He suggested using wording such as “appraised” by CMAS rather than “accredited”.

Caroline Stewart (chair) asked would the membership like to

- Be more involved with discussions
- Respond to email questions

- Access web site regularly
- Write short reports for publication

Jill: suggested we should include a members' page.

Caroline asked would the membership prefer

1. email newsletter
2. web site email

Adam cautioned against trying to do everything but not doing it all well and advised that we need to avoid losing focus by over-expansion. Caroline agreed. We need to be careful not to swamp people and lose what is important.

Caroline promised we will try to get more information out soon regarding standards etc.

Penny undertook to update the web site soon. She suggested that the membership should check web site about once per month.

Caroline asked for comments about the AGM and meeting that might be useful for next year's organisers. We are aiming for Newcastle in March 2006 for the next meeting. It was suggested that an end of week meeting might be preferred to the Sunday/Monday format. Comments were requested.

Meeting closed.